THE DEVELOPMENT AND VALIDATION OF THE CORPORATE SOCIAL

RESPONSIBILITY INVENTORY (CSRI)

By

HEATHER LAWTON

B.A.H., Queen's University, August 2014

A THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR

THE DEGREE OF

MASTER OF ARTS

in

ORGANIZATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY

ADLER UNIVERSITY

April 2017

© Heather Lawton, 2017

Thesis Committee

Thesis Advisor: Dr. Patrick O'Neill

Second Reader: Dr. Lucy Jdanova

ProQuest Number: 10265569

ProQuest 10265569

www.manaraa.com

Abstract

A growing body of research has examined the association between corporate social responsibility (CSR) and positive organizational benefits like community improvement (Ehrenfeld, 2005), employee well-being (Ferreira & Real de Oliveira, 2014; Davies & Crane, 2010), and the company's profit margin (Ruf et al., 2001), yet researchers have yet to converge on a self-report measure of CSR with established psychometric properties. The present study was broken down into two parts to explore the meaning and measurement of CSR and develop a preliminary measurement model. Study 1 used an inductive methodology to generate items for the preliminary CSR scale through in-person and online interviews with 117 currently employed individuals followed by an empirical and peer review. Study 2 then validated the scale through the distribution of an online survey. Exploratory factor analysis on a diverse sample of 211 respondents resulted in a six-factor, 33-item Corporate Social Responsibility Inventory (CSRI) consisting of Responsibility to Employee, Responsibility to Environment, CSR Culture, Responsibility to Community, Triple Bottom Line, and Responsibility to Customer. Significant positive associations with engagement, organizational commitment, and trust in management as well as negative associations with intention to resign were as expected and established the criterion-related validity of each subscale. These findings lay the empirical foundation for further confirmatory factor analytic research with tests of invariance to further corroborate the hypothesized factor structure and support its use in academic and applied settings. This paper discusses the practical and theoretical implications of the findings.

Keywords: corporate social responsibility, CSR, culture, community, employee.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

List of Figures

Acknowledgements

This thesis would not have been possible without the immense support I received from my school, colleagues, family and friends. At the forefront, I would like to thank my parents. Without their unending support for my ambitions, I couldn't imagine being where I am today. They were the ones who taught me to dream big, and saw me through to the end. They never stopped believing in my ability to achieve, and for that I thank them. This thesis would not have been possible without either of you.

In addition, I'd like to thank my thesis supervisor, Dr. Patrick O'Neill, who channelled his incredible passion for excellence into this project, taking it from idea to reality. Patrick has the amazing ability to see the potential in yourself before you even realize it's there. His support through the successes and stresses was invaluable and I will always thank him for that.

Of course, I have to thank my Master's cohort. We may have started as peers but we certainly ended as friends. Thank you for your continuous support, and undying passion for this field. I will forever cherish the unique opportunity I had to surround myself with such a diverse group of characters all sharing the same core values and interests. You have all made me grow in different ways. Thank you each for your exceptional insight.

To all of my other friends who checked in on me and encouraged me throughout the process, I thank you as well. I would like to draw special attention to my two roommates who saw me through the journey: Alyson and Sarah. Thank you for listening to me, supporting me, and pushing me when I needed it. Again, this thesis would not have been possible without you two.

The Development and Validation of the Corporate Social Responsibility Inventory (CSRI)

Chapter I: Introduction

"Goodness is the only investment that never fails." – Henry David Thoreau

Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) has become a well-known buzzword within the organizational world with a growing number of corporations looking to include some semblance of community or environmental sponsorship (Rangan, Chase, & Karim, 2012). Yet, many companies choose to invest in the façade of CSR, ignoring the actual need or impact for key stakeholders (DuBois et al., 2013). When properly deployed and measured, CSR may offer organizations meaningful benefits both from a human and financial perspective. Although the majority of the research is fairly recent, several studies have reported positive correlations between CSR programs and community improvement (Ehrenfeld, 2005), employee well-being (Ferreira & Real de Oliveira, 2014; Davies & Crane, 2010), and the company's profit margin (Ruf et al., 2001). Ultimately, CSR is emerging as a powerful movement both internal and external to a company. As summarized by the United Nations Global Compact (2015), "By committing to sustainability, businesses can take shared responsibility for achieving a better world."

Inherently, the stereotypical role of companies in simply maximizing profits is changing. Contingency Theory argues that there is no one best strategy for organizations to succeed, stating that companies should instead adapt to their changing external environment (Donaldson, 2001). As stated by Muchinsky and Culbertson (2015), "[Organizations] exist in a larger environment that encompasses economic, legal, and social factors. Thus there must be a sense of fit between the organization and the environment in which it exists" (p. 264). Companies that invest in CSR are taking steps towards adapting to a changing environment where resources are dwindling,

competitors are investing in employee morale, and customers expect social investment. Dilchert and Ones (2012) went even further stating, "If humanity does not survive in the face of resource shortages (for example, clean water and food supplies for nine billion individuals by 2050) and environmental calamities (such as climate change and destruction of the ecosystem), no organizations will remain" (p. 503). Thus, integrating CSR into a company's strategic plan is integral to its survival in the economy both today and in the future.

While the importance of CSR has been recognized by both scholars and practitioners, convergence on one generally accepted definition of CSR has yet to be realized. To some, CSR simply translates to a legal responsibility, while to others it connotes a socially responsible behaviour in an ethical sense (Votaw, 1972). In a recent meta-analysis by Dahlsrud (2008), five elements were identified as common to almost all definitions of CSR: environmental, social, economic, stakeholder and voluntariness. A complete definition of CSR should encompass all of these dimensions, yet the current literature still struggles to converge on one clear definition.

This confusion regarding a clear definition of CSR has made it difficult to operationalize and measure the concept within contemporary organizations. Traditionally, objective measures like reputation indices or databases have been used to measure CSR. However, it has been argued that these indices fail to account for the multi-dimensionality of CSR and they are suspected to be more indicative of management quality than capturing a true representation of the construct (Waddock & Graves, 1997). For example, Fortune's past CSR index suffered from the fact that its items did not appropriately represent the economic, legal, ethical, and discretionary dimensions of the CSR construct (Maignan & Ferrell, 2005). In contrast, a measure with a theoretical foundation embraces the multidimensionality of the construct. Given current research indicating the positive impact that employee perceptions of CSR programs can have on

an organization, a company could reap considerable benefits by being able to measure how employees view their own company's efforts in this area. This would enable practitioners to assess employee perceptions of CSR in their organization in comparison to normative data, and study whether CSR policies and practices are having their desired impact. An organization could further measure how their investment in CSR is relating to key performance indicators such as: productivity, employee engagement, morale, team cohesion, or intention to resign. This information would provide an indication of financial return for the organization's investment, as well as assist researchers in developing more advanced theoretical models delineating the antecedents and consequences of CSR programs.

Unfortunately, few attempts have been made to develop a CSR measurement tool from the employee perspective with sound psychometric properties. A primary criticism of most contemporary CSR scales is that most of these items were primarily developed from a researcher's perspective or a pre-existing theoretical framework (i.e. Turker, 2009; D'Aprile & Talò, 2013). Implicit in this approach is the assumption that the researcher's interpretation of the nature of the construct will capture the potentially divergent perspective of workers from different industries, occupational types, and levels. No current measure of general CSR has used an inductive method, which would generate items based on a heterogeneous sample of working professionals who offer diverse perspectives on what it means to experience CSR in an organizational context. Bartunek and Seo (2002) make a strong case for using inductive approaches in item generation as a way of increasing an understanding of local perceptions and enhancing content validity. It is logical that CSR measures can be greatly improved by generating items from a diverse sample of professionals working in a variety of industries, organizations and having exposure to a range of CSR programs. For these reasons, this study will

use a combined inductive and deductive methodology for item generation by conducting focus groups with a diverse sample of workers before integrating these findings with current CSR literature.

In addition, many CSR scale validation studies are too specific or focus on a small, culturally homogeneous population (Turker, 2009). To the best of the author's knowledge, no measure has been developed on a diverse, multinational population. In addition to the lack of diversity, no study has developed a CSR measure from the employee perspective that includes more recent organizational models like triple bottom line. This study will survey a more diverse sample that includes cross-cultural data, incorporates inductive methodology, and includes recent frameworks and theoretical approaches.

In summary, the purpose of this research is to develop and validate a new measure that represents, in a parsimonious way, the salient dimensions of CSR in the workplace from an employee perspective. Study 1 asked currently employed participants to complete either an online or in-person focus group describing their views of what CSR means to them. These responses were then converged with theoretical and empirical literature and pre-existing measures to create a preliminary original CSR scale. Study 2 then distributed this scale, along with various additional measures of job-related criterion, to a diverse, multinational sample. Exploratory factor analysis (EFA) was then used to determine the factor structure of the preliminary measurement model. A final CSR measure was determined and tested for reliability and criterion-related validity. Theoretical and practical implications are discussed and suggestions for future research are provided.

Chapter II: Literature Review

Defining CSR

Although the idea of Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) is relatively new to mainstream culture, the concept itself dates back to the 1950's. The ideology alone can be said to have emerged from a general concern for society, which has been inherent in business for centuries. However, the most pertinent writings go back to recent developments in the United States, where a large body of literature in the area has accumulated (Carroll, 1999). More specifically, the publication *Social Responsibilities of the Businessman* by Howard R. Bowen (1953) is often cited as the commencement of modern literature on this subject. In his book, Bowen (1953) presented many important questions regarding the role of business in power and decision making within society and around which responsibilities to society businessmen may reasonably assume. He was also the first to put forth a formal definition of what may now be referred to as CSR, noting that, "It refers to the obligations of businessmen to pursue those policies, to make those decisions, or to follow those lines of action which are desirable in terms of the objectives and values of our society" (Bowen, 1953, p. 6).

The 1960's marked a rapid growth in attempts to formalize or define CSR. Keith Davis was one of the most significant writers of this time (Carroll, 1999), defining social responsibility as, "Businessmen's decisions and actions taken for reasons at least partially beyond the firm's direct economic or technical interest" (Davis, 1960, p. 70). He was also the one to develop the "Iron Law of Responsibility," which maintained that "social responsibilities of businessmen need to be commensurate with their social power" (Davis, 1960, p. 71). Bowen and Davis are often considered the fore fathers of CSR definition (Carroll, 1999). Joseph McGuire (1963) further refined the definition of CSR stating, "The idea of social responsibilities supposes that the corporation has not only economic and legal obligations but also certain responsibilities to

society which extend beyond these obligations" (p. 144). Around this time, the term "Corporate Social Responsibility" was formally coined by Clarence Walton (1967) in his book of the same name. This book presented a number of social responsibility theories and perspectives, as well as Walton's own opinions on the issue. Walton (1967) focused heavily on corporate volunteerism and identified the possibility of costs involved for which there may be no measure of economic return.

The 1970's ushered in a plethora of new research and thought regarding CSR. Four primary views emerged during this time. Johnson (1971) first presented what may now be referred to as a stakeholder approach, taking into account "employees, suppliers, dealers, local communities, and the nation" (p. 50). Johnson's (1971) second view characterizes CSR as a long-term profit maximization, noting that, "Businesses carry out social programs to add profits to their organization" (p. 54). His third approach, which he refers to as "utility maximization," assumes that an organization seeks multiple goals beyond that of maximum profits. In this view, the manager is, "Interested not only of his own well-being, but also in that of the other members of the enterprise and that of his fellow citizens" (Johnson, 1971, p. 68). Lastly, the fourth view or the "lexicographic view of social responsibility" ranks social goals according to a number of factors, namely the firm's past experience with these goals and the past performance of similar business enterprises (Johnson, 1971). Although these four views may appear contradictory in some ways, they are essentially complementary in how they define CSR.

Public opinion regarding a company's responsibilities also began to change in the 1970's (Carroll, 1999). In response to a public survey conducted by the Opinion Research Corporation in 1970, two-thirds of respondents believed that corporations had a moral obligation to aid other large institutions in achieving social progress, even at the expense of profits. The concept was

becoming a popular topic for debate within boardrooms as well, mostly due to the renowned economist Milton Friedman coming out as a fierce opponent of the idea. His opinion can be summarized well in the title of his *New York Times Magazine* (1970) article: "The Social Responsibility of Business is to Increase Profits." Despite his unwavering position on the issue, the idea of CSR continued to garner increasing support from organizational researchers and academics.

Early research on the dimensions and effects of CSR also began around this time. For example, Bowman and Haire (1975) conducted a study regarding the effects of CSR and the extent to which companies were engaging in the practice. Additionally, Sandra Holmes (1976) conducted a study in which she sought to gather executive perceptions of corporate social responsibility. Holmes (1976) created a list of statements about CSR and examined how many participants agreed or disagreed with each statement. Holmes (1976) helped to identify the outcomes to which executives expected from their firm's involvement in CSR as well as the factors that executives used in selecting their own type of social involvement. This may be considered one of the first attempts at empirically developing an operational definition of CSR. In the following years, Abbott and Monsen (1979) did a qualitative analysis of the annual reports of Fortune 500 companies. They presented a "social involvement disclosure" (SID) scale that they posited could be used to measure CSR in corporations. Their approach tended to be topical and issues-oriented and would not be considered relevant today.

In 1979, Carroll argued that for organizations to engage in CSR, they needed a definition of CSR, an understanding of the issues for which social responsibility exists, and a specificity of the ideology of responsiveness. He then went on to propose the following four-part definition: "The social responsibility of business encompasses the economic, legal, ethical, and

discretionary expectations that society has of organizations at a given point of time" (Carroll, 1979, p. 500). The first part of this definition describes the business as an economic unit in society, and thus it has a responsibility to produce goods and services and sell them at a profit. Similarly, society expects businesses to obey the law, and thus this economic responsibility must be deployed in a legal framework. Beyond these more basic responsibilities, the organization further has a duty to go beyond what is required by the law, particularly regarding the ethical norms and duties that society expects a business to follow. Lastly, the discretionary responsibility represents voluntary roles that a business assumes but for which there is no clear-cut expectation (Carroll, 1979). Carroll (1983) eventually reoriented this responsibility towards volunteerism and philanthropy as these seemed to be the most relevant arenas for this component. This definition was also later operationalized and the four-part structure was confirmed empirically (Aupperle, Carroll, & Hatfield, 1985). Still, today, many have categorized the economic responsibility of CSR as what a company does for itself and the legal, ethical, and discretionary components as what a company does for others (Carroll, 1999). This is an important distinction that remains in most contemporary definitions.

The 80's brought about a time of increased research and alternative thought around CSR (Carroll, 1999). In 1981, Tuzzolino and Armandi applied the ideology of Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs to a CSR frame of reference. Using Carroll's 1979 definition, the authors supposed that organizations have physiological, safety, affiliative, esteem, and self-actualization needs just as people do. Dalton and Cosier (1982) took a different approach. They presented a model of CSR with four cells: "illegal" and "legal" on one axis and "irresponsible" and "responsible" on the other. They concluded that the "legal" and "responsible" cell was the appropriate CSR strategy

for firms to follow, therefore inferring that CSR translates to an operation that is both law abiding and ethical.

