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ABSTRACT

Corporate social responsibility (CSR) is an expanding trend as more organizations have adopted various CSR policies. Due to this, CSR has been a growing topic in Business and Psychology research, especially on the micro-level of CSR's effects on individual employee outcomes. In this study, we proposed a new sub-dimension of Person-Organization (P-O) fit, such that there’s a Person-CSR (P-CSR) fit: the perceived congruence between an individuals' values with an organization’s CSR initiatives. We predicted that P-CSR fit would explain additional variance over and beyond P-O fit for organizational outcomes: organizational commitment, organizational identity, job satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behaviors. Further, we predicted the relationship between P-CSR fit and these organizational outcomes would be moderated by the individual's social responsibility values. Using a sample of 230 participants, who worked for their current organization for an average of 2.92 years and an average of 35.10 hours per week, results of this study consistently found P-CSR fit to capture additional variance over and beyond P-O fit. However, this study did not find the predicted moderating relationships. This study provides important implications for organizations that do not have CSR established, organizations that have CSR but do not make it known, and organizations that have CSR that are not proactive nor reflective of their industry.
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A company’s reputation can heavily influence whether it attracts consumers to purchase its products or services, and employees to work for it. Lately, there has been a trend for companies to engage in Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) as a way to polish or enhance their reputation, which has led CSR to be a popular topic in business research and classes. CSR initiatives have been found to increase product innovation, increase cost savings, create brand differentiation, establish long-term thinking (i.e., the company’s future), and foster customer and employee engagement (Epstein-Revees, 2012). Each of these perks not only allows the company to gain competitive advantages but also enhances a company’s reputation, thus making CSR an ideal component of a company’s business model. Business schools, such as the College of Business and Public Administration at California State University, San Bernardino (CSUSB), have their MBA graduate students enroll in a management capstone class covering CSR, in which students are given the option to sign an oath to engage in CSR practices, promoting the idea that they will go forth in the business world with ethical and sustainable practices in mind. More recently, CSR has been a research topic in Industrial Organizational Psychology, in which researchers are interested in employee engagement and how this relationship with CSR can produce important organizational outcomes. CSR has been found
to increase job satisfaction, commitment, and organizational citizenship behaviors (OCBs), which lead to overall greater organizational performance. Person-Organization (P-O) fit, the match between a person and an organization, has also been found to produce similar outcomes. Because CSR is a strong predictor of outcomes within P-O fit, we proposed that CSR is a component of P-O fit, such that there is a Person-Corporate Social Responsibility (P-CSR) fit, a sub-dimensional of P-O fit.

**Person-Organization Fit**

People are generally attracted to people (e.g., peers and significant others), places (e.g., religious congregations), and products (e.g., biodegradable products that lead to sustainability) that align with their values and beliefs. The same applies to the organizations, the industries in which people work for, and the types of careers people pursue. The etiology framework suggests that organizations are functions of the kind of people they contain and people are functions of an attraction-selection-attrition (ASA) cycle (Schneider, 1987). The organization is made up of its employees whose purpose and values are established by these employees, attracting other similar individuals to the organization. Further, Schneider asserts that people are attracted to careers based on their own interests, their personality, and other people in the organization who share similar interests. Whom or what an employee chooses to identify with, helps establish her or his organizational identity. Organizational
identity stems from the social identification function of Social Identity Theory (SIT; Tajfel & Turner, 1979), which is the perception of belonging or being a part of an organizational entity (Ashforth & Mael, 1989). Organizational identification can stem from individual perception, actual participation in successes and failures, internalizing group values with oneself, and a reciprocal role relationship between one or more persons (e.g. employer-employee). Ashforth and Mael (1989) argue that organizational identification is a specific form of social identification, which is crucial to enhancing one’s self-esteem, organizational commitment, and group cohesion.

Based on the ASA cycle, P-O fit is utilized to better understand the relationship people and their organizations by exploring the compatibility of people and the organizations they work for. Kristof (1996) defined P-O fit as the compatibility between employees and their current organization, in which there is either an exchange of needs (i.e., employee meets the organization’s needs by completing tasks, organization meets employees needs with socialization and wages), they share similar characteristics, or have both of these elements. Carless (2005) also described P-O fit as the congruence between an individual and an organization’s overall characteristics. However, P-O fit is not to be confused with Person-Environment Fit, which is the fit between the person and his/her general work environment (Vogel & Feldman, 2009). This can be considered as the broadest, most general form of fit and may include anything in a person’s social environment (e.g., desk setting, lighting, or employed location).
People tend to experience higher levels of satisfaction as well as mental and physical well-being when there is a P-E fit (Dawis & Lofquist, 1984). Thus, understanding the various dimension of P-E fit will help predict various organizational outcomes.

**Supplementary Versus Complementary Fit**

Kristof (1996) proposed that an employee’s compatibility may vary depending on the circumstance. The first set of dichotomies she discussed is supplementary fit and complementary fit. Van Vuuren, Veldkamp, de Jong, and Seydel (2007) defined supplementary fit as both parties (the employee and the organization) sharing similar characteristics, and defined complementary fit as both parties simply providing what the other needs. Supplementary fit is when both the employee and the organization coexist with the same values without a form of exchange. Since there is not a form of exchange, Vogel and Feldman (2009) would argue that supplementary fit does not require additional effort to make a fit happen because people would rather work in environments that allow their work ability to thrive. Further, this fit is typically examined through value congruence between employees and the organization (Kristof, 1996; Cable & Edwards, 2004). Values important to an individual or organization determines each of their decisions and behaviors. Complementary fit would require the additional exchange of effort to compensate for the employees and organizations needs when the other falls short. This is typically examined through psychological need fulfillment, such that there are desires that are met through
environmental supplies which are extrinsic and intrinsic resources and rewards (Cable & Edwards, 2004).

**Needs-Supplies and Demands-Abilities**

The second set of dichotomies Kristof (1996) addresses is needs-supplies fit and demands-abilities fit. Needs-supplies fit is when an individual feels she or he is properly rewarded based on her or his needs, whereas abilities-demand fit is where there is a congruence between one’s skills and abilities with specific job tasks (Vogel & Feldman, 2009). The needs-supplies perspective can be viewed as employee-focused (i.e., the organization providing for the employee), whereas demands-abilities perspective can be viewed as organization-focused (i.e., the individual must meet the organizational demands). Kristof (1996) argued that these definitions are extended components of complimentary fit. Further, when employees are rewarded with factors that are job related, they tend to experience greater job satisfaction, career satisfaction and greater commitment to the organization (Vogel & Feldman, 2009; Cable & DeRue, 2002).

Other sub-dimensions of P-O fit include: congruence: vocation, group, and job. **Person-vocation (P-V) fit** is the next broadest level of fit that is measured with an individual’s personality and her or his vocational environment. P-V fit is when a person’s interests and abilities align with the characteristics and requirements of the individual’s desired occupation (Vogel & Feldman, 2009; Holland, 1985). **Person-group (P-G) fit** is the alignment of an individual with his or her work group, in which groups can vary in size and can range from working
with those in an individual’s close proximity or with people in other departments and locations (Kristof 1996). P-G fit has been accepted as a separate distinction from P-O fit due to the idea that group level beliefs and values may entirely differ from the organization of which they belong to (Trice & Beyer, 1993). When individuals establish a fit within their work groups, they are more likely to experience greater group performance (Feldman, 1984). **Person-Job (P-J) fit** is when individuals find an alignment of their ability with their job, which includes the tasks a person does while on the job and the nature of these tasks (Kristof, 1996). **P-V Fit** differs from P-J fit because vocation refers to the skills necessary to perform whereas job refers to individual tasks. For example, individuals may like their profession overall (high P-V fit), but may be put into a situation where they experience low P-J fit due to the environment.

It is important to establish P-J, P-G, and P-V fit as separate constructs and sub-dimensions of P-O fit to enforce the differences between fits within the organization and the sub-parts of the organization in which the employee may fit differently. Additionally, an employee may fit in various aspects of fit and not in others. For example, an employee may perform well in his or her job but do not share the same values with the organization (Lauver & Kristof-Brown, 2001). Kristof (1996) argued that some fits may counter other fits, but ideally, employees and employers should strive to seek each of these forms of fit to achieve the best organizational outcomes. However, this is contingent upon whether they both can
distinctly identify the various forms of fit as Lauver and Kristof-Brown found that more established employees within a company were able to do so.

*Job Search & Selection.* Carless (2005) found when individuals perceive P-J and P-O fit with a particular organization, they are more likely to be attracted to that specific organization, such that they perceived a match between their knowledge, skills, and abilities (KSAs), the job requirement, and their personal characteristics with that of the organization. Further, when individuals experience a P-J fit during the application process, they are more likely to remain throughout the entire selection process and more likely to accept a job offer if they are given a realistic job preview (RJPs; Carless, 2005). RJPs lead to higher job satisfaction, lower voluntary turnover, and higher work performance (Breaugh & Starke, 2000). However, Carless's (2005) results conflict with Cable and Judge's (1996) results in determining whether P-J or P-O fit are stronger predictors of whether a person will accept a job offer.

