How Team Creative environment is fostered by Corporate Social Responsibility and Team's Organizational Citizenship Behaviors in Travel agencies? A Mediation Model

Eman Elshenawy   Islam Elgammal

Suez Canal University

ABSTRACT

Team creativity is a process that result from the interaction between some organizational factors and team processes. Teams are more creative if their environments foster creativity. Team environment will be more creative when organizations are more socially responsible and when team members are good citizens to their teams. Team creativity research focused on team factors or organization factors but not on both. In this paper, the focus is on the group level Organization Citizenship Behavior (OCBG) mediation to the effect of Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) on team creative environment (TCE). Results of a sample of 301 Egyptian employees in the tourism field (i.e. travel agencies) in Sharm Elsheikh, support the hypotheses. CSR has significant positive effect on organizational citizenship behavior, supporting hypothesis one. Group level citizenship behavior has a significant positive effect on team creative environment, supporting hypothesis two. Multiple dimensions of both CSR and OCBG are tested and results are in multiple directions. The results are discussed in the light of that both organizational and team level factors are essential for affecting individual behavior and creativity in teams in the tourism industry.

Keywords: Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR), Creativity, Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB), Teams, Tourism, Sharm Elshiekh, Egypt.

……………………………………………………………………………………………………

INTRODUCTION

Corporate social responsibility (CSR) is a wide spread phenomenon in local and international business due to the global wake of concern for protecting societies and natural environments. There is a mounting pressure on organizations to be good citizens in their societies and protect the natural resources when conducting business. An increasing number of corporations apply CSR business practices daily, giving mounting importance to CSR as a survival mechanism in the tough-to-survive global business environment. CSR has gained research attention for decades; however, research on its effect on team processes and individual behaviors is rare.

CSR is viewed as a multidimensional concept since its early development by Bowen (1953). Since its early introduction, researchers differ on the number and nature of CSR dimensions. Henderson (2007) indicates that it is including social and environmental issues. Carroll (1979) offered four theoretical dimensions of CSR: economic, legal, ethical, and philanthropic; that were operationalized latter by Aupperle, Carroll, and Hatfield (1985). Schwartz and Carroll (2003) modified CSR dimensions to: economic, legal, and ethical with some interference among them. These dimensions were later developed by Turker (2009) into four dimensions relating more to stakeholders' expectations: responsibility to society/environment, employees, customers, and government/legal. Aguinis (2011) view of CSR as a corporate strategy to satisfy stakeholders' expectations; is the one adopted in the current study.

In tourism, while CSR is considered a core strategy for sustainable tourism development, studies on the impact of the concept on different aspects of the industry still need more attention (Coles, Fenclova, & Dinan, 2013). Generally, little research exists on the effect of CSR on team processes. Sizable body of previous research

How Team Creative environment is fostered by Corporate Social Responsibility and Team's

Organizational Citizenship Behaviors in Travel agencies? A Mediation Model

investigated the effect of top management teams on CSR thoroughly. Interestingly, the effect of CSR on top management teams was rarely investigated. Findings of these studies illustrate that; board of directors supports CSR practices in order to add value to stakeholders (Hung, 2011). CSR is affected by top management teams' decision-making styles (Wong, Ormiston, & Tetlock, 2011), and political ideologies (Chin, Hambrick, & Trevino, 2013). Management teams' communications of CSR with outsiders improve the organization reputation (Arvidsson, 2010). There are no studies linking CSR directly to team processes. However, some mediation was tested. Research shows that CSR three-dimension model, modified from the original model of Carroll (1979), has an indirect effect on team performance that varies for the three dimensions (Lin, Baruch, & Shih, 2011). Team efficacy and team self-esteem mediate the relationship between CSR three dimensions economic, legal, and ethical on team performance (Lin et al., 2011). Since, inside stakeholders form their perceptions, judgment, and reactions to CSR, which affect insiders' behavior, attitudes, and performance (Vlachos, Panagopoulos, & Rapp, 2014). CSR has directly impacted team processes and individual behaviors in teams, and hypothetically will affect OCBG.

The indirect effect of CSR on team creativity is not identified in previous research; only some relations are explored. CSR has a mediating effect on employee creativity as Brammer, He, and Mellahi (2014) supported. Creativity is formed by individual, group, and organizational characteristics; as Woodman, Sawyer, and Griffin (1993) proposed. Some researchers support that Organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) has a direct effect on team processes (Nielsen, Bachrach, Sundstrom, & Halfhill, 2012); which support our argument for the direct effect of OCBG on team creativity.

It is interesting to explore the effect of CSR perception on employees' creativity, and how organizational citizenship at the team level mediates this relationship. Team creativity research focused on team- or organization-level factors but not on both. No previous study aimed to explore the effect of CSR on creativity, so this paper is the first to combine the effects of CSR, and OCB at within the team on team's creative environment using the case of tourism organizations in Sharm Elshiekh.

LITERATURE REVIEW & HYPOTHESES DEVELOPMENT

Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR)

Was first introduced by Bowen (1953), CSR is the discretionary action of organizations to exceed legal requirements in serving their societies and stakeholders (McWilliams & Siegel, 2001). Aguinis (2011) adopts a stakeholder view of CSR, since organizations strive to satisfy their stakeholders and gain their loyalty. He defines CSR as "context-specific organizational actions and policies that take into account stakeholders' expectations and the triple bottom line of economic, social, and environmental performance" (Aguinis, 2011, p. 805). We consider CSR as a corporate strategy directed toward satisfying stakeholders' expectations to sustain the environment, society, labor, and government benevolence beyond imposed legal requirements or financial benefits; and to survive in the recent global business environment.

CSR has recently become more relevant to the tourism industry worldwide, due to the increasing attention on implementing sustainable tourism (Sheldon and Park, 2011). CSR has been investigated in the tourism industry in relation to a number of aspects; employment and environmental negative impacts (Ferus-Comelo, 2014), and human resources management (HRM) (Marija and Matjaž, 2014), implementation and economic rationale (Coles etal., 2013). However, it is claimed that the focus in studies related to CSR and tourism is always on Macro/organizational level rather than the functional/ micro (i.e. team level (Mason & Simmons, 2011).

Wells, et al. (2015) indicated that at the micro level, there is a lack of proper awareness of CSR among employees working in heritage tourism. However, Dodds and Kuehnel, (2010) claimed that despite the

How Team Creative environment is fostered by Corporate Social Responsibility and Team's

Organizational Citizenship Behaviors in Travel agencies? A Mediation Model

Canadian tour operators staff awareness of CSR, they do little action to be socially responsible due to the focus on competition and profit maximization rather than long term goals of sustainability.

The relationship between CSR and financial performance is not always in one direction. On one hand, evidence supports that CSR has a positive effect on firm's financial performance and reputation(Brammer & Millington, 2008; Rettab, Brik, & Mellahi, 2009; Riordan, Gatewood, & Bill, 1997). On the other hand, some researchers argue that firms with high financial performance are the socially responsible ones, not those with low financial performance (Campbell, 2007; McGuire, Sundgren, & Schneeweis, 1988). CSR improves firms' image in the society, and in the same time, reputation, which reflects positively on the firm's market value but not financial performance (Flammer, 2013; Mackey, Mackey, & Barney, 2007).

Therefore, we do not consider economic performance to be a dimension of CSR. We view CSR as an extra obligation of organizations toward their societies' wellbeing, and a commitment to take extra effort to benefit societies. Accordingly, corporations take all possible precautions to sustain their natural environments, and make positive social change that develops their societies to be socially responsible (Aguilera, Rupp, Williams, & Ganapathi, 2007; Surroca, Tribó, & Zahra, 2013), in order to make a positive impact on their stakeholders (Waddock & Graves, 1997).

In the recent business environment, organizations strive to satisfy stakeholders in order to survive. Stakeholders impose mounting pressure on corporations to behave responsibly to reserve societies' natural resources (Crilly, Zollo, & Hansen, 2012; Wong et al., 2011), and maintain the major ethical values and go beyond focusing on financial performance. Corporations do not reap much benefits of being irresponsible. Long-term performance is harmed when managers make irresponsible decisions (Armstrong & Green, 2013). Irresponsible corporations cannot satisfy or retain their customers, stockholders, or continue being profitable in the present challenging business environment (Lange & Washburn, 2012).

Stakeholders are no longer just pressure groups or the target of CSR. Large trend in recent research redefines CSR in terms of stakeholders trading actions to benefit the organization. Stakeholder theory kept stakeholder satisfaction as the target of management decisions and actions and therefore, CSR strategies are devoted for satisfying stakeholders' expectations (Parmar et al., 2010). More precisely this trend views "CSR" as the "corporate stakeholder responsibilities" (Freeman, Harrison, & Wicks, 2007; p:99) to suggest and carry over voluntary activities for the organization in order to improve its social performance. Freeman (1984) planted the seeds for considering business as a web of interrelated beneficial reciprocal relationships with groups of stakeholders who affect and are affected by the activities that constitute the business (El Akremi, Gond, Swaen, De Roeck, & Igalens, 2015)..

Stakeholders' role in CSR is critical for business success, they are the target and the means of accomplishing a satisfactory practice of CSR in organizations. This role is distinguished by how influential is a group of stakeholder for the corporation performance and survival, according to stakeholder theory (Freeman, 1984; Parmar et al., 2010). Consequently, managers have a defined ranking of stakeholders in terms of their importance to meet their expectations when planning and implementing corporate strategies including CSRs. They also ask stakeholders to interactively participate in corporate, mainly internal stakeholders who have more hands on the planning and achieving corporate strategies especially CSR. Employees are the key stakeholders who are targeted by most CSR activities of the organization and carry them out in most cases (Shen & Benson, 2014).

