

THE INFLUENCE OF CORPORATE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY, WORKPLACE SPIRITUALITY, AND POSITIVE EMOTION ON THE PERIPHERAL PERFORMANCE OF EMPLOYEES

Wei Li¹⁾, Surachai Traiwannakij¹⁾

¹⁾ Institute of Science Innovation and Culture, Rajamangala University of Technology Krungthep, Thailand

Corresponding author: surachai.t@mail.rmutk.ac.th

Abstract

Modern enterprises compete separately from talent competition. Employees are a crucial part of the corporate talent pool, and their key role in the rapid development of enterprises cannot be underestimated. Therefore, this study aims to explore evaluating corporate social responsibility (CSR) from the employee perspective to reflect employees' subjective feelings about their company and better understand their changing needs. This study's core variables include Corporate Social Responsibility, Workplace Spirituality, Positive Emotion, and Peripheral Performance of Employees. The Quantitative Method is introduced in this study. Descriptive statistics such as frequency, percent frequency, mean, and standard deviation are introduced. Various inferential statistical methods are used to test the hypothesis, particularly the Independent Samples t-test, the One-way ANOVA, and the Multiple Linear Regression analysis. The results obtained from the study indicate that differences in Occupation and Working Position generate differences in Employee Peripheral Performance. Based on the multiple linear regression analysis, all aspects of corporate social responsibility (CSR) and workplace spirituality positively impact employee peripheral performance. For Positive Emotion, the Simple Linear Regression Analysis reveals that it positively impacts Employee Peripheral Performance. All independent factors except demographic factors positively impacted employee peripheral performance under the multiple linear regression analysis.

Keywords: Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR), Workplace Spirituality, Positive Emotions, Peripheral Performance of Employees

Introduction

With the rapid development of the Internet, the increasing degree of informatization, and the increasing transparency of corporate information, the government, scholars, consumers, and other parties are paying more and more attention to Corporate Social Responsibility. Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) has emerged as an enduring trend in socio-economic development amidst globalization, and it is essential for the sustainable development of China. As the market economy evolves, Chinese businesses increasingly recognize the significance of CSR engagement. This commitment to social responsibility has been reflected in the continuous growth of the CSR development index among Chinese enterprises (The Blue Book of Corporate Social Responsibility, 2017).

Based on the theory of social identity and attribution, this study draws on the existing research results of scholars to explore and study the impact mechanism of corporate social responsibility behaviors on employees, the influence of workplace spirit and positive emotion, and also to verify the role of corporate social responsibility in promoting the company's development, to provide practical information for companies to fulfill corporate social responsibility efficiently—management recommendations.

Literature Review

Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR)

Some scholars believe that the enterprise to fulfill social responsibility to a certain extent cannot be without the staff's emotional degree of belonging and sense of identity, only so that the implementation of corporate social responsibility can be effective. Staff Perception of Corporate Social Responsibility refers to the internal enterprise in the product operation and corporate decision-making process, the enterprise to their products related to the main interest groups and their non-focused interest groups within a practical perception of the activity, the activity can make the enterprise within the staff to produce increased awareness of the firm's specific responsibilities (Glavas & Godwin, 2013). In general, there is a clear difference between employee-level and firm-level understanding of CSR, mainly in that the understanding of CSR within the firm by its

employees is fundamentally different from the actual internal CSR activities of the firm, which are perceived and acted upon by the employees as the activities carried out within the firm as well as the specific CSR activities that the firm makes its employees aware of. If employees lack the perception of social responsibility of the company they work for, then the company's behavior will not affect their actions and mindset (Turker, 2009). Consequently, companies need to increase their employees' awareness of their social responsibility to develop adhesion within the employee's organization. Corporate social responsibility behavior in the sense of belonging to the value of employees affects the employees' behaviors within the work, so the sense of belonging to the employees' sex and sense of identity is crucial for the enterprise's social responsibility (Tsai et al., 2012).

