Using relational leadership theory to magnify actors’ dynamic participation: 
The implementation of Corporate Social Responsibility practices in the Hospitality sector

Abstract

Purpose. In this paper, we propose the application of relational leadership theory for magnifying the dynamics involving the individual who participates in the implementation of Corporate Social Responsibility practices in the hospitality sector. Dominant theories in this field, fail to show what drivers affect such dynamics. The key preoccupation of those frameworks is the extent to which CSR can attract, motivate, and retain employees.

Design/methodology/approach. We use both qualitative and quantitative methods. Through a quantitative survey involving circa 1,300 hotels, and qualitative semi-structured interviews we seek to unpick what actors identify as sustainable practice driving motives, which in turn influence the implementation of corporate social responsibility initiatives. In this perspective, actors drift away from being mere receivers, or executors of sustainable practices, acquiring a more active role. We collect our qualitative data through semi-structured interviews in hotels in Italy, the UK and Pakistan, and run the quantitative survey across the same three countries.

Findings. Our quantitative data showed a significant positive correlation between economic incentive, and teamwork on corporate social responsibility practices. This aligned with the qualitative data that showed two main drivers - responsibility and convenience – displaying characteristics of collectivity and collaboration, which tie to the principles of relational leadership theory.

Research implications. We posit the relevance of relatedness at multiple levels to spot how corporate social responsibility initiatives can produce varying ‘hospitality work’ outcomes.

Originality. By focusing on actors and identifying the driving motives of sustainable initiatives, our paper suggests that leaderful practice stands at the core of corporate social responsibility implementation.
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1. Introduction

In our paper, we posit that relational leadership theory (RLT) can magnify the dynamics involving individuals who participate in, and influence the implementation of corporate social responsibility (CSR) practices in the hospitality sector. The specific gap in the literature we address is the lack of attention on the role of employees as critical enablers in the implementation of CSR policies. The novelty of our article is the focus on the social influence process that characterizes hospitality employees’ work, which offers a more holistic perspective of CSR implementation. The theoretical rationale that justifies the pursuit of our research is that extant studies conducted in the hospitality sector investigate the impact of CSR on non-shareholding stakeholders (Rhou and Singal, 2020) framing them as mere receivers of CSR practices, or as implementers. Those contributions take either a social exchange theory stance (Emerson, 1976) or a social identity theory one (Tajfel and Turner, 1979). Specifically, research on the Hospitality-CSR-employee ‘triangle’ spans from looking at CSR initiatives towards employees and its consequences on employment markets (Emerson, 1976), to using CSR for increasing employees’ affective commitment towards corporate culture (Wong and Gao, 2014). It also spans from discussing opportunities and barriers to attracting new hotel workers in the context of CSR (McGinley et al., 2017), to the positive financial impact of hospitality businesses investment on diversity in recruitment and selection (Singal, 2014). Finally, yet importantly, there are studies (Park et al., 2017) that look at how socially responsible human resource management practices (HRM) influence unsystematic risk in hospitality businesses. As much as employees have been central to non-shareholding stakeholders’ studies on CSR in hospitality, they have been framed as policy addressees or policy implementers. Such contributions offer little opportunity for capturing what a different focus on them can reveal about CSR practices. Considering they play an important part in the ‘unfolding’ of the hospitality experience for customers, communities, and other stakeholders (Rhou and Singal, 2020; Chou et al., 2021), the presence of such a gap is surprising. Unpicking the dynamics centred on the individual who participates in the implementation of CSR practices calls for a more agile theoretical approach than the ones literature has proposed so far.

From an empirical point of view, the originality of our work lies in the choice of adopting an interpretivist perspective for making sense of our qualitative and quantitative data. Our aim is neither that of testing hypothesis, nor establishing cause and effect relationships as it would otherwise be by adopting a positivist epistemology.
We set to address the question: what can a focus on employees reveal on the implementation of CSR practices in the hospitality sector if we look at it from a relational leadership theory perspective? We posit that the use of relational leadership theory (Uhl-Bien, 2006; Cunliffe and Eriksen, 2011; Raelin, 2014; Raelin, 2016) can amplify the social influence process that characterizes hospitality employees’ work and offer a more holistic perspective of CSR implementation. We draw on the notion of RLT to recognize those actors’ collective and concurrent action, which is not restricted to a prescribed role that formally reflects it hierarchically. The paper is structured as follows. Firstly, we justify the choice of the hospitality sector as our research context. Secondly, we illustrate extant studies that link HRM and CSR practices, which emphasize the centrality of organizational actors in these dynamics. We then look at relational leadership theory and the value of using this framework for addressing the limitations of extant literature on the role of employees’ implementation of CSR in the hospitality sector. Thirdly, we discuss our methodology, and we illustrate how we framed the pilot study. Fourthly, we use the data we collected showing actors’ accounts on the driving motives of sustainable practice, and then emphasize the links with relational leadership theory constitutional aspects. Finally, we discuss what this framework reveals about CSR practice and illustrate our contributions for research and practice.

2. Research context

Over the past two decades, the hospitality industry has experienced increased diversification and consistent growth to become one of the major industries across the world, considerably affecting the global economy (Tang and Tan, 2013, Ridderstaat et al., 2016). The development of this industry benefits both, local and regional communities (He et al. 2019). Many hospitality businesses have faced the increasing demands of the Corporate Responsibility Association calling for a more socially responsible and environmentally friendly approach. Driven by this trend, several practitioners and researchers have been focusing on how hospitality companies engage with socially responsible initiatives, and how these initiatives can enhance their economic outcomes and relationships with their stakeholders (Gürlek et al., 2017; Theodoulidis et al., 2017; Su and Swanson, 2019; Youn et al., 2018). Schoemaker et al. (2006) suggest organisations operate in a significantly complex context and can no longer merely focus on profit to succeed. Rather, they must demonstrate their attention to social responsibility. CSR is seen as a social obligation for sustainable economic and social development, aspects that also serve to magnify companies’
business ethics approaches (Aguilera-Caracuel et al., 2015; Pätäri et al., 2014; Wang et al., 2018). Rhou and Singal (2020) note how the hospitality sector raised a lot of interest in CSR research. This is because the sector lends itself to significant consumption of energy and water and, therefore, to the implementation of initiatives that can reduce such waste. Additionally, from an employment perspective, some hospitality companies might often come to the forefront of critique due to the low wages policies juxtaposed to the high-end luxury establishments (Rhou and Singal, 2020).

