

Development and validation of a questionnaire for measuring socially responsible behavior

Desarrollo y validación de un cuestionario para medir el comportamiento socialmente responsable

RAMOS, Valentina¹
VITERI-SALAZAR, Oswaldo²
IDROBO, Darincka³
RAMOS-GALARZA, Carlos⁴

Abstract

Our study has to do with the development and validation of a tool that allows the measuring of socially responsible behavior based on five psychological components. The questionnaire was applied to a sample of 160 people from various organizations (ratio of questions vs answers per question - 7:1). As a result, we obtained an instrument with 14 items, distributed in five components: Competence, Autonomy, Empathy, Ethics and Justice. This tool allows to strengthen actions in terms of social responsibility, allowing to identify shortcomings within the organization.

keywords: socially responsible behavior, corporate social responsibility, self-determination, justice, ethics

Resumen

Nuestra investigación se relaciona con el desarrollo y validación de una herramienta que permite la medición del comportamiento socialmente responsable. El cuestionario se aplicó a una muestra de 160 trabajadores de varias organizaciones (ratio de preguntas vs respuestas por preguntas 7:1). Como resultado, se obtuvo un instrumento compuesto por 14 ítems, distribuidos en cinco componentes: competencia, autonomía, empatía, ética y justicia. Esta herramienta permite fortalecer las acciones que se realicen, relacionadas con la responsabilidad social, permitiendo identificar estos impactos dentro de la organización.

Palabras clave: comportamiento socialmente responsable, responsabilidad social corporativa, autodeterminación, ética, justicia

¹ Docente/Investigador. Grupo de Investigación en Sistemas de Información, Gestión de la Tecnología e Innovación. Escuela Politécnica Nacional. valentina.ramos@epn.edu.ec

² Docente/Investigador. Grupo de Investigación en Sistemas de Información, Gestión de la Tecnología e Innovación. Escuela Politécnica Nacional. hector.viteri@epn.edu.ec

³ Investigador. Escuela Politécnica Nacional. darinckais@hotmail.com

⁴ Investigador. Facultad de Psicología, Pontificia Universidad Católica del Ecuador, caramos@puce.edu.ec

1. Introduction

Labor organizations carry out actions that are not necessarily related to purely economic benefits. The humanist movement has refocused the concern of organizations and their leaders towards the people they employ and with whom they relate, the latter seen as a community and society in the general sense. This humanistic approach to organizational processes and behavior will be geared, according to Arnaud & Wasieleski (2014), to the determination of competences in workers aimed at creating a notion of responsibility for society in general, and individuals in particular.

This vision that orients organizational actions beyond an economic approach and towards a social approach, has been described within the concept of Socially Responsible Behavior - SRB (Arnaud & Wasieleski, 2014). For the World Business Council for Sustainable Development (WBCSD), SRB is a priority element in organizations, due to its human rights approach towards employees and the community with which it relates, thus ensuring an approach toward environmental protection (Melorose et al., 2015). This way, SRB will be a concept within organizations that allows us to understand the behavior that organizations will develop and promote towards society in a general sense and, due to its humanist approach, in its consequences will allow an orientation of the organization and its stakeholders towards respect and environmental commitment (Stoian & Zaharia, 2012).

There is, however, a great challenge related to SRB as to how to evaluate SRB in labor organizations (Melorose et al., 2015). In this sense our study aims to create a tool based on the definition of dimensions that allow for the measurement of SRB, valid for the organizational context in Ecuador.

1.1. Socially Responsible Behavior and Corporate Social Responsibility

According to Moneva (2005), CSR is defined as "the voluntary commitment of companies with the social development of society and the preservation of the environment, taking account its social composition and responsible behavior towards individuals and social groups with which they interact" (p. 44). One of the essential elements in studies on CSR has been the inclusion of the perception of stakeholders in the process of identifying and validating the actions carried out by the organization (Larrán-Jorge et al., 2013), especially with regard to social indicators set out in guides such as GRI Guideline, which allows the measurement of the social impact that the organization makes in terms of sustainability actions (Global Reporting Initiative, 2011).