The 80's also brought about an important discussion about whether socially responsible firms could also be profitable firms (Carroll, 1999). Cochran and Wood (1984) were at the forefront of this interest. They conceded that to demonstrate if CSR programs were profitable, they would need to measure it. To achieve this first step, they decided to use a reputation index based on past examples of how social and financial performance had been operationalized in the past. They used the Moskowitz Index in which companies were rated as "outstanding," "honorable mention," or "worst." Although Cochran and Wood (1984) admitted the numerous flaws that came with using a subjective and comparative system, they did find some of the first empirical connections between CSR and financial performance.

Researchers were also beginning to explore the idea of CSR being subsumed into CSP or Corporate Social Performance. Wartick and Cochran (1985) presented the "evolution of the corporate social performance model," which incorporated corporate social responsibilities, corporate social responsiveness, and social issues into a framework of principles, processes, and policies. Wood (1991) took this conceptualization, combined with Carroll's (1979) four-part characterization, and created one of the most elaborate models of CSR or CSP for that time. Wood's (1991) model took into account how the four responsibilities (economic, legal, ethical, and discretionary) related to various levels within society: the institutional level, the organizational level, and the individual level. She also highlighted the processes of environmental assessment, stakeholder management, and issues management. She then assimilated Wartick and Cochran's (1985) principles, processes, policies framework into the category of "outcomes of corporate behaviour" (Wood, 1991). Wood's (1991) model is

summarized in Figure 1. While this theoretical work remains as one of the most comprehensive

attempts at defining CSP, it offered no guidance on how a measurement model should be

developed (Moir, 2001).

Principles of Social Responsibility	**Processes** of Social Responsiveness	**Outcomes** of Corporate Behaviour
• Legitimacy • Public Responsibility • Managerial Discretion	• Environmental Scanning • Stakeholder Management • Issues Management	• Social Impacts • Social Policies • Social Programs

Figure 1. Corporate Social Performance Model (Wood, 1991). Adapted from "What do we mean by corporate social responsibility?" by L. Moir, 2001, *Corporate Governance, 1*(2), p. 13.

Going into the 1990's, some other important related concepts began to emerge. For

example, the idea of corporate citizenship was first discussed. Carroll (1991) described it first by

stating, "The CSR firm should strive to make a profit, obey the law, be ethical, and be a good

corporate citizen" (p. 43). The term corporate citizenship is used to, "Connect business activity

to broader social accountability and service for mutual benefit" (Waddell, 2000, p. 193). It brings

the organization to the level of an individual, with all the rights and responsibilities that

designation brings.

In addition, it was around this time that "stakeholder theory" was discussed in the context

of CSR. Freeman (1984) first discussed the concept of stakeholders as any group or individual

that, "Can affect or is affected by the achievement of an organization's objectives" (p. 46).

Traditionally, an organization was characterized by two main groups of stakeholders: suppliers

(inputs) and customers (outputs) (Benn & Bolton, 2011). Freeman (1984) gave a more realistic

multilateral relationship model, taking into account a broader range of players who would be

affected by the operation of the business. Stakeholder Theory then maintains that any business is

about, "Creating as much value as possible for stakeholders without resorting to trade-offs, fraud, or deception" (Freeman, Harrison, & Wicks, 2007, p. 166). This alone translates to its own definition of CSR; one where all people affected by an organization, from employees to members of the community, receive maximum value without a breach of ethical standards.

As is evident, the academic literature has struggled to converge on a common definition of CSR for over 60 years, and there remains little consensus (Öberseder, Schlegelmilch, Murphy, & Gruber, 2013). The academic exploration of CSR has been primarily philosophical and theoretical with few attempts to operationalize the construct. Competing definitions have created conceptual confusion surrounding the meaning and measurement of the CSR construct, which has, in turn, impacted the substantive research examining the antecedents and consequences of CSR. Researchers seem only to be able to agree that, "CSR means something, but not always the same thing, to everybody" (Martínez, Pérez, & Bosque, 2013, p. 367). However, some theories have stood out more than others due to both theoretical coherence and empirical rigor. This includes Carroll's (1979) four-dimension model (economic, legal, ethical, and discretionary/voluntary) and Freeman's (1984) stakeholder model. The structure of these models aligns with the findings from a recent meta-analysis, noting that there were five dimensions common to all definitions of CSR: environmental, social, economic, stakeholder, and voluntariness (Dahlsrud, 2008). It may be argued that Carroll's (1979) legal dimension has become less relevant as contemporary theorists argue that CSR goes beyond a company's legal obligations. As summarized by Sims (2003), "… 'Social responsibility' and 'legality' are not one and the same thing. CSR is often seen as acts that go beyond what is prescribed by the law" (p. 46).

For this study, it was important to find a definition that encompassed all five dimensions outlined by Dahlsrud (2008). It was determined that one definition alone could not encapsulate all of these concepts, so a decision was made to combine two widely-accepted definitions that also aligned with the extant literature. The first definition came from Global Affairs Canada (2015) which defined CSR as, "The voluntary activities undertaken by a company to operate in an economic, social and environmentally sustainable manner." This definition is simple and concise, yet lacks the stakeholder dimension. This was then combined with a definition from another scale validation study that aimed to summarize and synthesize most of the research in the area, defining the concept as, "Corporate behaviours that aim to affect stakeholders positively and that go beyond its economic interest" (Turker, 2009, p. 413). The author then determined that CSR would be defined as, "The activities engaged in by an organization and its employees that aim to affect stakeholders positively by contributing to operating in an economically, socially, and environmentally responsible manner." This definition incorporates the fundamentals of stakeholder theory, emboldens an organization in corporate citizenship, and encompasses the five dimensions outlined by Dahlsrud (2008).

Measuring CSR

Considering the lack of consistency in defining CSR, it is understandable that there has been considerable difficulty in measuring the construct. In answering the question of whether the related construct of Corporate Social Performance should be measured, Carroll (2000) responded in the affirmative, stating that, "It is an important topic to business and to society, and measurement is one part dealing seriously with an important matter… The real question is whether valid and reliable measures can be developed" (p. 273). Below is a summary of the most notable attempts by scholars to measure CSR.

Turker (2009) developed a CSR scale based on expectations from various stakeholders. The items for his scale were generated from a review of the theoretical and empirical literature on the topic. An EFA was then used to determine the underlying factorial structure. Data was collected from 269 business professionals in Turkey, discovering a four-dimensional measurement structure with 18 items. The first factor was labelled 'CSR to social and non-social stakeholders' and included items such as, "Our company targets sustainable growth which considers future generations" and, "Our company makes investment to create a better life for future generations") (Turker, 2009). The second factor was titled 'CSR to employees' and included items like, "Our company policies encourage employees to develop their skills and careers" and, "The managerial decisions related with the employees are usually fair" (Turker, 2009). The third factor was labelled 'CSR to customers' and included items like, "Our company respects consumer rights beyond the legal requirements" and, "Customer satisfaction is highly important for our company" (Turker, 2009). The fourth, and final, factor was titled 'CSR to government' and included items like, "Our company always pays its taxes on a regular and continual basis" and, "Our company complies with legal regulations completely and promptly" (Turker, 2009). A limitation of the study is that the sample was culturally homogenous and did not use a confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) with tests of measurement invariance.

Building on Turker's (2009) research, Hanzaee and Rahpeima (2013) examined the concept of CSR in Iran based on a review of the existing empirical research and applied EFA and CFA to validate the measurement model. Interviews were used in this study to further conceptualize the construct of CSR and to refine the items developed by the literature review. This validation process supported a 20-item scale consisting of five dimensions from 385 professionals. The first factor was labelled as 'obligation to employees' and included items like,

"My firm provides good condition for personal development of employees in many aspects" and

"My firm tries to make fair decision about and for the employees" (Hanzaee & Rahpeima, 2013).

The second factor was labelled 'obligation to customers and markets' and included items like

"My firm has enough disclosure about its products and services to customers" and, "My firm

tries to implement local and international standards in its production" (Hanzaee & Rahpeima,

2013). The third factor was labelled 'obligation to social programs and natural environment' and

included items like "My firm tries to minimize its unfavourable and damaging effects on the

natural environment" and "My firm supports social welfare programs and creation of

employment opportunities" (Hanzaee & Rahpeima, 2013). The fourth factor was labelled

'obligation to laws and regulations' and included items like "My firm tries to act on the basis of

local and global legal regulations" and "Complying with legal regulations in every situation is an

underlying purpose of my firm" (Hanzaee & Rahpeima, 2013). The fifth, and final, factor was

labelled 'obligation to society' and included items like "My firm cooperates with other private

and public entities in social responsibility projects" and "My firm targets sustainable

development and creation of a better life for future generations" (Hanzaee & Rahpeima, 2013).

They noted the limitations of a lack of random sampling and that the data was collected from

only one country with particular cultural and economic specifications.

   Another scale development study that extended Turker's (2009) initial research came

from D'Aprile and Talò (2014). They generated CSR items based on an a-priori psychosocial

model linking the cognitive, affective and behavioural dimensions of CSR. Exploratory and

confirmatory factor analysis on data from 345 small-medium sized business professionals in Italy

supported a 12-item measure of CSR representing three dimensions – behaviour, cognitive, and

affective. Examples of items in the behavioural factor include, "Our company cooperates with

institutions in social responsibility projects" and, "Our company targets sustainable growth that considers future generations." Examples of items in the cognitive factor include, "Our company tries to understand the needs and demands of our community" and, "In our company, we try to understand issues relating to environmental conditions." Examples of items in the affective factor include, "Our company considers the country to be a resource to be protected" and "Our company takes the requests of public institutions into consideration." Additionally, several other measures of CSR have focused on the consumer's perception of companies' participation in CSR activities (i.e. Martínez et al., 2013; Öberseder et al., 2013). Conversely, the scale in this study will look to measure CSR from an internal employee perspective.

These three CSR measures have many similarities in factor structure. Both Turker (2009) and Hanzaee and Rahpeima (2013) included analogous factors for employees, customers, and an aspect of legality. Both studies also captured aspects of the environment and society, however, they were defined slightly differently. D'Aprile and Talò (2014) diverged slightly by including affective and cognitive factors, however, their behavioural dimension included items that measured an organization's dedication to the environment, society, employees, customers, and legal requirements. These convergences in the development of a measurement model of CSR were considered when developing the CSR scale in this study.

It is noteworthy that none of these CSR studies used a North American sample as this limits their applicability. Each of the studies relied on European/Middle Eastern culturally homogeneous samples; however, samples that incorporate a diversity of different populations can be more readily used across different cultures (Allmark, 2003). Additionally, the items developed for these CSR measures relied primarily on the researcher's perspective or a pre-existing theoretical framework, with limited, if any, use of inductive methods. Since researchers

offer a unique and limited perspective on CSR, advantages may be gained by developing items from a broader sample of workers representing a diverse range of industries and CSR programs (inductive method) and then reconciling those against the theoretical and empirical literature (deductive method) (Hinkin, 1995). As suggested by Bartunek and Seo (2002) for the construct of job insecurity, qualitative research adds new meaning to purely quantitative methods. A purely deductive methodology relies on pre-existing theoretical frameworks and the researcher's interpretation of the nature of the construct. The discrepancy between the researchers' and workers' views of CSR may pose an important threat to the content validity of the construct (Bartunek & Seo, 2002). Bartunek and Seo (2002) identify the advantages of qualitative or inductive methods to (a) gain a richer understanding of the construct from the worker's perspective, (b) confirm or disconfirm academic definitions of the construct in a local context, and (c) uncover new dimensions that have not been included in previously developed scales. After using an inductive methodology, these new dimensions can be interpreted in light of prevailing theoretical models or may serve to enrich and expand such models. Table 1 summarizes the pre-existing CSR measures developed for an employee perspective included in this review.

Table 1

Pre-Existing CSR Measures from the Employee Perspective

Source & Measure	Dimension	Items	Nationality of Participants	Factors
Turker (2009)	CSR	18	Turkish	'CSR to social and non-social stakeholders' 'CSR to employees' 'CSR to customers' 'CSR to government.
Hanzaee & Rahpeima (2013)	CSR	20	Iranian	'Obligation to employees' 'Obligation to customers and markets' 'Obligation to social programs and natural environment' 'Obligation to laws and regulations' 'Obligation to society'
D'Aprile & Talò (2014)	Measuring CSR as a Psychosocial Construct	12	Italian	'Behavioural' 'Cognitive' 'Affective'

Consequences of CSR

Beyond the advancements in our understanding of the meaning and measurement of

CSR, an important question remains: why should organizations care about CSR? A growing

number of scholars and practitioners have recognized the need for contemporary organizations to

embed CSR in a company's strategic plan (Wempe & Kaptein, 2002). Going into the new

millennium, a poll by *Environics International* (1999) asked citizens from 23 countries in six

continents to state their opinions on the role of large companies in society. Responses suggested

that in the 21st century CSR would be a global expectation that would require a comprehensive

and strategic approach by any organization hoping to compete internationally (Environics

International, 1999). In addition, social responsibility was rated by this sample of international

citizens as the most important factor in influencing public impressions of individual companies, greater than both brand quality/reputation and business fundamentals. Currently, the United Nations Global Compact (2015) - the world's largest corporate sustainability initiative - has had over 8,000 companies participate in 162 countries.

Other studies have linked investing in a CSR program with numerous positive outcomes, including: increased employee engagement (Allen, 2013; Ferreira, & Real de Oliveira, 2014), job satisfaction (Tziner et al., 2011), customer satisfaction (Joireman, et al., 2015), organizational justice (Tziner et al., 2011), and financial performance (Ruf et al., 2001; Saeidi et al., 2015). Moreover, 73% of consumers across the 15 largest markets in the world are willing to recommend companies that are perceived to be delivering on CSR (Rogers, 2013). As another example, Joireman, et al. (2015) found that customers were less likely to experience anger and spread bad word-of-mouth following a service failure when companies engaged in high, but not low, levels of environmental CSR. Ruf et al. (2001) demonstrated that change in CSP was positively associated with growth in sales for the current and subsequent year while return on sales further increased when CSP was improved. Turban and Greening's (1997) study on corporate performance and organizational attractiveness to prospective employees indicated that firms higher in CSR have a more positive reputation and are more attractive employers than firms that are lower in CSR. Saeidi, et al. (2015) surveyed various manufacturing and consumer product firms to find that CSR indirectly promotes organizational financial performance by enhancing a company's reputation and competitive advantage while improving the level of customer satisfaction. Thus, there appear to be many potential benefits of organizational investment in CSR.

Summary and Research Objectives

In summary, despite recent attempts to define and operationalize CSR, researchers have

yet to settle on a common understanding of the meaning and measurement of the construct. The failure to converge on a robust CSR measure partly stems from the proliferation of CSR definitions derived from different theoretical orientations and perspective. Evident in the literature is the absence of a psychometrically robust CSR measure developed from the perspective of workers from a variety of cultures. Additionally, most researchers "fit" the worker's perspective into a pre-existing theoretical framework, focusing primarily on a deductive method.

The present research attempts to address these gaps by developing and validating a new CSR measure from the worker's perspective and based on an integration of current research and CSR measurement models. The research is divided into two studies. Study one involves the development of the preliminary CSR measure from the employee's perspective using inductive item generation. The dimensionality and construct validity of the instrument will then be explored in Study 2 on a diverse sample through a combination of exploratory factor analysis (EFA) and internal consistency reliability analysis. The criterion-related validity of the hypothesized measurement model is then tested by examining its association with a variety of outcomes related to psychological well-being and organizational attitudes.

Chapter III: Study 1 - Developing the Corporate Social Responsibility Inventory (CSRI)

To generate the items of the pilot CSR measure, an inductive approach was used in Study 1 through online and in-person interviews followed by an empirical and peer review.