3. Employees’ ‘collocation’ in research that links Corporate Social Responsibility and Human Resource Management in the hospitality sector

In this section of the paper, we look at how employees have been framed in studies that bring together Human Resource Management literature and Corporate Social Responsibility literature. Despite our awareness that HRM and CSR constitute two separate literature corpora, our aim is not that of analysing those two streams per se, as this would digress from the overarching aim of our study that we illustrated in the introduction. Rather, we focus on those overlaps to unpick the way employees have been ‘placed’, collocated, in that specific literature space to put emphasis on the gap that we identified and aim to address: the dynamics involving the individual who participates in the application of CSR practices in the hospitality sector from a Relational Leadership Theory perspective. It is with these lens that we aim to shed light on what has not been looked at so far. Conscious that Relational Leadership Theory has never been considered in studies involving CSR in hospitality, we set the scene by considering extant research that leads to introducing the idea of using the former for revealing new insights in the field.

CSR as a concept has been debated, with its benefits and pitfalls, since the 1960s (Walton, 1964; Davis, 1967; Eilbirt and Parket, 1973; Jones, 1980; Mintzberg, 1983; Epstein, 1987; Carroll, 1999; Smith, 2003; Aguinis and Glavas, 2012; Latapi Agudelo et al., 2019). Although there still is not a definition that meets scholars’ consensus, CSR can be broadly identified as a social contract between business and society (Carroll, 2015) one that simultaneously encompasses business ethics and stakeholder management; corporate citizenship and sustainability (Carroll, 2015).

In our paper, we direct our attention to the literature that looked at the benefits of CSR initiatives, particularly the ones tied to employees. Scholars that investigated the benefits of CSR initiatives (Wong and Gao, 2014) argue that the advantages springing from them relate to both companies and actors. This is because CSR can interest strategic aspects (e.g. external stakeholders tend to
think more favourably of companies that implement CSR initiatives) as well as employee-related ones (Du et al., 2010). Thus, companies are encouraged to establish such practices. Figueiredo, Monteiro and Mónico (2016) observed how the more employee valuing practices are applied the greater the occurrence of processes facilitating and promoting an internal cultural orientation to knowledge. Organisational cultural change draws on intellectual capital; the latter needs to be configured as a transversal resource to shape commitment to sustainable change (Alvino et al., 2021). Singh et al. (2020) suggest that firms should invest in green HRM practices to strategically lead human potential towards firms’ environmental management activities.

Several researchers (Guetat et. al., 2015; Akmese et al., 2016) set to explore how CSR initiatives affect the hospitality sector. What makes hospitality interesting from this perspective, is the need for businesses to strike a balance between attracting people to areas in proximity of natural and cultural resources, and protecting those same areas and resources from tourists’ ‘footprint’ (Gürlek et al., 2017). Additionally, from the perspective of managing employees, those working in the hospitality sector might easily face issues tied to challenging working conditions such as, seasonal work, long-hours, low pay, and poor work/life balance (Wong and Ko, 2009). Ghaderi et al. (2019) argue that the face value generated in the hospitality sector often overshadows its social, professional, and environmental costs making CSR initiatives particularly relevant for establishing a fair balance (Ettinger et al., 2018; Suárez-Cebador et al., 2018; Ahn and Kwon, 2020; Choi and Choi, 2021; Guzzo et al., 2022; Sun et al., 2022).

The implications of the presence (or absence) and nature of CSR initiatives on actors’ work in the hospitality sector raise the question of how individuals deal with it. This is especially interesting to explore in light of the Human Resource Management policies and practices setting the standards actors must abide to in order to operate in their specific roles. The development, management, and retention of individuals at work unfolds through a set of functions that span across the organization and involve all people, and a set of activities orchestrated so to influence people’s effectiveness; such functions and activities fall under the overarching label of HRM (Inyang et al., 2011). HRM practices have been looked at from a variety of perspectives and levels of analysis (Boxall et al., 2007). Regarding the links between HRM and CSR, some scholars suggest that the former should be a front-runner in the initiation and implementation of CSR programmes (Kwan and Tuuk, 2012; Gond et al., 2011) which can lead to greater support from organisations’ top management (Gond et al., 2011). Employees’ involvement in CSR initiatives and the impact those have on their behaviour and attitudes has led to increased study interest into the integration of HRM and CSR
practices. Specifically, researchers (Ehnert et al., 2014; Asrar-Ul-Haq et al., 2017) have been looking into employee focused CSR in connection with the ethics-driven aspects of HRM. The latter are framed to support employees’ understanding and actions towards reaching the environmental and social goals of the organization (Shen et al., 2018), generating value with the implementation of CSR principles (Fenwick and Bierema, 2008), and mitigating issues affecting internal cohesion. Sharma et al. (2015) suggest that HRM is crucial in facilitating the understanding of the role of CSR initiatives and how to implement CSR practices. Gond et al. (2011) as well as Kwan and Tuuk (2012) underline how HRM plays a vital role in the development of an organization-wide CSR culture. Lam and Khare (2010) argue that HR policies deeply affect the implementation of CSR initiatives, and Fenwick and Bierema (2008) stress how they also improve CSR initiatives significance in enhancing overarching organizational performances, and achieving environmental and social goals. The emphasis of CSR training programmes in recruitment supports HR attracting and engaging top employees; it can also increase awareness among existing employees, reducing cynicism, and increasing commitment towards socially responsible behaviours (Sharma et al., 2015; Renwick et al., 2013).

The ethical and social dimension of CSR are reflected in the way employees carry out their roles in their work setting, and those roles are affected by HRM policies (Kwan and Tuuk, 2012; Gond et al., 2011). The HR guidelines for managing aspects such as, training and development, health and safety, diversity and inclusion, equal opportunities, intellectual capital, and ethical standards influence the way employees operate in their workplace. Equally, their interpretation of CSR policies affects the way initiatives of this type are implemented (Fuentes-Garcia et al., 2008; Bonn and Fisher, 2011; Sarvaiya et al., 2018). Research linking HRM and CSR (Michailides and Lipsett, 2013; Bonn and Fisher, 2011) emphasized issues of hierarchy, values, attitudes, beliefs, and decision-making. In most cases, CSR initiatives have been interpreted as a management’s prerogative, rather than an opportunity for employees to participate in its definition, development, and implementation (Low and Ong, 2015). Researchers (Voegtlin and Greenwood, 2016; Jamali et al., 2015; El Akremi et al., 2018; Stahl et al., 2020) note that it would be important to shed light on how HR policies allow the implementation of CSR in organisations, and on what role employees play in this dynamic.