According to Black & Härtel (2004), the use of stakeholders to define the existence of CSR will be determined by the capabilities that the organization develops in order to establish a dialogue between the two, following ethical behavior, defined by good interpersonal relationships. In this manner, SRB would be an aspect within the definition of CSR. However, another type of studies involving CSR with SRB proposes another type of relationship. According to Melorose et al. (2015), RSC encompasses three aspects: financial responsibility, environmental responsibility and social responsibility. That is, CSR is an element that is found within the conceptualization of SRB.

For the purposes of this study, we will consider SRB to be an element that can be measured regardless of the existence of CSR, but which can contribute to its development (Crilly, Schneider & Zollo, 2008; Schneider et al., 2005). In effect, the SRB must be taken into account when measuring CSR actions, since it will allow verification of the organization's humanist and ethical orientation, not only socially but also environmentally, as explained below.

1.2. Measuring Socially Responsible Behavior

For the WBCSD, CSR is defined as "the continuing commitment by business to behave ethically and contribute to economic development while improving the quality of life of the workforce and their families as well as the local

community and society in general " (Melorose et al., 2015: 3). In this way ethics becomes evident as an element within the concept that is essential to identify whether an organization manifests CSR. Other authors such as Black & Härtel (2004); corroborate that the existence of ethical behavior is one of the characteristics that organizations that develop socially responsible actions must have.

In turn, the vast consideration of human rights within the description of socially responsible behavior according to the WBCSD, directs authors such as Arnaud & Wasieleski (2014) and Maç & Çaliş (2012) to indicate humanism as another of the components essential within this concept. Arnaud & Wasieleski (2014) define the existence of humanism when there is a presence of worker autonomous capacities when carrying out their activities. Capabilities that must be encouraged by the organization to which these workers belong, and which manifest themselves as self-determination (Arnaud & Wasieleski, 2014).

However, an essential aspect of CSR is given by the perception that the stakeholders have of the organizational behavior, independently of the objective evidence that may exist. According to Crilly et al. (2008), CSR cannot be defined by the organization itself, since it is the workers who make up an organization, and it is they who must indicate whether the organization demonstrates CSR. For this reason, more than by an objective verification of action compliance, CSR must be identified from a perception of how these actions are carried out. Authors such as Rupp et al. (2010) and Schneider et al. (2005), also define CSR from the existence of psychological aspects, as this not only ensures that workers understand organizational policies on social responsibility, but that they internalize and are motivated by them (Rupp et al., 2010). In this way the concept of CSR is related to that of social conscience, since this is the only way in which it is possible to guarantee that beliefs are transformed into desired social behavior and that these behaviors are internalized in the form of beliefs (Schneider et al., 2005).

In summary, SRB can effectively be defined by parameters that allow it to be measured but which are not necessarily within the quantitative realm, but rather in the way in which the organization carries out its activities aimed toward both its workers and society in general. For this reason, in order to measure an organization's SRB, we will take into account those psychological aspects of this concept that can be achieved through the perception of workers as well as that of internal stakeholders, as to how the organization behaves as regards.

1.3. Identification of dimensions for the study of socially responsible behavior

The aspects most frequently encountered, associated with the measurement of socially responsible behavior are those related with the existence of altruistic, cooperative, and social norms, as well as self-control or self-determination behaviors (Davidovich et al., 2005). In this study, we decided to focus on the dimensions proposed by Rupp et al. (2010), since these encompass proposals made in previous studies.

According to Rupp et al. (2010), organizations that develop a CSR have to focus on two aspects: motivation due to the execution of these actions – viewed from a self-determination theory – and the sense of justice and ethics of worker relationship processes. These authors focus on individuals' perceptions of how people are treated within the organization, giving weight to the role that this plays in the taking of decisions that they make and the degree of commitment to CSR activities that the organization develops (Rupp et al., 2010). Below we will detail each of these dimensions.