Sample

To generate the items of the CSRI, a combination of semi-structured interviews and an online survey was used. Interview participants needed to be 19 years or older and currently

employed full-time, part-time or contractually at an organization for 160 hours or the equivalent of one month working full-time. These restrictions were necessary as respondents needed to understand contemporary work environments.

The interview component consisted of three focus group sessions with voluntary convenience samples from international educational institutes located in the United States (n = 31), United Arab Emirates (n = 22), and India (n = 5). Individuals who were unable to attend an in-person session completed an online version of the interview (n = 59). These participants were sent an online survey with the same questions as the semi-structured interviews. Online and in-person interviews combined, 116 individuals participated (73 women, 42 men, 1 preferred not to identify). Participants resided in countries all over the world, and from varying cultures, including Canada, the United States, United Arab Emirates, India, Germany, Australia, Nepal, Saudi Arabia, and China. They also worked in a variety of industries including banking, retail, healthcare, education, energy, government, and technology. Ages of the participants ranged from 21 to 64 (M_{age} = 30.23). The majority of participants were at the employee level (n = 72, 62%) followed by manager (n = 11, 9%) and supervisor (n = 8, 7%). Most participants had worked at their current organization for five years or less (n = 27, 23.3%) and most were aware of CSR policies or practices in place at their current workplace (n = 53, 45.7%). The demographics for Study 1 are summarized in Table 2. Participants were given the option of receiving a copy of the final study, including the CSR scale. The results from this study were used to determine the items used in the scale in Study 2.

Table 2

Study 1 Sample Demographics

	Frequency (n)	Percentage
Survey Type		
Online	59	50.9
In-Person	57	49.1
Gender		
Male	73	62.9
Female	42	36.2
Prefer not to identify	1	0.8
Age		
<25	24	20.7
25-35	69	59.5
>35	18	15.5
Missing information	5	4.3
Position		
Employee	72	62.1
Supervisor	8	6.9
Manager	11	9.5
Director or senior manager	4	3.4
Executive	0	0
Independent contractor	3	2.6
Self-employed	4	3.8
Other	12	10.3
Missing information	2	1.7
Employment Status		
Employed, working full-time	63	54.3
Employed, working part-time	23	19.8
Temporary or casual	12	10.3
Contracted	3	2.6
Other	15	12.9
Length of Employment		
One month	6	5.2
Six months or less	18	15.5
One year or less	18	15.5
Two years or less	22	19.0
Five years or less	27	23.3
Ten years or less	10	8.6
Greater than ten years	10	8.6
Missing information	5	4.3
Aware of CSR Program at Workplace		
Yes	53	45.7
No	33	28.4
Not Sure	30	25.9

Item Generation

Three standardized focus groups led by trained facilitators took place in the United States, India, and United Arab Emirates. In these sessions, participants first read and signed a letter of information and consent. Once they agreed to participate, participants were asked to complete a short demographic form. After this, they were asked to think about the study definition of CSR and complete the sentence: "A company demonstrates CSR when…" Participants recorded as many responses as they could think of on the sticky notes provided. After this task, participants then grouped each of the sticky notes into logical clusters according to conceptual similarity and were asked to label each cluster. Refer to *Appendix A* for a copy of the In-Person Focus Group Guide.

Volunteer participants who were unable to attend a focus group, or to whom a focus group session was unavailable, completed an online survey with identical interview questions. In this online survey, participants were asked to read the standard consent form and check a box to indicate their willingness to participate before completing a series of demographic questions. Participants were then asked to complete the same sentence above by entering their responses in an open text box. The environment of each measurement method was mimicked to encourage consistency of results with individuals in both types of sessions completing the sentences individually. Refer to *Appendix B* for a copy of the Online Focus Group Guide including the consent form.

The researcher then took this survey data and grouped the responses into logical clusters according to conceptual similarity. The information from both the in-person focus groups and the online survey were analyzed and used to generate items and hypothesized factors. Participants originally completed 485 sentences, but this number was reduced to 96 after deleting ambiguous

or redundant items. These 96 items were then sorted into five domains: environment, community, customer, employee, and culture. Domain definitions were refined and items were edited as necessary. Item generation was discontinued when no new items were identified in the survey and interview data.

The researcher then analyzed the items in each domain to determine a final scale for survey deployment in Study 2. Again, items were excluded that seemed too ambiguous, or redundant, resulting in the deletion of 43 items. The study employed multiple raters so that tests of reliability could be measured. Where relevant, scale items were revised and added based on a review of pre-existing measures and theoretical frameworks. Particularly, items for the environmental, employee, community, and customer factors were compared with items from Turker (2009), Hanzaee & Rahpeima (2013), and D'Aprile & Talò (2014), who all had previously validated measures with similar factors/items. The empirical review also resulted in the addition of a sixth factor, labelled triple bottom line.

The pilot measure of this study was peer-reviewed by six subject matter experts in both academic and professional fields all with experience in CSR consulting and developing psychometric instruments. After completing the measure, each reviewer was asked to review the instrument regarding clarity, wording, face validity, content validity and ease of usage. This peer review resulted in the deletion of 9 items and the rewording of others resulting in a 44-item pilot Corporate Social Responsibility Inventory (CSRI).

Table 3

CSRI Pilot Measure with Dimensions, Items and Measurement Sources

No.	CSRI Dimensions & Items	Measurement Sources
	Responsibility for Environment	
1	Employees in my organization are given opportunities to participate in activities that aim to protect and improve the natural environment.	D'Aprile & Talò (2013) Psychosocial-CSR Scale Turker (2009) CSR Scale
2	Employees in my organization demonstrate a commitment to environmentally sustainable practice in their day-to-day actions at work (e.g. reducing waste, reusing materials, and recycling).	Hanzaee & Rahpeima (2013) CSR Scale
3	Employees in my organization work hard to ensure our products and/or services are environmentally sustainable.	
4	Management in my organization encourage exploration and application of new methods for protecting and enriching the natural environment.	
5	Issues of environmental protection or enhancement are embedded in my organization's policies and practices.	
6	My organization is a force for positive environmental change.	
7	My organization considers the impact of its core operations (products and services) on the natural environment.	
8	My organization would be willing to sacrifice profit to ensure the protection or enhancement of our natural environment.	
	Responsibility for Employees	
9	My organization's policies and practices support the development of employee's skills and careers.	Turker (2009) CSR Scale Hanzaee & Rahpeima (2013)
10	My organization invests in the health and well-being of its employees.	CSR Scale
11	My organization pays a fair and liveable wage to its employees.	
12	My organization fosters an enjoyable work atmosphere for employees.	
13	My organization goes out of its way to hire fairly and equitably.	
14	My organization's policies and practices support a core value of respect for its employees.	
15	My organization considers employees' interests when making decisions.	
16	My organization has policies and practices that	

support a healthy work-life balance for employees.

17 My organization is willing to sacrifice profit to support our employees' health and well-being.

Responsibility for Community

18 My organization provides or contributes to activities that help the local community (e.g. local city, town, or region).

19 My organization provides or contributes to activities that help the global community.

20 My organization is recognized in the community as exemplifying Corporate Social Responsibility.

21 Employees in my organization are rewarded for or given opportunities to volunteer in the local or global community.

22 My organization has received public recognition for helping the local or global community.

23 My organization donates money or resources tailored to address the needs of the community.

24 My organization collaborates with local or global institutions on socially responsible projects.

25 My organization would be willing to sacrifice profit to ensure the protection or enhancement of society.

D'Aprile & Talò (2013) Psychosocial-CSR Scale
Turker (2009) CSR Scale

Responsibility for Customer

26 My organization goes above and beyond to protect and enhance the well-being of our customers.

27 My organization maintains a high level of trust among its customers.

28 My organization is dedicated to treating its customers with respect and dignity.

29 My organization respects customers' rights beyond the legal requirements.

30 My organization is willing to sacrifice profit to support our customers' health and well-being.

Turker (2009) CSR Scale
Hanzaee & Rahpeima (2013) CSR Scale

CSR Culture

31 My organization has clear values or written policies relating to Corporate Social Responsibility.

32 Corporate Social Responsibility is a core aspect of my organization's identity.

33 It is assumed that members of my organization will behave in a socially responsible manner.

34 It is obvious to visitors that my organization cares about Corporate Social Responsibility.

35 People who are not socially responsible would feel out of place in my organization.

36 There are clear consequences in my organization for engaging in illegal or immoral behaviour.

Schein (2004) Organizational Culture
Barker, Ingersoll, & Teal (2014) CSR Culture and Subculture

37	Corporate Social Responsibility is embedded in the human resource policies and practices of my organization (e.g. training, employee orientation, selection, etc.).
38	My organization has a formal Corporate Social Responsibility team or lead.
39	My organization has a budget allocated to Corporate Social Responsibility projects or causes.

Triple Bottom Line

40	Success to my organization means more than just profit but also social or environmental benefit.
41	The aim of my organization is not simply to maximize financial return but also to generate social and environmental value to society.
42	In addition to reporting profit/losses, my company also reports on social or environmental impacts.
43	My organization contributes positively to people and the planet, while also aiming to generate a profit.
44	Management in my organization is concerned about social and economic issues, not just company revenue.

Pilot CSRI Measure

The pilot CSRI was constructed based on semi-structured interviews with groups of both local and global business professionals. The process involved generating items that encompass what it means for an organization to be socially responsible. Items were refined by drawing from previous literature, modifying items from pre-existing measures, and having the items reviewed and edited by subject matter experts. After items had been generated, subject matter experts reviewed and edited the items, reducing the number to a total of 44. Refer to Table 3 for a copy of the full scale before factor analysis and further refinement.

The pilot CSRI scale is comprised of six dimensions. The "Responsibility for Environment" scale captures "Organizational policies and practices aimed at protecting and enriching the current and future state of the natural environment." Sample items include: "Employees in my organization are given opportunities to participate in activities that aim to

protect and improve the natural environment" and "Employees in my organization work hard to ensure our products and/or services are environmentally sustainable." Environmental responsibility originally appeared in Turker's (2009) CSR scale with adaptations also appearing in D'Aprile and Talò's (2013) P-CSR Scale and Hanzaee & Rahpeima's (2013) CSR Scale.

The "Responsibility for Employee" scale captures "Organizational policies and practices that demonstrate a dedication to improving the lives of employees." Sample items include: "My organization's policies and practices support the development of employee's skills and careers" and "My organization invests in the health and well-being of its employees." Responsibility for Employees originally appeared in Turker's (2009) CSR scale with adaptations also appearing in Hanzaee & Rahpeima's (2013) CSR Scale.

The "Responsibility for Community" scale captures "Organizational policies and practices dedicated to bettering both local and global collections of people." Sample items include: "My organization provides or contributes to activities that help the local community (e.g. local city, town, or region)" and "My organization provides or contributes to activities that help the global community." Responsibility for Community originally appeared in Turker's (2009) CSR scale with adaptations also appearing in D'Aprile and Talò's (2013) P-CSR Scale.

The "Responsibility for Customer" scale captures "Organizational policies and practices that demonstrate a dedication to protecting and enhancing customer well-being that extends beyond profit." A note was included to define a customer as a person or business that receives goods or services from the participant's organization. Sample items include: "My organization goes above and beyond to protect and enhance the well-being of our customers" and "My organization maintains a high level of trust among its customers." Responsibility for Customers

originally appeared in Turker's (2009) CSR scale with adaptations also appearing in Hanzaee &

Rahpeima's (2013) CSR Scale.

The "CSR Culture" scale captures "The shared basic assumption of a company to commit

to Corporate Social Responsibility." Sample items include: "It is assumed that members of my

organization will behave in a socially responsible manner" and "My organization has clear

values or written policies relating to Corporate Social Responsibility." No previous CSR scale

has captured this domain. In addition to the inductive data, literature from Schein (2004) was

referenced to understand the concept of culture with support from Barker, Ingersoll, and Teal

(2014) to understand how CSR and culture uniquely interact.

The "Triple Bottom Line" scale captures "Organizational policies and practices that

demonstrate a dedication to people, planet, and profit." Sample items include: "Success to my

organization means more than just profit but also social or environmental benefit" and "In

addition to reporting profit/losses, my company also reports on social or environmental impacts."

No previous CSR scale has captured this domain. Literature from Slaper and Hall (2011) and

Tyson (2010) was referenced to understand the contemporary business model.

Respondents were asked to indicate their level of agreement with statements on a seven-

point Likert scale ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*). All items were

positively worded with higher ratings indicating greater CSR.

Chapter IV: Study 2 – CSRI Validation

To determine whether the six CSR dimensions are an accurate reflection of the

underlying constructs and demonstrate sound psychometric properties, a preliminary validation

of the pilot CSRI was conducted in Study 2.

Data Collection

An online survey, including the pilot CSRI, was created and distributed internationally via email, online sites and social media to conduct an EFA. Participants were asked to open the link and read the letter of information and consent. If they agreed to participate they were then directed to the first page of the survey where they completed the CSR measures. After they filled in all of their responses and clicked 'next' they were taken to the end page thanking them for their participation. From here, they could choose to exit or click on a link to enter their email for a prize draw and request a copy of the research paper. This link opened a separate survey that had no connection to the results of the CSR survey so as to maintain confidentiality.

Survey

Participants were asked to respond to questions regarding CSR in their organization using an online survey site. The items of the survey were determined by the first phase of the study. Prior to completing the survey, participants completed a letter of consent and response form, and then debriefing was provided in online version for all participants. Information regarding demographics was also collected for secondary analyses. Additional related scales were used to test criterion-related validity. A full copy of the survey, including consent form, CSR measure, additional scales, and demographic form, can be found in *Appendix C*.

Sample

The same participation restrictions were in place in Study 1, with individuals only able to participate if they were older than 19 years old and currently employed full-time, part-time or contractually at an organization for 160 hours or the equivalent of one full-time month. This meant that both studies did not work with a vulnerable population (children/youth) and that individuals had some experience within an organizational context. It was particularly important

that individuals were currently employed for Study 2 as the survey asked the participant to reference an organization in which they currently worked.

305 participants started the CSR survey. However, due to the nature of online surveying, participants may only withdraw participation by exiting the survey at any point, and therefore any incomplete surveys were removed from the final analysis. In total, 210 complete cases were used in the final analysis. Participants were recruited online through a convenience sampling method. As an incentive to participate, participants could enter a draw for one of three $20 Starbucks gift cards and were also given the opportunity to receive a copy of the final study, which would include a new measure of CSR from the employee perspective.

107 women and 102 men completed the survey, providing a fairly even balance of input from both sexes. Participants responded from 24 countries, including Canada, the United States, the United Kingdom, India, Brazil, Australia, Portugal, the Philippines, Russia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Barbados, and Germany. Participants worked in a variety of industries including banking, government, retail, technology, construction, hospitality, education, insurance, healthcare, management consulting, and transit. Participant ages ranged from 19 to 69 (M_{age} = 32.21). Most participants had a bachelor's degree ($n = 97$, 46%) or graduate degree ($n = 53$, 25%). Most participants worked at the employee level ($n = 124$, 59%) or supervisor level (n = 30, 14%). Five executives and eight senior directors/managers completed the survey. The majority of respondents were full-time employees ($n = 151$, 72%) with slightly less respondents as part-time ($n = 39$, 19%), temporary or casual ($n = 11$, 5%), and contracted ($n = 8$, 4%). The demographics for Study 2 are summarized in Table 4.