Corporate social responsibility (CSR) is originally an idea at the organizational level. Still, the research content of this paper mainly focuses on the perceived corporate social responsibility of employees, which is a concept at the individual level rather than the actual corporate social responsibility behavior of enterprises. Although there may be some differences between this subjective perception and the actual performance of corporate responsibility, this perception has a more direct and close relationship between corporate social responsibility and changes in employees' actual behavior and attitudes (Grandey et al., 2013).

Workplace Spirituality

Spirituality reflects an individual's intrinsic motivation to live a vibrant life (Behan, 2018). Ross (2013) posits that spirituality is a relationship between oneself and the divine, nature, or even transcendent goals beyond oneself. Workplace spirituality refers to a transcendent experience for individuals within a work context. It enriches individuals' inner life experiences by enhancing the meaning and purpose of work and cultivating a sense of connection with others. This, in turn, elevates individuals' spiritual well-being, fostering personal growth and progress (Wang & Kim, 2013). Initially, researchers believed that spirituality emanated from religion. However, some scholars argue that while religion may be related to spirituality, spirituality is not necessarily linked to religion (Miller & Ewest, 2013). Overall, contemporary scholars generally agree that workplace spirituality reflects an individual's beliefs about their meaningful existence within an organization, measuring spirituality from a non-religious perspective.

Kovács & Kovács (2020) developed the workplace spirituality questionnaire. They obtained 7 dimensions: inner life, work meaning, sense of group belonging, sense of responsibility, good relationship with others, contemplation/transcendence, and aspects that hinder spirituality (negative dimensions). Duchon & Plowman (2005) integrated and operationalized the four aspects of Pfeffer (2003) and proposed the three most essential components of workplace spirituality: inner life, meaningful work, and a sense of group belonging. Milliman et al. (2003), based on Ashmos & Duchon's (2000) research, believe that factors such as transcendence have a more significant impact on personal life, so they chose three dimensions that are more closely related to work and organizations: meaningful work, group belonging, and consistency with organizational values. Rego & Cunha (2008) synthesized and listed three dimensions: group belonging, harmony between organization and individual values, and group contribution. Ke et al. (2014), based on the three dimensions of work meaning, sense of community, and consistency with organizational values, construct a local workplace mental strength scale for the local organization and cultural background. In this paper, workplace spirituality is classified into the following three categories: group belonging, organizational and personal value alignment, and contribution to the group.

Positive Emotion

High motivational intensity positive emotion (e.g., desire, excitement) often occurs in pursuing goals, such as things individuals want to obtain, such as food, water, social attachment, etc. Positive emotion at this time narrows attention and cognition, aiming to help organisms focus on goals and promote goal-directed behavior. On the other hand, low motivational intensity positive emotion (e.g., pleasure, tranquility) usually occurs after goals have been achieved or when there are no goals temporarily. At this time, the environment is generally comfortable, stable, and non-threatening, allowing individuals' attention to generalize, thoughts to diverge, and openness to unknown opportunities (Carver, 2003). This theory suggests that the expansion-construct theory of positive emotion applies to low-intensity positive emotion. The theory has experimental validation because most experiments induce low motivational intensity positive emotion (e.g., pleasant memories, giving gifts).

Based on the understanding of the measurement of positive emotion studied by previous researchers and the comparison of the reliability and validity of the main tools, the positive emotion scale selected here, namely, Active, Passionate, Happy, Cheerful, Excited, and Proud comes from Zheng Xue et al. "The Chinese Positive affect and Negative affect scale, c-PANAS in Chinese Version). This measurement is derived from the "Positive affect and negative affect scale, PANAS" (Positive affect and negative affect scale, PANAS) formulated by Watson in 1988 (Qiu et al., 2008).