Some scholars (Michailides and Lipsett, 2012; El Akremi et al., 2018) stress the importance of employees’ involvement in the creation and effective implementation of CSR initiatives for successful employees’ empowerment, buy-in, individual/organisational values overlap, and low
turnover. From 1990, research on CSR shifted from taking a shareholder perspective, to a stakeholder one, all the way to a non-shareholding stakeholder stance (Rhou and Singal, 2020) where attention focuses on community, customers, and employees. Regarding the latter, Gallardo-Vázquez and Sánchez Hernández (2014) and Sharma et al. (2015) specifically emphasise that CSR initiatives inspire staff satisfaction, enhance communication, stakeholder engagement, respect for ethical standards, social involvement, and sustainable performance. Having said so, Vuontisjärvi (2006) and Jackson et al. (2014) observe that, when it comes to CSR training programmes, there is little involvement of HRM officers, which then reflects on their lack of motivation either to include CSR in their own training programmes, or to incorporate aspects of it in HR initiatives addressed to employees. This is a challenge to the effective integration of CSR. Scuotto et al. (2022) stress the role leadership has in facilitating a knowledge sharing environment, one in which effective integration can occur. An empowering leadership paired with team reflexivity can lead to employee innovative behaviours (Wang et al., 2021).

Employees’ successful implementation of CSR initiatives can also be challenged by Fenwick and Bierema, 2008: (1) a resource consuming set of CSR initiatives (e.g. supporting the initiative might cost too much time to the individual); (2) the presence of inconsistency in supporting the initiative across the hierarchical levels (e.g. top management’s low interest in effectively facilitating its implementation); and (3) employees’ difficulty in understanding the purpose of the CSR initiatives.

By looking at the links between HRM and CSR initiatives, the above studies show employees’ centrality in the successful implementation of CSR. One could argue that actors become the liaising point where HRM and CSR meet. However, how this central role unfolds as part of actors’ lived experience in the workplace, what it implies, or how it influences CSR practices is still largely overshadowed. We argue the need for a novel perspective, one that can shed light on the dynamic side of individuals’ part in the implementation of CSR practices. To do so we need to overcome categorizations that portray them as mere addressees, or executors of CSR. Extant studies (Wong and Gao, 2014; Singal, 2014; Li et al., 2016; McGinley et al., 2017) only consider employees passively, as affected by initiatives linked to fair wages, just employment, diversity and inclusion. In this respect, the key preoccupation of those studies is the extent to which CSR can attract, motivate, and retain actors (Rhou and Singal, 2020). We set ourselves apart from this perspective by exploring what happens when framing employees as active and influential in the achievement of CSR goals and what we can learn about CSR practice by taking this different
stance. Any scholarly interest in understanding the CSR flow that drives sustainable performance cannot ignore the possibility of a wider view, open to a more holistic understanding of it.

4. Corporate Social Responsibility and Relational Leadership Theory

We formulated our research question in terms of ‘what can a focus on employees reveal on the implementation of CSR practices in the hospitality sector if we look at it from a relational leadership theory perspective?’ For addressing it, we draw on relational leadership theory (Uhl-Bien, 2006; Cunliffe and Eriksen, 2011; Raelin, 2011; 2014; 2016) which allows us to look at the social influence process constructing emergent coordination and change (Uhl-Bien, 2006). In this approach, the term relational does not refer to “interpersonal or intrapersonal processes between already known actors but to the relating of written and spoken language, as well as [...] non-verbal actions, things, and events” (Uhl-Bien, 2006, p. 662). The relational perspective assumes that social reality is an interdependent or co-dependent construction existing and known only in relations. Its approach to process is constructionist, such as it assumes that individuals and contexts are interrelated constructions made in ongoing local-cultural-historical processes. Its take on methodology assumes the primacy of relationships (Uhl-Bien, 2006) so leadership is “constituted in communicative actions and collective meaning making in interdependent contexts” (Jian, 2021, p. 933). From this angle, leadership looks at the “relational processes and joint practices, which could be material, embodied, and discursive, among social actors to construct and transform social order” (Jian, 2021, p. 933). Using RLT can unpick dynamics that remained largely underdeveloped in previous CSR research because it looks at the interactive process engaged in by all participants (Uhl-Bien, 2006). Such approach challenges the overreliance on fixed roles whereby employees are on the receiving end of HR and CSR guidelines they must then use to implement what they are told to. Rather, it looks at how they acknowledge guidelines’ constraints and opportunities, contextualize them, and socialize them. Their roles can constantly shift from recipients to initiators and from facilitators to challengers capturing the nature of their influence over the achievement of organizational CSR goals. In this framework, individuals can coordinate action as well as change the status quo. Their leadership occurs in relational dynamics throughout the organisation where they operate (Uhl-Bien, 2006), and is not limited by hierarchical positions. Employees become shapers of the dynamics by which CSR initiatives are produced and enabled, allowing us to see the responsibilities that lie with the collective rather than the single individual. Drawing on RLT, two sets of aspects are important for effectively influencing CSR initiatives: (1) being and relating
with others; and (2) displaying a sense of moral responsibility (Cunliffe and Eriksen, 2011). Adopting an RTL perspective allows us to consider the leaderful practice (Raelin, 2011; 2014) of CSR initiatives. Leaderful practice is expressed with collectiveness, collaboration, and compassion (in the sense of valuing everyone’s efforts) and sees actors as relationally responsive practitioners (Cunliffe and Eriksen, 2011), rather than receivers or blind executors. Leaderful practice looks for leadership in its activity, specifically in the ‘where’, ‘how’, and ‘why’ leadership work is being organised and accomplished (Raelin, 2011). Through shared engagement, leaderful practice enables relations and the co-creation of an inclusive community. Its key concern is about what people can accomplish together.

5. Methodology

The underpinning epistemology of our study is interpretivism, which emphasises the way individuals make sense of their subjective realities, and the way context influences the construction of meaning drawing from their lived experience (Bryman, 2021). We draw on an inductive approach for connecting data to theory, which means that the theoretical framework is not predefined but derives directly from the data (Bryman, 2021). Although we collected both quantitative and qualitative data, our aim is not that of testing hypothesis or establishing cause and effect relationships. Neither is that of generalizing the results of our study to a wider setting. We look at our data with the aim of understanding the context in which it develops. Specifically, our priority is that of showing the centrality of the hospitality sector context and the knowledge that can be gathered by looking at individuals in relation to it. We frame our study in a case study design to understand and evaluate actors’ beliefs, opinions, and attitudes. Within this design, we conduct the quantitative and the qualitative data collection. Below, we explain both and the rationale for our choice.

Quantitative data collection.

With the quantitative data collection, we aimed to understand the behaviour, attitude, and characteristics of the population (Creswell, 2003) and analysed the correlation between HRM and CSR in the hotel industry. To us it represented a way of mapping our context of interest. We used a variety of methods in the analysis, such as validity tests, reliability tests, correlations, regression analyses, which we ran on SPSS v. 20 in line with Hayes PROCESS (Hayes and Rockwood, 2017). PROCESS macro was introduced by Hayes (2013) and immediately became
crucial in many research fields including management, business, and marketing (Hayes and Rockwood, 2017). PROCESS is “a computational tool — a “macro” — available for SPSS and SAS that simplifies the implementation of mediation, moderation, and conditional process analysis with observed (e.g., ‘manifest’) variables” (Hayes and Rockwood, 2017, p. 77).