Table 4

Study 2 Sample Demographics

	Frequency (n)	Percentage
Gender		
Male	107	51.0
Female	102	48.6
Prefer not to identify	1	0.5
Age		
<25	40	19.1
25-35	119	56.7
>35	51	24.2
Education		
Less than a high school degree	2	1.0
High school degree or equivalent (e.g., GED)	10	4.8
Some college but no degree	38	18.1
Associate degree	9	4.3
Bachelor degree	97	46.2
Graduate degree	53	25.2
Other	1	0.5
Position		
Employee	124	59.0
Supervisor	30	14.3
Manager	25	11.9
Director or senior manager	8	3.8
Executive	5	2.4
Independent contractor	9	4.3
Self-employed	8	3.8
Other	1	0.5
Employment Status		
Employed, working full-time	151	71.9
Employed, working part-time	39	18.6
Temporary or casual	11	5.2
Contracted	8	3.8
Other	1	0.5

Statistical Analyses

An EFA was performed on the sample ($N = 210$) to obtain a factor solution.

Because EFA is a multivariate statistical approach, it is appropriate for reducing the number of

factors, examining relationships between categories, and evaluating the construct validity of a

measurement scale (Williams et al., 2010). As stated by Beavers et al., "Because the family of factor analysis procedures are multivariate tools, and multivariate methods require larger sample sizes than do univariate methods, one should plan for a sample of at least 150 cases for initial structure exploration" (2013, p. 10). As 210 participants exceeds this recommendation, the data was eligible for EFA, although it did not meet the threshold of $N = 400$ for CFA (Hoetler, 1983) after using Anderson and Gerbing's (1988) recommended procedure of randomly splitting the main sample into independent EFA ($n = 200$) and CFA samples ($n = 200$).

EFA was chosen over Principal Components Analysis (PCA) as the preferred method of extraction. This decision was based primarily on the objective of the analysis which is to identify constructs uncontaminated by unique and error variability. As this analysis was testing a theoretical model of latent factors, EFA was the preferred method over PCA which focuses instead on data reduction (Costello & Osborne, 2005). In this vein, Gorsuch (1990) has recommended Factor Analysis over PCA because "it recognises we have error in our variables, gives unbiased instead of inflated loadings, and is more elegant as a part of the standard model used in univariate and multivariate analysis" (p. 39).

A preliminary assessment of the correlation matrix was first conducted using the KMO test to determine the statistical significance of the matrix. This was followed by the Bartlett test to compare the correlation matrix against the identity matrix. Statistically significant results from both of these tests would provide sufficient rationale for proceeding with the Exploratory Factor Analysis. The number of factors used for the present analyses was based on eigenvalues equal to or greater than 1 (Harmon, 1967), the percentage of variance accounted for by each factor and the scree test.

The maximum likelihood (ML) procedure was used in EFA to delineate the relationship between CSRI item measurements (the observed variables) and their underlying latent constructs. ML was selected as the model was a parametric distribution and as stated by Myung (2002), "Unlike least-squares estimation which is primarily a descriptive tool, MLE is a preferred method of parameter estimation in statistics and is an indispensable tool for many statistical modelling techniques, in particular in non-linear modelling" (p. 90). When calculating the population estimates for factor loadings, this procedure aims to maximize the probability of sampling the observed correlation matrix from a population (Tabachnick & Fidell, 1989). Oblique rotation using the PROMAX method was the option selected for interpreting the solution since it "provides a more accurate representation of how constructs are likely to be related to one another" (Fabrigar et al., 1999, p. 282), rather than the Varimax (orthogonal) rotation that assumes independence among the constructs, since theoretically these dimensions were expected to correlate. Input for all analyses consisted of the 44 Pilot CSRI items.

Criterion-related validity. Internal consistency reliability was assessed based on alpha reliability coefficients and whether they exceeded the minimum threshold of .70 (Garson, 2010). Pearson's correlation was used to examine the intercorrelations between the CSR factors and relationship between each subscale and important outcomes related to individual well-being (job-related affective well-being, employee engagement) and organizational attitudes (organizational commitment, trust in management, intention to resign).

Chapter V: Measures

CSRI. The 44-item Pilot CSRI was used as input for EFA. Following EFA, the final six-factor, 33-item CSRI was used to test for criterion-related validity. Responsibility for Employees

(e.g. "My organization fosters an enjoyable work atmosphere for employees"; α = .927) and CSR Culture (e.g. "Corporate Social Responsibility is a core aspect of my organization's identity"; α = .909) were both measured with six-item scales. Responsibility for Customers (three items; e.g. "My organization goes out of its way to protect or enhance the well-being of our customers"; α = .883), Triple Bottom Line (four items; e.g. "Success to my organization means more than just profit but also social or environmental benefit"; α = .915), and Responsibility for Community (five items; e.g. "Employees in my organization are rewarded for or given opportunities to volunteer in the local or global community"; α = .887) were tapped with three, four and five-item scales, respectively. Responsibility for the Environment was measured with seven items (e.g. "Employees in my organization are given opportunities to participate in activities that aim to protect and improve the natural environment"; α = .942). The internal consistency reliability (Cronbach's α) of the six CSRI scales was .966.

Engagement. Engagement was measured by the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES; Schaufeli et al., 2002). The items of the UWES are grouped into three subscales that reflect the underlying dimensions of engagement: Vigor (six items; e.g., "When I get up in the morning, I feel like going to work"; α = .878); Dedication (five items; e.g., "I am enthusiastic about my job"; α = .797), and Absorption (six items; e.g., "When I am working, I forget everything else around me"; α = .751). Participants were asked to indicate their level of agreement or disagreement with the items on a scale from 1 (*No, I strongly disagree*) to 7 (*Yes, I strongly agree*). The overall score (averaged across the three subscales) was used in the analyses. The internal consistency reliability (Cronbach's α) of the three scales used in this survey was .932.

Organizational commitment. A five-item scale was used to measure organizational commitment from the nine-item scale by Cook & Wall (1980). Example statements include "I am quite proud to be able to tell people whom it is I work for" and "I feel myself to be a part of this organization" (α = .864). Responses are on a seven-point scale (1 = *no, I strongly disagree* to 7 = *yes, I strongly agree*).

Intention to resign. A three-item scale derived from the Michigan Organizational Assessment Questionnaire (Seashore, Lawler, Mirvis & Cammann, 1982) was used to measure intention to resign. Statements include "I often think about quitting," "I will probably look for a new job within the next year," and "I expect to be working somewhere else a year from now" (α = .905). Responses are on a seven-point scale (1 = *no, I strongly disagree* to 7 = *yes, I strongly agree*).

Trust in management. Cook and Wall's (1980) five-item Trust in Management scale was used. Sample items include "Management at (organization) is sincere in its attempts to meet the workers' point of view" and "Management can be trusted to make sensible decisions for (organization)'s future" (α = .881). Responses are on a seven-point scale (1 = *no, I strongly disagree* to 7 = *yes, I strongly agree*).

Job-related affective well-being. Two scales developed by Warr (1990) were used to measure the two dimensions of affective well-being at work: Anxiety-Contentment (α = .852) and Depression-Enthusiasm (α = .876). The six-item, six-point scales ask respondents to think of the past few weeks and rate a series of emotions related to the job (e.g. tense, optimistic). Scores range from 1 (*never*) to 6 (*all the time*).

Demographics. Demographic data was collected including age, country of residence, employment industry, highest level of education beyond grade school, gender, level of employment, and employment status (i.e. full-time, part-time, etc.).

Chapter VI: Results

Two rounds of EFA were completed. Results of the first round of EFA on the 44-item Pilot CSRI measure identified seven factors as having eigenvalues greater than 1, which accounted for 73.23% of the variance. Of these factors, only six were considered reliable after PROMAX rotation. An examination of the pattern matrix showed that only one item was found to load above .40 on the seventh factor and was therefore considered unreliable. Items 2, 23, 24, 25, 28, 30, 33, 35, and 36 were deleted as they were considered to be unreliable and did not meet the minimum cut-off of .70 (Garson, 2010).

Table 5

Exploratory Factor Analysis of the Pilot CSRI

No.	Items	Factor					
		EMP	ENV	CUL	COM	TBL	CUS
9	My organization's policies and practices support the development of employee's skills and careers.	.619					
10	My organization invests in the health and well-being of its employees.	.813					
11	My organization pays a fair and liveable wage to its employees.	.806					
12	My organization fosters an enjoyable work atmosphere for employees.	.779					
14	My organization's policies and practices support a core value of respect for its employees.	.812					
15	My organization considers employees' interests when making decisions.	.722					
16	My organization has policies and practices that support a healthy work-life balance for employees.	.865					
17	My organization is willing to sacrifice profit to support our employees' health and well-being.	.623					
1	Employees in my organization are given opportunities to participate in activities that aim to protect and improve the natural environment.		.619				
3	Employees in my organization work hard to ensure our products and/or services are environmentally sustainable.		.935				

4	Management in my organization encourage exploration and application of new methods for protecting and enriching the natural environment.	.834	
5	Issues of environmental protection or enhancement are embedded in my organization's policies and practices.	.887	
6	My organization is a force for positive environmental change.	.928	
7	My organization considers the impact of its core operations (products and services) on the natural environment.	.850	
8	My organization would be willing to sacrifice profit to ensure the protection or enhancement of our natural environment.	.564	
31	My organization has clear values or written policies relating to Corporate Social Responsibility.		.904
32	Corporate Social Responsibility is a core aspect of my organization's identity.		.668
34	It is obvious to visitors that my organization cares about Corporate Social Responsibility.		.382
37	Corporate Social Responsibility is embedded in the human resource policies and practices of my organization (e.g. training, employee orientation, selection, etc.).		.685
38	My organization has a formal Corporate Social Responsibility team or lead.		.831
39	My organization has a budget allocated to Corporate Social Responsibility projects or causes.		.736

18	My organization provides or contributes to activities that help the local community (e.g. local city, town, or region).	.811		
19	My organization provides or contributes to activities that help the global community.	.563		
20	My organization is recognized in the community as exemplifying Corporate Social Responsibility.	.571		
21	Employees in my organization are rewarded for or given opportunities to volunteer in the local or global community.	.780		
22	My organization has received public recognition for helping the local or global community.	.826		
40	Success to my organization means more than just profit but also social or environmental benefit.		.952	
41	The aim of my organization is not simply to maximize financial return but also to generate social and environmental value to society.		1.020	
42	In addition to reporting profit/losses, my company also reports on social or environmental impacts.		.616	
44	Management in my organization is concerned about social and economic issues, not just company revenue.		.723	
26	My organization goes above and beyond to protect and enhance the well-being of our customers.			.632
27	My organization maintains a high level of trust among its customers.			.643

29	My organization respects customers' rights beyond the legal requirements.						.504
Eigenvalues		15.677	2.552	1.699	1.537	.896	.675
% Variance		47.507	7.735	5.149	4.658	2.714	2.046
Total Variance							69.809

Note. Analysis based on Study 2 data (*N* = 210). EMP = Responsibility to Employees; ENV = Responsibility to the Environment; CUL = CSR Culture; COM = Responsibility to the Community; TBL = Triple Bottom Line; CUS = Responsibility to Customers.

As a result of the item retention process, 35 items were obtained and a second EFA was conducted. In the second iteration of EFA, the KMO Measure verified the sampling adequacy for the analysis (KMO = .94) and Bartlett's Test of Sphericity, χ^2 (528) = 6198.29, $p < .0001$, was significant. After conducting reliability tests, items 13 and 43 were deleted as these items had lower inter-item correlations and contributed marginally to Cronbach's alpha for that factor. These 33 items comprise the final CSR scale and are listed in Table 5 along with their factor loadings. Within these 33 items, the analysis identified six factors with an eigenvalue above 1. Together these factors accounted for 69.81% of the total variance.

The first CSR factor consisted of eight items accounting for 47.51% of the variance. Items within this factor were associated with the organization's Responsibility to Employees (e.g., "My organization invests in the health and well-being of its employees," "My organization pays a fair and liveable wage to its employees"). The second factor included seven items that accounted for 7.74% of the variance. Items within this factor addressed the organization's Responsibility to the Environment (e.g., "Employees in my organization are given opportunities to participate in activities that aim to protect and improve the natural environment," "My

organization is a force for positive environmental change"). The third factor consisted of six items accounting for 5.15% of the variance. Items within this factor were associated with the organization's CSR Culture (e.g., "Corporate Social Responsibility is a core aspect of my organization's identity," "It is obvious to visitors that my organization cares about Corporate Social Responsibility"). The fourth factor consisted of five items accounting for 4.66% of the variance. Items within this factor addressed the organization's Responsibility to the Community (e.g., "Employees in my organization are rewarded for or given opportunities to volunteer in the local or global community," "My organization is recognized in the community as exemplifying Corporate Social Responsibility"). The fifth factor consisted of four items accounting for 2.71% of the variance. Items within this factor addressed the organization's Triple Bottom Line mentality (e.g. "Success to my organization means more than just profit but also social or environmental benefit," "Management in my organization is concerned about social and economic issues, not just company revenue"). The sixth factor consisted of three items accounting for 2.05% of the variance. Items within this factor addressed the organization's Responsibility to Customers (e.g. "My organization goes out of its way to protect or enhance the well-being of our customers," "My organization respects customers' rights beyond the legal requirements"). Table 5 summarizes the total variance explained for each factor.

Intercorrelations and reliability statistics. Displayed in Table 6 are the summary statistics for the main sample ($N = 210$), including means, standard deviations, reliability estimates, and intercorrelations for the six CSR dimensions. Alpha reliabilities for each dimension far exceed the minimum requirement of .70 (Nunnally, 1978), confirming the reliability of the instrument. The intercorrelations between the six factors were between .490 and .671, indicating that the subscales are related but distinct. The strongest intercorrelation was

between Responsibility to Employees and Responsibility to Customers ($r = .744$), This would be

characterized as a large effect size (Cohen, 1988). The weakest correlations were between

Responsibility to Customer and CSR Culture ($r = .490$), Responsibility to Customer and

Responsibility to Environment ($r = .492$) and Responsibility to Customer and Responsibility to

Community ($r = .497$). These correlations would be characterized as medium effect sizes

(Cohen, 1988).

Table 6

Means, Standard Deviations, Alpha Reliabilities and Pearson Intercorrelations Among Study Variables

	M (SD)	ITR (1)	ENG (2)	A-C (3)	D-E (4)	CMT (5)	TRU (6)	ENV (7)	EMP (8)	CUL (9)	COM (10)	TBL (11)	CUS (12)
1	3.86 (1.87)	**.905**											
2	4.75 (1.08)	-.714**	**.932**										
3	3.88 (1.00)	-.436**	.500**	**.852**									
4	4.38 (1.05)	-.621**	.676**	.720**	**.876**								
5	4.66 (1.11)	-.759**	.770**	.462**	.661**	**.864**							
6	4.70 (1.39)	-.544**	.503**	.473**	.540**	.692**	**.881**						
7	4.03 (1.45)	-.302**	.448**	.360**	.408**	.477**	.386**	**.942**					
8	4.93 (1.22)	-.507**	.530**	.443*	.512**	.678**	.771**	.552**	**.927**				
9	4.26 (1.40)	-.312**	.435**	.290**	.300**	.472**	.390**	.653**	.544**	**.909**			
10	4.36 (1.38)	-.419**	.484**	.248**	.357**	.526**	.407**	.571**	.577**	.671**	**.887**		
11	4.35 (1.58)	-.359**	.480**	.275**	.349**	.531**	.486**	.616**	.609**	.654**	.608**	**.915**	
12	5.43 (1.21)	-.459**	.505**	.300**	.419**	.610**	.663**	.492**	.744**	.490**	.497**	.542**	**.883**

Note. N = 211. Alpha reliabilities appear in the diagonal. *M* and *SD* represent mean and standard deviation, respectively.
ITR = Intention to Resign; ENG = Engagement; A-C = Anxiety-Contentment; D-E = Depression-Enthusiasm; CMT = Organizational Commitment; TRU = Trust in Management; ENV = Responsibility to Environment; EMP = Responsibility to Employees; CUL = CSR Culture; COM = Responsibility to Community; TBL = Triple Bottom Line; CUS = Responsibility to Customer.
** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (two-tailed). * Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (two-tailed).