Boon, Den Hartog, Boselie, and Paauwe (2011) explain that the majority of studies have only addressed single HR practices (i.e., selection, socialization, development and training, appraisal and reward systems) and the relationship with P-O and P-J fit. In their study, they combine multiple HR practices to predict positive relationships with P-O and P-J fit. Further, they proposed that P-O and P-J fit partly mediate the relationship between perceptions of HR practices, organizational commitment, and organizational citizenship behaviors (OCBs); as well as P-O fit and P-J fit moderating the relationship between perceptions of HR
practices, organizational commitment, and OCBs. Each hypothesis was supported except for the ones regarding moderating relationships. Their results suggest human resource practices influence employees' perceptions of being able to meet the needs and demands of their job as well as meeting individual needs (i.e., money to provide for other needs such as food and shelter), which overall, improves individuals' job satisfaction. Although this study looks more at P-J fit, this finding supports the notion that addressing certain fits may improve organizational outcomes.

Oh, Guay, Kim, Harold, Lee, Heo, and Shin (2014) also examined four dimensions of P-E fit across East Asia, Europe, and North America in a meta-analysis. They found P-O and P-J fit to be more prominent in North America, and P-G fit and person-supervisor fit (the dyadic relationship between individuals and his/her supervisor; Kristof-Brown, Zimmerman, & Johnson, 2005) to be more highly correlated in East Asia. This supports the notion of differences in individualistic versus collectivistic cultures, such that employees in individualistic countries tend to focus on achievements on the job itself (rational fit), whereas employees in collectivistic cultures tend to focus on the relationships developed on the job (relational fit). Additionally, they found supporting evidence to Kristof-Brown et al.’s (2005) results that P-O fit, above other fit dimensions, predict organizational commitment; and P-J fit, above other fit dimensions, predict job satisfaction across cultures. Regardless of these findings, fit happens cross-culturally.
Personal and organizational interests are more likely to be aligned when a person experiences P-O fit. Both the organization and the employee benefit from finding the right candidate to fit within the organization (Rousseau & Mclean Parks, 1992). The employee spends less resources searching for a job, while the organization saves resources invested into hiring a matched individual. With this in mind, P-O fit is associated with long term commitment (Kristof, 1996).

Additionally, lower levels of stress and prosocial behaviors are associated with high levels of P-O fit. Under supplementary fit, work attitudes have been known to determine job satisfaction and organizational commitment as well as improving motivation and work group cohesion (Boxx, Odom, & Dunn, 1991). Addressing each of these issues allows the organization to save money during the hiring process and during the individual's employment (e.g., lower absenteeism due to lower stress levels). Prosocial behaviors generally increase when a person experiences P-O fit which include organizational citizenship behaviors (O'Reilly & Chatman, 1986), self-reported teamwork (Posner, 1992), and tendencies toward ethical behavior (Posner, Kouzes, & Schmidt, 1985). Regardless of whether these improvements are based on self-reports, these are important components of Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR).
Corporate Social Responsibility

Being socially responsible is not a new topic, but rather an emerging topic due to corporate scandals regarding greed and fraud. CSR has been around since the 1930s (Carroll, 1979), but has been heavily researched and discussed in the 21st century due to the rise of corporations, the rate at which they expand, and the stakeholders they affect (Murphy & Schlegelmilch, 2013). Further, Carroll (1979) would argue that this gap between the 1930s and the 21st century may have been attributed to the lack of understanding of what it actually meant to be “socially responsible.” Prior definitions have questioned whether CSR should be voluntary (i.e., they have exceeded their organizational and legal duties; Bowman & Haire, 1975) or required (i.e., they have a duty to the area in which the organization exists; Carroll, 1979). Harris and Twomey (2010) and Smith (2013) suggest businesses’ responsibilities are beyond profit that must include ecological sustainability and employee well-being. This is termed as corporate social responsibility (CSR). Further, Rupp, Ganapathi, Aguilera, and Williams (2006) emphasize that CSR is a process that is distinguished through its corporate culture and its reception by society. It is a macro-level concept due to its broadness and its understanding at an organizational level. Although it is a broad concept, there are many definitions that fall under the umbrella of CSR, which is attributed to its evolving nature. (Matten & Moon, 2008) For the purpose of this project, we used Rupp et al.’s (as originally termed by Aguinis and Glavas [2012]) definition of CSR, which is: “context-specific organizational actions and
policies that take into account stakeholders’ expectations and the triple bottom line of economic, social, and environmental performance” (p. 933).

In Aguinis and Glavas’s (2012) review of CSR, they break down the outcomes of CSR at various levels of the organization including institutional (e.g., firm reputation and brand loyalty), organizational (e.g., financial and demographic diversity), and individual (e.g., attractiveness to potential employees, commitment, and organizational identification). On an institutional level, customer retention is crucial to the survival of a company as it needs money to operate. If the customers perceive the product or service as being socially responsible (which is also important to them), then they are more likely to buy the product again (e.g., Honest Company and premium eco-friendly disposable diapers; The Honest Company). On an organizational level, Zahra, Oviatt, and Minyard (1993) argue that when the Board of Directors is diverse, the more likely the organization will experience demographic diversity. This can be viewed as an organization’s social responsibility to more accurately reflect the demographics of the community the organization exists in. Understanding the effects of CSR on individual outcomes, including applicant rate and commitment, has allowed companies to gain a competitive advantage (Zhang & Gowan, 2011). For instance, when being socially responsible, companies attract higher quality and quantity of job applicants (Greening & Turban, 2000), which may be due to the perception that they are viewed as attractive employers (Zhang & Gowan, 2011).
This gives the employers a large applicant pool to find the best candidate to fit the position and the company.

Being socially responsible as a corporation is now considered a mainstream concern, especially in the United States. As a result, corporations are becoming more involved in how they should be responsible rather than considering CSR as a liability (Smith, Wokutch, & Harrington, 2001). A majority of CSR behaviors have revolved around ecological sustainability involving recycling products or reducing waste emissions. Recently, there has been a push for more employee-based initiatives such as benefit packages, higher income, and enjoyable work environments. CSR can be blatantly viewed in the culture of the organization (Rupp et al., 2006), which is evident in companies such as Google. Google has been reported to be a leader in multiple types of CSR by donating to various charitable initiatives, paying their employees well, providing a variety of food choices for their employees, and granting them autonomy to work on their own creative projects (Smith, 2013; Google “Careers”). These unique characteristics of the company have attracted many prospective employees who want to be a part of that culture. Google’s culture is so prominent that employees have identified themselves as “Googlers,” and when they are first hired, they are identified as “Nooglers” (New Googlers or an upcoming Googler) where they are given attire labeling them as such. These labels instill organizational culture and the feeling of being a part of the organization (Google “Diversity & inclusion in our culture”), which meets employees’ needs (i.e., security, safety, esteem,
distinctiveness) and establishes a sense of social identity within the organization. Each of these aspects identified Google’s culture (along with those labeled as “Googlers” and “Nooglers”) as being heavily involved in their societal, environmental, and economic impact.

Perceptions about a company’s CSR contributions affect employees’ attitudes and behaviors. Meyer, Paunonen, Gellatly, Goffin, and Jackson (1989) argue that greater worker productivity, reduced absenteeism, and lower turnover rates are associated with work attitudes. Thus, understanding an individual’s perception of hers or his employer’s involvement in CSR affects hers or his commitment to the organization. Bauman and Skitka (2012) suggest that when an employee knows that the company engages in CSR, this perception leads to a positive view of the company, making the employees believe their investment with the company will be safe. They find a sense of reward for investing in a socially responsible firm. Additionally, Carmeli, Gilat, and Waldman (2007) found evidence that employees’ perceptions of CSR, the supervisors’ ratings of their employees’ performance, and cohesion lead to organizational identification. Further, Bartel’s (2001) study suggests that CSR enhances employees’ willingness to assist coworkers and improve positive work relationships, leading the employees to invest more time and effort to the company because they believe they belong. CSR also enhances identification because CSR helps employees find others within the organization who share similar values (Bauman & Skitka, 2012).
Social identity theory suggests that individuals are defined by their individuality and by their group differences. They also seek to protect and maintain positive distinctiveness (Tajfel & Turner, 1979), which helps individuals feel a sense of belongingness to their organization (Bauman & Skitka, 2012). Other studies suggest that when an organization’s reputation shows it engages in CSR, their employees will feel proud, and identify with the company (Dutton, Dukerich, & Harquail, 1994). However, organizational identity is dynamic since it can be reinterpreted throughout a company’s existence (Collier & Esteban, 2007). Instances of wrongdoing may influence employee perceptions of a company (lowering identification and allegiance to the company), which can be corrected. If left unaddressed, this wrongdoing may result in greater employee turnover. Further, Smith et al. (2001) found that employees who identify with a successful group experience higher levels of self-esteem, suggesting that employees whose companies engage in CSR are more identified with their companies since they are viewed favorably by society. These findings support the argument that it is important for companies to have strategies that create an organizational culture where employees can fit in.