Employee Peripheral Performance

In organizational theory, peripheral performance refers to contributions made by employees that fall outside their job description's core tasks. This concept contrasts with core job performance, which encompasses an employee's primary responsibilities and duties. The theoretical foundation for peripheral performance is primarily based on the Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) theory. Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) is a term that encompasses anything positive and constructive that employees do of their own choice, which supports co-workers and benefits the company. Employees who frequently engage in OCB may not always be the top performers. Still, they are the ones who are known to 'go the extra mile' or 'go above and beyond' the minimum efforts required to do a merely satisfactory job. Theory and research on OCB have presumed OCB as a set of desirable behaviors contributing to organizational effectiveness. So far, OCB has been indicated as one of the precursors of organizational performance (Thiruvankadam, T. & Durairaj, I.Y.A., 2017).

Methodology

This study uses the questionnaire survey method to obtain the information needed for the research process. First of all, from the literature review, the information scale that meets the actual needs of this subject research is widely used by many researchers and has high reliability and validity is selected to measure the relevant data variables in the paper. Then, the employees of the enterprise filled out a questionnaire survey on the subject of the research. The core variable scale mainly includes four variables: Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR), Workplace Spirituality, Positive Emotion, and Employee Peripheral Performance. These questionnaires are then analyzed by advanced and modern statistical programs and presented in terms of descriptive and inferential statistics.

Result

Descriptive Statistics

Demographic Factors

Table 1: The Frequency and Percent Frequency Classified by Demographic Factors

Demographic Factors	Classification	Frequency	% Frequency
1. Gender	Male	265	69.01
	Female	119	30.99
2. Marital Status	Single	110	28.65
	Married	144	37.50
	Divorced	130	33.85
3. Age	Below 25 years old	56	14.58
	25 but less than 35 years old	76	19.79
	35 but less than 45 years old	120	31.25
	45 years old and more	132	34.38
4. Educational Level	High school or junior high school	108	28.13
	Junior College	147	38.28
	Undergraduate	87	22.66
	Master's degree and above	42	10.94
5. Monthly Income	Below 3,000 yuan	181	47.14
	3,000 but less than 5,000 yuan	40	10.42
	5,000 but less than 10,000 yuan	99	25.78
	10,000 but less than 15,000 yuan	42	10.94
	15,000 yuan and more	22	5.73
6. Occupation	Administrative Institutions	54	14.06
	State-owned Enterprises	55	14.32
	Foreign-funded Enterprise	91	23.70

	Private Enterprises	127	33.07
	Others	57	14.84
7. Working Position	General Worker	83	21.61
	Junior Manager or alike	156	40.63
	Senior Manager or alike	90	23.44
	Executive or alike	55	14.32
8. Working Experiences	Less than 1 year	98	25.52
	1 but less than 3 years	118	30.73
	3 but less than 5 years	119	30.99
	5 years and more	49	12.76
9. Working Location	Beijing	49	12.76
	Tianjin	47	12.24
	Hebei	98	25.52
	Shanghai	44	11.46
	Guangzhou	146	38.02
Total		384	100.00

It is evident from Table 1 that most of the respondents are male, accounting for approximately 69.01%, while females account for only 30.99%. Most respondents are married, recording around 37.50%, followed by divorced and single status. The age group of 45 years old and older takes the highest share of about 34.38%, followed by the age group 35 but less than 45 years old and the age group 25 but less than 35 years old, respectively, while the lowest percentage belongs to the age group below 25 years old. Regarding educational level, most respondents enjoy junior college with approximately 38.28%, followed by high school and undergraduate, respectively, leaving the smallest percentage for master's degrees and higher. According to the monthly income, most respondents, approximately 47.14%, earn below 3,000 yuan, followed by 5,000 but less than 10,000 yuan and 10,000 but less than 15,000 yuan, respectively. Earning 15,000 yuan and more accounts for only 5.73% of all respondents. Private Enterprises occupy the highest proportion, around 33.07%, while the foreign-funded enterprises group captures the second rank. Most are junior managers, occupying about 40.63% of the senior managers, general workers, executives, or alike. Regarding the working experiences, most respondents worked for 3 but less than 5 years, accounting for about 30.99%, followed by 1 but less than 3 years, less than 1 year, and 5 years and more, respectively. Most are from Guangzhou, accounting for about 38.02%, followed by Hebei, Beijing, Tianjin, and Shanghai.