Criterion-related validity. Table 6 displays the Pearson correlations between each factor and job-related construct. All six CSRI scales, Environment ($r = -.302$), Employee ($r = -.507$), Culture ($r = -.312$), Community ($r = -.419$), Triple Bottom Line ($r = -.359$), Customer ($r = -.459$), were negatively correlated at a statistically significant level ($p < .05$) with intention to resign. All six CSRI scales, Environment ($r = .448$), Employee ($r = .530$), Culture ($r = .435$), Community ($r = .484$), Triple Bottom Line ($r = .480$), Customer ($r = .505$), were positively correlated at a statistically significant level ($p < .05$) with engagement. All six factors, Environment ($r = .477$), Employee ($r = .678$), Culture ($r = .472$), Community ($r = .526$), Triple Bottom Line ($r = .531$), Customer ($r = .610$), were all positively correlated at a statistically significant level ($p < .05$) with organizational commitment. All six factors, Environment ($r = .386$), Employee ($r = .771$), Culture ($r = .390$), Community ($r = .407$), Triple Bottom Line ($r = .486$), Customer ($r = .663$), were positively correlated at a statistically significant level ($p < .05$) with trust in management. Responsibility to Employees and Organizational Commitment ($r = .678$) and Trust in Management ($r = .771$) both exceeded Cohen's (1988) criteria for a large correlation ($> .50$). Responsibility to Customers and Trust in Management ($r = .663$) were also strongly correlated (Cohen, 1988; $> .50$).

Chapter VII: Discussion

The results of Study 2 revealed that there are six correlated but distinct factors that make up the CSR construct from the employee perspective including: Responsibility for Employees (eight items), Responsibility for Environment (seven items), CSR Culture (six items), Responsibility for Community (five items), Triple Bottom Line (four items), and Responsibility for Customers (three items) for a total of 33 items. Demonstrated criterion-related validity for

each of the CSR subscales support the utility of the measure regarding important outcomes related to employee well-being and organizational behaviour

In contrast to previous research that typically examined CSR from the consumers' perspective or measurement by unidimensional reputation indices, this study examined CSR from the employee perspective. This study approached the development of the scale inductively through extensive interviews with a broad, heterogeneous sample of workers from a range of cultures, industries, and occupations to ensure that the measurement model reflects the diverse employee experience of CSR. As suggested by Bartunek and Seo (2002), an inductive methodology adds to the explanatory power of a model. This scale also built upon theoretical dimensions from previous CSR measures to create an integrated measurement model.

It was discovered that the factor, Responsibility to Employee, accounted for the most variance (47.51%). This is an interesting discovery and may be due to the idea that a sense of responsibility to the well-being of employees provides a psychological foundation for the commitment to the other dimensions of CSR. This finding may be explained through the Employee-Customer-Profit model, which suggests that employee attitude is the driver of customer impression, which is a strong determinant of the organization's profitability (Rucci, Kirn, & Quinn, 1998). This also highlights the important distinction between measuring CSR from a consumer vs. employee perspective. To employees, this responsibility may represent a tangible distinction between an espoused commitment to CSR and living these values. As argued by Argyris (1980), espoused values are distinct from values-in-use and it is values-in-use that are the primary drivers of human behaviour. Employees can directly experience the organizational commitment to CSR, which then, in turn, allows them to discover other ways their organization has committed to CSR. This theory is explored further in a study by Young and Thyil (2009),

which emphasizes the possible divergence between espoused statements of CSR and how they are operationalized. Young and Thyil (2009) theorize that following through on espoused statements of CSR is the key to unlocking employee perceptions of CSR and therefore realizing the true value from a CSR program. It is recommended that the causal relationship between Responsibility to Employee and other CSRI dimensions be examined in future research using multi-wave longitudinal research design and covariance structure analysis.

Another interesting discovery illuminated through this study was the strong correlation between Responsibility to Employee and Responsibility to Customer. This is consistent with numerous research linking employee satisfaction and customer satisfaction, sometimes referred to as the employee-customer satisfaction chain (e.g., Wiley, 1991, Vilares & Coelho, 2003, Brooks, 2000). This research proposes a link between employee satisfaction and its causal implication on perceived value and customer satisfaction (Vilares & Coelho, 2003). This research would support the finding that as Responsibility to Employees increases, so too does the Responsibility to Customers – both having a beneficial impact on the company's bottom-line.

By using an inductive and deductive approach, two new CSR factors emerged that, to this researcher's knowledge or according to available current literature, have never before been captured in a CSR scale: CSR Culture and Triple Bottom Line. Together these two factors accounted for 7.86% of the variance. According to Schein (2004), "The term culture should be reserved for the deeper level of basic assumptions and beliefs that are shared by members of an organization, that operate unconsciously, and that define in a basic 'take-for-granted' fashion an organization's view of itself and its environment" (p. 6). Understandably, the impact of a CSR culture at an organization could have important and widespread implications on how a company operates. Beyond direct actions and behaviours, it represents a shared, unconscious

understanding and assumption of the members of an organization. By including this dimension, the CSR measure can capture the deeper underlying values driving CSR behaviour in an organization.

In addition, triple bottom line is an emerging theory in CSR literature. Triple bottom line is a framework that accounts for a broader perspective of what it means to generate business value, recognizing the reciprocal relationship between people and planet as well as profit (Slaper & Hall, 2011). This business model is garnering more attention as it argues that factoring these impacts into overall corporate balance sheets delivers greater efficiency, making companies more competitive and sparking innovation - all drivers of profitability over time (Tyson, 2010). Furthermore, as resources become increasingly scarce, a triple bottom line mindset may not only be an advantage, but a necessity for companies hoping to survive (Muchinsky & Culbertson, 2015). Thus, incorporating this dimension into a measure of CSR enables organizations to assess their commitment to a CSR-oriented business model from the workers' perspective.

This study also differed from other scale validation studies by incorporating responses from a diverse sample. The scale developed by Turker (2009) examined perceptions from individuals in Turkey, the scale developed by D'Aprile and Talò (2014) surveyed members of small and medium-sized Italian enterprises and the scale by Hanzaee and Rahpeima (2013) surveyed individuals in Iran. There are all culturally-specific populations that may not generalize to other populations. By contrast, this study analyzed responses from culturally diverse workers all over the world. As such, the measure is more likely to generalize across international organizations. However, future research is still needed to assess the cross-cultural invariance of the measure to empirically establish generalizability.

Also of note in this study is the exclusion of a factor relating to organizations'
commitment to legal requirements. This is in contrast to Turker (2009), D'Aprile and Talò
(2014), and Hanzaee and Rahpeima (2013), which all include this as either a factor or
measurement item. This theme was not evident in the feedback gathered from current employees.
Contemporary models postulate that CSR means something more than compliance (McWilliams,
Siegel, Wright, 2006), and instead involves, "Actions that appear to further some social good,
beyond the interests of the firm and that which is required by law" (McWilliams & Siegel, 2001,
p. 117). Additionally, a meta-analysis by Dahlsrud (2008) on the elements that comprise a
definition of CSR did not include an aspect of legality. Therefore, it was decided that an
organization's commitment to legal requirements would not be included in this measure.

A final important finding was that the use of in-person interviews and online interviews
did not result in different responses from the participants. The researcher tried to mimic the
conditions in each measurement method, with identical preambles and framing of questions, and
was pleased to see that the difference in techniques did not result in different outcomes. Results
were also stable across the different cultures, indicating that there may be some consistency in
the cross-cultural understanding of CSR, however, it would be recommended that this is
explored further.

Employee Perception of CSR and Organizational Outcomes

Four organizational outcome measures were used to assess the criterion validity of the
CSR scale: intention to resign, engagement, organizational commitment, and trust in
management. The CSR factors were all negatively correlated to intention to resign and positively
correlated to engagement, organizational commitment, and trust in management. These findings
validate the current CSR scale as previous researchers have found a similar relationship between

CSR and organizational commitment (You et al., 2013; Glavas & Kelley, 2014; Jin & Drozdenko, 2010), turnover intentions (Bhattacharya, Sen & Korschun, 2008; Ghosh & Gurunathan, 2014), employee engagement (You et al., 2013; Rupp, Ganapathi, Aguilera & Williams, 2006), and trust in management (Vlachos, Tsamakos, Vrechopoulos, Avramidis, 2008).

The correlation between CSR and outcomes related to employee well-being and organizational attitudes underscore the importance of CSR within a competitive market. Given that studies have found a relationship between organizational commitment and job performance (Meyer et al., 1989), employee engagement and job performance (Rich, Lepine, & Crawford, 2010), and trust in management and job performance (Mayer & Gavin, 2005), improving these outcomes through CSR not only has clear benefits for the employees of an organization but may also significantly improve a company's bottom line.

Interestingly, the Responsibility to Employees factor yielded strong correlations (Cohen, 1988) with both organizational commitment and trust in management. This can be explained by the fact that some of the strongest items for the Responsibility to Employee factor regarded an organization's consideration of the needs and perspectives of employees and promoting work-life balance. Spector's (1997) research suggests that satisfied employees are more likely to be cooperative, helpful to colleagues, punctual, time-efficient, committed, and will stay at the company longer than dissatisfied employees. This further aligns with the Happy-Productive Worker hypothesis, which asserts that satisfied employees will be more engaged and productive than dissatisfied employees (Staw, 1986). Taken together, these results suggest that incorporating the values of CSR may help create an environment in which employees are happier, more committed, and more trusting of their superiors, however, more research is needed to test this

hypothesis definitively. Future studies are suggested to include more robust longitudinal research designs capable of establishing strength and direction of causation.

Additionally, the Responsibility to Customers dimension also had a strong correlation with trust in management (Cohen, 1988). This result suggests that as employees see their employers truly commitment to customer satisfaction and well-being, they may be more willing to trust them. As mentioned previously, numerous studies have been able to demonstrate a relationship between employee and customer satisfaction (Wiley, 1991, Vilares & Coelho, 2003, Brooks, 2000). However, Hee Yoon, Beatty, & Suh (2001) went even further to demonstrate a link between supportive management and employee service quality. It is recommended that this interesting relationship be examined further in future studies.

Theoretical and Practical Implications

While the consumer perception of CSR is an important construct, it may not necessarily align with an internal, employee perspective. If employees are unaware of their organization's CSR efforts, the previously mentioned positive internal benefits of a commitment to CSR may become null. The development of this scale enables an organization to be able to measure their own CSR efforts from an employee perspective, allowing them to ensure the employees awareness of their efforts and allowing them to reap additional internal benefits. In turn, the instrument would enable an organization to fully track return on investment (ROI) of their CSR programs. Relatedly, the CSR Culture scale could help employers identify specific behaviours that can help them to develop and maintain a culture that values CSR. A growing body of research supports the positive benefits of a commitment to CSR on an organization's competitive advantage. However, as prior research has used different and often competing measurement models, it is difficult to ascertain the full impact of CSR. This scale will help organizations to

determine the factors that constitute CSR, using a consistent measurement model. By understanding each of the factors and items, organizations will have precise behaviours and areas in which they can focus their organizational development efforts to enhance CSR.

In addition, this research will benefit the field of organizational psychology as it will allow academics to use a well-validated and reliable tool for future substantive research of CSR from the employee perspective. Also, common acceptance of a CSR measurement model in the literature will support the development of a normative database allowing organizations to benchmark employee perception levels of CSR.

Limitations and Future Research

These findings provide preliminary evidence of construct validity and reliability of a new CSR measure from the employee perspective. Future confirmatory factor analyses (CFA) with analyses of sample invariance will further substantiate the use of the instrument in future academic and applied settings. According to Harrington (2008), CFA with analysis of invariance can be used to examine construct validation and the stability of a measure across groups, populations, or time. This would allow the researcher to test the hypothesis that a relationship between the observed variables and their underlying latent constructs exists. Tests of invariance across groups such as gender and culture would further substantiate the generalizability of the factor structure. It is also recommended that future research test for convergent and discriminant validity.

As previously mentioned, it was discovered that the Responsibility to Employee scale accounted for the most variance (47.51%). It is possible that this factor may be a causal driver of the other CSR factors. However, this hypothesis and others related to causal sequencing remain to be tested. A rigorous test of competing structural models would require structural equations

modelling, and ideally a multi-wave longitudinal research design. Such research is needed to advance our understanding of the antecedents and consequences to CSR.

Also as indicated, there seems to be some stability in the understanding of CSR across various cultures. It would be recommended that a researcher examines this possible cultural consistency further, to understand if CSR is a stable construct throughout diverse and varying cultures.

While the development of this preliminary CSR measure has demonstrated evidence of construct validity, reliability and utility, it is not without limitations. First of all, any research designed to understand individual perceptions is subject to participant bias or inaccuracies. To combat this limitation, individuals were assured of the confidentiality of their responses. However, the idea that employees may not be fully aware of the extent of their organization's CSR program mimics a realistic issue that organizations may have and suggests a direction for future research to examine communication climate as an antecedent for CSR. In addition, this study surveyed a relatively younger population of business professionals (19-69, $M_{age} = 32.21$). It is plausible that an older population may have different views, and this may be another direction for future research. As well, due to limitations in resources, a convenience sample was used, which always has the potential to bias data due to a possible lack of diversity of responses. A great effort was expended to seek a large amount and variety of individuals and companies internationally to sample a wide spectrum of types of CSR programs and company cultures. There is also the issue of common method variance or, "Variance that is attributable to the measurement method rather than to the constructs the measures represent" (Podsakoff, Mackenzie, Lee, & Podsakoff, 2003, p. 879) in self-report studies.

Conclusion

The purpose of this study was to conduct a preliminary validation study of the Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) construct from the perspective of employees. With further validation research, this preliminary CSR measure may provide a benchmark that allows business leaders to measure how impactful their CSR efforts are on their employees, and identify areas in which they can improve. This study builds on previous research, integrating new dimensions from the worker's perspective to create a more holistic measurement model. This measure not only acts as a powerful tool to help companies develop their triple bottom line – people, planet, and profit (Slaper & Hall, 2011), but also to reap positive organizational benefits and remain competitive in increasingly aggressive markets. Awareness of how an organization's employees perceive the strengths and weaknesses of their CSR efforts can allow the organization to seize opportunities for developing healthy communities and an environment that ultimately supports organizational growth and development.

References

Abbott, W. F., & Monsen, R. J. (1979). On the measurement of corporate social responsibility: Self-reported disclosures as a method of measuring corporate social involvement. *The Academy of Management Journal, 22*(3), 501-515.