In terms of study population, we used three star, four star, and five star hotels, in three different countries, namely Italy, the UK, and Pakistan. The choice of the three Countries, is twofold: they represent different realities of economic development and CSR practice, and we had direct access to the three research contexts. We articulate the latter point in more detail in the next section. In Italy, there were a total of 33,200 hotels among which 24,200 fell into our selected categories. In the UK, there were 45,000 hotels of which 12,089 fell into the three-, four-, and five-star categories. In Pakistan, there were 15,000 hotels of which 475 hotels fell into our selected categories. We developed a database of three stars, four stars, and five stars hotels separately for each country and excluded the ones which did not match this requirement. After using a sampling technique that allowed us a 95% confidence interval, a 1% margin of error, and a 10% number of hotels fitting the requirements, the sample of hotels we considered was 3,037 for Italy, 2,684 for the UK, and 475 for Pakistan. We approached 6,196 respondents in total.

To collect the quantitative data, we used a structured survey questionnaire. We designed it in both English and Italian using Google Forms. We then sent it to the mailing list of randomly selected hotels from each of the three countries. We used the self-developed questionnaire to create an original tool suitable for the specific study objectives. The number of completed questionnaires we received was 1,312 of which 438 from the UK, 520 from Italy, and 354 from Pakistan. The total respondents’ rate reflects the following percentage split by country: 33% from the UK, 40% from Italy, and 27% from Pakistan.

A pilot study was conducted to establish the reliability and validity across all countries. LoBiondo-Wood and Haber (2010) explain reliability as the consistency, repeatability, quality, and accuracy of measuring instrument in the study. Antonakis and House (2013) refer to reliability as the truthfulness and relevancy of the research questions to measure a variable. The results show that HRM ($\alpha = 0.892$) and CSR ($\alpha = 0.891$) have a strong reliability compared to the given threshold value of 0.60. Additionally, the confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) shows the discriminant and convergent validities as values of each item is greater than 0.30. The purpose of analysing validity and reliability in the pilot study was to know whether different perceptions regarding HRM and CSR prevailed in the three culturally distinct countries. We performed the pilot study before the
actual data collection to confirm the validity of this questionnaire based on 23 questions investigating 23-items. In particular: CSR practices were analysed from 09-items that included economic, social, and environmental dimensions and HRM practices were analysed from 14-items that consist of employee rights, incentives, teamwork, trainings, safety, selection process, wellbeing, ethical culture, engagement, shared objectives and results and transparency. All items were measured on 07-items scale where 1 = strongly disagree and 7 = strongly agree.

Sample respondents were managers and employees from the three-star, four-star, and five-star hotels of Pakistan, UK, and Italy. We extracted the list of Pakistani hotels from “Pakistan Hotels Association” and “Sustainable Tourism Foundation Pakistan”, the list of UK hotels from the “Visit Britain” and the list of Italian hotels from “Open data” platforms of the Italian Regions.

After six weeks from the launch of the survey (from June 2020 to July 2020), we received 354 completed questionnaires from Pakistan, 438 completed questionnaires from the UK and 520 completed questionnaires from Italy. Hence, 1,312 questionnaires were received from all countries corresponding to a 21.2 percent response rate. For analysing the quantitative data, we used Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) Version 20.

Table 2 shows the characteristics of the hotels that were part of the survey from all three countries. The table indicates that 33% from the UK, 40% of hotels are from Italy, and 27% from Pakistan. In the hotel category, only 7% have a five-star category, 38% have 4-stars and 55% of hotels have 3 star category. 51% of hotels have 21-50 rooms whereas only 6% of hotels have 100+ rooms. 37% hotels are operational between 11-20 years, while 52% of hotels have a number of employees ranging from 02-49.

In terms of demographic characteristics, we chose to present them here in the text, as background information, rather than in our tables. To this end, 65% of respondents were male and 35% were female in total. 50% of respondents had ages between 36 years – 45 years; 24% were between 26-35 years, and 22% were between 46-60 years’ age bracket. A total of 21% respondents were Chief Executive Officers, 56% working on managerial rank, and 4% were on the hotels. As far as current position experience is concerned, 41% of respondents work on the same position from 4-6 years while 42% were working between 7-9 years on the current designation. Moreover, 35% of respondents had 4-6 years in the current hotel in which they are working while 48% had the experience of 7-9 years in the said hotel. For clarity, we would like to expand on our R-squared
value. In some research fields, R-squared values are expected to be low (Field, 2017). For instance, any field that endeavours to predict human behaviour, usually has R-squared values lower than 50%. Moreover, if the R-squared value is low but the researcher has statistically significant predictors, a researcher can still draw valuable conclusions about how changes in predictor values are associated with changes in the response value. According to Field (2017, p. 88) one “should be careful about labelling effect sizes as small, medium, or large - it depends entirely on the research field and the phenomenon” being studied. “In education research, for instance, the effects are generally small”. However, Cohen (1992) suggests that “R-squared values of 0.02, 0.13, 0.26” are associated to “small, medium, and large, respectively. Before going more into depth with analysis one can refer to Cohen’s values” (Field, 2017, p. 88). We would argue that regardless of the R-squared, the significant coefficients still represent the mean change in the response for one unit of change in the predictor, while holding other predictors in the model constant.

Qualitative data collection.
With the qualitative data collection, we aimed at looking into the shifting, emergent reality (Bell and Bryman, 2007) constructed by those who operate in the hospitality sector. We looked at the driver motives inspiring their action in the achievement of CSR goals. Our collection consisted of 09 semi-structured interviews with employees from five-star luxury hotels in Pakistan (4), the UK (4) and Italy (1). Our sampling was based on non-probability methods. We used a mix of convenience and snowball sampling prompted by the difficulty in accessing the type of accommodation facilities we selected at the start of our research. We started with convenience sampling which allowed us to contact individuals operating in hotel HR departments and have quick access to the context. From there, we then expanded our sample base by adopting snowball sampling. We kept faith to 5-star types of hospitality businesses because of a twofold reason. First, five-star hotels have full operational HRM functions, explicit strategies, formal CSR practices, budget for CSR activities, and tend to foster sustainable performance. Therefore, they might apparently be in a position of advantage than other types of hotels. Second, drawing on Rhou and Singal (2020) these hotels can leave a significant footprint on energy and water consumption: having to deal with the controversy this raises among the public and the communities they affect makes those businesses interesting to research. The choice of the three countries, namely Pakistan, the UK and Italy is tied to accessibility. Specifically, the authors’ team was formed of three members who had access to the hospitality sector in the UK, Italy, and Pakistan Although the
amount of data collected does not lend itself to a comparative study, the fact that we collected it in three different cultures offers hints to learn if there are any country-related differences based on values, attitudes, and beliefs. Access to data was also affected by the unforeseen pandemic circumstances, which limited the number of interviews we could arrange in Italy. The latter had been scheduled to occur during what then became the peak of lockdown in Italy, a time of high uncertainty on all fronts, and of reluctance to engage in any activity other than those related to the survival of the business employees worked in. We decided to include that one interview in light of Collier and Mahoney’s (1996) reflections on small scale studies and related bias in qualitative research. From our interpretivist stance we do not aim to draw generalising conclusions on the Italian context; rather, we aim to capture participants’ behaviour and how that is grounded in their temporality. Including the interview conducted in Italy helped us gain a sense of the differences between cases (Collier and Mahoney, 1996).