Aguinis and Glavas (2012) addressed that there is a small minority of CSR research focusing on the individual level of analysis. With critical outcomes (e.g., increased organizational identification, employee engagement, retention, and commitment) having a further understanding of CSR on an individual level stresses CSR’s importance as it may incur a major return on investment from
partaking in such initiatives. From this, we aim to further explore individual level of analysis by proposing another dimension of P-O fit, such that there is a Person-CSR fit between an employee and a company (currently employed or seeking employment) which will further predict certain outcomes.

Person-Corporate Social Responsibility Fit

Kristof (1996) proposed in her literature review that there may be other forms of P-E fit. We propose that there is a Person-Corporate Social Responsibility (P-CSR) fit, such that there is a perceived congruence between the organization’s CSR initiatives and the individual’s values. This is not to be confused with Du, Bhattacharya, and Sen’s (2010) definition of CSR-fit which is the congruence between an organization and a social issue (e.g., going green, gender equality) it promotes. For example, Chegg is a company whose primary mission is to provide textbooks for students at a cheaper rate than their competitors, whether they buy a hardcopy or e-book, or choose to rent. Additionally, their website provides students with job, internship, and scholarship opportunities, and offers to plant trees. Each of these are viewed as CSR-initiatives because they are going above and beyond their organizational duties, helping students with their future college and career opportunities, as well as replenishing the Earth with new trees since they are using paper to print books. There is blatant congruence of Chegg’s CSR initiatives and their organizational purpose. If these were not aligned, stakeholders would view this as a gimmick
and would not be receptive to their products or be willing to purchase from their site. CSR-fit differs from what we aim to understand since Du et al. (2010) looked to all stakeholders, especially the customer. What we aim to understand is whether the employee or potential candidate (specific stakeholders) will seek a fit within this organization because the individual believes in the same CSR initiatives Chegg is pursuing, and thus wish to work for this company.

Having a better understanding of what may constitute as a “fit” may allow the company to have greater flexibility and more committed employees, which will essentially give them a competitive advantage over other organizations. As easy as it is for consumers to switch their brand of products, employees can equally switch from company to company seeking a better fit for their CSR needs and values. Cable and DeRue (2002) argued that needs-supplies fit above other forms of fit may be the most important, especially from the employee’s perspective, due to the idea that individuals seek jobs to receive the rewards of being employed. With this in mind, P-CSR Fit could enhance this fit by providing other rewards not commonly granted by organizations (e.g., an employee could find their company CSR efforts rewarding because it is a reflection of themselves).

Zhang and Gowan (2011) explored CSR from a P-O fit perspective. They propose that during the hiring and decision making process, applicants may consider an organization’s social performance in addition to other characteristics of the organization and the job (i.e., the type of work, the amount of pay) she or
he seeks. Further, these authors address that previous studies have only examined employees’ attraction to organizations whose CSR activities and policies relate to social issues (e.g., community related, employee related, and environmental considerations), but have not found studies that examined employees’ attraction to other CSR activities in relation to economic, legal and ethical responsibilities. Zhang and Gowan (2011) assume those who value ethical behavior will be attracted to socially responsible companies who also value ethical practices. In their study, they proposed that different aspects of CSR (i.e., economic and non-economic) will have independent associations with job applicants’ attraction to the organization. Additionally, they examined whether CSR will make an organization more attractive to a potential job applicant from a P-O fit perspective, such that applicants will be attracted to companies whose CSR aligns with their own ethics and values. Consumers tend to make ethical trade-offs between monetary and ethical considerations, which is assumed to be the same for job applicants, such that they may trade off monetary incentives for organizational reputation (De Pelsmacker, Driesen, & Rayp, 2005; Zhang & Gowan, 2011). Thus, Zhang and Gowan (2011) hypothesized that there will be a strong relationship between economic responsibility and applicant attraction when both legal and ethical responsibilities are high. Further, they hypothesized that the relationships between economic, legal, and ethical aspects of CSR will be stronger for people with strong characteristics (i.e., utilitarians and formalists). Each of their hypotheses were supported, such that each type of CSR had
individual relationships with the perception of organizational attraction. More importantly, each of these hypotheses were supported from a P-O fit perspective, such that certain individuals were attracted to certain companies more than others based on CSR.

Another approach to CSR from a P-O fit perspective was Coldwell, Billsberry, van Meurs, and Marsh’s (2008) study, which examined an ethical dimension of P-O fit. P-O ethical fit is simply the congruence between the ethical values of an organization and an individual, otherwise considered CSR. They suggest that CSR perceptions (prior to employment) and actual CSR values (during employment) will result in individual forms of fit. Companies who find ethical fit with employees are more likely to have higher retention rates than those organizations that have employees with mismatch ethical values. Although they address acquiring employees, we are more interested in how they explored the retention aspect of CSR performance since we want to look at outcomes that an organization will benefit from employees who experience fit. Once an individual perceives fit during her/his application process, these views of fit may change once employed because s/he can actually witness what operations are being conducted within the company. However, the ethical climate (composed of organizational values, managerial attitudes, and behaviors) of the company may not always predict behavior, such that certain circumstances may change ethical behavior (e.g., presence of authority versus absence of authority; Coldwell et al., 2008; Weber, 1995). Therefore, it is possible that individuals may experience fit
with the organization due to the new hire socialization process despite their initial perceived lack of fit prior to employment (Chatman, 1989). Regardless, Coldwell and colleagues (2008) propose P-O ethical fit should vary in relation to compatibility that is contingent upon specific individual-organization combinations. Because CSR is heavily weighted by ethical components, there is a potential congruence between these findings of P-O ethical fit and P-CSR fit. Although this has not been empirically tested, we aim to explore these factors as a part of our P-CSR fit.

Most similar to this project’s proposition, Ruiz-Palomino and Martinez-Canas (2014) found P-O fit to moderate the relationship between ethical culture (EC; e.g., training efforts, rewards systems, top management ethical leadership, formal policies concerning ethics) and ethical intent of an organization, as well as P-O fit mediating the relationship between ethical culture and organizational citizenship behavior. Further, they found that even when there is a poor P-O fit, EC still maintains a positive relationship with ethical intent. Even though there is not a perceived fit with the organization, the ethical culture of the organization is more predictive of an employee’s ethical intent, suggesting that those companies engaging in ethical behaviors (again, an important component of CSR) will have more employees engaging in OCBs. Although the researchers specifically looked at the justices and behaviors within the organization, what occurs externally may be reflective of what occurs internally in the organization, such that the
organization behaves with ethical standards financially, environmentally, and employee policies, fostering employees who behave in a similar fashion.

**Commitment**

Meyer et al. (1989) suggested that there is a need for understanding organizational commitment and its predictors are important. Previous research has found a significant relationship between perceptions of CSR and organizational commitment (Peterson, 2004). Allen and Meyer (1990) suggested there are three types of commitment: affective commitment where the values of the individual and the organization are aligned; normative commitment where commitment is based off a personal sense of obligation; and continuous commitment where individuals stay with an organization due to sunk costs being greater than the costs gained by leaving an organization. This is relevant to our proposed P-CSR fit, such that we aim to target people’s affective commitment to an organization where their values are aligned with the organizations so they feel more committed to the company considering they find a fit with the organization’s CSR initiatives. Additionally, if they feel they have a sense of purpose by contributing to a company who “does good” beyond their organizational duties, they may feel an obligation to work for that company.

**H1:** P-CSR fit will explain additional variance in organizational commitment after accounting for the effects of P-O fit.

Further, we predict that the relationship between organizational commitment and P-CSR fit will be stronger for those who believe in being socially
responsible, such that those who find P-CSR fit and stress the importance of being socially responsible will experience higher levels of organizational commitment. Similarly, Peterson (2004) found that those who believe in being socially responsible were also more likely to be committed than those who did not believe in being socially responsible. Therefore, we predict that those who believe in being socially responsible will experience more P-CSR Fit than those who do not. We will assume this model for the rest of our predicted outcomes.

H2: The relationship between P-CSR fit and organizational commitment will be moderated by an individual’s importance of CSR.

Organizational Identity

Rodrigo and Arenas (2008) found employee congruence with organizational values to be associated with organizational identification. This is due to the perception that employees’ values and beliefs are projected through organizational values and practices as well as the organization being a “good citizen” in society. Additionally, Collier and Esteban (2007) proposed the more an employee perceives organizational attributes as attractive, the more he or she will identify with the organization. Assuming that CSR is an attractive organizational attribute, employees will strongly identify with an organization where they experience P-CSR fit. Further, diversity management helps establish organizational identity, especially for women and minorities, since employees are able to find managers who are reflective of themselves and help establish their own identity (Ng & Burke, 2005). As mentioned, Carmeli et al. (2007), Bauman
and Skitka (2012), and Smith et al. (2001) found evidence that CSR improves organizational identification. Further, Kim, Lee, Lee, and Kim (2010) proposed that CSR association would be positively related to employee-company identification, but did not find results supporting this proposition. Rather, it is when employees actually participate in CSR that leads to a positive relationship. However, this may the result of a misalignment with the company’s CSR initiatives and the employee, and thus association with the company is not enough to establish identity. Therefore, an experienced P-CSR fit may in fact lead to a positive relationship with identity that was not found in Kim et al.’s (2010) study. Therefore, we propose that P-CSR fit will predict organizational identity above and beyond P-O fit and perceptions of CSR.