Self-determination

Within mankind's motivational aspects are those associated with the theory of self-determination (Moreno et al., 2008; Ryan & Deci, 2000). In this sense, for example, intrinsically motivated people will be more predisposed to work harder on volunteer actions as well as to maintain a positive attitude towards society (Oostlander et al., 2014). According to Ryan & Deci (2000), there are three behaviors associated with self-determination:

autonomy, competence and interpersonal relationships which, in the context of socially responsible behavior, has a special characteristic since it includes the capacity for empathy that people must possess in order for them to succeed in their interpersonal relationships.

Autonomy

Just as Oostlander et al. (2014) indicates, the existence of autonomy in people is associated with the desire and sense of psychological freedom to make decisions during the course of any activity. In turn, Jennings & Campos (1997) define autonomy as the ability that social agents have to make their own decisions based on what goals to follow or not to follow. These authors argue that the importance of autonomy in socially responsible behaviors is based on the correlation between group contributions and the ability to make individual decisions. That is to say, those workers with a greater capacity to be autonomous in their organizations will also be those with the greatest contribution and social projection (Jennings & Campos, 1997).

Competencies, Responsibilities

Competencies as part of self-determination are associated with the perception of success in the development of activities within an organization (Oostlander et al., 2014). Following this logic, a competent worker is one who meets the expectations of behavior that both the worker expects of himself as well as that expected by the organization in which the he/she carries out his/her activities. In this way, organizations that promote skills training in their workers will be contributing to their intrinsic motivation (Ryan & Deci, 2000) and self-efficacy (Arnaud & Wasieleski, 2014).

Interactions (empathy)

In turn, the existence of interpersonal interactions is associated with the desire individuals have of feeling connected with others and to maintain this bond (Oostlander et al., 2014). According to Arnaud & Wasieleski (2014), this type of feeling is going to be focused on mutual respect between colleagues, and in the need for social integration. For this reason, it is important that workers have developed their ability to relate, and that this is also developed in their organization; since this will encourage greater cooperation and a greater sense of collectivity and trust (Moss & Wilson, 2014).

An element that allows for greater social awareness in the establishment of relationships is empathy. For Arnaud & Wasieleski (2014), people with high self-determination will also present high levels of empathy in their interpersonal relationships, understanding empathy as the ability to put oneself in the other person's shoes (Arnaud & Wasieleski, 2014; Davidovich et al., 2005).

Ethics

According to Praulins et al. (2014), there is a close relationship between ethics and morality. The existence of ethical behaviors indicates a decrease in situations of role conflict, ambiguity, and inconsistent internal and external situations in the organization (Praulins et al., 2014).

For Schneider et al. (2010), ethics must be present in the implementation of actions that demonstrate that organizations have incorporated a CSR. The existence of intrinsic values in an organization and its workers should guide this type of CSR which, in addition, must be consistent between the vision statement and the actual workplace ethics of the organization. There are two elements associated with ethical behaviors of social responsibility: the existence of a social conscience and social knowledge (Schneider et al., 2010). Awareness and/or social knowledge cannot be manifested without acknowledging the existence of the "other" objective, and of feelings and values associated with "doing no harm" and "doing good" (Schneider et al., 2010; Schneider et al., 2005).

Justice

Lastly, according to González (2011), the idea of justice derives from the way in which duties and rights are distributed in social groups, based on individual and/or collective contributions (González, 2011; Moretti & Linhares, 2014). For Patlán et al. (2014), justice in organizations relates to the concept of fairness in labor practices, and how this affects the perception that workers have of their performance and the organization's performance (Patlán et al., 2014). On their part, Lakshman et al. (2014), indicate that there are two types of justice: distributive and procedural. In the first case, they point out that justice is a derivative of the way in which organizational practices are perceived at the time of distribution of recognitions and/or in the treatment that is received as a worker. As for procedural justice, it relates to the application of the law to organizational processes.

Thus, the determination of CSR at the level of perception by the workers of the organization, will be a consequence of the capabilities that the organization develops associated with worker self-determination, as well as the ethics and justice that it manifests as regards them. These dimensions are the basis for building a tool that measures CSR. This tool will be validated for the Ecuadorian organizational context in which the present research is carried out. In this way, we respond to the objective of the study presented above.