CSR is not what an organization does in order to be favorable in the society, rather it is organized around its stakeholders' perception of how good (bad) organization is being in society (El Akremi et al., 2015; Rupp, Ganapathi, Aguilera, & Williams, 2006). How employees perceive CSR strategy of their organizations, improves their images and perception of their organizations as well reputed ones in the societies (Carmeli, Gilat, & Waldman, 2007; Collier & Esteban, 2007; El Akremi et al., 2015).

How Team Creative environment is fostered by Corporate Social Responsibility and Team's

Organizational Citizenship Behaviors in Travel agencies? A Mediation Model

Corporations cannot serve their societies responsibly without the sincere voluntary effort of their employees. CSR is achieved through employees' efforts that go beyond regular duties and responsibilities to voluntary work (Caligiuri, Mencin, & Jiang, 2013). Employees volunteerism actions beyond-formal-duties are the base for CSR-related high performance and good reputation (Rupp, Shao, Thornton, & Skarlicki, 2013; Vlachos et al., 2014). Employees are key players in achieving CSR goals for the organization (Shen & Benson, 2014). Whether through remaining in their organizations and increasing their work efforts, or volunteering to carry out CSR activities, or for just being proud and committed to increase their organizations performance, employees are the most influential stakeholders in the CSR process (Collier & Esteban, 2007). Researchers found that external macro factors such as CSR, shape employees' organizational behavior, attitudes, and commitment (De Roeck, El Akremi, & Swaen, 2016; Rupp et al., 2006; Vlachos et al., 2014), moreover, it makes organizations more attractive for new employees (Evans & Davis, 2011; Gully, Phillips, Castellano, Han, & Kim, 2013). The mediated effect of CSR on OCB gained much attention from researchers of CSR.

Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB)

The literature offered three levels of analysis of OCB, the organizational, the group and the individual; refer to Brebels, De Cremer, and Van Dijke (2014)for a review. OCB's at the organizational level areemployees' extra-role activities that are not rewarded by the normal reward systems of the organization (Organ, 1988; Organ & Konovsky, 1989). More specifically, OCB at the organizational level (OCBO) is the employee effort to benefit the organization in general such as targeting behavior toward adhering to increasing and improving one's performance and consequently organizational performance (Williams & Anderson, 1991).

OCB at the work group-level (OCBG) represents a group norm of committing to helping members of the group to each other, and to new members, with a goal to improve group-performance and consequently organizational performance (Bachrach, Powell, Collins, & Richey, 2006; Bommer, Dierdorff, & Rubin, 2007). It is defined as the normative level of citizenship performed by members ofa work-group (Nielsen et al., 2012). This is more a normative interactional perspective of OCBG which is focused on the individual discretionary behavior directed toward other members to enhance the team performance and eventually the organizational performance (Choi & Sy, 2010). This perspective of OCBG is going to be the focus of this study. Some researchers broaden the concept of OCBG to include within groups interactions (Bommer et al., 2007), but this is beyond the focus of this study.

OCB at the individual level (OCBI) is the individual behavior that is directed toward helping other individuals, and benefiting the organization indirectly, such as felling for absent coworkers, giving help when needed (Chung et al., 2015; Williams & Anderson, 1991).

Researchers define OCB construct as multidimensional one with several categories that differ due to different views of OCB(LePine, Erez, & Johnson, 2002). Organ (1988) offers basic five-dimension definition of OCB. These dimensions have constituted the foundation for many studies; and later, were modified and altered by many researchers. For instance, Van Dyne, Graham, and Dienesch (1994) offered the political and covenantal relationship views as the most descriptive of OCB multidimensionality. They offered three dimensions of OCB: organizational obedience, loyalty, and participation. The authors found that the reciprocal nature of OCB mediates the relationship between employees' perception of organization support and motivation, performance, trust, commitment, and innovation of individuals.

OCB was mostly investigated as the dependent variable. A large number of researchers investigated the predictors of OCB. Predictors of OCB are: job responsibilities, justice (Fassina, Jones, & Uggerslev, 2008; Lin, Lyau, Tsai, Chen, & Chin, 2010), procedural justice (Lambert & Hogan, 2013; Lavelle et al., 2009; Tepper & Taylor, 2003), leadership style (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, & Bommer, 1996), individual differences (Bolino, Harvey, & Bachrach, 2012; Lester, Meglino, & Korsgaard, 2008). Some mediators of the relationship between predictors and OCB were tested; for instance, perceived organizational support mediates the relationship

How Team Creative environment is fostered by Corporate Social Responsibility and Team's

Organizational Citizenship Behaviors in Travel agencies? A Mediation Model

between procedural justice and OCB (Moorman, Blakely, & Niehoff, 1998). Few studies investigated the consequences of OCB on team members' attitudes and feelings, for instance, OCB was found to enhance satisfaction and commitment (Koopman, Lanaj, & Scott, 2016). OCB was not tested as mediator; neither directly related to CSR effects on teams, and especially at the group level of analysis.

*Why CSR and OCB connect?*Employees are the key stakeholders that the management seeks to satisfy, for their abilities to affect organizational strategies and outcome at all levels (Flammer & Luo, 2016; Gupta, Briscoe, & Hambrick, 2016). Results of previous research show evidence for the positive effect of CSR strategies and activities on employees' behavior and attitude. Implementing CSR strategy and activities improves employees' ethical perception and satisfaction (Bauman & Skitka, 2012; Valentine & Fleischman, 2008). Feeling part of a well reputed organization in the society improves corporation's imagefor employees (Albinger & Freeman, 2000; Soo-Yeon & Park, 2011; Turban & Greening, 1996). CSR improves employees sense of belonging to the organization (Glavas & Godwin, 2013), raises their commitment(Madsen & Rodgers, 2015; Peterson, 2004; Turker, 2009), and engagement to the organizational objectives (Jones, Willness, & Madey, 2014). CSR increases employees' extra-role helping to their co-workers (Shen & Benson, 2014). It is evident that helping behavior increases unit-level (Ehrhart, Bliese, & Thomas, 2006) and overall organizational effectiveness. Theoretically, external environment variables affect employees' behavior, perception, and satisfaction (Dreher, 1982) and the contextual factors outside and inside the organization affect OCB at all levels (Bommer et al., 2007). This all leads to one logical conclusion; CSR has amediating positive effect on employees' OCB at the group level (Farooq, Rupp, & Farooq, 2016; Jones, 2010).

A handful of studies focused on the direct effect of CSR on OCB at the organizational level. One of these studies is Lin et al. (2010) study that tested the effect of perceived CSR on employees' OCB. The study tested the interrelated effects of each dimension of CSR as perceived by employees and OCB. Results show that CSR has two dimensions, legal and ethical, positive associations with OCB dimensions; but perceived discretionary CSR negatively affects OCB's two dimensions: altruism and courtesy. They relate the negative effects to employees' preferences to CSR activities that serve the internal members of the organization directly over these targeted toward externals. Therefore, the more organizations get socially responsible the more employees become good citizens in their teams.

> *Hypothesis 1: Corporate Social Responsibilitywill relate positively to organizational citizenship behavior in teams.*

CSR & OCBG Dimensions multivariate effects. Researchers offered around three to four dimensions of the original concept of CSR as a discretionary action. Carroll (1979) offeredfour dimensions of CSR:economic, legal, ethical, and philanthropic. Latter Aupperle et al. (1985) operationalized these three dimensions. Schwartz and Carroll (2003) modified them to: economic, legal, and ethical with some interference among them. Henderson (2007) highlighted that the core dimensions of CSR are the social and the environmental. Aguinis (2011) offered three dimensions for CSR: economic, environmental, and social performance with a focus on stakeholders' expectations, but mostly external stakeholders. Not all researchers gave focus to internal stakeholders, who are influential for implementing CSR strategies. This study adopts dimensions of CSR that emphasis internal and external stakeholders' expectations. These are four dimensions: the responsibility to: society/environment, employees, customers, and government/legal, as developed by Turker (2009). These dimensions incorporated the original dimensions of Caroll's (1979) and the most recent ones of Aguinis' (2011).

Podsakoff and Mackenzie (1994) offer three dimensions for OCB at the group level, developed from the original dimensions of Organ (1988): Civic virtue, Sportsmanship, and Helping behavior. Civic virtue refers to employee's concerns regarding group's life, responsible participation in decision making to improve group performance (Carpenter, Berry, & Houston, 2014; Nielsen et al., 2012). Sportsmanship, as first offered by Organ (1988), refers to employee voluntarily readiness to tolerate minor workplace discomforts and less than ideal circumstances without complaining (Podsakoff, Ahearne, & MacKenzie, 1997). Helping means active assistance of other members of the work group and avoiding and preventing work-related problems (Nielsen et al., 2012).

How Team Creative environment is fostered by Corporate Social Responsibility and Team's

Organizational Citizenship Behaviors in Travel agencies? A Mediation Model

The three dimensions represent the voluntarily nature of employees' behavior to improve prosocial motivation, commitment, and creativity of their teams and consequently team performance (George & Bettenhausen, 1990; Hu & Liden, 2015).

Each of CSR four dimensions is expected to affect each of OCBG dimensions differently. Given that team members reactions to team interactions are affected by organizational and external level factors. Results of previous studies provide that the more employees participate in CSR activities the more they perceive their organizations as a good citizen in the society and the more they become committed to helping other members in their groups (Glavas & Kelley, 2014).

> *Hypothesis 1-a: Responsibility to Society is expected to relate positively to i. civic virtue, ii. Helping behavior, and iii. Sportsmanship of team members.*

Without being fully committed and motivated employees will not be willing to participate in CSR, voluntarily or obligatory (Collier & Esteban, 2007). It is evident that helping behavior increases unit-level (Ehrhart et al., 2006) and overall organizational effectiveness. Team members interact positively when they perceive the favorable value of employees in the company CSR strategies and become more willing to volunteer to work harder to improve the overall performance of their team. Therefore,

> *Hypothesis 1-b: Responsibility to Employees is positively related to i. civic virtue, ii. Helping behavior, and iii. Sportsmanship of team members.*

Customers are the focus of all organizational actions. When considerable attention was given to meeting customer expectations of CSR, employees were more active in voluntarily work for the organization (Luo & Bhattacharya, 2006). Responsibility to customers, motivated employees to improve the organizational performance; through being more cooperative (Korschun, Bhattacharya, & Swain, 2014). Therefore, we argue that employees will increase their helping behavior, and be more active in their teams when they perceive their organizations as being more socially responsible toward its customers.