H3: P-CSR fit will explain additional variance in organizational identity after accounting for the effects of P-O fit.

H4: The relationship between P-CSR Fit and organizational identity will be moderated by an individual’s importance of CSR.

Job Satisfaction

Locke (1969) defined job satisfaction as:

[T]he pleasurable emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one’s job as achieving or facilitating the achievement of one’s job value… [The] three elements involved in the appraisal process [include] 1) the perception of some aspect of the job;…2) an implicit or explicit value
standard; and 3) a conscious or subconscious judgment of the relationship between one’s perception(s) and one’s values(s). (p. 316)

Each of these elements can be linked with a component of P-O fit and CSR. For instance, a person may be satisfied with their job due to: 1) the greater congruence of fit between the person and the organization; 2) how ideally they perceived this congruence, and 3) whether there is an actual congruence. Therefore, this will also occur for P-CSR fit. Many studies aim to understand what makes employees’ satisfied with their job with various answers ranging from autonomy, creativity, and rewards. Bretz and Judge (1994) found P-O fit to explain more variance above and beyond assessing demographic, human capital, job and organizational, and industry characteristics. P-O fit leads to higher levels of satisfaction when people are more involved in their job (displaying OCBs) and displaying greater commitment. Having P-O fit as our first model, we aim to find similar results when adding P-CSR fit.

P-O fit alone has a strong relationship with job satisfaction, but it is unknown which exact source (e.g., interviewers, current employees) cause the fit (Cable & Judge, 1996). Furthermore, Cable and Judge (1996) stress that recruiters should be cognizant of the values they project to potential candidates during the hiring process. Employees who experience a high P-O fit upon beginning the hiring process did not experience more P-O fit during selection and socialization (Chatman, 1991). Highlighting the fact that we are looking at a P-CSR fit, recruiters projecting their organization’s CSR values may help predict
enhanced fit, which is expected to be consistent with the Locke’s (1967) findings that values, rather than expectations, are greater determinants of satisfaction. Additionally, Chatman (1991) suggests the match between individual and organizational values may affect satisfaction. Therefore, we predict P-CSR fit to predict additional variance for job satisfaction over and beyond P-O fit and the presence of CSR.

H5: P-CSR fit will explain additional variance in job satisfaction after accounting for the effects of P-O fit.

H6: The relationship between P-CSR fit and job satisfaction will be moderated by an individual’s importance of CSR.

Workplace Behaviors

As discussed, P-O fit mediates the relationship between ethical culture (EC) and OCBs (Ruiz-Palomino & Martinez-Canas, 2014). Since CSR encompasses ethical components, we propose that P-CSR fit will predict additional variance for prosocial behaviors, rather than the mediating relationship P-O fit played between EC and OCBs. Further, Turnipseed (2002) found more ethical individuals to rate higher on OCBs than less ethical individuals, and more ethical employees to be more likely to exhibit OCBs. This may be because organizational practices influence employee behaviors, and those with higher levels of ethical behavior are positively associated with OCBs (Baker, Hunt, & Andrews, 2006). Since ethics is a dimension of CSR, we believe that socially responsible companies will produce employees who display more OCBs.
Additionally, Yaniv, Lavi and Siti (2010) found a positive relationship between OCB and P-O fit, such that greater P-O fit produced higher OCBs. Because P-CSR fit is a sub-dimension, we anticipate P-CSR Fit to find similar results. We predict that those who find a P-CSR fit will be more likely to engage in OCBs.

H7: P-CSR Fit will explain additional variance in organizational citizenship behaviors after accounting for the effects of P-O Fit.

H8: The relationship between P-CSR Fit and organizational citizenship behaviors will be moderated by an individual’s importance of CSR.
CHAPTER TWO

METHOD

Participants

Participants included a nonrandom convenience sample of working adults from various occupations and organizations consisting of both men and women all over the age of 18 who currently work at least 30 hours per week and have been employed by their organization for at least one year. Allen and Meyer (1996) reported these criteria yield higher reliabilities on organizational commitment. Participants were recruited from a general working adult population via e-mail, CSUSB’s SONA survey system, and word of mouth. The final sample included 230 participants who worked for their current organization for an average of 2.92 years and an average of 35.10 hours per week. Twenty-two point six percent of the participants were male and 77.4% of the participants were female. The average age of the participants was 23.8, and the ethnicity of this sample was 67% Hispanic, 18.7% Caucasian, and all other ethnicities made up 14.3% of the sample.

Procedure

All data was collected via the Internet on the website, Qualtrics. Online method of survey research was ideal because it ensures participants’ anonymity, since identifying information (i.e. names, e-mails, IP addresses) was not tracked,
and allowed participants to complete the study at their own convenience. Before starting the questionnaire, they were given an informed consent (see Appendix A) which reminded them that the study is voluntary and allowed them to drop out of the study at any time. Once the participants agreed, they were checked for working at least 30 hours each week and working for their organization for at least one year. After meeting the criteria, they began the actual survey which had random survey orders. Randomization was done to reduce carryover effects. Upon completing the survey, the participants were provided with a debriefing screen (See Appendix C). Finally, participants were asked to forward their survey invitation or distribute the survey link to their coworkers, family, or friends.

Materials

Seven measures and demographics (self-report surveys) included in our study was adapted into a single web-based electronic survey format via Qualtrics. A new P-CSR fit scale was developed for this project after a pilot study was conducted. Majority of the scales were measured on a 7-point Likert-type scale, with the exception of demographics.

Measures

Person-Organization Fit

To measure P-O Fit, we used Gilbert and Rodgers’s (2002) Person-Organization Fit scale. This 19-item questionnaire is comprised of four sub-
scales including value congruence (5 items), goal congruence (3 items), personality/climate congruence (6 items), and needs/supplies fit (5 items). An example item asked, “To what degree are your goals similar to your organization’s goals?” (full questionnaire in Appendix A). Participants were asked to rate agreement with each item by using a 7-point Likert-type scale where 1 = Not at all and 7 = Completely.

For the present study, coefficient alpha values were .89 for value congruence, .91 for goal congruence, .94 for personality/climate congruence, .91 for needs/supplies fit, and .96 overall P–O fit. Responses to all items were averaged to form the overall P–O fit score, computing a score for participants who will answer at least 18 of the 19 total items. Higher scores indicated better fit.

**Person-Corporate Social Responsibility Fit**

P-CSR fit was assessed using a measure developed for this project. Twenty-eight items were originally conceived for this scale but was narrowed down to 24 items due to redundancy and lack of association to the construct before being piloted. After a pilot test was administered, we used exploratory factor analysis and reliability analysis to determine the factors and the scale was simplified to a 21-item scale with the factors: P-CSR Value Alignment, Organizational CSR Ethics Engagement, Organizational CSR Behavior, and P-CSR Pursuit. The measure was correlated with Bretz and Judge’s (1994) P-O fit measure and the Brown and Ryan’s (2003) Mindful Attention Awareness Scale.
(MAAS) to establish convergent and divergent validity, respectively. P-CSR fit was correlated with P-O fit since they are related constructs, but not with MAAS since it is a cognitive measure. Using the original 24 items, P-CSR significantly correlated with OCBs ($r = .68$, $r = .46$, $p < .01$) and organizational identity ($r = .61$, $r = .37$, $p < .01$) with moderate to large effect sizes. Further, the 24-item measure was used in a two-step hierarchical regression analysis with P-O fit to predict OCBs and organizational identity, in which P-CSR fit accounted for additional variance and the change in $R^2$ was significant.

Because we felt the factor “P-CSR Pursuit” more accurately depicted Social Responsibility Attitudes, we removed this factor from this scale and included it with the Social Responsibility Attitudes scale. The final P-CSR fit scale used for this project was reduced to 17 items, in which the coefficient alpha reliabilities were .96 for P-CSR Value Alignment, .78 for Organizational CSR Ethics Engagement, .90 for Organizational CSR Behavior, and .95 for the entire measure. The responses were averaged across each respondent with larger values indicating greater fit.

**Social Responsibility Attitudes**

The individual’s importance of CSR was assessed using Hunt, Kiecker, and Chonko’s (1990) 4-item social responsibility attitudes scale with the addition of four items from the original P-CSR fit scale (P-CSR Pursuit), resulting in an 8-item scale with coefficient alpha of .72. An example item asked, “The social responsible manager must occasionally place the interests of society over the
interests of the company.” Participants were asked to rate agreement with each item using a 7-point Likert-type scale where 1 = Strong Disagree and 7 = Strongly Agree. The responses were averaged across each respondent with larger values indicating greater importance.

Organizational Identity

Organizational Identity was assessed using Mael and Ashforth’s (1992) 6-item, organizational identity scale. This measure had a coefficient alpha of .92. Example items asked, “When someone criticizes my organization, it feels like a personal insult” (organizational prestige) and “People in my community think highly of my organization” (perceived organizational prestige). Participants were asked to rate agreement with each item by using a 7-point Likert-type scale where 1 = Strong Disagree and 7 = Strongly Agree. The responses were averaged across each respondent with larger values indicating greater identity.