2. Methodology

We will follow the steps for the development of questionnaires suggested by Hinkin (1998) for the construction and validation of a tool that measures CSR in organizations. Among these steps is the initial process of generating items (questions) and reducing the number of these items to have a final version of the questionnaire. The process of generation of items is based on the theory that is the basis for this study, where each dimension is previously defined. This process should include validation of the questionnaire at a comprehensive level. The suggested method to be used is the Likert scale.

Once the first version of the questionnaire is finished, it must be applied to a sample corresponding to a 1:4 scale (4 subjects per item) to 1:10 (ten subjects per item), as this distribution allows the calculation of distribution in major components. Factorial analysis, which has been used in this study, is recommended when reducing items.

2.1. Sample

The sample group consisted of a total of 160 workers, in other words, a distribution of seven subjects per item (ratio 1:7) was obtained corresponding to the requirements recommended by Gorsuch (1983) and Hinkin (1998). Of these 47.5% were women and 52.5% men, occupationally linked to companies of different sizes, founding dates, and legal structures in Ecuador. The average age of the participants was 34. Academic level varied from High School Education (0.6%) to PhDs (4.4%), the predominant level being Bachelor Degrees (55%) and Master's Degrees (34.4%). While seniority ranged from 1 month to 32 years in the same organization. Total sample values for the data described above, as well as for the type, size, and age of the company, are described in Table 1.

Table 1
Description of the sample of participating workers

Sample distribution taking into account sociodemographic characteristics		Sample distribution taking into account organization characteristics	
Sex		Type of Corporation	
Femenine	76	Public	101
Masculine	84	Private	57
Age		Mixed	2
Between 20 & 30 years old	44	Organizational sector	
Between 31 & 40 years old	87	Primary	5

Sample distribution taking into account sociodemographic characteristics		Sample distribution taking into account organization characteristics	
Between 41 & 50 years old	19	Services	122
More than 51 years old	10	Commercial	11
Marital Status		Agricultural	13
Single	68	Industrial	9
Married	83	Company seniority	
Divorced	6	Between 1 & 5 years	75
Other	3	Between 6 & 10 years	17
Educational background		More than 10 years	68
High School Education	1	Company size	
Technical education	9	Micro	19
Bachelor’s Degree	88	Small	7
Master’s Degree	55	Medium	21
Doctoral Degree (Ph.D)	7	Large	113
Position you hold in the company			
Operational	63		
Mid-level	72		
Management level	25		
Number of years in the company			
Less than 4 years	111		
Between 4 & 10 years	35		
More than 10 years	14		

Note: N_{total}=160

2.2. Instrument

A questionnaire aimed at obtaining information on the general characteristics of participants and information related to the organization where he/she works, including socio-demographic and employment data, was prepared in order to comply with the purpose of this study. In addition, dimensions were developed as affirmations (items) to measure CSR, following the proposal of psychological categories set out by Rupp et al. (2010). The work of different authors (Lakshman et al., 2014; Moreno et al., 2008; Patlán et al., 2014; Rupp et al., 2010; Van Der Doef & Maes, 1999) were taken as sources for the preparation of these items.

The preliminary version of the survey is made up a total of 26 items. A 7-point Likert scale ranging from “total disagreement” to “total agreement” was used to analyze the responses. In order to validate content, the first version was presented to a group of experts composed of four faculty-researchers from the Escuela Politécnica Nacional and three professionals employed in the public and private sectors who are in charge of managing RSC in their respective organizations. The level of understanding, adequacy of question order and scale were thus determined; also considering other observations that allowed the improvement of the measuring instrument.

As a result of the contributions made by the group of experts, nine items were eliminated and three items were modified to improve their comprehension levels. In addition, two items were moved to a different variable and five new items were added. The version of the questionnaire to be used was composed of a total of 22 items. The distribution of items by variables, as well as the source from which the items were extracted are included in the Supplementary Material.