The qualitative data collection method was the semi-structured interview (Bell and Bryman, 2007). We conducted interviews between January and March 2020, face-to-face, in English for the duration of one hour, at interviewees’ work premises. The same author conducted interviews in England, in Pakistan and in Italy. Participants were asked a total of 29 questions. Based on the interview guide, participants were initially asked ice-breaking questions tied to their roles and employment in the organization, then shifted to more salient aspects involving the HR and CSR policies and initiatives, their perspectives, involvement and concerns (Bryman, 2021). Prompts were asked to understand participants’ own interpretation of the aspects they mentioned in their accounts. With participants’ permission, all interviews were recorded and fully transcribed. Hotel names were concealed as well as participants’ names who instead were given codes (e.g., P1, P2, P3) to facilitate the analysis conducted by the authors. Based on the table below, Hotel A was founded in 1970 and it has 144 rooms at one location in Pakistan. Hotel B is one of the prime hotels in UK that was originally established in 1899 and has 300 rooms. Hotel C is part of a hotel chain (founded in 1970) that operates in almost 100 countries. It has 170 rooms at one location in Italy. In the hotels participants worked in departments of HR, CSR, Operations, and Project Management. The table below offers an overview of participants’ gender, age and designation in their respective organization.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hotel</th>
<th>Founded Year</th>
<th>Rooms</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hotel A</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel B</td>
<td>1899</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel C</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>Italy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Insert Table 2 here
We used thematic analysis to make sense of the data (Braun and Clarke, 2012). This type of analysis allowed us to identify recurrent patterns across participants’ accounts, organise them, and highlight key themes across the data set. The approach to coding was driven by inductivism. We made sense of data in three stages. First, we familiarized with the data and generated initial codes that reflected participants’ language. We provided labels for data extract that could have been relevant to our research question. Second, we generated themes based on the codes we had created in the first stage. We re-looked at the data and the codes and focused on those parts that were capturing important aspects linked to our research question. Finally, we reviewed the themes checking if they actually revealed something important about our research problem, what they encompassed, if they overlapped with other themes, if there were enough data to ground each theme. From a validity point of view, we challenged the strength, truthfulness, and accuracy of our data collection and analysis iteratively. We systematically checked our mutual understanding and interpretation of the accounts against our research objective, the literature, and the key methodology contributions that guided our analysis. As qualitative researchers, we acknowledged the risk of influencing, and being influenced by participants, and by the research process. The fact that we are in a team of three with slightly different approaches helped challenge our individual and collective role, perspective, and any bias emerging from that, systematically.

6. Results

Quantitative analysis of results
The quantitative data we collected to map the context of our research revealed the correlations between HRM practices and CSR. Results were coherent. Table 3 explores the abovementioned correlations and shows that HRM strongly correlates with CSR.

Insert Table 3 here

Table 4 shows the correlational relationships of different HRM aspects including wellbeing, training, engagement, ethical culture, safety, human rights, incentives, recruitment process, transparency, teamwork, shared objectives and results. The table shows that HRM aspects are significantly correlated with CSR in three countries. The HRM aspects: incentives ($r = 0.500, p = 0.001$), recruitment process ($r = 0.404, p = 0.001$), teamwork ($r = 0.390, p = 0.001$) and ethical culture ($r = 0.319, p = 0.001$) have higher correlation with CSR in the sample from Pakistan. The HRM aspects: incentives ($r = 0.525, p = 0.001$), recruitment process ($r = 0.445, p = 0.001$), ethical
culture (r = 0.388, p = 0.001) and teamwork (r = 0.373, p = 0.001) have higher correlation with CSR in the sample from the UK. The HRM aspects: incentives (r = 0.474, p = 0.001), teamwork (r = 0.411, p = 0.001), ethical culture (r = 0.382, p = 0.001) and wellbeing (r = 0.378, p = 0.001) have higher correlation with CSR in the sample from Italy.

Table 5 shows the correlation and regression coefficients to examine the impact of HRM on CSR in the hospitality industry in three culturally different countries. The result shows the positive and significant correlation of HRM and CSR (r = 0.625, p = 0.001) for the overall sample. When regression analysis was performed, the results showed that HRM explains 30% variance significant F-Model statistics (F = 284.523, p = 0.001). These results highlight that HRM has significant and positive impact on CSR (beta = 0.201, t = 4.741, p = 0.001) for the overall sample.

For the sample in Pakistan, the correlation between HRM and CSR is also positive and significant (r = 0.47, p = 0.001) whereas the summary of regression analysis displays that HRM explains 31% variance significant F-Model statistics (F = 97.662, p = 0.001). These results highlight that HRM has a positive impact on CSR (beta = 0.22, t = 2.824, p = 0.001) but the significant level is at 0.07 (90% confidence interval) for the above sample.

In the case of the UK sample, the results show that CSR has a significant and positive relationship with HRM (r = 0.50, p = 0.001) while the regression results show that that HRM explains 31% variance significant F-Model statistics (F = 97.662, p = 0.001). These results highlight that HRM has a positive and significant impact on CSR (beta = 0.32, t = 3.578, p = 0.001) for the UK sample.

Lastly, the correlation of HRM with CSR is also significant and positive in the Italian sample (r = 0.48, p = 0.001). With respect to the regression results, the latter show that that HRM explains 29% variance significant F-Model statistics (F = 104.006, p = 0.001). These results highlight that HRM has a positive and significant impact on CSR (beta = 0.190, t = 2.974, p = 0.001) for the Italian sample.

An interesting outcome we picked up in our findings are the scores for economic incentive and teamwork. These scores were very close in all the three countries. These findings well connect with what we observed in the qualitative data, which we illustrate in the next section.
Qualitative analysis of results

In the qualitative data analysis, by looking at the environmental, social, economic, and institutional aspects raised by our interviewees, we identified two underpinning driving motives influencing actors’ interpretation of CSR practices: responsibility and convenience (see Figure 1).