Organizational Commitment

Organizational Commitment was assessed using Meyer and Allen’s (1997) 18-item, three dimensional scale measuring of affective, continuous, and normative commitment. Example items included, “I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career with this organization” (affective commitment), “This organization deserves my loyalty” (normative commitment), and “It would be very hard for me to leave my organization right now, even if I wanted to” (continuance commitment). Participants were asked to rate agreement with each item by using a 7-point Likert-type scale where 1 = Strongly Disagree and 7 = Strongly Agree.
Coefficient alphas were .87 for affective commitment, .88 for normative commitment, .83 for continuance commitment, and .90 for the entire measure. The responses were averaged across each respondent, with larger values indicating greater commitment.

**Job Satisfaction**

Job satisfaction was assessed using Cook, Hepworth, Wall and Warr’s (1981) 6-item, Overall Job Satisfaction Scale. An example item asked, “All in all, how satisfied are you with the persons in your work group?” Participants were asked to rate agreement with each item by using a 7-point Likert-type scale where 1 = Very Dissatisfied and 7 = Very Satisfied. Coefficient alpha for this measure was also .90. The responses were averaged across each respondent with larger values indicating greater satisfaction.

**Workplace Behaviors**

Workplace behaviors was assessed using Moorman and Blakely’s (1995) Organizational Citizenship Behavior 19-item, four dimensional scale measuring interpersonal helping (similar to altruistic behaviors), individual initiative (improving individual and group performance), person-ally industry (compliance with rules and maintaining quality), and loyal boosterism (loyalty to the organization). Example items included, “Goes out of his/her way to help coworkers with work related problems” (interpersonal helping) and “Defends the organization when other employees criticize it” (loyal boosterism). Participants were asked to rate their agreement to the statements by using a 7-point Likert
type scale where 1 = Strongly Disagree and 7 = Strongly Agree. Coefficient alpha for this measure was .89. The responses were averaged across each respondent with larger values indicating more workplace behaviors.

**Demographics**

Participants were asked to report basic demographic information (gender, age, marital status, number of dependents, religious affiliation, ethnic origin, education level, length of employment at current organization, average hours worked per week) on a 9-item questionnaire. An example item asks “What is your marital status?” to which participants must mark “Married,” “Living together,” “Separated,” “Divorced,” “Widowed,” or “Single, never married.”
CHAPTER THREE
RESULTS

Initial Screening and Assumptions

Cases in which participants did not answer one or more survey items, failed manipulation checks, and did not meeting our criteria (i.e. working for their current organization for a year and working 30 hours a week) were screened out. A sample of 244 valid cases were used for an exploration of assumptions. When a participant gave a range for amount of hours or years worked, an average was taken of the given numbers (e.g., if a participant reported working 40-50 hours a week, this person was recoded as having worked 45 hours a week). Using an outlier criteria of 3.3 standard deviations, none of dependent or independent variables had outliers. However, the number of hours (i.e., greater than 53 hours), years worked (i.e., greater than 15 years), and age (i.e., greater than age 44) had outliers, which is expected since full time ranges around 40 hours a week and college students (typically, ages 18 to 25) employed in full time jobs seems less likely. Further, item two of SRA; three, four, six and seven of OC; and nine of OCBs were reversed coded due to these items being worded negatively.

The remaining sample had 230 participants. P-O Fit, P-CSR Fit, SRA, OC, OI, JS, OCBs, Years, and Hours were assessed for skewness and kurtosis in which P-CSR Fit, OI, JS, Years and Hours were significantly negatively skewed, while Years and Hours had significant kurtosis. Due to the large sample size of
the data, these significant results were ignored. Looking at the histograms, the
data appeared to be normally distributed, again with the exception of Age, Years,
and Hours. Five randomly picked combinations of predictors and outcomes were
used to assess linearity, in which none of these assumptions were violated.
Finally, the assumptions of homoscedasticity and multicollinearity were not
violated. Table 1 shows a listing of the bivariate correlations.

Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P-CSR Fit</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-O Fit</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>.76**</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRA</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.39**</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>.63**</td>
<td>.64**</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OI</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>.67**</td>
<td>.64**</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>.67**</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JS</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>.71**</td>
<td>.69**</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td>.66**</td>
<td>.61**</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCBs</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>.59**</td>
<td>.58**</td>
<td>.42**</td>
<td>.53**</td>
<td>.60**</td>
<td>.50**</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: N = 230. Cronbach’s α listed in the diagonal. ** Denotes significant correlations at p < .01 level. * Denotes significant correlation at p < .05 level.
Hierarchical Regression

We hypothesized P-CSR Fit to predict additional variance over and beyond P-O Fit for the outcomes: Organizational Commitment, Job Satisfaction, Organizational Identity, and Organizational Citizenship Behavior. A two stage hierarchical multiple regression was conducted with each of our predicted outcomes. P-O Fit was entered in the first stage and P-CSR Fit was entered at stage two.

The analysis for organizational commitment revealed that at Stage 1, P-O Fit contributed significantly to the regression model, $F(1,228) = 151.35 \ p < .001$ and accounted for 39.9% percent of the variation in OC. P-CSR Fit explained an additional 6% in OC and this change in $R^2$ was significant, $F(1,227) = 96.18, \ p < .001$. For OC, the two independent variables accounted for 45.4% of the variance. Thus, Hypothesis 1 was supported.

Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary of Hierarchical Regression for Person-Organization Fit and Person-Corporate Social Responsibility Fit Predicting Organizational Commitment (N = 230)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PO fit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Consistent with previous findings from the pilot study, the analysis for organizational identity revealed that at Stage 1, P-O Fit contributed significantly to the regression model, $F(1,228) = 186.63 \ p < .001$ and accounted for 44.8% percent of the variation in OI. P-CSR Fit explained an additional 4.4% in OI and this change in $R^2$ was significant, $F(1,227) = 110.89, \ p < .001$. The two independent variables accounted for 49% of the variance for OI. Thus, Hypothesis 3 was supported.

### Table 3.

*Summary of Hierarchical Regression for Person-Organization Fit and Person-Corporate Social Responsibility Fit Predicting Organizational Identification (N = 230)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE(B)</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>Δ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PO fit</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.67**</td>
<td>13.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>.323</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The analysis for job satisfaction revealed that at Stage 1, P-O Fit contributed significantly to the regression model, $F(1,228) = 225.25, p < .001$ and accounted for 49.5% percent of the variation in JS. P-CSR Fit explained an additional 5.7% in JS and this change in $R^2$ was significant, $F(1,227) = 141.10, p < .001$. The two independent variables accounted for 55% of the variance for JS. Thus, Hypothesis 5 was supported.

Table 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE(B)</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>Δ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.50**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PO fit</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.71**</td>
<td>15.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.06**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PO fit</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.43**</td>
<td>6.28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-CSR fit</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Similarly with OI, the results for OCBs were consistent with previous findings from the pilot study. The analysis for organizational citizenship behaviors revealed that at Stage 1, P-O Fit contributed significantly to the regression model, $F(1,228) = 124.58, p < .001$ and accounted for 35.3% of the variation in OCB. P-CSR Fit explained an additional 3.9% in OCB and this change in $R^2$ was significant, $F(1,227) = 73.15, p < .001$. The two independent variables accounted for 38.7% of the variance for OCB. Thus, Hypothesis 7 was supported.

Table 5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary of Hierarchical Regression for Person-Organization Fit and Person-Corporate Social Responsibility Fit Predicting Organizational Citizenship Behaviors (N = 230)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PO fit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PO fit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-CSR fit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: **$p < .001$
Interactions

We predicted that P-CSR Fit and our predicted outcomes would be moderated by their Social Responsible Attitudes, such that those who had greater SRA and greater P-CSR fit would have more Organization Commitment, Job Satisfaction, Organizational Identity, and Organizational Citizenship Behaviors. To test Hypotheses 2, 4, 6, and 8, we centered P-CSR fit and Social Responsible Attitudes by setting their mean to zero (i.e., PCSRfit_ctr and SRA_ctr). To create the interaction term, the centered P-CSR fit and SRA variables were multiplied together (i.e., PCSRfit_ctr * SRA_ctr). The centered variables and the interaction term was then entered into a linear regression, with the interaction term entered as the second step to see if there are any significant changes in $R^2$. However, none of the hypotheses were supported.

The analysis for organizational commitment revealed that at Stage 1, the centered P-CSR Fit and SRA variables, fit contributed significantly to the regression model, $F(2,227) = 78.07, p < .001$ and accounted for 40.2% percent of the variation in OC. The interaction term explained an additional 0.02% in OC and this change in $R^2$ was not significant, $F(1,226) = 52.31, p < .001$. The three independent variables significantly contributed to the model and accounted for 41.0% of the variance for OC. Thus, Hypothesis 2 was not supported. However, there was significant main effect for P-CSRfit_ctr (Unstandardized B = .70, $t(227) = 11.57, p < .001$).
Table 6.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE(B)</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>Δ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>71.50</td>
<td></td>
<td>.41**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-CSRfit_ctr</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>11.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRA_ctr</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>68.47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-CSRfit_ctr</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>11.57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRA_ctr</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: **p < .001

The analysis for organizational identity revealed that at Stage 1, the centered P-CSR Fit and SRA variables, fit contributed significantly to the regression model, $F(2,227) = 82.68, p < .001$ and accounted for 42.1% percent of the variation in OC. The interaction term explained an additional 0.01% in OI and this change in $R^2$ was not significant, $F(1,226) = 55.13, p < .001$. The three independent variables significantly contributed to the model and accounted for 42.3% of the variance for OI. Thus, Hypothesis 4 was not supported. However,
there was significant main effect for P-CSRfit_ctr (Unstandardized B= .94, t(227) = 11.24, p < .001).