2.3. Procedure

The questionnaire was uploaded to Google's forms platform (2015). The tool was kept online for 28 days. Its distribution was carried out following the Atkinson & Flint (2001) "snowball" method, beginning with the closest contacts which were asked to collaborate in order to begin distribution. Participants were informed of the purpose of the investigation, as well as the confidentiality of the data that was generated. In addition to the questionnaire, a space was included to collect information related to the socio-demographic data of the collaborators and the characteristics of the organization where they work. The very use of Google forms (2015) allowed for the anonymity of the responses.

2.4. Data analysis

A main components analysis was used for item reduction. The indicator values of the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) and Bartlett tests were used in order to proceed with this method. Removing items that had a saturation of more than one factor with a difference of less than 0.10, according to Pérez & Medrano (2010), and having communality values below 0.50 (Hinkin, 1998) was considered. Cronbach's alpha coefficient was used to measure the confidence factor of the questionnaire and of each factor obtained. This set of elements formed the basis for exploratory factor analysis (AFE). The calculations were performed using the SPSS 20 (IBM Corp, 2011) statistics program.

3. Results and analysis

The results of the validation and confidence levels of the tool, once the questionnaire was generated and applied to the sample, are indicated below.

3.1. Assessment tool validity

The AFE or EBA application was validated taking into account the indicators of Bartlett's sphericity test ($\chi^2 \times 964,157$; $p .000$); and the value of the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin index (KMO $\times 0.873$) that were satisfactory according to (Pérez & Medrano, 2010). During the reduction of items, the distribution was restricted to five factors, in correspondence with the Rupp et al. (2010) theory. The distribution of the total number items into 5 factors is indicated in Table 2.

Table 2
Factor distribution

Factors				
Competencies	Ethics	Autonomy	Empathy	Justice
0.709				
0.692				
0.684				
0.613	0.573			
0.584				
0.514		0.462		
	0.762			
	0.674			
	0.631			
	0.599			
		0.826		

Factors				
Competencies	Ethics	Autonomy	Empathy	Justice
		0.781		
		0.694		
			0.775	
			0.639	
			0.625	
				0.754
				0.668

Note: The extraction method used was the analysis of main components method. The rotation was convergent in 8 iterations

Items 2, 13, 18, and 19 were removed from the total number of items due to having communal values below 0.50. In addition, items 6 and 15 were removed for saturating two factors with a difference of less than 0.10. Upon not considering these six items, the remaining five main components were re-analyzed. The results are shown in Table 3.

Table 3

Identified factors, distributed according to a Varimax rotation with Kaiser Standardization. Distribution after items 2, 6, 13, 15, 18 and 19 were removed.

Factors					
Item	Competencies	Ethics	Autonomy	Empathy	Justice
8*	0.718				
9	0.659				
14	0.638				
3		0.778			
11		0.772			
22		0.713			
17*		0.585			
1			0.822		
7			0.781		
12			0.713		
4				0.825	
21				0.670	
20				0.557	
5					0.880
10					0.665

Note: The extraction method used was the main component analysis method. The rotation was convergent in 6 iterations.

* indicates that the item was removed due to the authors' decision in the absence of a theoretical correspondence between the content of the item and the saturating factor.

There were items in this distribution that saturated factors differently from those desired according to theory. In the case of items 16 and 18, which were originally designed to measure variables for "Justice" and "Empathy"

respectively, they saturated the factor corresponding to the "Ethics" variable. After an analysis of the content of item 16, the decision was made to accept this new distribution. In the absence of theoretical correspondence or content, it was decided that item 18 would be deleted.

Item 17, which was initially designed to measure the "Empathy" variable, saturated the factor corresponding to the "Competition" variable. In the absence of theoretical correspondence or content, it was eliminated.

Item 20, which was initially designed to measure the "Ethics" variable, saturated the factor corresponding to the "empathy" variable. After an analysis of the item content, it was decided to accept this new distribution. Table 4 indicates the factor distribution, restricted to five factors, after items 17 and 18 have been removed.

After an analysis of the content of the item a decision was made to accept this new distribution. Table 4 shows the distribution by factors, restricted to five factors, after having deleted items 17 and 18.