> *Hypothesis 1-c: Responsibility to customers is positively related to i. civic virtue, ii. Helping behavior, and iii. Sportsmanship of team members.*

Committing to legal standards imposed by the government, gives employees a sense of security and legitimacy of all organizational actions and strategies through being more helpful for their team members (Porter et al., 2003). Employees, as a result, try to be in line with legal actions for their organizations to keep the social responsible image. This motivate employees to be good citizens and keep motivated to help their team members. Therefore, we argue that when employees perceive their organizations as legally legitimate and dedicated for the good of all society, they try harder to improve their organizations through being good citizens to their teams.

> *Hypothesis 1-d: Responsibility to government (legal responsibility) is positively related to i. civic virtue, ii. Helping behavior, and iii. Sportsmanship of team members.*

Team Creativity

Researchers offer different views of creativity and consequently there are numerous definitions of creativity. The common factor in these definition is that creativity contributes to changing the status quotowards creating meaningful improvement in outcomes to add value to stakeholders; as suggested in the original work of (Amabile, 1983; Bolen & Torrance, 1978; Cummings, 1965; Torrance, 1988). Woodman et al. (1993) define of creativity as "the creation of valuable, useful new product, service, idea, procedure, or process by individuals working together in a complex social system" p: 293. They conclude that the creative situation is the product of environment and social factors effect on creative behavior.

In accordance, researchers view team creativity as a group of interacting multilevel-processes that contribute to forming a creative team environment that fosters individual creativity (Gilson, Mathieu, Shalley, &

How Team Creative environment is fostered by Corporate Social Responsibility and Team's

Organizational Citizenship Behaviors in Travel agencies? A Mediation Model

Ruddy, 2005; Harvey, 2014; Hirst, Van Knippenberg, & Zhou, 2009; Shin, Kim, Lee, & Bian, 2012). Viewing team creativity as a process more than a trait of the team (Shin et al., 2012), researchers identified threecomplementary processes of team creativity. These processes are: - encouraging and supporting generating new ideas, - accepting change,and - flexibility in accepting and applying novel ideas (Choi & Thompson, 2005; Goncalo & Staw, 2006; Hulsheger, Anderson, & Salgado, 2009).

Team creativity is a process affected by the surrounding environment, to produce a team creative environment, through which members produce innovative, useful and useable outcome that changes the regular procedures of work and/or consumption habits. This outcome ranges between incremental to breakthrough ideas, processes, services, or products that improve the status-quo and add value to the organization and its stakeholders (George, 2007; Harvey, 2014; Lin, Law, & Zhou, 2016; Shin et al., 2012; Staw, 2009).

When the right work conditions are present in the organization's environment, and when team processes are positive, team environment becomes creative (Gilson et al., 2005; Pirola-Merlo & Mann, 2004). Team members engage in behaviors and activities devoted to developing novel solutions that work for various tasks, generate creative work processes, and produce innovative outcomes (Drazin, Glynn, & Kazanjian, 1999).

Research of team creativity has introduced several factors that promote team creativity that are related to organization and teamenvironment. Examples of factors related to organization's environment are: social capital inside the organization (Gu, Wang, & Wang, 2013; Han, Han, & Brass, 2014), and work environment (Amabile, Conti, Coon, Lazenby, & Herron, 1996), that support and accept change, and social interaction with outsiders, (Hulsheger et al., 2009). Supportive work environment and leader style enhance and encourage creativity through fostering intrinsic motivation of team members (Oldham & Cummings, 1996). These factors encourage team members to explore new ideas through gaining knowledge and information from, and share new ideas withoutsiders.

These factors are the team processes that motivate team members to be more creative and produce more ideas and outcomes. Examples of the team factors are: Commitment (Bishop, Scott, & Burroughs, 2000), learning culture (Joo, Song, Lim, & Yoon, 2012), information sharing (Gong, Kim, Lee, & Zhu, 2013), sharing experience (Gino, Argote, Miron-Spektor, & Todorova, 2010), different educational background (Shin & Zhou, 2007), cognitive diversity (Shin et al., 2012), and perspective taking (Hoever, van Knippenberg, van Ginkel, & Barkema, 2012) among team members.

Ample evidence provided in previous research shows the direct effect of social exchange within team members on team's creativity. Social exchange theory represented the foundation for team environment and processes that foster creativity (Aime, Humphrey, DeRue, & Paul, 2014; Khazanchi & Masterson, 2011; Liao, Liu, & Loi, 2010). The climate of interpersonal social interactions in teams fosters creativity when positive and motivational, as found in the study of ČErne, Nerstad, Dysvik, and ŠKerlavaj (2014). Negative demotivating climates lead to knowledge withholding among team members and negatively affect creativity as the authors found. Results of Chua (2013)'s study on the effect of social exchange environment, supports that conflict and negative interactions decreased creativity in multicultural teams. Informality in team interactions fosters creativity, according to results of Hirst, Van Knippenberg, Chin-Hui, and Sacramento (2011) study. Communication style within team members fosters creativity (Jia, Shaw, Tsui, & Park, 2014). When team environment encourage resources exploitation, creativity increases to a limit (Hirst, van Knippenberg, Zhou, Zhu, & Tsai, 2015).

Team creativity research rarely investigated OCB as a mediator. It was found that OCB mediated the effect of team identification on creative behavior in teams (Janssen & Xu Huang, 2008). However, the OCBG resulted high quality interactions among team members would foster creativity in teams. Social and organizational support was a factor in motivating teams to be more creative as supported by results of many studies (i.e. Luksyte & Spitzmueller, 2016; Oldham & Cummings, 1996). Social networking helped employees to be more creative through creating the appropriate support through interpersonal social exchange (Hirst, Van

How Team Creative environment is fostered by Corporate Social Responsibility and Team's

Organizational Citizenship Behaviors in Travel agencies? A Mediation Model

Knippenberg, Zhou, Quintane, & Zhu, 2015). To conclude, social environment is the major factor in fostering team creativity as research results indicated (Luksyte & Spitzmueller, 2016).

OCB at the team level means commitment to helping other members of the team, which makes the team social environment supportive for members' creativity. Therefore, we argue that:

> *Hypothesis 2: Organizational citizenship behavior at the team level will relate positively to team creative environment.*
>
> *Hypothesis 2-a:Civic Virtue, -b: Sportsmanship, -c: Helping will positively affect team creative environment.*

METHODS

The study major objective is to find out how OCBG mediates the effect of CSR on team creative environment. The branch objectives of the study are to test for the branch effects of the dimensions of OCBG and CSR in the hypothesized direction.

Sample

The sample of this study consists of 301middle-level managers and employees work in travel agencies and up-scale hotels, 4-star and above. Employees targeted in hotels were mainly employed by travel agencies as tour guides that are based in hotels to manage tourists groups. So in each hotel, a number of tour guides working for different travel agencies are met and asked to fill the survey for the current study. All travel agencies and hotels are located in Sharm-Elsheik city south-east of Egypt, to control for local environment effect on employees' behavior. Sharm-Elsheik is world-wide famous as a tourism destination attracting tourists from all over the world especially Europe and Russia. We delivered one survey personally to the participants over a four-week period, while staying in the city for trips of 3-days each. We toured most hotels and firms and asked for the management's approval to participate, we left printed surveys to participants and returned in 2-3 days to pick them up. Response rates was 88%, 12% of employees refused to participate in the study for being busy. The survey was anonymous with no personal data required. All responses were valid with few missing data in age and experience part. The survey included all variable measures and was conducted in English. English is the second language in Egypt and is mastered by all middle-managers and employees in the tourism field allover Egypt.

The 301 participants' average age of 28 and their ages ranged from 20 years to 55 years. Participants' experience ranged from 1-year to 25-years with average of 5 years of experience. Participants were all males, to avoid gender effect on responses, and because generally the majority of workers in the tourism industry in Egypt are male (97%) (UNWTO, 2011), particularly in Sharm-Elsheik city, due to reallocation from home-cities and the demanding work conditions (Elgammal and Wilbert, 2013). All participants had medium to high-level education.

Measures

Unless otherwise noted, all scales used were seven-point Likert responses. Basically, all responses were modified to Likert 7-point instead of the original 5-point responses to give participants more freedom to express their opinions. So we asked participants the following: Please decide if you agree or disagree with each of the following statement. Circle the choice that accurately characterizes you from the provided answers noting that:7 = "absolutely accurate", 6 = "somehow accurate", 5 = "accurate", 4= "undecided", 3 = "inaccurate", 2= "somehow inaccurate", 1= "completely inaccurate"

The independent variable, CSR

How Team Creative environment is fostered by Corporate Social Responsibility and Team's

Organizational Citizenship Behaviors in Travel agencies? A Mediation Model

We adopt the view of most academics of CSR as multi-dimensional structure, and choose the dimensions that focus on stakeholders' expectations. The four dimensionsincorporate Caroll's (1979) and Aguinis' (2011) view of CSR responsibility to: society/environment, employees, customers, and government/legal. To measure these dimensions, we used the scale validated by Truker (2009) to measure these four dimensions. The scale has 18 items written in plural format to express team level sense of CSR. For example, "Our organization implements special programs to minimize its negative impact on the natural environment," "Our organization respects consumer rights beyond the legal requirements."