Table 7.

Summary of Hierarchical Regression for Person-Corporate Social Responsibility Fit (Centered), Social Responsibility Attitudes (Centered), and the Interaction Term Predicting Organizational Commitment (N = 230)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE(B)</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>Δ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>56.97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-CSRfit_ctr</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>11.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRA_ctr</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Step 2       |       |       |       | .65  | .42  | .00  |
| Constant     | 4.39  | .08   | 54.52 |      |      |      |
| P-CSRfit_ctr | .94   | .08   | 11.24 |      |      |      |
| SRA_ctr      | .12   | .09   | 1.39  |      |      |      |
| Interaction  | 0.04  | 0.06  | 0.66  |      |      |      |

Note: **p < .001

The analysis for job satisfaction revealed that at Stage 1, the centered P-CSR Fit and SRA variables, fit contributed significantly to the regression model, $F(2,227) = 111.990, p < .001$ and accounted for 49.2% percent of the variation in JS. The interaction term explained an additional 0.00% in JS and this change in $R^2$ was not significant, $F(1,226) = 74.31, p < .001$. The three independent
variables significantly contributed to the model and accounted for 49.7% of the variance for JS. Thus, Hypothesis 6 was not supported. However, there were significant main effects for P-CSRfit_ctr (Unstandardized B = 1.00, t(227) = 11.24, p < .001) and SRA_ctr (Unstandardized B = -.21, t(227) = -1.39, p < .05).

Table 8.

**Summary of Hierarchical Regression for Person-Corporate Social Responsibility Fit (Centered), Social Responsibility Attitudes (Centered), and the Interaction Term Predicting Job Satisfaction (N = 230)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE(B)</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>Δ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>56.97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-CSRfit_ctr</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>11.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRA_ctr</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Step 2        |      |       | .71   | .50 | .00|
| Constant      | 4.84 | .07   | 54.52 |    |   |
| P-CSRfit_ctr  | 1.00 | .07   | 11.24 |    |   |
| SRA_ctr       | -.21 | 0.07  | 1.39  |    |   |
| Interaction   | 0.01 | 0.05  | 0.66  |    |   |

Note: **p < .001. *p < .05
The analysis for organizational citizenship behavior revealed that at Stage one, the centered P-CSR Fit and SRA variables, fit contributed significantly to the regression model, $F(2,227) = 69.48, p < .001$) and accounted for 38.0% percent of the variation in OCB. The interaction term explained an additional 0.01% in OCB and this change in $R^2$ was not significant, $F(1,226) = 46.41, p < .001$. The three independent variables significantly contributed to the model and accounted for 38.1% of the variance for OCB. Thus, Hypothesis 8 was not supported. However, there were significant main effects for P-CSRfit_ctr (Unstandardized B = .39, $t(227) = 8.62, p < .001$) and SRA_ctr (Unstandardized B = .23, $t(227) = 4.08, p < .001$).

Table 9.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE(B)</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>Δ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>5.21</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>123.31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-CSRfit_ctr</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>8.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRA_ctr</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>118.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-CSRfit_ctr</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>8.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Additional Analyses

We then analyzed whether there were any group differences in responses for our predicted outcomes based on gender, in which an independent samples t-test was conducted. Men had an average score of 4.49 (SD = 1.17) for P-O Fit, 4.72 (SD = 1.06) for P-CSR Fit, 4.91 (SD = .74) for SRA, 3.85 (SD = 1.03) for OC, 4.28 (SD = 1.57) for OI, 4.87 (SD = 1.34) for JS, and 5.11 (SD = .79) for OCB. Women had an average score of 4.40 (SD = 1.15) for P-O Fit, 4.76 (SD = 1.14) for P-CSR Fit, 4.94 (SD = .75) for SRA, 4.05 (SD = 1.12) for OC, 4.44 (SD = 1.52) for OI, 4.83 (SD = 1.34) for JS, and 5.23 (SD = .81) for OCB. Results from the independent samples t-test show that none of these differences were significant: P-O Fit, t(225) = .45, p = .65; P-CSR Fit, t(225) = -.26, p = .798; SRA, t(225) = -.25, p = .802; OI, t(225) = -1.16, p = .25; OC, t(225) = -.63, p = .53; JS, t(225) = .21, p = .83; OCBs, t(225) = -.918, p = .36.

Further, we wanted to see if there were group differences in responses for our predicted outcomes based on ethnicity. We used a one-way ANOVA for each analysis. Ethnicity included Native American, Asian, African American, Hispanic, Caucasian, and Other Race. There were not any statistically significant relationships between ethnicity and responses for each of our measures: P-O Fit,
F(5, 225) = .74, p = .59; P-CSR Fit, F(5, 225) = 1.06, p = .38; SRA, F(5, 225) = 1.02, p = .41; OC, F(5, 225) = 1.33, p = .25; OI, F(5,225) = 1.85, p = .10; JS, F(5,225) = 1.01, p = .42; and OCB, F(5,225) = 2.20, p = .06.

After further examining the SRA scale, the wording of the items had prompted us to break down the scale into two parts, with the first four items as one dimension (SRA 1) and the second half of the items as another dimension (SRA 2). SRA 1 had a Cronbach’s alpha reliability of .49 and SRA 2 had a Cronbach’s alpha reliability of .85. With SRA 2 having a higher reliability, we decided to explore whether SRA 2 would yield the interaction we predicted. Although there was slightly more variability in SRA 2 (SD = 1.00) than SRA, we still were unable to yield a significant interaction.

Table 10.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE(B)</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1</strong></td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.41**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>71.68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-CSRfit_ctr</td>
<td>0.63**</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>11.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRA_2_ctr</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2</strong></td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>67.76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizational Identity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-CSRfit_ctr</td>
<td>.68**</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.41**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRA_2_ctr</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>57.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-CSRfit_ctr</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>11.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRA_2_ctr</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job Satisfaction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-CSRfit_ctr</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.48**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRA_ctr</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-0.71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>75.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-CSRfit_ctr</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>13.52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRA_ctr</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-0.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizational Citizenship</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-CSRfit_ctr</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRA_ctr</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>8.69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>5.21</td>
<td>5.21</td>
<td>122.47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-CSRfit_ctr</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>8.69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRA_ctr</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behaviors</td>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>5.19</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>115.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-CSRfit_ctr</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRA_ctr</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: **p < .001
The majority of the Corporate Social Responsibility literature has evaluated CSR from a marketing perspective and its effects on consumer purchase intentions and brand loyalty, such that socially responsible products are more likely to be purchased again (Aguinis & Glavas, 2012) or be sought. From a human resources perspective, the research has also discussed CSR and its effects on the hiring process including larger applicant pools, greater commitment throughout the interview, and higher quality of job applicants because these individuals tend to find CSR involved companies more attractive (Zhang & Gowan, 2011; Greening & Turban, 2000). Thus, CSR gives employers a competitive advantage when hiring new candidates.

However, we aimed to find CSR’s effects on employee outcomes during their actual employment, as Aguinis and Glavas (2012) suggested a push for more research in this area. When examining CSR’s relationships as a standalone, previous research has found when employees are aware the organization engages in CSR, they are more likely to be committed to a company (Bauman & Skitka, 2012), have higher organizational identification (Carmeli et al., 2007), and are willing to assist other coworkers (Bartel, 2001). Employees who have greater commitment, identification, and job satisfaction will help reduce hiring expenses as these employees are less likely to leave for another
organization. Further, this may reduce training costs if employees are going above their organizational duties to help other employees as well as helping them get acclimated to the company culture, which will also establish their organizational identity.

CSR has become a necessary part of an organization’s survival, so understanding CSR’s relationship to an employee’s fit is an important contributor to the Person-Organization fit literature. Prior studies have examined CSR from a P-O fit perspective in which potential job candidates consider the organization’s social performance as well as being attracted to particular companies with similar ethics and values (Zhang & Gowan, 2011). Another study found P-O fit moderated the relationship between ethical culture and OCBs (Ruiz-Palomino & Martinez-Canas, 2014). These studies suggested that there may be a significant relationship between P-O fit and CSR, leading us to develop P-CSR Fit.

In the present study, we predicted that P-CSR Fit would contribute additional variance over and beyond P-O Fit for Organizational Commitment, Job Satisfaction, Organizational Identity, and Organizational Citizenship Behaviors. We found support for these hypotheses (H1, H3, H5, and H7). This is consistent with our previous findings in the pilot study (Winters, Gomez, & Veltri, 2014), finding support for P-CSR fit predicting over and beyond P-O fit for Organizational Identity and Organizational Citizenship Behaviors. The unique variance captured by P-CSR Fit not only supports the importance of the topic, but also confirms that it plays an additional role in organizational fit beyond the
previously researched dimensions. Further, we predicted Social Responsibility Attitudes to moderate the relationship between P-CSR fit and the outcomes mentioned previously; suggesting that the degree to which they believe CSR is important effects their P-CSR fit. Thus, those who believe CSR is important and experience a high P-CSR fit will experience more Organizational Commitment, Job Satisfaction, Organizational Identity, and Organizational Citizenship Behaviors. However, we did not find support for these hypotheses (H2, H4, H6, and H8).