Table 4

Identified factors, distributed in accordance to a Varimax rotation with a Kaiser standardization. Distribution after having removed items 17 and 18. Final distribution.

Item	Factors				
	Competencies	Ethics	Autonomy	Empathy	Justice
3	0.799				
11	0.795				
22	0.739				
1		0.826			
7		0.783			
12		0.718			
4			0.831		
21			0.704		
20			0.596		
16				0.838	
9				0.636	
14				0.594	
5					0.885
10					0.670

Note: The analysis of major components method was the method used. The rotation was convergent in 6 iterations.

The questionnaire ended up consisting of 14 items distributed in five factors, explaining 72.25% of the variance, which is appropriate (Pérez & Medrano, 2010).

3.1. Tool Reliability

Cronbach's alpha coefficient was used to measure the degree of reliability and internal consistency between the factors. The results of the internal consistency of the total number of items was $\alpha = 0.887$. Values of α above 0.7 are considered acceptable according to Hinkin (1998). The Cronbach alpha values for each component are listed in Table 5.

Table 5
Reliability Statistics by component

Component	α Value
Competency	0.841
Autonomy	0.783
Empathy	0.781
Ethics	0.698
Justice	0.562

The Cronbach alpha values in all cases can be considered acceptable, except in factor 5 that corresponds to the "Justice" variable. According to Oviedo & Campo-Arias (2005), the minimum number of items needed to apply Cronbach's alpha is three, as it is susceptible to the number of items for calculation. There were only two items that saturated for factor 5. However, the factor was kept, and the items not eliminated since this distribution was maintained in all applied tests.

4. Conclusions and Recommendations

Our study allowed the creation of a questionnaire to measure Socially Responsible Behavior through the perception of behaviors associated with autonomy, ethics and justice that labor organizations have with their internal stakeholders. The statistical results obtained in the AFE suggest the validity of the tool and the items that compose it. It also demonstrates that the instrument is valid for application in a study context. However, for future investigations the use of a Factorial Analysis Confirmatory associated with the measurement of the variables in the developed tool should be considered. One element to consider in order to strengthening the measurement of variables within the tool is the incorporation of at least one new item to the "Justice" factor, which allows to increase the values of internal consistency.

This questionnaire allows the definition in organizations of those elements that ensure that socially responsible behaviors, like these elements are manifested and perceived by workers, and the possible actions to be taken based on the scores that these dimensions show. This way, organizations will be able to make proposals for actions to develop a CSR that not only becomes more conscious, but more effective.

Acknowledgment

This study was supported by grant with reference: PII-17-06

Bibliographic references

- Arnaud, S., & Wasieleski, D. (2014). Corporate Humanistic Responsibility: Social Performance Through Managerial Discretion of the HRM. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 120(3), 313–334. doi: 10.1007/s10551-013-1652-z
- Atkinson, R., & Flint, J. (2001). Accessing Hidden and Hard-to-Reach Populations: Snowball Research Strategies. *Social Research Update*, 33(1), 1–4.
- Black, L. D., & Härtel, C. E. J. (2004). The five capabilities of socially responsible companies. *Journal of Public Affairs* (14723891), 4(2), 125–144. doi:10.1002/pa.176