The mediator variable, OCBG: Some previous studies used a rated survey of team members to each other OCB or supervisor evaluation of individual OCB. We used a self-reported survey to Measure OCB. Results of a meta-analysis of 133 studies show that predictors are of the same significance for OCB reported by the participant and OCB evaluated by some raters such as the manager or coworkers(LePine et al., 2002). A recent meta-analysis study results showed minimal differences between self-rated and other-rated OCB of individuals (Carpenter et al., 2014).Measuring OCB as self-reported construct has been used widely in previous research and is an accepted measure of OCB at all levels by most researchers.

To measure OCBG, the three dimensions model offered by Farh, Podsakoff, & Organ(1990), was used. The scale was a self-reported scale of OCB offered in later studies of (Podsakoff et al., 1997) to measure team-members OCBG. The actual items were all first-person statements, for example "I give my time to help employees with work-relatedproblems",and "I support employees who have problems at work." Original items were modified to test OCBG by altering them to ask about interactions with team members. For instance, the item used was "I give my time to help my team members with work-related problems", and "I support my team members who have problems at work."

The dependent variable, creative team environment;which is defined as"one in which members encourage each other to be engaged in creative activities and to employ creative work processes" (Gilson et al., 2005, p:522). The team creative environment is essentially dependent on internal team processes and outside organizational factors (Janssen & Xu Huang, 2008). Team processes that affect team creative environment are: team members' support of each other ideas, encouragement for generating ideas, and acceptance of change; willingness to implement creative ideas and initiatives of the team members (Jiang & Zhang, 2014).

To measure creative team environment, we used a modified version of Gilson's et al. (2005) three-item scale of team creative environment. The three items are: 1- My workgroup members always welcome change to improve work, 2- My workgroup members always encourage each other to try new things, even though they might not work, 3- My work group members are always willing to try creative solutions to solve difficult problems. We used Likert 7-point scale instead of the original 5-point scale. Each participant, who represents a team member, was askedto decide if s/he agrees that the three statements are accurate.

RESULTS

Means, standard deviations, and correlations of the study main variables are shown in Table 1. The correlation test shows significant correlations between variables in the hypothesized direction. Table 2 exhibits means, standard deviations, and correlations of the dimensions of CSR and OCBG and TCE. Notably, sportsmanship has the lowest correlations of all, indicating a different effect for each of OCBG dimensions on the hypothesized relationships.

Results of the regression analysis models that were used to test mediation and Hypotheses 1 & 2, are exhibited in Table 3. Table 4 exhibits the results of testing Hypothesis 1 a-d and 2 a-c.

To test the mediation effect, of OCBG, four-steps were done, as suggest by David and Kenny (1986) original three steps and later added fourth step. Results support the mediation of OCBG to the indirect effect of CSR on team creative environment (TCE).

How Team Creative environment is fostered by Corporate Social Responsibility and Team's

Organizational Citizenship Behaviors in Travel agencies? A Mediation Model

Table 3 exhibits the results of the regression analysis models that were used to test mediation and Hypotheses 1 & 2, the table reports the unstandardized coefficient (*b*), standard error (SE), standardized beta coefficient (β), *t*-value and both R^2 and F-value associated with each of the regression models. Table 4 & 5 exhibit the results of testing Hypothesis 1 a-d. Table 6 exhibits results for testing Hypothesis 2 a-c.

To test the mediation effect, of OCBG, a four steps-procedure were done, as suggest by David and Kenny (1986) original three steps and later added fourth step for testing mediation. Results support the mediation of OCBG to the indirect effect of CSR on team creative environment (TCE).

Table 1
Correlations for main effects of OCB & CSR

	Mean	ST.Dev.	1	2	3
1. TCE	5.49	1.27	1		
2. OCB	5.65	1.26	.68**	1	
3. CSR	5.67	0.75	.75**	.63**	1

N= 301
 * *p< .05*
** *p < .01*

Table 2
Correlations for Dimensions of OCB & CSR

	Mean	ST. Dev.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1. Team Creative Environment	5.49	1.27	1							
2. Helping Behavior	5.99	0.85	.65**	1						
3. Civic Behavior	5.25	0.99	.74**	.80**	1					
4. Sportsmanship	5.77	1.01	.22**	.28**	.21**	1				
5. Res. to Society	5.53	1.27	.73**	.61**	.58**	.15**	1			
6. Res. to Employees	5.48	1.36	.71**	.56**	.55**	.19**	.82**	1		
7. Res. to Customers	5.81	1.19	.52**	.58**	.50**	.14*	.63**	.64**	1	
8. Legal Res.	5.78	1.31	.67**	.66**	.56**	.18**	.73**	.69**	.66**	1

N= 301
 * *p< .05*
** *p < .01*

50

Table 3

Regression Models for TCE, OCBG, & CSR

	Model 1 (TCE / CSR)				Model 2 (OCBG / CSR)				Model 3 (TCE / OCBG)				Model 4 (TCE / OCBG, CSR)			
	b	SE	B	t	b	SE	β	t	b	SE	β	t	b	SE	β	t
Team Creative Environment (TCE)	.68ª	.25*		2.75ª					-1.08ª	.42*		-2.62*	-1.3ª	.34*		-3.7
Organizational Behavior at the Group level (OCBG)					3.33ª	.17*		19.35ª	1.6*	.07*	.68*	15.98ª	.59*	.08*	.34*	7.65ª
Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR)	.85ª	.04*	.75*	19.7ª	.41*	.03*	.63*	13.87ª					.61*	.05*	.54*	11.9ª
R^2		.57*				.39*				.46*				.64*		
F		387.8ª				192.3ª				255.2ª				260.4ª		

* $\rho < 0.05$ N = 301

How Team Creative environment is fostered by Corporate Social Responsibility and Team's

Organizational Citizenship Behaviors in Travel agencies? A Mediation Model

Mediation and Main effects

The direct effect size for CSR on TCE is larger than the same effect when OCBG inserted, model 4, and there is a direct significant effect of OCBG on TCE and of CSR on OCBG. Details follow.

First, regression model for the direct effect of CSR on team creative environment (TCE) was done; $\beta = .75$, $\rho < 0.05$, standard error of 0.04, $R^2 = .57$ and $F (1,300) = 387.8$, $\rho < 0.05$. *Second,* regression model for the direct effect of CSR on OCBG was done; with $\beta = .63$, $\rho < 0.05$, standard error of 0.03, $R^2 = .39$ and $F (1,300) = 193.2$, $\rho < 0.05$. *Third,* the regression model for the direct effect of OCBG on TCE was done, with $\beta = .68$, $\rho < 0.05$, standard error of 0.07, $R^2 = .46$ and $F (1,300) = 255.2$, $\rho < 0.05$. *Fourth,* we ran a regression model for the effect of both CSR ($\beta = .54$, $\rho < 0.05$), and OCBG ($\beta = .34$, $\rho < 0.05$), on TCE, with $R^2 = .64$ and $F (1,300) = 260.4$, $\rho < 0.05$. Therefore, mediation of OCBG is supported by enough evidence from the data, and relationships are in the hypothesized direction.

Hypothesis one was supported by the results of regression model 2. CSR explains around 40% of the variance in OCBG, $R^2 = .39$, $\rho < 0.05$, and $F (1,300) = 193.2$, $\rho < 0.05$. Hypothesis two was supported by the results of regression model 3 that show that OCGB explains 46% of the variance in TCE, OCBG, $R^2 = .46$, $\rho < 0.05$, and $F (1,300) = 255.2$, $\rho < 0.05$.

Multivariate analysis of CSR & OCBG dimensions

It is interesting to know which dimension of CSR would be more effective on the three dimensions of OCBG. In details, which type of social responsibility, to society, employees, customers, or government, would be more effective on employees' civic virtue, helping behavior, and sportsmanship?

A multivariate analysis was conducted to know these effect. Results of the multivariate analysis to test hypotheses 1a, c, b, d: i, ii, iii, are shown in Table 4 & 5. Most results support relationships in the hypothesized direction except for sportsmanship. The overall effect of CSR on each of OCBG dimensions are shown in model one, the corrected model of Table 4. The effect of CSR on helping behavior is important $R^2 = .49$, $F (4, 296) = 193.2$, $\rho < 0.05$. CSR has a significant but not sizable effect on sportsmanship $R^2 = .04$, $F (4, 296) = 3.31$, $\rho < 0.05$. The effect of CSR on civic virtue is important $R^2 = .39$, $F (4, 296) = 47.69$, $\rho < 0.05$.

For the individual effect of each of CSR's four dimensions on each of OCBG's three dimensions, different impacts resulted. Responsibility to society (RSS) has significant impact on helping $\beta = 0.13$, $\rho < 0.05$, standard error of 0.05, $F (1,296) = 6.43$, $\rho < 0.05$; and civic virtue $\beta = 0.20$, $\rho < 0.05$, standard error of 0.07, $F (1,296) = 8.02$, $\rho < 0.05$; but not on sportsmanship $\beta = -0.06$, $\rho < 0.05$, standard error of 0.09, $F (1,296) = 0.50$, $\rho = 0.48$.

Responsibility to employees (RSE) has significant effect size on helping $\beta = 0.01$, $\rho < 0.05$, standard error of 0.05, but $F (1, 296) = 0.02$, $\rho = 0.089$. RSS has significant effect on civic virtue $\beta = 0.09$, $\rho < 0.05$, standard error of 0.06, but $F (1, 296) = 2.06$, $\rho = 0.152$. RSE has significant effect on sportsmanship $\beta = 0.12$, $\rho < 0.05$, standard error of 0.08, but $F (1,296) = 2.86$ $\rho = .09$.

Responsibility to customers (RSCU) has a significant effect on helping behavior $\beta = 0.15$, $\rho < 0.05$, standard error of 0.04, $F (1,296) = 13.38$, $\rho < 0.05$. RSCU has significant effect on civic virtue $\beta = 0.11$, $\rho < 0.05$, standard error of 0.06, $F (1,296) = 3.92$, $\rho < 0.05$. RSCU has no effect on sportsmanship, all parameters are close to zero and non-significant as Tables 4 & 5 indicate.