Insert Figure 1 here

Responsibility

The responsibility driver emerges from the way participants talk about CSR practices. It shows their ‘stake’ in the sustainability ‘venture’, their chance and way to participate in it (Raelin, 2014). Interviewees understand CSR as a means to preserve social and environmental resources in the long term. Here are some examples: “CSR means using fewer resources so that we can reduce food waste” (P6). “We are very conscious of our carbon footprint, so we are reducing the number of deliveries and orders in our hotel” (P8). “We are focusing on eliminating single use plastic glasses…mmh, looking to eradicate single use items” (P7).

These first few quotes draw our attention on intersubjectivity. Cunliffe and Eriksen (2011) suggest that speaking and acting in relation to others, collectively, shapes social realities in a way that recognizes one’s responsibility of interacting in ethical ways. The single individual is not foundational in the expression of social responsibility practices. This amplifies the role of otherness and the being ‘in relation to others’. Such considerations also apply when there are concerns for what participants think is not being done properly by their hotels:

- We should take greater care of water and energy consumption to be a greener and more sustainable business. It’s about avoiding the environmentally harmful material and saving resources (P2).
- We follow sustainable practices in terms of saving electricity and water but waste is not managed... We just mix rubbish together and it all goes to the landfill! (P1).

The two quotes above also recall participants’ ownership of distributed knowledge (e.g. what is to avoid, what is to do in terms of sustainability). The fact that knowledge is not a top management prerogative any longer (Raelin, 2014) but any actor can have access to its domain increases the centrality of individuals. It offers scope for them to run their immediate tasks as well as to know how those connect to the rest of the organisation and wider context. This links employees with one another, more than it ever occurred in the past (Raelin, 2014). Enhancing the relationship with others in the implementation of CSR initiatives emerges from participants’ accounts about training.
It addresses one of the challenges identified by Fenwick and Bierema (2008) about the difficulties of understanding the purpose of CSR. Training is the arena where individuals’ engagement and confidence can develop. In participants’ words: “We provide training courses that give people the confidence to deal with guests. People feel valued” (P2). Also:

Training helps communicate sustainability commitment to employees, stakeholders and a wider audience. It is an effective way to make an impact on reputation, CSR culture, and individuals’ involvement with sustainability. It influences the construction of relational capital (P9).

It is worth noticing how the responsibility thread keeps emerging (e.g., communicating the sustainability commitment) and the hint to the value of relationships (e.g., relational capital). The latter was also spotted in other accounts on employees’ wellbeing. In fact, while illustrating the importance of it, interviewees mention ‘people’s participation’ and ‘relationship improvement’. In terms of wellbeing, on the one side, it is an aim of CSR initiatives (e.g., those targeted at improving employees’ working conditions); on the other, it is a crucial element for granting the effective implementation of sustainable practices. Following are some examples:

CSR practices here enhance employees’ wellbeing by satisfying spiritual, psychological and physical needs. That is the reason why we are happy and don’t want to leave the job (P3).

CSR initiatives are important for people’s physical and psychological wellbeing. Those activities are always beneficial for those working in hotels. Talking about CSR implementation cannot happen without people’s buy-in, confidence and peace of mind (P4).

Enhancing people, encouraging them, gratifying them and equipping them with the tools for improving their work improves relationships with each other. Taking care of those relationships and the embedded knowledge sharing is very important not just for the company but for people too (P9).

We would argue that the relational aspect in terms of both buying people in and allowing them to interact with each other recalls Raelin’s (2016) notion of social interaction as a mobilizer of collective action. Such type of effort expands from the people within the organisation to the immediate community, which also has an active role in the implementation of CSR initiatives. According to interviewees, the community needs to understand the value of sustainable practices, and contribute to make hotels efforts worthwhile. Here is an example:
Sustainable practices are a two-way thing, performing sustainable activities is everyone’s responsibility. Being sustainable and giving back is not one person’s job it’s everyone’s job in the community (P7).

While on the one hand the community is seen as important in complementing sustainable practice, on the other, participants illustrate the investment that goes into it. This recalls the notions of attunement and response (Cunliffe and Eriksen, 2011) to the context. Investing in the community with CSR initiatives can be seen, again, as way of ‘being in relation to others’ (Cunliffe and Eriksen, 2011). Some quotes illustrating this aspect are reported as follows. “Our hotel is engaged in community development initiatives” (P1) and “Giving back to the community is also one of our responsibilities” (P7). Additionally,

In Pakistan, a big part of our population is uneducated and unable to fulfil their social and environmental responsibilities. Therefore, we are providing free education and training programmes for a lot of them. This training and education can help them promote a sustainable attitude towards society (P4).

If someone is relying on us with his or her life, we are responsible for their safety. We are providing our services and help to the needy (P6).

We would argue that the responsibility driver emerging from the way participants talk about CSR initiatives shows aspects of collectiveness and collaboration, all elements that recall the notion of leaderful practice (Raelin, 2014). These aspects can be gathered in the way interviewees portray CSR, training, and interactions with the immediate community. There is a sense of ongoing, shared commitment in the way sustainable initiatives are framed which leads us closer to the notion that actors’ implementation of such practices is much more to them than a set of favourable working conditions, or guidelines execution.

Convenience: advantage and economic incentive

Participants illustrate the utilitarian side of sustainable practices. They articulate the drive that comes from obtaining something in return, that reciprocates sustainable practice efforts, but equally the implications of not obtaining anything. In some cases, returns affecting CSR practice benefit the hotel. In other cases, those returns benefit individuals. Examples of the former are reported here, in participants’ words:

Implementing socially responsible initiatives has a financial cost and it’s obvious that shareholders don’t want to bear it. In some cases, they transfer this cost to customers. All shareholders always think about their own benefit. They don’t think
of benefitting the employee. I know it's employees’ obligation to perform well for keeping profitability high. But all top management and the owners think of is to keep their pockets full, not to benefit employees (P4).