- Crilly, D., Schneider, S., & Zollo, M. (2008). Psychological antecedents to socially responsible behavior. *European Management Review*, (39), 1–45.
- Davidovich, M. P., Espina, A., Navarro, G., & Salazar, L. (2005). Construcción y estudio piloto de un cuestionario para evaluar comportamientos socialmente responsables en estudiantes universitarios. *Revista de Psicología de La Universidad de Chile*, XIV, 125–140. doi:10.5354/0719-0581.2005.17418
- González, L. (2011). La idea de la justicia: de J.Rawls a Amartya Sen. *Anales de La Real Academia de Ciencias Morales Y Políticas*. Madrid: Real Academia de Ciencias Morales y Políticas.
- Gorsuch, R. (1983). *Factor Analysis* (2nd ed.). New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Global Reporting Initiative. (2011). *Guía para la elaboración de Memorias de Sostenibilidad*. Amsterdam: Global Reporting Initiative.
- Hinkin, T. R. (1998). A Brief Tutorial on the Development of Measures for Use in Survey Questionnaires. *Organizational Research Methods*, 1, 104–121. doi:10.1177/109442819800100106
- Jennings, N. R., & Campos, J. R. (1997). Towards a social level characterization of socially responsible agents. *IEE Proceedings on Software Engineering*, 144(1), 11–25.
- Lakshman, C., Ramaswami, A., Alas, R., Kabongo, J., & Rajendran Pandian, J. (2014). Ethics trumps culture? A cross-national study of business leader responsibility for downsizing and CSR perceptions. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 125(1), 101–119. doi:10.1007/s10551-013-1907-8
- Larrán-Jorge, M., Martínez-Martínez, D., de los Reyes, M. J. M., & Martínez-, D. (2013). ¿Qué habría de incluir una memoria completa de sostenibilidad? *Universia Business Review*, (39), 66–103.
- Maç, S. D., & Çaliş, T. (2012). Social Responsibility within the Ethics and Human Resource Management Debates: A Review of Global Compact and SA8000 Social Responsibility Standard. *Turkish Journal of Business Ethics*, 5(10), 41–53.
- Melrose, J., Perroy, R., & Careas, S. (2015). *Corporate Social Responsibility*. (P. Watts, S. International, Lord Holme, & R. Tinto, Eds.), *Statewide Agricultural Land Use Baseline 2015* (Vol. 1). Conches-Geneva: World Business Council for Sustainable Development. doi:10.1017/CBO9781107415324.004
- Moneva, J. M. (2005). Información sobre responsabilidad social corporativa: Situación y tendencias. *RAE: Revista Asturiana de Economía*, (34), 43–67.
- Moreno, J. A., González-Cutre, D., Chillón, M., & Parra, N. (2008). Adaptación a La Educación Física De La Escala De Las Necesidades Psicológicas Básicas En El Ejercicio. *Revista Mexicana de Psicología*, 25(2), 295–303.
- Moretti, D., & Linhares, G. (2014). Amartya Sen E John Rawls : Um Diálogo Entre a Abordagem Das Capacidades E. *Theoria -Revista Eletrônica de Filosofia*, VI(15), 153–161.
- Moss, S. A., & Wilson, S. G. (2014). Why are the Attempts of Organisations to Enhance the Wellbeing of Individuals Often Likely to Fail: The Curse of Conflicting Needs. *Australasian Journal of Organisational Psychology*, 7, N.PAG–00. doi:10.1017/orp.2014.6
- Oostlander, J., Güntert, S., & Wehner, T. (2014). Linking Autonomy-Supportive Leadership to Volunteer Satisfaction: A Self-Determination Theory Perspective. *Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary & Nonprofit Organizations*, 25(6), 1368–1387. doi:10.1007/s11266-013-9395-0