Corporate Social Responsibility Perception

Table 2: The Descriptive Statistics of Corporate Social Responsibility Perception

Classification	Mean	S.D.	Rank	Meaning
Corporate Social Responsibility Towards Employees	3.338	0.8162	2	Moderate
Corporate Social Responsibility Towards Stakeholders	3.391	0.8299	1	Moderate
Corporate Social Responsibility Towards Consumers	3.338	0.8028	3	Moderate
Corporate Social Responsibility Perception	3.355	0.798	-	Moderate

The results obtained from the Table 2 review show that Corporate Social Responsibility Towards Stakeholders is the most essential characteristic, with a mean value of approximately 3.391. Corporate Social Responsibility Towards Employees and Corporate Social Responsibility Towards Consumers join the same rank with a mean value of 3.338. For the overall Corporate Social Responsibility Perception, its mean is about

3.355, a moderate level.

Workplace Spirituality

Table 3: Descriptive Statistics of Workplace Spirituality

Classification	Mean	S.D.	Rank	Meaning
Group Belonging	3.336	0.820	3	Moderate
Organizational and Personal Value Alignment	3.420	0.985	1	Moderate
Contribution to the Group	3.350	0.906	2	Moderate
Workplace Spirituality	3.367	0.868		Moderate

The results obtained from Table 3 review that Organizational and Personal Value Alignment is the most essential characteristic, with a mean value of approximately 3.420, followed by Contribution to the Group with a mean value of 3.350 and Group Belonging with a mean value of 3.336. The overall Workplace Spirituality's mean is recorded as about 3.367, a moderate level.

Positive Emotion

Table 4: Descriptive Statistics of Positive Emotion

Classification	Mean	S.D.	Rank	Meaning
Positive Emotion	3.620	1.407	-	Agree

It is evident from Table 4 that its mean value of Positive Emotion is recorded as about 3.620, which is the level of Agree.

Employee Peripheral Performance

Table 5: The Descriptive Statistics of Employee Peripheral Performance

Classification	Mean	S.D.	Rank	Meaning
Interpersonal Facilitation	3.420	0.977	1	Moderate
Work Dedication	3.370	0.904	3	Moderate
Organizational Maintenance	3.410	0.825	2	Moderate
Peripheral Performance	3.400	0.852	-	Moderate

The results from Table 5 suggest that Interpersonal Facilitation is the most essential characteristic, with a mean value of approximately 3.420, Organizational Maintenance with a mean value of 3.410, and Work Dedication with a mean value of 3.370. For the overall employee peripheral performance, its mean is about 3.400, a moderate level.

Inferential Statistics

Differences in Demographic Factors Generate Differences in Employee Peripheral Performance

Differences in Gender Generate Differences in Employee Peripheral Performance

$$H_0: \mu_1 = \mu_2$$

$$H_a: \mu_1 \neq \mu_2$$

Table 6: The Independent Samples t-test of the Gender Factor

Factor	Classification	N	Mean	S.D.	t-value	p-value
Employee Peripheral Performance	Male	265	3.38	1.028	1.271	0.26
	Female	119	3.38	1.089		

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

From Table 6, it can be seen that the p-value of the Employee Peripheral Performance concerning Gender is about 0.26, which is much higher than the critical value of 0.05. Therefore, the null hypothesis (H_0) cannot be rejected, which implies that differences in Gender generate no differences in Employee Peripheral Performance

Differences in Marital Status, Age, Educational Level, Monthly Income, Occupation, Working Position, Working Experiences, and Working Location Generate Differences in Employee Peripheral Performance

$$H_0: \mu_i = \mu_j$$

$$H_a: \mu_i \neq \mu_j \text{ at last one Pair where } i \neq j.$$

Table 7: The One-Way ANOVA of Marital Status, Age, Educational Level, Monthly Income, Occupation, Working Position, Working Experiences, and Working Location