The type of convenience portrayed above suggests that unless the owners see a way of earning from CSR, its implementation can be compromised. This recalls Fenwick and Bierema’s (2008) challenge on the inconsistencies in supporting CSR initiatives across hierarchical levels. Even in cases where there are resources available to support sustainable initiatives, there can still be a general sense of financial loss, as the quote below shows:

*It’s always challenging to adopt CSR practices in our hotel because the main aim of the organisation is to gain financial benefits. When we do socially responsible activities, it has a cost that the organisation does not want to bear so they transfer it to customers in the form of hidden charges. We work in a big hotel, so we have many resources for implementing CSR. CSR is necessary for the environment and for people... but some think that it causes financial loss... CSR actually generates revenue (P2).*

The above quote juxtaposes the convenience driver (e.g., the cost the organisation does not want to bear) with the responsibility one (e.g., CSR is necessary for the environment and for people) drawing attention on the endogenous tensions affecting the context of CSR. In terms of the convenience driver, the way it is framed leads us to think of its structuring role in the unfolding of CSR practice. Relational dynamics of convenience (e.g., involving owners, employees) construct the context for action (Uhl-bien, 2006). The nuances of sustainable practice implementation will depend on the benefits deriving from them, which shape the arena where action occurs. This notion of convenience is expressed also at the level of government support. According to some participants, explicit Government policies supporting the implementation of sustainable practices influence the extent to which hotels find it beneficial to pursue CSR initiatives: ‘we are happy that our government policies and strategies always support us to be involved in sustainable practices’ (P6). Also:

*We’re doing a lot of work for sustainability in our hotel, and this is because of government support...we have been engaged in CSR for some time now and we feel that people know our hotel because of that... it is a marketing tool (P5).*

Examples of returns benefitting individuals are reported below:

*You know... a hotel can enhance its performance and reputation by implementing financial and non-financial reward practices, for example, merit-based pay and incentive compensation (P7).*
The hotel provides economic incentives in the form of bonuses and monetary gifts. Our hotel also helps employees when they are facing bad times... whenever we need some support. Everyone knows this and that’s why we feel good and motivated. It is obvious that if the employees are motivated, they perform better (P3).

Incentive and rewards seem to be tied to increasing and maintaining employees’ performance high so to benefit the overall results.

Economic and social rewards are necessary both for people and for the hotel. It is important to motivate people to perform better but this also gives a sense of purpose... it makes you feel alive on the job (P5).

The notion and extent of convenience influences the balance affecting CSR practice. We would argue that the interaction between government, hotels’ proprietorship/management, and employees collectively structures the context where sustainable initiatives unfold. It endorses the active engagement of all the parties involved (Raelin, 2016), but also hints to an underpinning collaborative exchange (Raelin, 2014).

7. Discussion

Conclusion

We would argue that looking at the dynamics involving hospitality sector actors from a relational leadership perspective reveals that the implementation of CSR initiatives lies on leaderful practice (Raelin, 2014). We find that the leadership expressed in the practice of CSR becomes explicit with the collectiveness, collaboration, and compassion (in the sense of considering others’ efforts) (Raelin, 2011) lying at the base of the responsibility and convenience drivers. Interacting individuals that negotiate their shared understanding of CSR practices demonstrate that there is a third way through which CSR unfolds in an actor’s lived experience, one that goes beyond the CSR policies where the employee is merely a receiver or an implementer. This research reveals an original perspective on the links between CSR and HRM in the hospitality sector of Pakistan, the UK, and Italy. It shows how incentives and teamwork strongly correlate with CSR in all three cultures. It shows that the leaderful practice dynamics we shed light on in our study suggest that actors are creators and negotiators of corporate social responsibility practices and that this happens thanks to the role and value of relatedness.

Theoretical Implications
Extant studies focusing on non-shareholding stakeholders’ role (e.g., employees, communities, etc.) in CSR in the hospitality sector overlooked the dynamics framed by individuals who participate in the implementation of sustainable initiatives. Those studies tended to focus on organisational actors as policy addressees, or policy implementers. Yet, those studies stressed the important part that individuals play in the unfolding of the hospitality experience for customers, communities, and other stakeholders. We addressed the call for further analysis to offer a more holistic perspective on CSR implementation. We used a Relational Leadership Theory lens (Uhl-Bien, 2006; Cunliffe and Eriksen, 2011; Raelin, 2014; 2016) which offered a novel way of looking at the issue. In our study, we set to explore what a focus on employees’ dynamics could reveal about the implementation of CSR practices in the hospitality sector. We mapped the context of our research to explore the status quo in the hotel sector in Pakistan, the UK and Italy, especially with regard to the correlations between HRM and Corporate Social Responsibility. We then used the data we collected in our qualitative study to exemplify what applying RLT could tell us about CSR in hospitality.

We would argue that the aspects of being and relating with others and displaying a sense of moral responsibility (Cunliffe and Eriksen, 2011) underpin CSR practices in the sector in question. The responsibility and convenience drivers emerging from our data tie to the notions of relating and relatedness (Uhl-Bien, 2006; Cunliffe and Eriksen, 2011). This underscores that the single individual is not foundational in the expression of social responsibility practices, rather, the relation with others is. The ‘being in relation with others’ (e.g., other organisational actors, the community, other external stakeholders) occurs through collectiveness and cooperation and shapes the way of doing ‘hospitality work’. We would argue that whether or not practices are supported or implemented - even in hotels with little engagement in CSR - the framing of the CSR relationships per se (e.g., expensive, or worth the cost, or important, or secondary) reveals how hospitality is practiced, not only CSR. The relational processes involved in the implementation of sustainable practices are what shapes the way of interpreting and doing hospitality. In those processes, roles are shifting. Adhering to a view where employees are passive recipients or implementers of sustainable practice overshadows their position as relational actors as well as the implications this has. The sense of collectivity and collaboration beneath the drivers of responsibility and convenience speaks of relatedness, a kind that shapes sustainable practice dynamically. This was consistent with the quantitative findings where teamwork and economic incentive showed a significant positive impact on CSR.
Extant literature aiming to shed light on sustainable practice implementation refers to the liaisons between the environment, owners, human resources, communities; however, it does so in a fixed way, whereby each stakeholder has its place and function. We suggest there is not a fixed equilibrium in the way this unfolds; rather, it morphs – as roles do - depending on the way relatedness develops and evolves. Whether relatedness refers to the dynamics that are internal to the organisation, or to the external ones (e.g., with the community, with the local authorities), it eventually affects the outcome.

The implementation of a CSR strategy and its related initiatives invites organizations to engage individuals, align CSR with actors’ day-to-day activities and functions, promoting meaningful changes in the organization's culture (D’Aprile and Mannarini, 2012; Davies and Crane, 2010; Sarvaiya et al., 2018). Employees have been emphasized as key stakeholders or even drivers of CSR (Inyang et al., 2011; Lam and Khare, 2010; Eyasu et al., 2020; Hur et al., 2019; Kim and Kim, 2020). It is suggested that this involvement can positively impact CSR efforts through the alignment of employee values, and increased motivation (Inyang et al., 2011; Eyasu et al., 2020). Besides, it is argued that successful CSR is reliant on employees’ reciprocation, collaboration, and willingness to get involved (Bučiūnienė and Kazlauskaitė, 2012; Hur et al., 2019), and that overall, employees’ non-involvement in CSR may affect the success of the CSR strategy and initiatives (Inyang et al., 2011; Lee et al., 2013; Jermsittiparsert et al., 2019).