Allen, W. R. (2013). *The correlation between corporate volunteerism and employee engagement levels of employed service club participants located in northern Missouri* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest LLC. (3558927).

Allmark, P. (2003). Should research samples reflect the diversity of the population? *Journal of Medical Ethics, 30*, 185-189.

Anderson, J. C., & Gerbing, D. W. (1988). Structural equation modelling in practice: A review and recommended two-step approach. *Psychological Bulletin, 103*(3), 411-423.

Argyris, C. (1980). *Inner contradictions of rigorous research*. New York: Academic Press.

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

Barker, B., Ingersoll, L., & Teal, G. (2014). Understanding CSR culture and subcultures: Consensual and conflicting narratives. *International Journal of Engineering Studies, 22*(2), 25-48.

Bartunek, J. M., & Seo, M. (2002). Qualitative research can add new meanings to quantitative research. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour, 23*, 237-242.

Benn, S., & Bolton, D. (2011). *Key concepts in corporate social responsibility*. London: SAGE Publications.

Beavers, A. S., Lounsbury, J. W., Richards, J. K., Huck, S. W., Skolits, G. J., & Esquivel, S. L.

(2013). Practical considerations for using exploratory factor analysis in educational research. *Practical Assessment, Research & Evaluation, 18*(6).

Bhattacharya, C. B., Sen, S., & Korschun, D. (2008). Using corporate social responsibility to win the war for talent. *MIT Sloan Management Review*, *49*(2), 37–44.

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

Bowman, E. H., & Haire, M. (1975). A strategic posture toward corporate social responsibility. *California Management Review*, *18*, 49-58.

Brooks, R. (2000). Why loyal employees and customers improve the bottom line. *Journal of Quality and Participation, 23*(2), 40-44.

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*, 825-860.

Carroll, A. B. (1979). A three-dimensional conceptual model of corporate social performance. *Academy of Management Review, 4,* 497-505.

Carroll, A. B. (1983). Corporate social responsibility: Will industry respond to cutbacks in social program funding? *Vital Speeches of the Day, 49,* 604-608.

Carroll, A. B. (1991). The pyramid of corporate social responsibility: Toward the moral management of organizational stakeholders. *Business Horizons, 34,* 39-48.

Carroll, A. B. (1998). The four faces of corporate citizenship. *Business and Society Review, 100-101*(1), 1-7.

Carroll, A. B. (1999). Corporate social responsibility: Evolution of a definitional construct. *Business and Society, 38*(3), 268-295.

Carroll, A. B. (2000). A commentary and an overview of key questions on corporate social

performance measurement. *Business & Society, 39*(4), 466-478.

Cochran, P. L., & Wood, R. A., (1984). Corporate social responsibility and financial

performance. *Academy of Management Journal, 27,* 42-56.

Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioural sciences* (2nd ed.). Hillsdale, NJ:

Lawrence Earlbaum Associates.

Cook, J., & Wall, T. (1980). New work attitude measures of trust, organizational commitment

and personal need non-fulfilment. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, *53*(1), 39–52.

Costello, A. B., & Osborne, J. W. (2005). Best practices in exploratory factor analysis: Four

recommendations for getting the most from your analysis. *Practical Assessment,*

Research & Evaluation, 10(7). Retrieved

from http://pareonline.net/getvn.asp?v=10&n=7.

D'Aprile, G., & Mannarini, T. (2012). Corporate social responsibility: A psychosocial

multidimensional construct. *Journal of Global Responsibility, 3*(1), 48-65.

D'Aprile, G., & Talò, C. (2014). Measuring corporate social responsibility as a psychosocial

construct: A new multidimensional scale. *Employee Responsibility Rights Journal, 26,*

153-175.

Dalton, D. R., & Cosier, R. A. (1982). The four faces of social responsibility. *Business Horizons,*

19-27.

Davies, A. I., & Crane, A. (2010). Corporate social responsibility in small- and medium-size

enterprises: Investigating employee engagement in fair trade companies. *Business Ethics:*

A European Review, 19(2), 126-139.

Davis, K. (1970). Can business afford to ignore social responsibilities? *California Management*

Review, 2, 70-76.

Dilchert, S., & Ones, D. S. (2012). Environmental sustainability in and of organizations. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology, 5*(4), 503-511.

DuBois, C. L. Z., Astakhova, M. N., & DuBois, D. A. (2013). Motivating behaviour change to support organizational sustainability goals. In A. H. Huffman & S. R. Klein (Eds.), *Green Organizations: Driving Change with I-O Psychology* (pp. 186-208). Hove, UK: Routledge.

Donaldson, L. (2001). *The contingency theory of organizations.* Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Ehrenfeld, J. R. (2005). The roots of sustainability. *MIT Sloan Management Review, 46*(2), 23-25.

Environics International Ltd. (1999). *The millennium poll on corporate social responsibility*. Toronto, ON: Environics International Ltd.

Fabrigar, L.R., Wegener, D.T., MacCallum, R.C., & Strahan, E.J. (1999). Evaluating the use of exploratory factor analysis in psychological research. *Psychological Methods, 4*, 272-299.

Fiske, S. T., & Taylor, S. E. (1991). *Social cognition.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Ferreira, P., & Real de Oliveira, E. (2014). Does corporate social responsibility impact on employee engagement? *Journal of Workplace Learning, 26*(3/4), 232-248.

Freeman, R. E. (1984). *Strategic management: A stakeholder approach*. Boston: Pitman.

Freeman, R. E., Harrison, J., & Wicks, A. (2007). *Managing for Stakeholders: Survival, Reputation, and Success*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Friedman, M. (1970). The social responsibility of business is to increase its profits. *New York Times Magazine,* 32.

Garson, D. (2010). Factor analysis. *StatNotes.* Retrieved from

http://faculty.chass.ncsu.edu/garson/PA765/factor.htm.

Ghosh, D., & Gurunathan, L. (2014). Linking perceived corporate social responsibility and

intention to quit: The mediating role of job embeddedness. *Vision*, *18*(3), 175–183.

Glavas, A., & Kelley, K. (2014). The effects of perceived corporate social responsibility on

employee attitudes. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, *24*(2), 165–202.

Gorsuch, R.L. (1990). Common factor analysis versus component analysis: Some well and little

known facts. *Multivariate Behavioral Research, 25*, 33-39.

Hanzaee, K., & Rahpeima, A. (2013) Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR): A scale

development study in Iran. *Research Journal of Applied Sciences, Engineering and

Technology,* 6(9): 1513-1522.

Harmon, (1967). *Modern factor analysis (2nd ed.)*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Harrington, D. (2008). *Confirmatory factor analysis: Pocket guides to social work research

methods*. Oxford University Press.

Hee Yoon, M., Beatty, S. E., & Suh, J. (2001). The effect of work climate on critical employee

and customer outcomes: An employee-level analysis. *International Journal of Service

Industry Management, 12*(5), 500-521.

Hinkin, T. R. (1995). A review of the scale development practices in the study of organizations.

Journal of Management, 21(5), 967-988.

Hoelter, J.W. (1983). The analysis of covariance structures: Goodness-of-fit

indices. *Sociological Methods and Research*, *11*, 325–344.

Holmes, S. L. (1976). Executive perceptions of corporate social responsibility. *Business

Horizons, 19*, 34-40.

Jin, K. G., & Drozdenko, R. G. (2010). Relationships among perceived organizational core

    values, corporate social responsibility, ethics, and organizational performance outcomes:

    An empirical study of information technology professionals. *Journal of Business Ethics*,

    92(3), 341–359.

Johnson, H. L. (1971). *Business in contemporary society: Framework and issues.* Belmont, CA:

    Wadsworth.

Martínez, P., Pérez, A., & Rodríguez del Bosque, I. (2013). Measuring Corporate Social

    Responsibility in tourism: Development and validation of an efficient measurement scale

    in the hospitality industry. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, *30*(4), 365-385.

Mayer, R. C., & Gavin, M. B. (2005). Trust in management and performance: Who minds the

    shop while the employees watch the boss? *Academy of Management Journal, 48*(5), 874-

    888.

McGuire, J. W. (1963). *Business and society.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

McWilliams, A., & Siegel, D. S. (2001). Corporate social responsibility: A theory of the firm

    perspective. *Academy of Management Review, 26,* 117-127.

McWilliams, A., Siegel, D. S., & Wright, P. M. (2006). Corporate social responsibility:

    International perspectives. *Rensselaer Working Papers in Economics*. Retrieved from

    http://www.economics.rpi.edu/workingpapers/rpi0604.pdf.

Meyer, J. P., Paunonen, S. V., Gellatly, I. R., Goffin, R. D., & Jackson, D. N. (1989).

    Organizational commitment and job performance: It's the nature of the commitment that

    counts. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *74*(1), 152.

Moir, L. (2001). What do we mean by corporate social responsibility? *Corporate Governance,*

    1(2), 1-19.

Muchinsky, P. M., & Culbertson, S. S. (2015). *Psychology applied to work: Eleventh edition.* New York: Hypergraphic Press.

Myung, J. (2003). Tutorial on maximum likelihood estimation. *Journal of Mathematical \ Psychology, 47*, 90-100.

Nunnally, J. C. (1978). *Psychometric theory* (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Öberseder, M., Schlegelmilch, B., Murphy, P., & Gruber, V. (2013). Consumers' Perceptions of Corporate Social Responsibility: Scale Development and Validation. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *124*(1), 101-115.

Podsakoff, P. M., Mackenzie, S. B., Lee, J. Y., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2003). Common method biases in behavioural research: A critical review of the literature and recommended remedies. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 88*, 879-903.

Rangan, K., Chase, L. A., & Karim, S. (2012). Why every company needs a CSR strategy and how to build it (Working Paper No. 12-088). Retrieved from Harvard Business School website: http://www.hbs.edu/faculty/Publication%20Files/12-088.pdf.

Rich, B. L., Lepine, J. A., & Crawford, E. R. (2010). Job engagement: Antecedents and effects on job performance. *Academy of Management Journal, 53*(3), 617-635.

Rogers, B. (2013). Too many feelings and not enough facts in CSR strategy. *Forbes*. Retrieved from http://www.forbes.com/sites/brucerogers/2013/10/07/too-many-feelings-and-not-enough-facts-in-csr-strategy/.

Rucci, A. J., Kirn, S. P., & Quinn, R. T. (1998). The employee-customer-profit chain at Sears. *Harvard Business Review.* Retrieved from https://hbr.org/1998/01/the-employee-customer-profit-chain-at-sears.

Ruf, B. M., Muralidhar K., Brown R. M., Janney, J. J. & Paul, K. (2001). An empirical

investigation of the relationship between change in corporate social performance and

financial performance: A stakeholder theory perspective. *Journal of Business Ethics,*

32(2), 143-156.

Rupp, D. E., Gananpathy, J., Aguilera, R. V., & Williams, C. A. (2006). Employees' reactions to

corporate social responsibility: An organizational justice framework. *Journal of*

Organizational Behaviour, 27, 537-543.

Saeidi, S. P., Sofian, S., Saeidi, P., Saeidi, S. P., & Saaeidi, S. A. (2015). How does corporate

social responsibility contribute to firm financial performance? The mediating role of

competitive advantage, reputation, and customer satisfaction. *Journal of Business*

Research, 68, 341-350.

Schaufeli, W. B., Salanova, M., González-Romá, V., & Bakker, A. B. (2002). The measurement

of engagement and burnout: A confirmative analytic approach. *Journal of Happiness*

Studies, *3*, 71–92.

Schaufeli, W. B., & Bakker, A. B. (2003). Utrecht work engagement scale: Preliminary manual.

Occupational Health Psychology Unit, Utrecht University, Utrecht.

Schein, E. M. (2004). *Organizational culture and leadership*. (3rd ed.). Jossey-Bass.

Seashore, S. E., Lawler, E. E., Mirvis, P., & Cammann, C. (1982). *Observing and measuring*

organizational change: A guide to field practice. New York: Wiley.

Sims, R. R. (2003). *Ethics and corporate social responsibility: Why giants fall.* New York:

Praeger

Slaper, T. F., & Hall, T. J. (2011). The triple bottom line: What is it and how does it work?

Indiana Business Review, 86(1), 4-8.

Spector, P. E (1997). *Job satisfaction: Application, assessment, cause and consequences*.

Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Staw, B. M. (1986). Organizational psychology and the pursuit of the happy/productive worker.

California Management Review, 28(4), 40-53.

Tabachnick, B.G. & Fidell, L.S. (1989). *Using multivariate statistics (2nd ed.).* California:

Harper-Collins Publishers.

Turban, D. B., & Greening, D. W. (1997). Corporate social performance and organizational

attractiveness to prospective employees. *Academy of Management Journal, 40*, 658-

672.

Turker, D. (2009). Measuring corporate social responsibility: A scale development study.

Journal of Business Ethics, 85(4), 411-427.

Tuzzolino, F., & Armandi, B. R. (1981). A need-hierarchy framework for assessing corporate

social responsibility. *Academy of Management Review, 6,* 21-28.

Tyson (2010). Why the triple bottom line matters more than ever. Retrieved from

https://www.greenbiz.com/blog/2010/01/08/why-triple-bottom-line-matters-more-ever.

Tziner, A., Bar, Y., Oren, L., & Kadosh, G. (2011). Corporate social responsibility,

organizational justice and job satisfaction: How do they interrelate, if at all? *Revista de

Psicología del Trabajo y de las Organizaciones, 27*(1), 67-72.

United Nations Global Compact. (2015). What is UN Global Compact? Retrieved from

https://www.unglobalcompact.org/what-is-gc/mission.

Vilares, M. J., & Coelho, P. S. (2003). The employee-customer satisfaction chain in the ECSI

model. *European Journal of Marketing, 37*(12), 1703-1722.

Vlachos, P. A., Tsamakos, A., Vrechopoulos, A. P., Avramidis, P. K. (2009). Corporate social

responsibility: Attributions, loyalty, and the mediating role of trust. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 37*(2), 170-180.

Votaw, D. (1972). Genius became rare: A comment on the doctrine of social responsibility pt. 1. *California Management Review, 15*(2), 25-31.

Waddell, S. (2000). New institutions for the practice of corporate citizenship: Historical, intersectoral, and developmental perspectives. *Business and Society Review, 105*(1), 107-217.

Waddock, S. A., & Graves, S. B. (1997). The corporate social performance-financial performance link. *Strategic Management Journal*, *18*(4), 303-319.

Warr, P. (1990). The measurement of well-being and other aspects of mental health. *Journal of Occupational Psychology, 63*, 193–210.

Wempe, J., & Kaptein, M. (2002). *The balanced company. A theory of corporate integrity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wiley, J. W. (1991). Customer satisfaction: A supportive work environment and its financial cost. *Human Resource Planning, 14*(2), 117-127.

Williams, L. J., Hartman, N., & Cavazotte, F. (2010). Method variance and marker variables: A review and comprehensive CFA marker technique. *Organizational Research Methods, 13*(3), 477-514.

Wood, D. J. (1991). Corporate social performance revisited. *Academy of Management Review, 16*, 691-718.

You, C., Huang, C., Wang, H., Liu, K., Lin, C. & Tseng, J. (2013). The relationship between corporate social responsibility, job satisfaction and organizational commitment. *International Journal of Organizational Innovation*, *5*(4), 65–77.