Factor	Classification	SS	df	MS	F=	p-value
--------	----------------	----	----	----	----	---------

Marital Status	Between Groups	0.469	2	0.234	0.322	0.725
	Within Groups	277.607	381	0.729		
	Total	278.076	383			
Age	Between Groups	0.41	3	0.137	0.187	0.905
	Within Groups	277.665	380	0.731		
	Total	278.076	383			
Educational Level	Between Groups	1.532	3	0.511	0.702	0.552
	Within Groups	276.544	380	0.728		
	Total	278.076	383			
Monthly Income	Between Groups	1.136	4	0.284	0.389	0.817
	Within Groups	276.94	379	0.731		
	Total	278.076	383			
Occupation	Between Groups	6.437	4	1.609	2.245	0.034*
	Within Groups	271.639	379	0.717		
	Total	278.076	383			
Working Position	Between Groups	6.93	3	2.31	3.237	0.022*
	Within Groups	271.146	380	0.714		
	Total	278.076	383			
Working Experiences	Between Groups	4.435	3	1.478	2.053	0.106
	Within Groups	273.641	380	0.72		
	Total	278.076	383			
Working Location	Between Groups	0.77	4	0.193	0.263	0.902
	Within Groups	277.306	379	0.732		
	Total	278.076	383			

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

It can be seen from Table 7 that the p-value of Employee Peripheral Performance for Marital Status, Age, Educational Level, Monthly Income, Working Experiences, and Working Location are approximately .725, .905, .552, .817, .106, and .902, respectively, which are much higher than the critical value of 0.05. Therefore, the null hypothesis (H₀) for these aspects cannot be rejected, meaning that the differences in these 6 factors generate no differences in employee peripheral performance. On the contrary, the p-values of Occupation and Working Position are about .034 and .022, less than the critical value of 0.05. Therefore, the null hypothesis (H₀) is rejected, meaning that differences in Occupation and Working Position generate differences in Employee Peripheral Performance.

The Influence of Corporate Social Responsibility on Peripheral Performance

The results obtained from the study can be written in terms of equation (1).

$$Y = -.034 + .248X_1 + .446X_2 + .328X_3$$

(.518) (.000) (.000) (.000)(1)

Adjusted R² = 0.921

From equation (1), the overall model indicates that the constant term is not statistically significant. Its p-value of about 0.518 suggests that when all predictor variables are zero, the Employee Peripheral Performance is not significantly different from zero. Corporate Social Responsibility Towards Stakeholders (X₂) is found to be the most important factor influencing Employee Peripheral Performance with a coefficient of about .446, followed by Corporate Social Responsibility Towards Consumers (X₃) and Corporate Social Responsibility Towards Employees (X₁), the coefficients of which are about .328 and .248, respectively. The Adjust R² of this Multiple Linear Regression is approximately .921, which is very high, meaning that one unit change in these 3 factors, namely, Corporate Social Responsibility Towards Employees (X₁), Corporate Social Responsibility Towards Stakeholders (X₂), and Corporate Social Responsibility Towards Consumers (X₃) will cause the Employee Peripheral Performance change about 0.921 unit in the same direction.

The Influence of Workplace Spirituality on Peripheral Performance

The results obtained from the study can be written in terms of equation (2).

$$Y = .094 + .553X_1 + .300X_2 + .130X_3$$

(.012) (.000) (.000) (.000)(2)

Adjusted R² = 0.958

The overall equation (2) model reveals that the constant term is statistically significant. Its p-value of about 0.012 suggests that when all predictor variables are zero, the Employee Peripheral Performance significantly differs from zero. Group Belonging (X₁) is found to be the most important factor influencing Employee Peripheral Performance with a coefficient of about .553, followed by Organizational and Personal

Value Alignment (X_2) and Contribution to the Group (X_3), the coefficients of which are about .300 and .130, respectively. The Adjust R^2 of this Multiple Linear Regression is approximately .958, which is very high, meaning that one unit change in these 3 factors, namely, Group Belonging, Organizational and Personal Value Alignment, and Contribution to the Group, will cause the Employee Peripheral Performance change about 0.958 unit in the same direction.