Based on this research, CSR is clearly important to implement in an organization as finding this additional fit in an organization above P-O fit is substantial. P-O fit itself is a broad category that encompasses needs-supplies, goals, personality/climate, and values, each of which are a part of P-CSR fit. Thus, capturing any additional variance with a significant change in R² by finding a fit between an employee and CSR needs to be addressed to employers since this can change their workforce and their future hiring practices. Further, across all of our outcomes, there is a decrease in standardized beta for P-O fit from the first step to the second step. This adds to the notion that P-CSR fit is a part of P-O fit since P-CSR fit is taking some of the variance away from P-O Fit. Further, despite the high correlation between P-O fit and P-CSR fit, P-CSR fit is its own construct.

Based on our results, the participants felt safe to invest (i.e., time, resources) in their company and found P-CSR fit with the organization (Bauman
Further, the participants may have felt their organizational duties have a greater purpose, thus they felt more committed to their organization. Because “doing good” is reflective of a person’s identity, our findings related to Organizational Identity are not surprising. As Bauman and Sitka (2012) argued, when an organization engages in CSR, their employees will feel proudly identified with the company and feel they have a greater purpose, thus leading to greater OI. We also proposed that CSR is an attractive organizational attribute, thus the participants strongly identify with their organization since they experience P-CSR fit.

In their review paper, Harter, Schmidt, and Keyes (2002) concluded that employees' well-being should be employers' priority, because employees’ work life affects every aspect of their life. When an organization engages in employee-focused CSR efforts (e.g., medical coverage, flexibility, enjoyable working environment), they are more likely to experience greater job satisfaction. The authors also address the possibility that job satisfaction can be contingent upon whether the employees feel they are contributing. Thus, when an organization engages in any CSR and employees experience P-CSR fit, they feel their work effort is contributing to a greater purpose and feel more job satisfaction.

Because CSR is viewed as going over and beyond an organization’s duties, we expected to find those who experienced P-CSR fit to engage in more OCBs. We found support for this hypothesis. Bartel’s (2001) study suggested that CSR enhances an employee’s willingness to assist coworkers and attempts
to improve positive work relationships. Therefore, when people experience P-CSR Fit, they are more likely engage in OCBs.

Regardless, we consistently found P-CSR Fit to predict over and beyond P-O Fit for our predicted outcomes, despite P-O fit encompassing a large breadth of fit within an organization. This helps establish P-CSR fit as its own sub-dimension of P-O fit and CSR’s importance to an organization. If employees seeks an organization with CSR during their hiring process, they would also seek P-CSR fit during their employment. When considering CSR from a needs-supplies fit perspective, it’s evident that CSR would provide for employees by giving them greater purpose, satisfaction, and identity beyond their physical tasks.

Limitations

Our other set of hypotheses were modeled after Peterson’s (2004) study, in which he found SRA to moderate the relationship between Corporate Citizenship (Maignan and Ferrell, 2000) and Organizational Commitment. In his study, Corporate Citizenship itself was a significant predictor of Organizational Commitment. Contrary to Peterson’s findings regarding the interaction between SRA and Corporate Citizenship being a significant predictor of Organizational Commitment, we did not obtain similar findings with SRA and P-CSR fit across all of our predicted outcomes. Not only was the interaction term not a greater predictor of the outcomes, but SRA alone had negative standardized betas for
OC and JS. Therefore, with every unit increase in OC and JS, SRA actually decreased, suggesting that their value of CSR does not seem to contribute to this relationship. This may have been due to the fact that participants may have imagined how their company and its managers actually behave, rather than their actual attitude of CSR aside from their current organization.

One other potential limitation was that the majority of the participants were Psychology students who were probably unfamiliar with the concept of CSR and thus, may not have valued it. The mean response to SRA was 4.93 with little variability (SD = .75), suggesting that socially responsible attitudes are of somewhat importance and indicating they may not have understood the concept. The CSR definition was presented to them when signing up for the study, agreeing to the informed consent, and completing the P-CSR fit measure. Since our survey was randomized, they could have forgotten the CSR definition throughout the study, especially if they were not presented with the P-CSR fit measure before the SRA measure. Thus, because they were not familiar with the definition CSR, they were more likely to respond with no opinion or somewhat agree since it seems like something an organization should do. The CSR definition should have been provided again when presented the SRA measure, in the event the participant may have forgotten the definition and answered the items anyway. If the participants were more knowledgeable about the concept, we may have seen greater variability in responses as well as significant moderations.
Interpretation of the results is limited by the correlational nature of the design and the lack of information about the organizations of the participants. We did not directly ask: “Does your organization engage in CSR?”, “Are you aware of your organization’s CSR?”, or “What CSR initiatives does your company engage in?”. The organization might have had CSR but the CSR initiative may not have matched the needs of the employee. For instance, the employee’s organization may have had philanthropic donations to various charities but the employee does not find a fit with the organization because it had not addressed its duty to its employees. Thus, the participant may not have found fit. This measure was developed to encompass CSR broadly without accounting the various CSR categories, so asking these specific questions would help organizations tailor its CSR efforts to the needs of the employee.

Implications
As important as it is for an organization’s CSR efforts to match its organizational purpose, it is also important for the employee’s CSR beliefs to match their organization’s CSR efforts. This study contributes to the P-O fit and CSR literature by further establishing P-CSR fit as a sub-dimension of P-O fit. Thus, future research should examine the various other P-O fit measures, aside from Gilbert and Rodger’s (2002) and Bretz and Judge’s (1994) measures, to see if the results from this study and our prior measure development from the pilot study (Winters et al., 2014) would vary with other P-O fit measures in relation to
their correlations and predictability. Further, the results provide evidence to companies as to why having CSR initiatives are important and why it might be necessary to find a fit between person and CSR initiative(s); as it may lead to higher job satisfaction and organizational commitment, and may further support greater OCBs and organizational identity. Even though CSR initiatives may be viewed as helping the bottom line, companies who authentically engage in CSR through their daily organizational activities and organizational culture may reap the benefits of when a person finds P-CSR fit.

Additionally, if an employee does not believe that the company is doing enough for society, then the employee might find a disconnect between herself or himself and leave for another organization whose CSR efforts match his or her needs. In other instances, employees are simply unaware of what their company’s CSR initiatives include. Thus, it is important that the organization is knowledgeable of its own CSR efforts and ensures those are known to its employees. Further, it is important to establish these CSR initiatives authentically, because if employees feel that they are not genuine or post hoc an issue, then this might also lead them to find another company. Even though their study is from a marketing perspective, Groza, Pronschinske, and Walker (2011) found when a company’s CSR is proactive (i.e., employing initiatives prior to any negative press) rather than reactive (i.e., rectifying irresponsible behavior), consumers view the company as favorably and are more likely to buy from this company. Similarly, employees who work for companies with proactive CSR
would be more likely to stay with that organization and leave ones with reactive CSR (Maignan, Ferrell, & Hult, 1999).

As mentioned, attending to meeting an employee’s fit will benefit a company as it does not have to spend additional resources in attracting new candidates. Because of the outcomes we explored, our findings will create a push for companies to participate in CSR actions, which will overall benefit the society in which the company exists depending on the action. Further, employers should consider including CSR related questions during their hiring processes to assess the employee’s potential fit with the organization’s CSR initiatives. Questionnaires, Situational Judgment Tests, or both can be used to assess a candidates P-CSR Fit.

Although we generally think of businesses, it is also important to address the education system developing organizational strategist and designers. Wurthmann (2013) stressed the importance of education of business ethics and we found there is greater fit with an organization based on CSR alignment. This research suggests that business educators should implement CSR and ethics education in their curriculum as this knowledge will become more important for students to know in order to prepare them for the workforce. Future managers will know that implementing CSR and having employees with P-CSR fit will help their businesses.
Future Research

Socially Responsible Attitudes is still an importance concept and it may be possible that Singhapakdi, Vitell, Rallapalli, and Kraft’s (1996) Perceived Role of Ethics and Social Responsibility (PRESOR) is a better measure to assess participants’ CSR values. Although this measure was originally conceived for marketers, it could be applied to employees as the language does not appear to be specific to marketing. The initial reliabilities for this measure’s three sub-dimensions ranged from .56 to .71 (i.e., “social responsibility and profitability”, “long term”, and “short term gains”). In a later study, Wurthmann (2013) found PRESOR to have two loadings, labeled “stakeholder view” (α = .85) and “stockholder view” (α = .79), making this a more reliable measure to assess CSR values. Further, this study looked at education in business ethics and its relationship with PRESOR, in which his sample consisted of students from an upper division undergraduate course in organizational behavior. We may have seen statistical significance for our interactions if we had more participants from the business department, a broader range of participants outside of the Psychology Department, and outside a college setting. Additionally, a sample from the College of Business and Public Administration may have had stronger CSR values as it is something that is instilled during their education.