Table 4   **Multivariate Analysis of CSR & OCBG dimensions**

Independent Variable	Dependent Variable	SS	df	F	ρ	η²	Λ	F (3,296)	ρ
1. Corrected Model (CSR)	Helping Behavior	104.92 [a]	4	70.51	.000	.488			
	Sportsmanship	12.84[b]	4	3.31	.011	.043			
	Civic Virtue	120.72[c]	4	47.69	.000	.392			
2. Intercept	Helping Behavior	94.71	1	254.60	.000	.462	.437	126.30	.000
	Sportsmanship	202.53	1	209.11	.000	.414			
	Civic Virtue	71.79	1	113.43	.000	.277			
3. RSS	Helping Behavior	2.39	1	6.43	.012	.021	.966	3.44	.017
	Sportsmanship	.482	1	.50	.481	.002			
	Civic Virtue	5.08	1	8.02	.005	.026			
4. RSE	Helping Behavior	.007	1	.02	.894	.000	.979	2.08	.102
	Sportsmanship	2.77	1	2.86	.092	.010			
	Civic Virtue	1.31	1	2.06	.152	.007			
5. RSCU	Helping Behavior	4.98	1	13.38	.000	.043	.954	4.76	.003
	Sportsmanship	.00	1	.000	.989	.000			
	Civic Virtue	2.48	1	3.92	.049	.013			
6. RSL	Helping Behavior	10.77	1	28.96	.000	.089	.909	9.77	.000
	Sportsmanship	1.55	1	1.60	.206	.005			
	Civic Virtue	5.68	1	8.98	.003	.029			
Error	Helping Behavior	110.11	296						
	Sportsmanship	286.70	296						
	Civic Virtue	187.34	296						

R Squared = .49 (Adjusted R Squared = .48)[a]

R Squared = .04 (Adjusted R Squared = .03)[b]

R Squared = .39 (Adjusted R Squared = .38)[c]

How Team Creative environment is fostered by Corporate Social Responsibility and Team's Organizational Citizenship Behaviors in

Travel agencies? A Mediation Model

How Team Creative environment is fostered by Corporate Social Responsibility and Team's

Organizational Citizenship Behaviors in Travel agencies? A Mediation Model

Table 5

Effect sizes of the Multivariate Analysis of CSR & OCBG dimensions

Dependent Variable	Parameter	*B*	*SE*	*t*
	Intercept	2.99*	.19	15.956
	RSS	.13*	.05	2.535
Helping Behavior	RSE	.01	.05	.133
	RSCU	.15*	.04	3.658
	RSL	.23*	.04	5.382
	Intercept	4.37*	.30	14.460
	RSS	-.06	.09	-.705
Sportsmanship	RSE	.12**	.08	1.692
	RSCU	.001	.07	.014
	RSL	.09	.07	1.266
	Intercept	2.60*	.24	10.650
	RSS	.20*	.07	2.833
Civic Behavior	RSE	.09	.06	1.436
	RSCU	.11*	.06	1.980
	RSL	.17*	.06	2.996

N= 301
* *p< .05*
** *p < .01*

Legal responsibility (RSL) has a significant effect on helping behavior $\beta = 0.23$, $\rho < 0.05$, standard error of 0.04, $F (1, 296) = 28.96$, $\rho < 0.05$. And to civic virtue $\beta = 0.17$, $\rho < 0.05$, standard error of 0.06, $F (1, 296) = 8.98$, $\rho < 0.05$. RSL has no significant effect on sportsmanship $\beta = 0.09$, $\rho < 0.05$, standard error of 0.07, $F (1, 296) = 1.6$, $\rho = 0.206$.

How Team Creative environment is fostered by Corporate Social Responsibility and Team's

Organizational Citizenship Behaviors in Travel agencies? A Mediation Model

Table 6
Regression results for the effect of OCBG dimensions on TCE

	Team Creative Environment			t	ρ
	ƅ	SE	β		
(Constant)	.47	.36		1.30	.194
HELP	.31	.08	.24	3.68	.000
SPORT	.01	.05	.01	.22	.828
CIVIC	.54	.07	.48	7.44	.000
R^2		.46*			
F (3,297)		85.69*			

N= 301
* $p < .05$

OCBG dimensions have different effects on team creative environment, as shown in Table 6. For the particular effects, results show significance for the effect of helping behavior on creativity (B = 0.24, p< 0.05). Also sportsmanship does not have important effect on creativity (B = 0.01, p = 0.828). Civic virtue shows significant effect on creativity (B = 0.48, p <0.05).

DISCUSSION

This paper offered a new model of team creativity predictors. We assumed a non-preceded OCB mediation of the relationship between CSR and creativity. The results support the assumed mediation; there is no significant direct effect of CSR on team creativity. There is a direct significant effect of CSR on OCBG, and in the same direction there is a direct significant effect of OCBG on team creative environment.

The study results strongly support the two hypotheses; CSR positively affects OCBG, which in turn positively affects team creativity. These results supports that organizational citizenship behavior at the team level is necessary to have creative teams in socially responsible organizations. CSR by itself is a positive behavior of organizations that have fostered employees' sense of belongings to the organization (i.e. Glaves & Godwin, 2013) and commitments (i.e. Madsen & Rodgers, 2015). However, is not enough to foster for creative team environment and increase team creativity without organizational citizenship behavior at the team level. This indicates that employees are one of the most influential stakeholders within the tourism industry. Top management should put them in a core attention when planning CSR strategies.

Interestingly, when we tested the effect of each of the dimensions of CSR and OCBG we found no significance for some of the dimensions. Responsibility to society (RSS) that was expected to positively affect the three dimensions of OCBG as hypothesized in H1a was not in the expected direction. RSS significantly affected the helping behavior and civic virtue but not sportsmanship. This supports hypotheses H1-ai and H1-aii but not H1-aiii. Helping and civic behavior are more important to employees working in teams in the Egyptian tourism industry. Employees are more able to be engaged in team working and to improve team performance and processes. However, they will not tolerate workplace discomfort or circumstances that are up to their expectations.

How Team Creative environment is fostered by Corporate Social Responsibility and Team's

Organizational Citizenship Behaviors in Travel agencies? A Mediation Model

Responsibility to employees (RSE) has a significant but not sizable (0.01) effect on helping behavior and on civic virtue but significantly affected. Employees show more motivation towards responsibility to society compared to their own best benefits. This contradicts some studies that gave internal stakeholders more weights in CSR strategies compared to external stakeholders (Flammer & Luo, 2016; Gupta *et.al*. 2016).

Responsibility to customers (RSCU) showed a significant effect on the helping behavior and civic virtue but not sportsmanship which in line with the previous results of RSS and RSE. Legal responsibility has shown the same results as well. Employees prefer to show more responsibility to external stakeholders than to themselves within the tourism industry.

The overall practices of CSR enhance each of OCBG dimensions but not equally. Sportsmanship was not enhanced with a large degree.

For the dimensions of OCBG; helping and civic behavior, have a significant effect on TCE. Only sportsmanship did not have significant effect on TCE in the current study. This supports hypothesis H2-a and H2-c and reject hypothesis H2-b. Creativity fostered by sharing ideas and collaboration among team members(Choi & Thompson, 2005; Goncalo & Staw, 2006; Hulsheger et al., 2009), but negatively affected by intolerance of uncomfortable working conditions.

All results showed insignificance for sportsmanship. Employees prefer to work in comfortable and acceptable working environment to be more creative.

Researchers should investigate the individual dimensions of some multi-dimensional constructs in different cultures to check on the universality of each of the dimensions.

Importance of CSR for employee's dimensions shows that the sample of employees as one group of stakeholders favors organizational actions and strategies targeted toward their wellbeing over other stakeholders groups. They care more for how much benefits they could gain from their corporations and less for benefits to other internal or external groups.

Conclusion and implications

The results of the current study suggest a wide range of activities that could be undertaken to strengthen team creativity within the tourism industry, several of these activitiesrise to the level of highest priority, such as, working with the Ministry of Tourism to determine information needed to relate CSR and OCB to team creativity and monitor how tourism organizations are developing steps towards such activities.

Tourism organizations, particularly travel agencies, need to give more attention to the impact of their adoption of CSR on their team creativity and encourage more innovative ideas brought up by employees and middle managers in order to improve performance and maximize the overall benefits. This could enhance the environmental, social and economic impact of tourism organizations and consequently improve their sustainability practices.

Excellence in performance among tourism organizations could also be achieved through sharing best practices in relation to CSR, OCB and team creativity. This could help in enhancing the overall performance of the tourism industry by adopting good applicable innovative ideas and consequently moving forward towards achieving sustainable tourism development.

For research to progress further and to match these ambitions, greater critical engagement with conventional thinking at macro/micro level of CSR is required using different conceptual and methodological approaches. It is important to check for some other mediators of the suggested relationship of CSR and team creativity, which raises a question regarding the universality of all the

How Team Creative environment is fostered by Corporate Social Responsibility and Team's

Organizational Citizenship Behaviors in Travel agencies? A Mediation Model

dimensions of certain constructs. We suggest that some team variables may be good mediators such as quality of team interactions, team coherence, and information sharing among members.

Some organizational level variables may moderate the effect of OCB on team creative environment such as ethical values, and different types of organizational justice. Several individual variables are important to be investigated as mediators of the relationship between OCB and team creative environments such as self-control, regulatory focus, and emotional intelligence.

References

Aguilera, R. V., Rupp, D. E., Williams, C. A., & Ganapathi, J. 2007. Putting the S back in corporate social responsibility: A multilevel theory of social change in organizations. *Academy of Management Review*, 32(3): 836-863.

Aguinis, H. 2011. Organizational responsibility: Doing good and doing well. In S. Zedeck (Ed.), *APA handbook of industrial and organizational psychology*, Vol. 3: 855-879: American Psychological Association.