- Oviedo, H. C., & Campo-Arias, A. (2005). Aproximación al uso Coeficiente Alfa de Cronbach. *Revista Colombiana de Psiquiatría*, 34(4), 572–80. doi:10.1590/S1135-57272002000200001
- Patlán, J., Flores, R., Martínez, E., & Hernández, R. (2014). Validez y confiabilidad de la escala de justicia organizacional de Niehoff y Moorman en población mexicana. *Contaduría Y Administración*, 59(2), 97–120. doi:10.1016/S0186-1042(14)71256-2
- Pérez, E. R., & Medrano, L. (2010). Análisis Factorial Exploratorio : Bases Conceptuales y Metodológicas. *Revista Argentina de Ciencias Del Comportamiento*, 2(1), 58–66.
- Praulins, A., Prauliņš, A., & Bratka, V. (2014). Ethical and Socially Responsible Behaviour of Tax Advisers: The Case of Moral Beliefs. *Socialiniai Tyrimai*, 2014(3), 153–163.
- Rupp, D. E., Williams, C. A., & Aguilera, R. V. (2010). Increasing Corporate Social Responsibility through stakeholder value internalization (and the catalyzing effect of new governance): An application of organizational justice, self-determination and social influence theories. In M. Schimnke (Ed.), *Managerial ethics: managing the psychology of morality*. New York: Routledge. doi:10.5860/CHOICE.48-3371
- Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). La Teoría de la Autodeterminación y la Facilitación de la Motivación Intrínseca , el Desarrollo Social , y el Bienestar Teoría de la Autodeterminación. *American Psychologist*, 55(1), 1–16. doi:10.1037110003 - 066X.55.1.68
- Schneider, S. C., Zollo, M., & Manocha, R. (2010). Developing Socially Responsible Behaviour in Managers. *Journal of Corporate Citizenship*, (39), 21–40.
- Schneider, S., Oppegaard, K., Zollo, M., & Huy, Q. N. (2005). Socially Responsible Behaviour: Developing Virtue in Organizations. *Faculty & Research*, 40, 2–54.
- Stoian, C., & Zaharia, R. M. (2012). CSR development in post-communist economies: employees' expectations regarding corporate socially responsible behaviour - the case of Romania. *Business Ethics-a European Review*, 21(4), 380–401. doi:10.1111/beer.12000
- Van Der Doef, M., & Maes, S. (1999). The Leiden Quality of Work Questionnaire: It's construction, Factor Structure, and Psychometric Qualities. *Psychological Reports*, 85, 954–962.

Supplementary Material

Sources for the definition of the associated items, the variables that allow the measurement of Socially Responsible Behavior. Version of the questionnaire to be applied for validation.

Order	Items associated to the variables	Source
Autonomy		
1	In my organization I have ample freedom to decide how I do my work.	(Van Der Doef & Maes, 1999)
7	I have the opportunity to choose how to do my job.	(Moreno et al., 2008)
12	My organization allows me to make a lot of decisions by myself.	(Van Der Doef & Maes, 1999)
20	I feel I can be myself at work.	(Moreno et al., 2008)
Ethics		

Order	Items associated to the variables	Source
2	I believe that my organization complies with the obligations and commitments made to workers	Adapted from (Lakshman et al., 2014)
6	I believe leaders in my organization promote ethical behavior in workers	Adapted from (Lakshman et al., 2014)
9	I think that work relations in my organization are characterized by cooperation, integrity, honesty and tolerance.	Adapted from (Lakshman et al., 2014)
14	I believe that there is a will of most members of my organization to engage with ethical values and behaviors.	Adapted from (Lakshman et al., 2014)
Competency		
3	My organization is interested in developing new competencies in me.	Adapted from (Rupp et al., 2010)
11	My organization provides workers with opportunities to acquire and apply new knowledge and skills	Adapted from (Rupp et al., 2010)
15	In my organization workers know what is expected of them in their current position and the competencies needed to progress and achieve other positions.	Adaptado from (Rupp et al., 2010)
19	I have been able to learn interesting new skills in my work.	Adapted from (Rupp et al., 2010)
22	I believe that there is a culture of continuous learning in my organization.	Adapted from (Rupp et al., 2010)
Empathy		
4	I feel integrated into my work group.	Adapted from (Rupp et al., 2010)
8	There are good relations among colleagues in my organization	Adapted from (Rupp et al., 2010)
13	In my organization it is easy to ask for help when there is any difficulty related to work activities.	Adapted from (Rupp et al., 2010)
17	My organization is concerned that relationships among colleagues are good.	Adapted from (Rupp et al., 2010)
21	In my organization there are good relations between boss and subordinates.	Adapted from (Rupp et al., 2010)
Justice		
5	I think my work schedule is fair.	(Patlán et al., 2014)
10	I believe my work load is fair.	(Patlán et al., 2014)
16	I think wage inequality between men and women does not exist in my organization.	Adapted from (Patlán et al., 2014)
18	I feel that I am treated fairly in my job.	Adapted from (Patlán et al., 2014)

Note: Items where the reference appears in the Source were extracted directly from the document. The items that appear to be adapted were constructed taking into account the theoretical assumptions indicated in the Source.