Young, S., & Thyil, V. (2009). Governance, employees and CSR: Integration is the key to

unlocking value. *Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources 47*(2), 39-57.

Appendix A: Study 1 In-Person Focus Group Guide

ADLER UNIVERSITY

Focus Group Guide

Date: _____

Focus Group Start Time: _____

Focus Group End Time: _____

Informational Preamble (3 Minutes):

As you know, I am conducting a research study under the supervision of Dr. Patrick O'Neill, Ph.D., that seeks to develop and validate a new measure of Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) in organizations from an employee perspective. For this study, CSR is defined as "the voluntary activities engaged in by a company and its employees that contribute to operating in an economically, socially, and environmentally responsible manner in order to benefit all stakeholders." This study may help organizations measure CSR levels and learn how this relates to other important organizational outcomes, such as employee engagement, organizational commitment, intention to resign, trust in management, and well-being. I would now like to invite you to participate in this focus group.

As a reminder, to participate in this study you must be:

1. Able to read and write in English
2. Nineteen (19) years or older
3. Currently employed full-time, part-time, or contractually at your organization for at least 160 hours (or the equivalent of one month full-time)

Your participation is entirely voluntary. You would not be identified in any of the material developed from these interviews. There will be a brief demographic questionnaire that will be used for research purposes only and will be kept strictly confidential. Results will be reported at the group level and will not identify any individual responses.

You are welcome to leave the study at any time. Unfortunately due to the nature of this session, I will be unable to remove your information once we have begun. The questions will focus on your experiences and opinions on Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR). From these interviews, a preliminary measure will be developed, peer reviewed and administered to a large North American sample.

Keep in mind that due to the nature of this group setting, I will not be able to ensure complete confidentiality. I am asking that you understand that other group members will not want their responses shared and that you respect confidentiality for whatever is discussed in this group.

Once the study is completed, a copy of the final thesis will be emailed to participants who requested it and the thesis will be published at Adler University. If you would like to receive a copy of the results (which will include a full measure of CSR that can be used in your organization) you can leave your email on the letter of Informed Consent.

This research has gained approval from the Research Ethics Board of Adler University. An Informed Consent has been provided to each of you. It will provide more information concerning this research and your rights during the research process.

Thank you again for your time and interest in this study. You can now read through the Informed Consent and sign if you would like to participate. Feel free to ask any questions you might have.

Read and Sign Informed Consent (5 Minutes):

Answer any questions as they arise

Complete Demographic Forms (5 Minutes):

Answer any questions as they arise

Brainstorming Session (7 minutes total):

Before we begin, I want to ensure that we have the same definition of Corporate Social Responsibility. For this study, CSR is defined as "the voluntary activities engaged in by a company and its employees that contribute to operating in an economically, socially, and environmentally responsible manner in order to benefit all stakeholders." For the purposes of this study, I want you to focus on this definition when thinking about CSR.

Keeping this definition in mind, please complete the following sentence:

"A company demonstrates CSR when…"

Please record your answer on the sticky notes provided. Try to keep your answers to observable behaviours in an organization. These may be behaviours you have observed at your organization or others or behaviours you would imagine an organization that is dedicated to CSR would do. You have six minutes to try and think of as many behaviours as you can.

Affinity Analysis (7.5 minutes):

In silence, I would now like you to bring all of your sticky notes to this table and cluster them into groups that you think are similar. If you don't think a sticky note belongs in any of the groups, just put it to the side.

Label the Factors (7.5 minutes):

Now speaking, we will go through each cluster's items and decide, as a group, on a name for that cluster.

Facilitator to read items for each group and record cluster names (items can be recorded later)

Cluster 1:

Name:

Items:

-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-

Cluster 2:

Name:

Items:

-
-

-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-

Cluster 3:

Name:

Items:

-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-

Cluster 4:

Name:

Items:

-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-

-

Cluster 5:

Name:

Items:

-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-

Cluster 6:

Name:

Items:

-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-

Other:

-
-

-
-
-
-

Appendix B: Study 1 Online Focus Group Guide

ADLER UNIVERSITY

CSR Scale Development & Validation (Phase 1)

Letter of Information

The Development and Validation of a New Corporate Social Responsibility Measure: An Inductive Methodology

Supervisor: Patrick O'Neill (PhD, CHRP) Program Director, Adler University.

Student researcher: Heather Lawton (BAH) undertaking this study as part of their Master's thesis at Adler University.

PURPOSE OF STUDY: The purpose of this study is to create a new measure of corporate social responsibility (CSR) and understand its correlation with other key indicators like: employee engagement, organizational commitment, intention to resign, trust in management, well-being as well as some background information. For this study, **CSR is defined as "the voluntary activities engaged in by a company and its employees that contribute to operating in an economically, socially, and environmentally responsible manner in order to benefit all stakeholders"**.

PARTICIPANTS: You will be eligible to participate if you are older than 19 years old and you are either full-time, part-time or contractually employed at your current organization.

PROCEDURE: **The survey will take about 10 minutes to complete**. You will be asked to answer some brief background information followed by an open-ended question regarding your opinion of CSR in organizations.

RISKS: No risks are anticipated. If there is something that makes you uncomfortable, you have the right to refuse to answer any question or exit the survey at any time without penalty.

BENEFITS: By participating you are eligible to receive a copy of the completed study which will include a new scale for measuring CSR in an organization. To maintain confidentiality, results and contact information will be stored separately. If you are interested there will be an email address at the end of the survey that you can contact to receive a copy of the final thesis.

CONFIDENTIALITY: You understand that your research records will be stored on an electronic file on a secured computer. You hereby authorize the use of all records, tests, and personal data derived from this experiment for research purposes. You understand that any information derived from this research project that personally identifies you will not be voluntarily released or disclosed by the researchers without my separate consent, except as specifically required by law. All documents will be stored for five years, after which they will be destroyed.

IF YOU HAVE QUESTIONS: Any questions about study participation may be directed to Dr. Patrick O'Neill at poneill@adler.edu or 604-482-5521. Any ethical concerns about the study may be directed to Debbie Clelland, Chair of the Adler Research Ethics Board, at dclelland@adler.edu or 604-699-3570.

VOLUNTARY PARTICIPATION: By checking the box below, you indicate that you understand the nature of this study, and that the experimenter has answered your questions satisfactorily. You know that you may discontinue your involvement at any time without penalty. Your checkmarks below indicates that you have read the letter of information, you are eligible to participate, and you consent to participate in this study voluntarily.

Thank you for taking part in this study.

Heather Lawton

* 1. Select a response below:

◯ I consent

◯ I do not consent

* 2. Confirm your eligibility:

◯ I AM older than 19 years old and employed full-time, part-time or contractually at my current organization for 160 hours or the equivalent of one full-time month.

◯ I am NOT older than 19 years old and employed full-time, part-time or contractually at my current organization for 160 hours or the equivalent of one full-time month.

ADLER UNIVERSITY

CSR Scale Development & Validation (Phase 1)

Demographic Information

The following questions are regarding your background information and will be used for research purposes only. Results will be reported at the group level and will not identify any individual responses. As indicated earlier, all responses will be kept strictly confidential.

If more than one category describes your job, please identify the category that is most often true.

Please complete the following details:

3. What gender do you most identify with?

◯ Female

◯ Male

◯ Other (please specify)

```
[                                          ]
```

4. What country do you currently reside in?

```
[                               ]
```

5. What industry do you currently work in? (e.g. healthcare, software, banking, etc.)

```
[                               ]
```

6. What year were you born in?

```
[                               ]
```

7. Which of the following best describes your employment status?

○ Employed, working full-time

○ Employed, working part-time

○ Temporary or casual

○ Contracted

○ Other (please specify)

[   ]

8. Which of the following best describes your position with your company?

○ Employee

○ Supervisor

○ Manager

○ Director or senior manager

○ Executive

○ Independent contractor

○ Self-employed

○ Other (please specify)

[   ]

9. How long have you been employed at your current organization?

○ One month

○ Six months or less

○ One year or less

○ Two years or less

○ Five years or less

○ Ten years or less

○ Greater than ten years

10. Are you aware of any formal policies or practices related to Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) at your organization?

As a reminder, for this study CSR is defined as "the voluntary activities engaged in by a company and its employees that contribute to operating in an economically, socially, and environmentally responsible manner in order to benefit all stakeholders".

○ Yes

○ No

○ Not sure

ADLER UNIVERSITY

CSR Scale Development & Validation (Phase 1)

* 11. Before beginning, it is important to have the same definition of Corporate Social Responsibility. For this study, **CSR is defined as "the voluntary activities engaged in by a company and its employees that contribute to operating in an economically, socially, and environmentally responsible manner in order to benefit all stakeholders"**. For the purposes of this study, I want you to focus on this definition when thinking about CSR.

Keeping this definition in mind, please complete the following sentence:

"A company demonstrates CSR when…"

Please record as many answers as you can think of in the space provided. Try to keep your answers to observable behaviours in an organization. These may be behaviours you have observed at your organization or others, or behaviours you would expect an organization that is dedicated to CSR would do. **Please record a minimum of 10 responses**. Once you feel like you can not think of any more, click 'next'.

ADLER UNIVERSITY

CSR Scale Development & Validation (Phase 1)

Thank you!

Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey. Please click the "Done" button below to submit your survey responses and ensure they are entered into the database.

Please feel free to pass the survey link along to others you think might be interested in participating as this will help us get as diverse a sample of people as possible.

If you would like a copy of the resulting thesis or would like to participate in the second part of this study, please email Heather Lawton at hlawton@my.adler.edu.

Appendix C: Study 2 Survey

Letter of Information

The Development and Validation of a New Corporate Social Responsibility Measure: An Inductive Methodology

Supervisor: Patrick O'Neill (PhD) Program Director, Adler University.

Student researcher: Heather Lawton (BAH) undertaking this study as part of her MA Organizational Psychology thesis at Adler University.

PURPOSE OF STUDY: The purpose of this study is to create a new measure of Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) and understand its relationship with other key indicators like: employee engagement, organizational commitment, intention to resign, trust in management, and well-being as well as some background information. For this study, CSR is defined as "The activities engaged in by an organization and its employees that contribute to operating in an economically, socially, and environmentally responsible manner".

PARTICIPANTS: You will be eligible to participate if you are older than 19 years of age and you are either full-time, part-time or contractually employed at your current organization.

PROCEDURE: The survey will take approximately 15 minutes to complete. The survey will ask various questions about your perspective on the policies and practices that foster CSR at your organization. This will be followed by other questions that aim to understand your experiences at work and your background. This includes questions related to employee engagement, organizational commitment, intention to resign, trust in management, well-being as well as some background information. Background information is collected for research purposes only.

RISKS: No risks are anticipated. Due to the anonymity of the online survey, you will not be able to have your previous results withdrawn after you have started the survey but any incomplete surveys will not be included in the final results. Therefore, if you do not answer the survey completely, your answers will not be used.

BENEFITS: If you choose to participate, you can enter your email into a draw for one of three 20 dollar Starbucks gift cards . By participating you are also eligible to receive a copy of the completed thesis including the final CSR measure. To maintain confidentiality, a link to a separate survey will be used to store any contact information.

CONFIDENTIALITY: You understand that your research records will be stored in the following manner: On an electronic file on a secured computer. You hereby authorize the use of all records, tests, and personal data derived from this experiment for research purposes. You understand that any information derived from this research project that personally identifies you will not be voluntarily released or disclosed by the researchers without your separate consent, except as specifically required by law. All documents will be stored for five years, after which they will be destroyed.

IF YOU HAVE QUESTIONS: Any questions regarding study participation may be directed to Dr. Patrick O'Neill at poneill@adler.edu or 604-482-5521. Any ethical concerns about the study may be directed to Debbie Clelland, Chair of the Adler Research Ethics Board, at dclelland@adler.edu or 604-699-3570.

* **VOLUNTARY PARTICIPATION**: By checking the box below, you indicate that you understand the nature of this study. You know that you may discontinue your involvement at any time without penalty. Your selections below indicate that you have read the letter of information, you are eligible to participate, and you consent to participate in this study voluntarily.

◯ I consent.

◯ I do not consent.

* **Confirm your eligibility**:

◯ I AM older than 19 years old and employed full-time, part-time or contractually at my current organization for 160 hours or the equivalent of one full-time month.

◯ I am NOT older than 19 years old and employed full-time, part-time or contractually at my current organization for 160 hours or the equivalent of one full-time month.

If you have been provided with an organizational/Prolific code, please enter it here. If you do not have a code,
please leave it blank.

CSR - Environment

As a reminder, for this study Corporate Social Responsibility is defined as"The voluntary activities engaged in by a company and its employees that contribute to operating in an economically, socially, and environmentally responsible manner".

The following items assess the degree to which your organization's policies and practices foster Corporate Social Responsibility. Please indicate the degree to which you agree or disagree with each statement.

Note: If you are using a mobile device, you will need to drag to the right to view all 7 response options.

* My organization demonstrates Corporate Social Responsibility.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
○	○	○	○	○	○	○

* 1. Employees in my organization are given opportunities to participate in activities that aim to protect and improve the natural environment.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
○	○	○	○	○	○	○

* 2. Employees in my organization demonstrate a commitment to environmentally sustainable practice in their day-to-day actions at work (e.g. reducing waste, reusing materials, and recycling).

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
○	○	○	○	○	○	○

* 3. Employees in my organization work hard to ensure our products and/or services are environmentally sustainable.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
○	○	○	○	○	○	○

* 4. Management in my organization encourage exploration and application of new methods for protecting and enriching the natural environment.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
○	○	○	○	○	○	○

* 5. Issues of environmental protection or enhancement are embedded in my organization's policies and practices.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
○	○	○	○	○	○	○

* 6. My organization is a force for positive environmental change.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
○	○	○	○	○	○	○

* 7. My organization considers the impact of its core operations (products and services) on the natural environment.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
○	○	○	○	○	○	○

* 8. My organization would be willing to sacrifice profit to ensure the protection or enhancement of our natural environment.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
○	○	○	○	○	○	○

CSR - Employee

The following items assess the degree to which your organization's policies and practices foster Corporate Social Responsibility. Please indicate the degree to which you agree or disagree with each statement.

* 9. My organization's policies and practices support the development of employees' skills and careers.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
○	○	○	○	○	○	○

* 10. My organization invests in the health and well-being of its employees.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
○	○	○	○	○	○	○

* 11. My organization pays a fair and liveable wage to its employees.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
○	○	○	○	○	○	○

* 12. My organization fosters an enjoyable work atmosphere for employees.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
○	○	○	○	○	○	○

* 13. My organization goes out of its way to hire fairly and equitably.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
○	○	○	○	○	○	○

* 14. My organization's policies and practices support a core value of respect for its employees.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
○	○	○	○	○	○	○

* 15. My organization considers employees' interests when making decisions.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
○	○	○	○	○	○	○

* 16. My organization has policies and practices that support a healthy work-life balance for employees.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
○	○	○	○	○	○	○

* 17. My organization is willing to sacrifice profit to support our employee's health and well-being.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
○	○	○	○	○	○	○

CSR - Community

The following items assess the degree to which your organization's policies and practices foster Corporate Social Responsibility. Please indicate the degree to which you agree or disagree with each statement.

* 18. My organization provides or contributes to activities that help the local community (e.g. local city, town, or region).