Aime, F., Humphrey, S., DeRue, D. S., & Paul, J. B. 2014. The Riddle of Heterarchy: Power Transitions in Cross-Functional Teams. *Academy of Management Journal*, 57(2): 327-352.

Albinger, H. S., & Freeman, S. J. 2000. Corporate Social Performance and Attractiveness as an Employer to Different Job Seeking Populations. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 28(3): 243-253.

Amabile, T. M. 1983. The social psychology of creativity: A componential conceptualization. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 45(2): 357-376.

Amabile, T. M., Conti, R., Coon, H., Lazenby, J., & Herron, M. 1996. Assessing the work environment for creativity *Academy of Management Journal*, 39(5): 1154-1184.

Armstrong, J. S., & Green, K. C. 2013. Effects of corporate social responsibility and irresponsibility policies. *Journal of Business Research*, 66(10): 1922-1927.

Arvidsson, S. 2010. Communication of Corporate Social Responsibility: A Study of the Views of Management Teams in Large Companies. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 96(3): 339-354.

Aupperle, K. E., Carroll, A. B., & Hatfield, J. D. 1985. An empirical examination of the relationship between corporate social responsibility and profitability. *Academy of management Journal*, 28(2): 446-463.

Bachrach, D. G., Powell, B. C., Collins, B. J., & Richey, R. G. 2006. Effects of task interdependence on the relationship between helping behavior and group performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91(6): 1396.

Baron, R. M., & Kenny, D. A. 1986. The moderator–mediator variable distinction in social psychological research: Conceptual, strategic, and statistical considerations. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 51(6): 1173.

Bauman, C. W., & Skitka, L. J. 2012. Corporate social responsibility as a source of employee satisfaction. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 32: 63-86.

Bishop, J. W., Scott, K. D., & Burroughs, S. M. 2000. Support, Commitment, and Employee Outcomes in a Team Environment. *Journal of Management*, 26(6): 1113-1132.

Bolen, L. M., & Torrance, E. P. 1978. The influence on creative thinking of locus of control, cooperation, and sex. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 34(4): 903-907.

Bolino, M. C., Harvey, J., & Bachrach, D. G. 2012. A self-regulation approach to understanding citizenship behavior in organizations. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 119(1): 126-139.

Bommer, W. H., Dierdorff, E. C., & Rubin, R. S. 2007. Does Prevalence Mitigate Relevance? The Moderating Effect of Group-Level OCB on Employee Performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 50(6): 1481-1494.

How Team Creative environment is fostered by Corporate Social Responsibility and Team's

Organizational Citizenship Behaviors in Travel agencies? A Mediation Model

Bowen, H. R. 1953. *Social responsibilities of the businessman*. New York: Harber & Row.

Brammer, S., He, H., & Mellahi, K. 2014. Corporate Social Responsibility, Employee Organizational Identification, and Creative Effort The Moderating Impact of Corporate Ability. *Group & Organization Management*: 1059601114562246.

Brammer, S., & Millington, A. 2008. Does It Pay to Be Different? An Analysis of the Relationship between Corporate Social and Financial Performance. *Strategic Management Journal*, 29(12): 1325-1343.

Brebels, L., De Cremer, D., & Van Dijke, M. 2014. Using Self-Definition to Predict the Influence of Procedural Justice on Organizational-, Interpersonal-, and Job/Task-Oriented Citizenship Behavior. *Journal of Management*, 40(3): 731-763.

Caligiuri, P., Mencin, A., & Jiang, K. 2013. Win–Win–Win: The Influence of Company-Sponsored Volunteerism Programs on Employees, NGOs, and Business Units. *Personnel Psychology*, 66(4): 825-860.

Campbell, J. L. 2007. Why would corporations behave in socially responsible ways? an institutional theory of corporate social responsibility. *Academy of Management Review*, 32(3): 946-967.

Carmeli, A., Gilat, G., & Waldman, D. A. 2007. The Role of Perceived Organizational Performance in Organizational Identification, Adjustment and Job Performance*. *Journal of Management Studies*, 44(6): 972-992.

Carpenter, N. C., Berry, C. M., & Houston, L. 2014. A meta-analytic comparison of self-reported and other-reported organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 35(4): 547-574.

Carroll, A. B. 1979. A Three-Dimensional Conceptual Model of Corporate Performance. *Academy of Management Review*, 4(4): 497-505.

ČErne, M., Nerstad, C. G. L., Dysvik, A., & ŠKerlavaj, M. 2014. What goes around comes around: Knowledge hiding, percieved motivitional climate, and creativity. *Academy of Management Journal*, 57(1): 172-192.

Chin, M. K., Hambrick, D. C., & Trevino, L. K. 2013. Political Ideologies of CEOs: The Influence of Executives' Values on Corporate Social Responsibility. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 58(2): 197-232.

Choi, H.-S., & Thompson, L. 2005. Old wine in a new bottle: Impact of membership change on group creativity. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 98(2): 121-132.

Choi, J. N., & Sy, T. 2010. Group-level organizational citizenship behavior: Effects of demographic faultlines and conflict in small work groups. *Journal of Organizational behavior*, 31(7): 1032-1054.

Chua, R. Y. J. 2013. The costs of ambient cultural disharmony: Indirect intercultural conflicts in social environment undermine creativity *Academy of Management Journal*, 56(6): 1545-1577.

Chung, Y., Liao, H., Jackson, S. E., Subramony, M., Colakoglu, S., & Jiang, Y. 2015. Cracking but not Breaking: Joint Effects of Faultline Strength and Diversity Climate on Loyal Behavior. *Academy of Management Journal*, 58(5): 1495-1515.

Coles, T.Fenclova, E. and Dinan, C. (2013) Tourism and corporate social responsibility: A critical review and research agenda. *Tourism Management Perspectives*, 6 (2013): 122–141

Collier, J., & Esteban, R. 2007. Corporate social responsibility and employee commitment. *Business Ethics: A European Review*, 16(1): 19-33.

Crilly, D., Zollo, M., & Hansen, M. T. 2012. Faking It or Muddling Through? Understanding Decoupling in Response to Stakeholder Pressures. *Academy of Management Journal*, 55(6): 1429-1448.

Cummings, L. 1965. Organizational Climates for Creativity. *Academy of Management Journal*, 8(3): 220-227.

How Team Creative environment is fostered by Corporate Social Responsibility and Team's

Organizational Citizenship Behaviors in Travel agencies? A Mediation Model

De Roeck, K., El Akremi, A., & Swaen, V. 2016. Consistency Matters! How and When Does Corporate Social Responsibility Affect Employees' Organizational Identification? *Journal of Management Studies*: n/a-n/a.

Dodds, R. and Kuehnel, J. 2010. CSR among Canadian mass tour operators: good awareness but little action, *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 22 (2): 221 -– 244

Drazin, R., Glynn, M. A., & Kazanjian, R. K. 1999. Multilevel theorizing about creativity in organizations: A sensemanking perspective *Academy of Management Review*, 24(2): 286-307.

Dreher, G. F. 1982. The Impact of Extra-Work Variables on Behavior in Work Environments. *The Academy of Management Review*, 7(2): 300-304.

Ehrhart, M. G., Bliese, P. D., & Thomas, J. L. 2006. Unit-Level OCB and Unit Effectiveness: Examining the Incremental Effect of Helping Behavior. *Human Performance*, 19(2): 159-173.

El Akremi, A., Gond, J.-P., Swaen, V., De Roeck, K., & Igalens, J. 2015. How Do Employees Perceive Corporate Responsibility? Development and Validation of a Multidimensional Corporate Stakeholder Responsibility Scale. *Journal of Management*.

Elgammal, I. and Wilbert, Ch. (2013) Tourism mobilities, marriages and 'mimicking some experiences of domestic migrant tourist workers in Sharm Elsheikh, *Annals of Leisure Research*, 16 (4): 332-347

Evans, R. W., & Davis, W. D. 2011. An Examination of Perceived Corporate Citizenship, Job Applicant Attraction, and CSR Work Role Definition. *Business & Society*, 50(3): 456-480.

Farh, J.-L., Podsakoff, P. M., & Organ, D. W. 1990. Accounting for Organizational Citizenship Behavior: Leader Fairness and Task Scope versus Satisfaction. *Journal of Management*, 16(4): 705-721.

Farooq, O., Rupp, D., & Farooq, M. 2016. The Multiple Pathways through which Internal and External Corporate Social Responsibility Influence Organizational Identification and Multifoci Outcomes: The Moderating Role of Cultural and Social Orientations. *Academy of Management Journal*.

Fassina, N. E., Jones, D. A., & Uggerslev, K. L. 2008. Meta-analytic tests of relationships between organizational justice and citizenship behavior: testing agent-system and shared-variance models. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 29(6): 805-828.

Ferus-Comelo, A. (2014) CSR as corporate self-reporting in India's tourism industry, *Social Responsibility Journal*, 10(1): 53–67.

Flammer, C. 2013. Corporate Social Responsibility and Shareholder Reaction: The Environmental Awareness of Investors. *Academy of Management Journal*, 56(3): 758-781.

Flammer, C., & Luo, J. 2016. Corporate social responsibility as an employee governance tool: Evidence from a quasi-experiment. *Strategic Management Journal*: n/a-n/a.

Freeman, R. E. 1984. *Strategic management: A stakeholder approach*: Cambridge University Press.

Freeman, R. E., Harrison, J. S., & Wicks, A. C. 2007. *Managing for stakeholders: Survival, reputation, and success*: Yale University Press.

George, J. M. 2007. Creativity in Organizations. *Academy of Management Annals*, 1(1): 439-477.

George, J. M., & Bettenhausen, K. 1990. Understanding prosocial behavior, sales performance, and turnover: A group-level analysis in a service context. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 75(6): 698-709.