The Influence of Positive Emotion on Peripheral Performance

The results obtained from the study can be written in terms of equation (3).

$$Y = .369 + .898X$$

$$(.012) (.000) \dots\dots\dots(3)$$

$$\text{Adjusted } R^2 = 0.909$$

The p-value of the constant term in equation (3) is approximately 0.000, implying that it is statistically significant. Therefore, when Positive Emotion is zero, the Employee Peripheral Performance significantly differs from zero. If Positive Emotion increases by 1 unit, the Employee Peripheral Performance will increase by 0.898 units. The adjusted R^2 is about 0.909, meaning the model explains 90.9% of the variance in Employee Peripheral Performance.

Discussion

The significant differences in peripheral performance between different occupations reflect the impact of job roles and responsibilities on employee behavior and attitudes. Warr (2008) indicated that the nature of the occupation (such as job autonomy, complexity, and required social interaction) is closely linked to employee job satisfaction and engagement. Therefore, employees in different occupations might vary in their participation in peripheral activities due to the distinct nature of their work. The significant impact of working positions, especially at managerial levels, on employee peripheral performance is supported by Mintzberg's (1973) classic theory of managerial roles. Due to their roles, higher-level managers must engage more extensively in organizational decision-making, culture shaping, and team leadership, inherently necessitating a higher level of engagement and efficiency in peripheral performance. This reflects the differences in how employees at various levels engage with and perceive organizational culture and peripheral activities.

The positive correlation between CSR perceptions and peripheral performance can be seen as an extension of the broader impacts of CSR on employee engagement and motivation. According to Glavas & Kelley (2014), CSR initiatives can enhance employee engagement by instilling a sense of purpose and meaning in their work. Employees are likelier to go beyond their basic job requirements when they perceive their organization as contributing positively to society. This is aligned with the self-determination theory (Ryan & Deci, 2000), which posits that fulfilling employees' need for autonomy, competence, and relatedness contributes to higher motivation and engagement.

Workplace spirituality focuses on how individuals seek purpose and meaning through their work, a sense of community and interconnectedness with others, and alignment with organizational values. According to Fry (2003), workplace spirituality can lead to higher organizational commitment and job satisfaction, as employees feel their work is meaningful and aligned with their values. This sense of purpose and belonging is believed to enhance overall performance, including activities beyond direct job responsibilities, improving peripheral performance.

Fredrickson's (2001) broaden-and-build theory provides a foundational framework for understanding the role of positive emotion in expanding individuals' thought-action repertoires. Positive emotions such as joy, gratitude, and inspiration can broaden individuals' awareness and encourage novel, varied, and exploratory thoughts and actions. In the context of the workplace, this means that positive emotions can enhance creativity, problem-solving skills, and adaptability, leading to improved performance not only in core job functions but also in peripheral tasks that contribute to organizational culture and success (Fredrickson, 2001; Fredrickson & Branigan, 2005).

Conclusion

Differences in Occupation and Working Position generate Differences in Employee Peripheral Performance. However, no significant effects are found for Gender, Marital status, Age, Educational Level, Monthly Income, Working Experiences, and Working Location—all Corporate Social Responsibility and Workplace Spirituality aspects Influence Peripheral Performance under the Multiple Linear Regression Analysis. Positive Emotion was also found to positively impact employee Peripheral Performance under the Simple Linear Regression Analysis.

References

- Ashmos, D. P. & Duchon, D. (2000). Spirituality at work: A conceptualization and Measure. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 9(2), 134-145.