Practical Implications

The implications of seeing CSR initiatives grounded in leaderful practice are twofold. First, it expands understanding beyond that gathered from studies looking at a specific dimension of CSR, or at an overall measure affecting specific stakeholders (e.g., customers, product markets, employment, bottom-line profitability) (Rhou and Singal, 2020). Understanding CSR as ‘a way of relating’ (e.g., to the context, to hospitality work, to other parties) instead of framing it as a set of operations (e.g., tied to CSR like employee relations, environmental relations, or non-tied to CSR like community relations) breaks from the tradition of attaching its value to a range of metrics. As Rhou and Singal (2020) noted in their encompassing review on CSR in hospitality, studies in this field tend to rely on metrics and, to a large extent, those metrics even fail to cover aspects such as the cost of capital, the attractiveness as a prospective employer, the regulatory benefits, and the M&A benefits. We do not aim to neglect the value of those studies; instead, we see our perspective expanding what we know about CSR in hospitality in a contextualised way, and beyond its
business impact, as defined, modelled, and measured in mainstream management literature. By acknowledging the importance of the context – from a cultural and relational perspective rather than just from an industry one - in which CSR practices unfold, we magnify its effects on aspects that would otherwise go unnoticed because ‘deemed unmeasurable’.

The second implication of seeing leaderful practice at the basis of CSR initiatives is that it shows the strategic value of sustainable practice, both internally and externally. In fact, it is a way of socialising values, attitudes, and beliefs within a hospitality business with the potential of creating cultural alignment across the board. Externally, it is a way of communicating how a specific hotel ‘does hospitality work’. The leaderful practice at the basis of CSR can tell a story of how well or how badly, collectively, and collaboratively, a hospitality business conducts itself in defining its social footprint (not just its environmental one), that “ongoing, recursive encounter among parties” (Raelin, 2011). The way of ‘doing hospitality work’ leaves a footprint in the past, but it also projects forward – as all practice does (Raelin, 2011) – attempting to set an order in a sector that is unpredictable and fast changing.

Our study offers an additional way of capturing the essence of CSR implementation in hospitality. It advocates the application of theories that can expand beyond the appreciation of its environmental, financial, and work policy benefits. We posit the relevance of relatedness at multiple levels to spot how CSR initiatives can produce varying ‘hospitality work’ outcomes.

Limitations and future research

We acknowledge the challenges of generalising from a small-scale qualitative pilot, although supported by a quantitative survey involving around 1,300 hotels. However, our aim was to use participants’ accounts to exemplify what Relational Leadership Theory could look like and could reveal about sustainable practice in hospitality. We did not draw conclusions on the possible comparisons between the three countries where our respondents worked because this would have required a greater pool of data, especially within the Italian hospitality sector. Nevertheless, despite the country of reference, we would acknowledge that relationships - internal and external, vertical, and lateral - would still exert an influence on the way CSR implementation unfolds and, in turn, ‘hospitality work’ and its social footprint.
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Appendix 1. Semi-structured interview guide.

1. For how long have you been working in this sector?
2. What would you say are the opportunities in this sector?
3. What are the major challenges for this sector?
4. To what extent you feel those challenges might affect the organization you work for?
5. How would your hotel/organization benefit from the opportunities the sector offers? And how would it be affected by its challenges?
6. For how long have you been working in this company/hotel/resort?
7. What would you say are your achievements since you started working here?
8. Have you ever heard about sustainable development goals? What are they in your opinion?
9. What does the expression “responsible society” bring to mind?
10. What are the steps that you have taken to be a part of a responsible society?
11. What does the expression “Corporate Social Responsibility” bring to mind?
12. From your point of view, what is your stance on CSR?
13. How would you see CSR in this sector, in general?
14. How would you see CSR, in your organization, in particular?
15. What have you, or your colleagues, experienced in participating in CSR initiatives/activities?
16. How would you define ethical and unethical practices?
17. Any examples of ethical practices in your hotel?
18. Any examples of unethical practices (if any) in your hotel?
19. Have you handled any ethical and unethical practices yourself in any capacity within your organization or sector?
20. How would you envisage a protocol of ethical policies and practices? What would it look like in your opinion?
21. What would a line manager responsibility be in terms of implementing ethical practices?
22. What values would a manager need to embed in your opinion?
23. Is there anything different that could be done to improve and promote an ethical culture in your firm?
24. From your perspective, does your HR department have a role in shaping CSR policies?
25. Are your CSR policies a way to develop sustainable HR policies?
26. How would you include your HR department staff in designing CSR strategies?
27. To what extent you feel you engage with sustainable HRM and CSR in your organization?
28. To what extent your colleagues engage in the above?
29. In your opinion, what would you think are the social impact strategies that need to be prioritized?
Appendix 2. Questionnaire Survey: investigation questions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Some-what Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Some-what Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The hotel works for social, environmental and economic development rather than focusing only on profit maximization</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Some-what Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Some-what Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate social responsibility (CSR) policies need to be considered as a core and inseparable component of the overall service or product offering</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Some-what Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Some-what Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementing CSR in business means that the managers must comply with the rules</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Some-what Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Some-what Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The hotel has CSR policies to head off potentially disastrous consumer backlashes</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Some-what Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Some-what Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The hotel selects suppliers or business partners based on CSR criteria</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Some-what Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Some-what Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The hotel selects suppliers or business partners based on financial criteria</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Some-what Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Some-what Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The charitable contributions are fundamental to the concept of CSR. The hotel must make charitable contributions every year</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Some-what Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Some-what Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The hotel encourages partnerships with local businesses (local suppliers) and local organizations (schools, universities, local public authorities, etc.)</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Some-what Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Some-what Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The hotel promotes local heritage (cultural, historical, arts and crafts, etc.)</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Some-what Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Some-what Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The hotel has a code of conduct related to CSR policies that every employee must know</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Some-what Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Some-what Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The hotel carefully hires its employees who shows positive mindset towards CSR practices</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Some-what Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Some-what Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The remuneration systems is based on the achievement of economic performance</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Some-what Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Some-what Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The remuneration systems is based on the achievement of sustainable (economic, social and environmental) performance</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Some-what Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Some-what Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The hotel ensures the balanced representation of women within their decision-making bodies and memberships</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Some-what Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Some-what Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The principle of equal remuneration for men and women workers for work of equal value must apply</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Some-what Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Some-what Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The cross-functional teams or steering committees (i.e. CSR committee) are important for better coordination related to CSR practices</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Some-what Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Some-what Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The proper training and development of employees leads to better CSR implementations</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Some-what Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Some-what Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers make the majority of decisions without consulting employees</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Some-what Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Some-what Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers share the strategic plan with employees</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Some-what Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Some-what Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers share the economic and social-environmental results with all stakeholders</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Some-what Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Some-what Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solving difficult problems requires a hard, male approach</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Some-what Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Some-what Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The hotel ensures all the safety procedures for employees</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Some-what Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Some-what Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The hotel ensures that any measures implemented respect human rights and manages the risk of having an adverse impact on human rights</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Some-what Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Some-what Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>