Gilson, L. L., Mathieu, J. E., Shalley, C. E., & Ruddy, T. M. 2005. Creativity and standardization: Complementary or conflicting drivers of team effectiveness? *Academy of Management Journal*, 48(3): 521-531.

Gino, F., Argote, L., Miron-Spektor, E., & Todorova, G. 2010. First, get your feet wet: The effects of learning from direct and indirect experience on team creativity. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 111(2): 102-115.

How Team Creative environment is fostered by Corporate Social Responsibility and Team's

Organizational Citizenship Behaviors in Travel agencies? A Mediation Model

Glavas, A., & Godwin, L. N. 2013. Is the Perception of 'Goodness' Good Enough? Exploring the Relationship Between Perceived Corporate Social Responsibility and Employee Organizational Identification. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 114(1): 15-27.

Glavas, A., & Kelley, K. 2014. The effects of perceived corporate social responsibility on employee attitudes. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 24(02): 165-202.

Goncalo, J. A., & Staw, B. M. 2006. Individualism–collectivism and group creativity. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 100(1): 96-109.

Gong, Y., Kim, T.-Y., Lee, D.-R., & Zhu, J. 2013. A Multilevel Model of Team Goal Orientation, Information Exchange, and Creativity. *Academy of Management Journal*, 56(3): 827-851.

Gu, Q., Wang, G. G., & Wang, L. 2013. Social capital and innovation in R&D teams: the mediating roles of psychological safety and learning from mistakes. *R&D Management*, 43(2): 89-102.

Gully, S. M., Phillips, J. M., Castellano, W. G., Han, K., & Kim, A. 2013. A Mediated Moderation Model of Recruiting Socially and Environmentally Responsible Job Applicants. *Personnel Psychology*, 66(4): 935-973.

Gupta, A., Briscoe, F., & Hambrick, D. C. 2016. Red, Blue, and Purple Firms: Organizational Political Ideology and Corporate Social Responsibility. *Strategic Management Journal*: n/a-n/a.

Han, J., Han, J., & Brass, D. J. 2014. Human capital diversity in the creation of social capital for team creativity. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 35(1): 54-71.

Harvey, S. 2014. Creative synthesis: Exploring the process of extraordinary group creativity. *Academy of Management Review*, 39(3): 324-343.

Henderson, J.C. (2007) Corporate social responsibility and tourism: Hotel companies in Phuket, Thailand, after the Indian Ocean tsunami. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 26 (1) (2007), pp. 228–239.

Hirst, G., Van Knippenberg, D., Chin-Hui, C., & Sacramento, C. A. 2011. How does bureaucracy impact individual creativity? A cross-level investigation of team contextual influences on goal orientation-creativity relationships *Academy of Management Journal*, 54(3): 624-641.

Hirst, G., Van Knippenberg, D., & Zhou, J. 2009. A cross-level perspective on employee creativity: Goal orientation, team learning behavior, and individual creativity *Academy of Management Journal*, 52(2): 280-293.

Hirst, G., Van Knippenberg, D., Zhou, J., Quintane, E., & Zhu, C. 2015. Heard it through the grapevine: Indirect networks and employee creativity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 100(2): 567.

Hirst, G., van Knippenberg, D., Zhou, Q., Zhu, C. J., & Tsai, P. C.-F. 2015. Exploitation and Exploration Climates' Influence on Performance and Creativity: Diminishing Returns as Function of Self-Efficacy. *Journal of Management*.

Hoever, I. J., van Knippenberg, D., van Ginkel, W. P., & Barkema, H. G. 2012. Fostering team creativity: perspective taking as key to unlocking diversity's potential. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 97(5): 982-996.

Hu, J., & Liden, R. C. 2015. Making a Difference in the Teamwork: Linking Team Prosocial Motivation to Team Processes and Effectiveness. *Academy of Management Journal*, 58(4): 1102-1127.

Hulsheger, U. R., Anderson, N., & Salgado, J. F. 2009. Team-level predictors of innovation at work: a comprehensive meta-analysis spanning three decades of research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94(5): 1128-1145.

Hung, H. 2011. Directors' Roles in Corporate Social Responsibility: A Stakeholder Perspective. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 103(3): 385-402.

How Team Creative environment is fostered by Corporate Social Responsibility and Team's

Organizational Citizenship Behaviors in Travel agencies? A Mediation Model

Janssen, O., & Xu Huang. 2008. Us and Me: Team Identification and Individual Differentiation as Complementary Drivers of Team Members' Citizenship and Creative Behaviors. *Journal of Management*, 34(1): 69-88.

Jia, L., Shaw, J. D., Tsui, A. S., & Park, T.-Y. 2014. A Social–Structural Perspective on Employee–Organization Relationships and Team Creativity. *Academy of Management Journal*, 57(3): 869-891.

Jiang, H., & Zhang, Q.-p. 2014. Development and Validation of Team Creativity Measures: A Complex Systems Perspective. *Creativity and Innovation Management*, 23(3): 264-275.

Jones, D. A. 2010. Does serving the community also serve the company? Using organizational identification and social exchange theories to understand employee responses to a volunteerism programme. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 83(4): 857-878.

Jones, D. A., Willness, C. R., & Madey, S. 2014. Why Are Job Seekers Attracted by Corporate Social Performance? Experimental and Field Tests of Three Signal-Based Mechanisms. *Academy of Management Journal*, 57(2): 383-404.

Joo, B.-K., Song, J. H., Lim, D. H., & Yoon, S. W. 2012. Team creativity: the effects of perceived learning culture, developmental feedback and team cohesion. *International Journal of Training and Development*, 16(2): 77-91.

Khazanchi, S., & Masterson, S. S. 2011. Who and what is fair matters: A multi-foci social exchange model of creativity. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 32(1): 86-106.

Koopman, J., Lanaj, K., & Scott, B. A. 2016. Integrating the Bright and Dark Sides of OCB: A Daily Investigation of the Benefits and Costs of Helping Others. *Academy of Management Journal*, 59(2): 414-435.

Korschun, D., Bhattacharya, C. B., & Swain, S. D. 2014. Corporate social responsibility, customer orientation, and the job performance of frontline employees. *Journal of Marketing*, 78(3): 20-37.

Lambert, E. G., & Hogan, N. L. 2013. The Association of Distributive and Procedural Justice With Organizational Citizenship Behavior. *The Prison Journal*, 93(3): 313-334.

Lange, D., & Washburn, N. T. 2012. Understanding Attributions of Corporate Social Irresponsibility. *Academy of Management Review*, 37(2): 300-326.

Lavelle, J. J., Brockner, J., Konovsky, M. A., Price, K. H., Henley, A. B., Taneja, A., & Vinekar, V. 2009. Commitment, procedural fairness, and organizational citizenship behavior: a multifoci analysis. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 30(3): 337-357.

LePine, J. A., Erez, A., & Johnson, D. E. 2002. The nature and dimensionality of organizational citizenship behavior: A critical review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(1): 52-65.

Lester, S. W., Meglino, B. M., & Korsgaard, M. A. 2008. The role of other orientation in organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 29(6): 829-841.

Liao, H., Liu, D., & Loi, R. 2010. Looking at Both Sides of the Social Exchange Coin: A Social Cognitive Perspective on the Joint Effects of Relationship Quality and Differentiation on Creativity. *Academy of Management Journal*, 53(5): 1090-1109.

Lin, B., Law, K., & Zhou, J. 2016. Why Is Underemployment Related to Creativity and OCB? A Task Crafting Explanation of the Curvilinear Moderated Relations. *Academy of Management Journal*.

Lin, C.-P., Baruch, Y., & Shih, W.-C. 2011. Corporate Social Responsibility and Team Performance: The Mediating Role of Team Efficacy and Team Self-Esteem. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 108(2): 167-180.

How Team Creative environment is fostered by Corporate Social Responsibility and Team's

Organizational Citizenship Behaviors in Travel agencies? A Mediation Model

Lin, C.-P., Lyau, N.-M., Tsai, Y.-H., Chen, W.-Y., & Chin, C.-K. 2010. Modeling Corporate Citizenship and Its Relationship with Organizational Citizenship Behaviors. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 95(3): 357-372.

Luksyte, A., & Spitzmueller, C. 2016. When are overqualified employees creative? It depends on contextual factors. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 37(5): 635-653.

Luo, X., & Bhattacharya, C. B. 2006. Corporate social responsibility, customer satisfaction, and market value. *Journal of marketing*, 70(4): 1-18.

Mackey, A., Mackey, T. B., & Barney, J. B. 2007. Corporate social responsibility and firm performance: Investor preferences and corporate strategies. *Academy of Management Review*, 32(3): 817-835.

Madsen, P. M., & Rodgers, Z. J. 2015. Looking good by doing good: The antecedents and consequences of stakeholder attention to corporate disaster relief. *Strategic Management Journal*, 36(5): 776-794.

Marija ,R. and Matjaž , M. 2014. CSR-based model for HRM in tourism and hospitality", *Kybernetes*, 43 (3/4): 346 – 362.

Mason, C., Simmons, J. 2011. Forward looking or looking unaffordable? Utilising academic perspectives on corporate social responsibility to assess the factors influencing its adoption by business, *Business Ethics: A European Review*, 20 (2): 159–176

McGuire, J. B., Sundgren, A., & Schneeweis, T. 1988. Corporate Social Responsibility and Firm Financial Performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 31(4): 854-872.

McWilliams, A., & Siegel, D. 2001. Corporate Social Responsibility: a Theory of the Firm Perspective. *Academy of Management Review*, 26(1): 117-127.

Moorman, R. H., Blakely, G. L., & Niehoff, B. P. 1998. Does Perceived Organizational Support Mediate the Relationship between Procedural Justice and Organizational Citizenship Behavior? *Academy of Management Journal*, 41(3): 351-357.

Nielsen, T. M., Bachrach, D. G., Sundstrom, E., & Halfhill, T. R. 2012. Utility of OCB: Organizational Citizenship Behavior and Group Performance in a Resource Allocation Framework. *Journal of Management*, 38(2): 668-694.