- Behan III, A. C. (2018). *Lasallian Workplace Spirituality: Toward an Understanding Of Meaningfulness, Belonging, and Person-organization Fit of the Lasallian Workplace*. (Doctoral dissertation, Saint Mary's University of Minnesota).
- Carver, C. S. (2003). Self-awareness. In M. R. Leary & J. P. Tangney (Eds.), *Handbook of self and identity*. (pp. 179–196), The Guilford Press.
- Duchon, D. & Plowman, D. A. (2005). Nurturing the spirit at work: Impact on work unit performance. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 16(5), 807-833.
- Fredrickson, B. L. (2001). The role of positive emotions in positive psychology: The broaden-and-build theory of positive emotions. *American Psychologist*, 56(3), 218–226. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.56.3.218>
- Fredrickson, B. L., & Branigan, C. (2005). Positive emotions broaden the scope of attention and thought-action repertoires. *Cognition & Emotion*, 19, 313-332. doi:10.1080/02699930441000238
- Fry, L. (2003). Toward a Theory of Spiritual Leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 14(6), 693-727. DOI:10.1016/j.leaqua.2003.09.001
- Glavas, A. & Kelley, K. (2014). The Effects of Perceived Corporate Social Responsibility on Employee Attitudes. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 24(2), 165-202
- Glavas, N. & Godwin, L. N. (2013). Is the perception of Goodness good enough? Exploring the Relationship between perceived corporate social responsibility and employee organizational identification[J]. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 114(1), 15-27.
- Grandey, A. A., Diefendorff, J. M. & Rupp, D. E. (Eds.). (2013). *Emotional labor in the 21st century: Diverse perspectives on emotion regulation at work*. Routledge/Taylor & Francis Group.
- Ke, J., Sun, J. & Wang, J. (2014). Development and validation of the workplace spiritual scale. *Chinese Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 22(05)
- Kovács, G. (2020). *The Value Orientations of Buddhist and Christian Entrepreneurs: A Comparative Perspective on Spirituality and Business Ethics*. (pp.61-93), Palgrave Macmillan Cham.
- Miller, D. W., & Ewest, T. (2013). The present state of workplace spirituality: A Literature review considering context, theory, and measurement/assessment. *Journal of religious & theological information*, 12(1-2), 29-54.
- Milliman, J., Czaplewski, A. J., & Ferguson, J. (2003). Workplace spirituality and employee work attitudes: An exploratory empirical assessment. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 16(4), 426-447.
- Mintzberg, H. (1973). Strategy-Making in Three Modes. *California Management Review*, 16 (2), 44. <https://doi.org/10.2307/411644>
- Pfeffer, J. (2003). Business and the spirit: Management practices that sustain values. In R. A. Giacalone & C. L. Jurkiewicz (Eds.), *Handbook of workplace spirituality and organizational performance*. (pp. 29-45). M.E. Sharpe.
- Qiu, L., Zheng, X., & Wang, Y. (2008). Revision of the Positive and Negative Affect Schedule (PANAS). *Applied Psychology*, 14(3), 249-254.
- Rego, A. & Cunha, M. P. (2008). Workplace spirituality and organizational commitment: An empirical study. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 21(1), 53-75.
- Ross, G. (2013). Meaning-making, life transitional experiences and personal well-being within the contexts of religious and spiritual travel. In *Tourist experience and fulfilment* (pp. 91-109). Routledge.
- Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being. *American Psychologist*, 55(1), 68–78. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.55.1.68>
- Thiruvankadam, T. & Durairaj, I.Y.A. (2017). Organizational Citizenship Behavior: Its Definition and Dimensions. *GE-International Journal of Management Research*, 5(5), 46-55.
- Tsai M T, Chen K S, Chien J L(2012). The factors that impact knowledge sharing intentions: the theory of reasoned action perspective[J]. *Quality & Quantity*, 46, 1479-1491.
- Turker, D. (2009). Measuring Corporate Social Responsibility: A Scale Development Study. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 85(4), 411-427.
- Wang, J., & Kim, TY (2013). Proactive socialization behavior in China: The mediating role of perceived insider status and the moderating role of supervisors' traditionality. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 34(3), 389- 406.
- Warr, P. (2008). Work values: Some demographic and cultural correlates. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 81(4), 751-775. <https://doi.org/10.1348/096317907X263638>