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
○	○	○	○	○	○	○

* 19. My organization provides or contributes to activities that help the global community.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
○	○	○	○	○	○	○

* 20. My organization is recognized in the community as exemplifying Corporate Social Responsibility.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
○	○	○	○	○	○	○

* 21. Employees in my organization are rewarded for or given opportunities to volunteer in the local or global community.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
○	○	○	○	○	○	○

* 22. My organization has received public recognition for helping the local or global community.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
○	○	○	○	○	○	○

* 23. My organization donates money or resources tailored to address the needs of the community.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
○	○	○	○	○	○	○

* 24. My organization collaborates with local or global institutions on socially responsible projects.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
○	○	○	○	○	○	○

* 25. My organization would be willing to sacrifice profit to ensure the protection or enhancement of society.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
○	○	○	○	○	○	○

CSR - Customer

The following items assess the degree to which your organization's policies and practices foster Corporate Social Responsibility. Please indicate the degree to which you agree or disagree with each statement.

The following items address your organization's interactions with its customers. A customer is defined as *a person or business that receives goods or services from your organization.*

* 26. My organization goes above and beyond to protect and enhance the well-being of our customers.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
○	○	○	○	○	○	○

* 27. My organization maintains a high level of trust among its customers.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
○	○	○	○	○	○	○

* 28. My organization is dedicated to treating its customers with respect and dignity.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
○	○	○	○	○	○	○

* 29. My organization respects customers' rights beyond the legal requirements.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
○	○	○	○	○	○	○

* 30. My organization is willing to sacrifice profit to support our customer's health and well-being.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
○	○	○	○	○	○	○

CSR - Culture

The following items assess the degree to which your organization's policies and practices foster Corporate Social Responsibility. Please indicate the degree to which you agree or disagree with each statement.

* 31. My organization has clear values or written policies relating to Corporate Social Responsibility.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
○	○	○	○	○	○	○

* 32. Corporate Social Responsibility is a core aspect of my organization's identity.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
○	○	○	○	○	○	○

* 33. It is assumed that members of my organization will behave in a socially responsible manner.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
○	○	○	○	○	○	○

* 34. It is obvious to visitors that my organization cares about Corporate Social Responsibility.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
○	○	○	○	○	○	○

* 35. People who are not socially responsible would feel out of place in my organization.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
○	○	○	○	○	○	○

* 36. There are clear consequences in my organization for engaging in illegal or immoral behaviour.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
○	○	○	○	○	○	○

* 37. Corporate Social Responsibility is embedded in the human resource policies and practices of my organization (e.g. training, employee orientation, selection, etc.).

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
○	○	○	○	○	○	○

* 38. My organization has a formal Corporate Social Responsibility team or lead.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
○	○	○	○	○	○	○

* 39. My organization has a budget allocated to Corporate Social Responsibility projects or causes.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
○	○	○	○	○	○	○

CSR - Triple Bottom Line

The following items assess the degree to which your organization's policies and practices foster Corporate Social Responsibility. Please indicate the degree to which you agree or disagree with each statement.

* 40. Success to my organization means more than just profit but also social or environmental benefit.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
○	○	○	○	○	○	○

* 41. The aim of my organization is not simply to maximize financial return but also to generate social and environmental value to society.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
○	○	○	○	○	○	○

* 42. In addition to reporting profit/losses, my company also reports on social or environmental impacts.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
○	○	○	○	○	○	○

* 43. My organization contributes positively to people and the planet, while also aiming to generate a profit.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
○	○	○	○	○	○	○

* 44. Management in my organization is concerned about social and economic issues, not just company revenue.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
○	○	○	○	○	○	○

UWES - Engagement

The following statements are about how you feel at work. Please read each statement carefully and decide if you ever feel this way about your job.

* 1. At my work, I feel that I am bursting with energy.

No, I strongly disagree.	No, I disagree quite a lot.	No, I disagree a little.	I'm not sure.	Yes, I agree a little.	Yes, I agree quite a lot.	Yes, I strongly agree.
○	○	○	○	○	○	○

* 2. At my job, I feel strong and vigorous.

No, I strongly disagree.	No, I disagree quite a lot.	No, I disagree a little.	I'm not sure.	Yes, I agree a little.	Yes, I agree quite a lot.	Yes, I strongly agree.
○	○	○	○	○	○	○

* 3. When I get up in the morning, I feel like going to work.

No, I strongly disagree.	No, I disagree quite a lot.	No, I disagree a little.	I'm not sure.	Yes, I agree a little.	Yes, I agree quite a lot.	Yes, I strongly agree.
○	○	○	○	○	○	○

* 4. I can continue working for very long periods at a time.

No, I strongly disagree.	No, I disagree quite a lot.	No, I disagree a little.	I'm not sure.	Yes, I agree a little.	Yes, I agree quite a lot.	Yes, I strongly agree.
○	○	○	○	○	○	○

* 5. At my job, I am very resilient, mentally.

No, I strongly disagree.	No, I disagree quite a lot.	No, I disagree a little.	I'm not sure.	Yes, I agree a little.	Yes, I agree quite a lot.	Yes, I strongly agree.
○	○	○	○	○	○	○

* 6. At my work I always persevere, even when things do not go well.

No, I strongly disagree.	No, I disagree quite a lot.	No, I disagree a little.	I'm not sure.	Yes, I agree a little.	Yes, I agree quite a lot.	Yes, I strongly agree.
○	○	○	○	○	○	○

* 7. I find the work that I do full of meaning and purpose.

No, I strongly disagree.	No, I disagree quite a lot.	No, I disagree a little.	I'm not sure.	Yes, I agree a little.	Yes, I agree quite a lot.	Yes, I strongly agree.
○	○	○	○	○	○	○

* 8. I am enthusiastic about my job.

No, I strongly disagree.	No, I disagree quite a lot.	No, I disagree a little.	I'm not sure.	Yes, I agree a little.	Yes, I agree quite a lot.	Yes, I strongly agree.
○	○	○	○	○	○	○

* 9. My job inspires me.

No, I strongly disagree.	No, I disagree quite a lot.	No, I disagree a little.	I'm not sure.	Yes, I agree a little.	Yes, I agree quite a lot.	Yes, I strongly agree.
○	○	○	○	○	○	○

* 10. I am proud of the work that I do.

No, I strongly disagree.	No, I disagree quite a lot.	No, I disagree a little.	I'm not sure.	Yes, I agree a little.	Yes, I agree quite a lot.	Yes, I strongly agree.
○	○	○	○	○	○	○

* 11. To me, my job is challenging.

No, I strongly disagree.	No, I disagree quite a lot.	No, I disagree a little.	I'm not sure.	Yes, I agree a little.	Yes, I agree quite a lot.	Yes, I strongly agree.
○	○	○	○	○	○	○

* 12. Time flies when I'm working.

No, I strongly disagree.	No, I disagree quite a lot.	No, I disagree a little.	I'm not sure.	Yes, I agree a little.	Yes, I agree quite a lot.	Yes, I strongly agree.
○	○	○	○	○	○	○

* 13. When I am working, I forget everything else around me.

No, I strongly disagree.	No, I disagree quite a lot.	No, I disagree a little.	I'm not sure.	Yes, I agree a little.	Yes, I agree quite a lot.	Yes, I strongly agree.
○	○	○	○	○	○	○

* 14. I feel happy when I am working intensely.

No, I strongly disagree.	No, I disagree quite a lot.	No, I disagree a little.	I'm not sure.	Yes, I agree a little.	Yes, I agree quite a lot.	Yes, I strongly agree.
○	○	○	○	○	○	○

* 15. I am immersed in my work.

No, I strongly disagree.	No, I disagree quite a lot.	No, I disagree a little.	I'm not sure.	Yes, I agree a little.	Yes, I agree quite a lot.	Yes, I strongly agree.
○	○	○	○	○	○	○

* 16. I get carried away when I'm working.

No, I strongly disagree.	No, I disagree quite a lot.	No, I disagree a little.	I'm not sure.	Yes, I agree a little.	Yes, I agree quite a lot.	Yes, I strongly agree.
○	○	○	○	○	○	○

* 17. It is difficult to detach myself from my job.

No, I strongly disagree.	No, I disagree quite a lot.	No, I disagree a little.	I'm not sure.	Yes, I agree a little.	Yes, I agree quite a lot.	Yes, I strongly agree.
○	○	○	○	○	○	○

Organizational Commitment

Please indicate on this scale how much you agree or disagree with each statement.

* 1. I am quite proud to be able to tell people who it is I work for.

No, I strongly disagree.	No, I disagree quite a lot.	No, I disagree a little.	I'm not sure.	Yes, I agree a little.	Yes, I agree quite a lot.	Yes, I strongly agree.
○	○	○	○	○	○	○

* 2. I sometimes feel like leaving this employment for good.

No, I strongly disagree.	No, I disagree quite a lot.	No, I disagree a little.	I'm not sure.	Yes, I agree a little.	Yes, I agree quite a lot.	Yes, I strongly agree.
○	○	○	○	○	○	○

* 3. I'm not willing to put myself out just to help the organization.

No, I strongly disagree.	No, I disagree quite a lot.	No, I disagree a little.	I'm not sure.	Yes, I agree a little.	Yes, I agree quite a lot.	Yes, I strongly agree.
○	○	○	○	○	○	○

* 4. Even if the firm were not doing too well financially, I would be reluctant to change to another employer.

No, I strongly disagree.	No, I disagree quite a lot.	No, I disagree a little.	I'm not sure.	Yes, I agree a little.	Yes, I agree quite a lot.	Yes, I strongly agree.
○	○	○	○	○	○	○

* 5. I feel myself to be a part of the organization.

No, I strongly disagree.	No, I disagree quite a lot.	No, I disagree a little.	I'm not sure.	Yes, I agree a little.	Yes, I agree quite a lot.	Yes, I strongly agree.
○	○	○	○	○	○	○

* 6. In my work I like to feel I am making some effort, not just for myself but for the organization as well.

No, I strongly disagree.	No, I disagree quite a lot.	No, I disagree a little.	I'm not sure.	Yes, I agree a little.	Yes, I agree quite a lot.	Yes, I strongly agree.
○	○	○	○	○	○	○

* 7. The offer of a bit more money with another employer would not seriously make me think of changing my job.

No, I strongly disagree.	No, I disagree quite a lot.	No, I disagree a little.	I'm not sure.	Yes, I agree a little.	Yes, I agree quite a lot.	Yes, I strongly agree.
○	○	○	○	○	○	○

* 8. I would not recommend a close friend to join our staff.

No, I strongly disagree.	No, I disagree quite a lot.	No, I disagree a little.	I'm not sure.	Yes, I agree a little.	Yes, I agree quite a lot.	Yes, I strongly agree.
○	○	○	○	○	○	○

* 9. To know that my own work had made a contribution to the good of the organization would please me.

No, I strongly disagree.	No, I disagree quite a lot.	No, I disagree a little.	I'm not sure.	Yes, I agree a little.	Yes, I agree quite a lot.	Yes, I strongly agree.
○	○	○	○	○	○	○

Intention to Resign

Please indicate on this scale how much you agree or disagree with each statement.

* 1. I often think about quitting.

No, I strongly disagree.	No, I disagree quite a lot.	No, I disagree a little.	I'm not sure.	Yes, I agree a little.	Yes, I agree quite a lot.	Yes, I strongly agree.
○	○	○	○	○	○	○

* 2. I will probably look for a new job within the next year.

No, I strongly disagree.	No, I disagree quite a lot.	No, I disagree a little.	I'm not sure.	Yes, I agree a little.	Yes, I agree quite a lot.	Yes, I strongly agree.
○	○	○	○	○	○	○

* 3. I expect to be working somewhere else a year from now.

No, I strongly disagree.	No, I disagree quite a lot.	No, I disagree a little.	I'm not sure.	Yes, I agree a little.	Yes, I agree quite a lot.	Yes, I strongly agree.
○	○	○	○	○	○	○

Trust in Management

Please indicate on this scale how much you agree or disagree with each statement.

* 1. Management at my organization is sincere in its attempts to meet the workers' point of view.

No, I strongly disagree.	No, I disagree quite a lot.	No, I disagree a little.	I'm not sure.	Yes, I agree a little.	Yes, I agree quite a lot.	Yes, I strongly agree.
○	○	○	○	○	○	○

* 2. Our organization has a poor future unless it can attract better managers.

No, I strongly disagree.	No, I disagree quite a lot.	No, I disagree a little.	I'm not sure.	Yes, I agree a little.	Yes, I agree quite a lot.	Yes, I strongly agree.
○	○	○	○	○	○	○

* 3. Management can be trusted to make sensible decisions for the organization's future.

No, I strongly disagree.	No, I disagree quite a lot.	No, I disagree a little.	I'm not sure.	Yes, I agree a little.	Yes, I agree quite a lot.	Yes, I strongly agree.
○	○	○	○	○	○	○

* 4. Management at work seems to do an efficient job.

No, I strongly disagree.	No, I disagree quite a lot.	No, I disagree a little.	I'm not sure.	Yes, I agree a little.	Yes, I agree quite a lot.	Yes, I strongly agree.
○	○	○	○	○	○	○

* 5. Our management would be quite prepared to gain advantage by deceiving the workers.

No, I strongly disagree.	No, I disagree quite a lot.	No, I disagree a little.	I'm not sure.	Yes, I agree a little.	Yes, I agree quite a lot.	Yes, I strongly agree.
○	○	○	○	○	○	○

Job-Related Affective Well-Being

Please answer the following questions by selecting the answers that describe how you have been feeling both at work and generally over the past few weeks.

* **Thinking of the past few weeks, how much of the time has your work made you feel each of the following:**

	Never	Very rarely	Rarely	Occasionally	Very Frequently	All the time
Tense	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
Uneasy	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
Worried	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
Calm	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
Contented	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
Relaxed	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
Depressed	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
Gloomy	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
Miserable	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
Cheerful	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
Enthusiastic	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
Optimistic	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯

Demographic Information

The following questions are regarding your background information and will be used for research purposes only. Results will be reported at the group level and will not identify any individual responses. As indicated earlier, all responses will be kept strictly confidential.

If more than one category describes your job, please identify the category that is most often true.

Please complete the following details:

* What gender do you most identify with?

○ Female

○ Male

Other (please specify)

[   ]

* How old are you?

[   ]

* What country do you currently reside in?

[   ]

* What industry do you currently work in? (e.g. healthcare, software, banking, etc.)

[   ]

* Which of the following best describes your employment status?

○ Employed, working full-time

○ Employed, working part-time

○ Temporary or casual

○ Contracted

Other (please specify)

[   ]

* What is the highest level of school you have completed or the highest degree you have received?

◯ Less than high school degree

◯ High school degree or equivalent (e.g., GED)

◯ Some college but no degree

◯ Associate degree

◯ Bachelor degree

◯ Graduate degree

Other (please specify)

[   ]

* Which one of the following best describes your position within the company?

◯ Employee

◯ Supervisor

◯ Manager

◯ Director or senior manager

◯ Executive

◯ Independent contractor

◯ Self-employed

Other (please specify)

[   ]

Thank you for your participation!

Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey. Please click the "Done" button below to submit your survey responses and ensure they are entered into the database.

If you would like to participate in the Starbucks gift card draw, you will be able to enter your name in a separate survey after you click "Done".

Please feel free to pass the survey link along to others you think might be interested in participating as this will help get as diverse a sample of people as possible. Note that organizations may participate and receive customized feedback on their employee scores on all surveys - all at no cost. Please email hlawton@my.adler.edu for more information.