Oldham, G. R., & Cummings, A. 1996. Employee Creativity: Personal and Contextual Factors at Work. *Academy of Management Journal*, 39(3): 607-634.

Organ, D. W. 1988. *Organizational citizenship behavior: The good soldier syndrome*. MA: Lexington.

Organ, D. W., & Konovsky, M. 1989. Cognitive versus affective determinants of organizational citizenship behavior *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 74(1): 157-164.

Parmar, B. L., Freeman, R. E., Harrison, J. S., Wicks, A. C., Purnell, L., & De Colle, S. 2010. Stakeholder theory: The state of the art. *The Academy of Management Annals*, 4(1): 403-445.

Peterson, D. K. 2004. The Relationship between Perceptions of Corporate Citizenship and Organizational Commitment. *Business & Society*, 43(3): 296-319.

Pirola-Merlo, A., & Mann, L. 2004. The relationship between individual creativity and team creativity: aggregating across people and time. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 25(2): 235-257.

Podsakoff, P. M., Ahearne, M., & MacKenzie, S. B. 1997. Organizational citizenship behavior and the quantity and quality of work group performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82(2): 262-270.

Podsakoff, P. M., & Mackenzie, S. B. 1994. Organizational citizenship behavior s and sales unit effectiveness. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 31(3): 351-363.

Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., & Bommer, W. H. 1996. Transformational Leader Behaviors and Substitutes for Leadership as Determinants of Employee Satisfaction, Commitment, Trust, and Organizational Citizenship Behaviors. *Journal of Management*, 22(2): 259-298.

How Team Creative environment is fostered by Corporate Social Responsibility and Team's

Organizational Citizenship Behaviors in Travel agencies? A Mediation Model

Porter, C. O., Hollenbeck, J. R., Ilgen, D. R., Ellis, A. P., West, B. J., & Moon, H. 2003. Backing up behaviors in teams: the role of personality and legitimacy of need. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(3): 391.

Rettab, B., Brik, A. B., & Mellahi, K. 2009. A Study of Management Perceptions of the Impact of Corporate Social Responsibility on Organisational Performance in Emerging Economies: The Case of Dubai. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 89(3): 371-390.

Riordan, C. M., Gatewood, R. D., & Bill, J. B. 1997. Corporate Image: Employee Reactions and Implications for Managing Corporate Social Performance. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 16(4): 401-412.

Rupp, D. E., Ganapathi, J., Aguilera, R. V., & Williams, C. A. 2006. Employee Reactions to Corporate Social Responsibility: An Organizational Justice Framework. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 27(4): 537-543.

Rupp, D. E., Shao, R., Thornton, M. A., & Skarlicki, D. P. 2013. Applicants' and Employees' Reactions to Corporate Social Responsibility: The Moderating Effects of First-Party Justice Perceptions and Moral Identity. *Personnel Psychology*, 66(4): 895-933.

Schwartz, M. S., & Carroll, A. B. 2003. Corporate social responsibility: a three-domain approach. *Business Ethics Quarterly*: 503-530.

Sheldon, P.J. and Park, S.Y. (2011), "An exploratory study of corporate social responsibility in the US travel industry". *Journal of Travel Research*, 50 (4): 392-407 .

Shen, J., & Benson, J. 2014. When CSR Is a Social Norm: How Socially Responsible Human Resource Management Affects Employee Work Behavior. *Journal of Management*.

Shin, S. J., Kim, T.-Y., Lee, J.-Y., & Bian, L. 2012. Cognitive Team Diversity and Individual Team Member Creativity: A Cross-Level Interaction. *Academy of Management Journal*, 55(1): 197-212.

Shin, S. J., & Zhou, J. 2007. When is educational specialization heterogeneity related to creativity in research and development teams? Transformational leadership as a moderator. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(6): 1709-1721.

Soo-Yeon, K., & Park, H. 2011. Corporate Social Responsibility as an Organizational Attractiveness for Prospective Public Relations Practitioners. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 103(4): 639-653.

Staw, B. M. 2009. Is Group Creativity ReallyAn Oxymoron? Some Thoughts on Bridging the Cohesion–Creativity Divide, *Creativity in Groups*: 311-323.

Surroca, J., Tribó, J. A., & Zahra, S. A. 2013. Stakeholder Pressure on MNEs and the Transfer of Socially Irresponsible Practices to Subsidiaries. *Academy of Management Journal*, 56(2): 549-572.

Tepper, B. J., & Taylor, E. C. 2003. Relationships among Supervisors' and Subordinates' Procedural Justice Perceptions and Organizational Citizenship Behaviors. *Academy of Management Journal*, 46(1): 97-105.

The Central Agency for Public Mobilisation and Statistics (2014) Hotel and Resorts Annual Statistics in Egypt available from: http://www.capmas.gov.eg/Pages/Publications.aspx?page_id=5104&YearID=22990 accessed on 31-08-2016.

Torrance, E. P. 1988. The nature of creativity as manifest in its testing. *The nature of creativity*: 43-75.

Turban, D. B., & Greening, D. W. 1996. Corporate Social Performance And Organizational Attractiveness To Prospective Employees. *Academy of Management Journal*, 40(3): 658-672.

Turker, D. 2009. How Corporate Social Responsibility Influences Organizational Commitment. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 89(2): 189-204.

How Team Creative environment is fostered by Corporate Social Responsibility and Team's

Organizational Citizenship Behaviors in Travel agencies? A Mediation Model

UNWTO (2011) Tourism Satallite Account: The case of Egypt, UNWTO committee on Statistics and TSA, Madrid, Spain available from: statistics.unwto.org/sites/all/files/pdf/egypt_2.pdf. Accessed on 30-08-2016

Valentine, S., & Fleischman, G. 2008. Ethics Programs, Perceived Corporate Social Responsibility and Job Satisfaction. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 77(2): 159-172.

Van Dyne, L., Graham, J. W., & Dienesch, R. M. 1994. Organizational Citizenship Behavior: Construct Redefinition, Measurement, and Validation. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 37(4): 765-802.

Vlachos, P. A., Panagopoulos, N. G., & Rapp, A. A. 2014. Employee judgments of and behaviors toward corporate social responsibility: A multi-study investigation of direct, cascading, and moderating effects. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 35(7): 990-1017.

Waddock, S. A., & Graves, S. B. 1997. The Corporate Social Performance-Financial Performance Link. *Strategic Management Journal*, 18(4): 303-319.

Wellsa, V. , Manikab, D., Gregory-Smithc, D. , Taherid, B. , McCowlene, C. 2014. Heritage tourism, CSR and the role of employee environmental behavior, *Tourism Management*, 48 (June 2015): 399–413

Williams, L. J., & Anderson, S. E. 1991. Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment as Predictors of Organizational Citizenship and In-Role Behaviors. *Journal of Management*, 17(3): 601-617.

Wong, E. M., Ormiston, M. E., & Tetlock, P. E. 2011. The Effects of Top Management Team Integrative Complexity and Decentralized Decision Making on Corporate Social Performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 54(6): 1207-1228.

Woodman, R. W., Sawyer, J. E., & Griffin, R. W. 1993. Toward a theory of organizational creativity *Academy of Management Review*, 18(2): 293-321.\

<div dir="rtl">

تأثير المسئولية الاجتماعية و سلوك المواطنة التنظيمية لفريق العمل فى تحسين البيئة الابتكارية فى شركات وو كالات السفر: نموذج مقترح

إسلام الجمال   إيمان الشناوى

جامعة قناة السويس

الملخص

إن ابداع فريق العمل هو العملية التى تنتج عن التفاعل بين بعض العوامل التنظيمية فى المؤسسات و العمليات التى تحدث فى فرق العمل نفسها. فرق العمل هى أكثر إبداعا إذا كانت بيئة المنظمة تساعد على تشجيع الإبداع . و فريق العمل يمكن أن يكون أكثر إبداعا عندما تكون سياسة المنظمات هى الأكثر من ناحية المسئولية الاجتماعية و عنما يكون أعضاء فريق العمل مواطنين صالحين لفرقهم. ركزت أبحاث الإبداع السابقة لفرق العمل على إما العوامل الخاصة بفرق العمل نفسها أو العوامل التنظيمية الخاصة بالمؤسسات و لكن ليس على كليهما. يهدف هذا البحث إلى التركيز فى سلوك المواطنه التنظيمى فى مستوى فرق العمل (OCBG) و المسئولية الاجتماعية للشركات (CSR) و قياس مدى تأثيرهما فى البيئة الإبداعية لفرق العمل (TCE) بالمنظمة. ركزت الدراسة الميدانية على القطاع السياحى (و خاصة شركات ووكالات السفر) بمدينة شرم الشيخ، حيث تم توزيع استمارات الاستقصاء على عينة من المدراء و الموظفين العاملين بهذه الشركات وعلى موظفى شركات السياحة المتواجدين فى الفنادق فئة الأربع و الخمس نجوم لمرافقة المجموعات السياحية الخاصة بهم. تم تجميع عدد 301 استمارة صالحة للتحليل الإحصائى حيث تم استخدام برنامج(SPSS V. 22). نتائج الدراسة أوضحت أن سلوك المواطنة التنظيمى على مستوى فرق العمل له تأثير إيجابى هام فى الإبداع فى بيئة العمل و كذلك المسئولية الاجتماعية. تم مناقشة النتائج فى ضوء الأبحاث السابقة وتوصلت الدراسة إلى إنه كلما زاد سلوك المواطنة التنظيمى و المسئولية الاجتماعية لشركات السياحة كلما زاد مستوى الإبداع بين الأفراد المكونين لفرق العمل.

الكلمات الدالة: المسئولية الاجتماعية للشركات (CSR) ، الإبداع، سلوك المواطنة التنظيمى (OCBG) ، شركات ووكالات السفر، شرم الشيخ

</div>