For some, being employed is a means to provide basic needs in terms of safety, and research has explored what an employee wants based on his or her position (Kovach, 1987). In this study, he found that supervisors (i.e., those in
higher positions) sought interesting work. Thus, for others, being employed provides esteem or self-actualization, such that they can engage in creativity and CSR activities. Therefore, it may be worthwhile to look at various employment levels in a company to determine if there is a difference amongst the various positions of employees and their P-CSR fit.

Furthermore, it may be that certain forms of CSR may spark greater forms of fit. As mentioned, our measure was developed to encompass CSR broadly without accounting the various categories CSR might entail (e.g., diversity and inclusion, environmental sustainability). There could be multiple sub-dimensions of P-CSR fit that may address the types of CSR people pursue and value in a company. It may be that the employees seek certain types of CSR, rather than their positions determining their fit. The future measure(s) could be modeled after Maignan and Ferrell’s (2000) Corporate Citizenship Scale which encompasses economic, legal, ethical, and discretionary sub-dimensions of Corporate Citizenship.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the CSR research is far from being complete, but establishing P-CSR fit as a sub-dimension of P-O fit is a small victory. CSR and matching an employee to the CSR will create a new trend in hiring practices and continue to change the way business education is taught. With more companies engaging in CSR, we are hopeful our research will help create a new era in
business where majority of businesses are going beyond the bottom line and seeking the best interest for every stakeholder involved.
APPENDIX A

INFORMED CONSENT
Informed Consent

Introduction/Purpose: You are invited to participate in a study designed to examine people's perceptions of fit with their current employer’s corporate social responsibility (CSR) initiatives. This study is being conducted by Brittney Winters, under the supervision of Dr. Janelle Gilbert, for a thesis project. This study has been approved by the Department of Psychology Institutional Review Board Subcommittee of California State University, San Bernardino. A copy of the official Psychology IRB Stamp of approval appears at the bottom of this page.

Procedures: You will first be asked to answer a questionnaire regarding your personal thoughts about the match between yourself and the organization that you work for. Next you will be asked your thoughts about the match between your values and your organization’s corporate social responsibility initiatives, followed by a questionnaire regarding your overall social responsibility attitudes. Then you will be asked to answer questions about your perceptions of identity with the organization, organizational commitment, job satisfaction and organizational citizenship behaviors. Finally, you will be asked to provide demographic information. The study should take approximately 30 minutes to complete.

Confidentiality: The information that you give us will be completely anonymous. Your name will not be associated with your data in any way. Your data will be assigned a code number and your name will not appear on any data reports. CSUSB students will be asked to provide their email address so we can assign them a SONA ID for extra credit points (if applicable). This information will be stored separately from the survey responses so to protect the anonymity of your responses. All data will be stored in password protected computers and only the researchers will be able to access the data.

Compensation: CSUSB students with a SONA account will receive 2 unit of extra credit as compensation at the end of the session.
Risks and Benefits: Participation in this study poses no risks to participants beyond those normally encountered in daily life when thinking about one’s fit with the company that they work for. There are no direct benefits to you as an individual. The research, however, can help expand knowledge on how perceptions of Person-CSR fit between individuals and companies can impact important organizational outcomes. In the unlikely event that answering these questions led to discomfort; CSUSB students can call the psychological counseling center at (909) 537-5040.

Participant’s Rights: We would like to remind you that you do have the right to refuse to participate in this study, refuse to answer any question, or to terminate your participation at any time without penalty (i.e., you will still receive participation credit).

Results: Results from this study will be available from Dr. Janelle Gilbert after April 13, 2016 at (909) 537-5587 or janelle@csusb.edu. The results may be submitted for presentation at scientific conferences and for publication in a scientific journal. The data will be destroyed 5 years after publication.

Finally, if you have any complaints or comments regarding this study, you can contact Brittney Winters (wintersb@coyote.csusb.edu) or the Department of Psychology Institutional Review Board Sub-Committee of the California State University, San Bernardino (psyc.irb@csusb.edu). Please read the following paragraph:

By clicking on the “I agree” below, I acknowledge that I have been informed of, and that I understand, the nature and purpose of this study, and I freely consent to participate. I also acknowledge that I am at least 18 years of age.
APPENDIX B

SCALES
Demographics

Please answer the following 10 questions regarding basic demographic information. For questions with multiple choices, please choose the one that best applies to you.

1. What is your gender?
   - Male
   - Female

2. What is your age? _______

3. What is your marital status?
   - Married
   - Living together
   - Separated
   - Divorced
   - Widowed
   - Single, never married

4. How many people live in your household? _______

5. What is your religious affiliation?
   - Christian
   - Jewish
   - Muslim
   - Hindu
   - Buddhist
   - None
   - Other _____________________

6. What is your ethnic origin?
   - Native American (including Alaskan Native)
   - Asian (including Oriental, Pacific Islander and Filipino)
   - African American
   - Hispanic
   - Caucasian
   - Other race _____________________

7. What is your education level?
   - Less than 8th grade
   - Grade 9–11
   - Completed high school
   - Additional non-college training (e.g., technical or trade school)
Some college
❑ Completed college degree
❑ Completed college with advanced degree (M.S., M.A., Ph.D., M.D., etc.)

8. How long have you worked for your current organization?
   ______ years ______ months

9. On average, how many hours (including overtime) do you work each week? ______
Values Congruence. This section measures the degree to which your values match or “fit” the values of your organization. Both you and your organization are going to have values around honestly, fairness, concern for others, and achievement.

1. Honesty can be referred to as the refusal to mislead others for personal gain and/or acting in accordance with one’s true feelings. According to this definition, to what degree do your values of honesty match your organization’s values of honesty?

2. Fairness can be defined as a state of impartiality, for example, judging disagreements in an impartial fashion, or considering different points of view before acting. According to this definition, to what degree do your values of fairness match your organization’s values of fairness?

3. Concern for others can be defined as having a caring, compassionate demeanor. Often times this is shown through helping others perform difficult jobs or encouraging others who are having a bad day. According to this definition, to what degree do your values of concern for others match your organization’s concern for others?

4. Achievement can be referred to as the concern for the advancement of one’s career, or willingness to work hard and take upon additional responsibilities. According to this definition, to what degree do your values of achievement match your organization’s values of achievement principles?

5. Overall, to what degree do you feel your values match your organization’s values?

Goal Congruence. This section measures the degree to which your goals match your organization’s goals. Using the example of an academic setting, goals may include 1) increase student’s basic skills, 2) increase breadth of courses, or 3) increase staff development, etc.
1. To what degree are your goals similar to your organization's goals?

2. To what degree do you strive for what your organization strives for?

3. To what degree do you agree with the goals of your organization?

**Personality/Climate Congruence.** This section measures the degree to which your personality matches the personality of your organization (i.e., organizational climate). Organizational climate is usually made up of the physical work environment, communication patterns, and expectations of employees. Individual personality as well as organizational climate can be thought of in terms of flexibility, sociability, creativity, cooperativeness, and conscientiousness.

1. To what degree does your level of flexibility meet your organization's level of flexibility?

2. To what degree does your level of sociability meet your organization's level of sociability?

3. To what degree does your level of creativity meet your organization's level of creativity?

4. To what degree does your level of cooperativeness meet your organization's level of cooperativeness?

5. To what degree does your level of conscientiousness meet your organization's level of conscientiousness?

6. Overall, to what degree does your personality match the personality of your organization?

**Needs/Supplies Fit.** This section measures the degree to which you perceive your needs will be fulfilled by the organization's supplies. For example, individuals are likely to have financial and growth needs in which they expect organizations to fulfill those needs through pay, bonuses, challenging work, etc. On the other hand, the organization is also looking for needs to be fulfilled (e.g., productivity, skills, etc.) by individual supplies (e.g., time, effort, knowledge, skills, and abilities, etc.).

1. To what degree do you feel your organization will supply you with what you need?
2. To what degree do you feel your organization will give you the rewards you need (e.g., pay, promotional opportunities, recognition, etc.)

3. To what degree do you feel your organization will meet your needs for achievement? (Need for achievement is defined as the degree to which you need to be challenged at work, focus on individual effort, and have a competitive disposition).

4. To what degree do you feel you supply something that your organization needs, that others do not have?

5. To what degree do you feel your needs will be supplied by your organization as well as your organization's needs be met by your supplies?

Person–Corporate Social Responsibility Fit

Using the scale below, please indicate the degree to which each statement reflects your personal thoughts about your organization’s CRS initiatives. CSR refers to an organization’s initiatives to go above and beyond its organizational duties (i.e., its economic and financial performance) to contribute to the society/environment. When asked about your thoughts regarding your company’s CSR initiatives we would like you think about the ways in which your company goes above and beyond to help the society and environment.

Using the scale below, please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>Very small degree</td>
<td>Small degree</td>
<td>Moderate degree</td>
<td>Great degree</td>
<td>Very great degree</td>
<td>Completely</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

P-CSR value alignment

1. Overall to what degree do your personal values match the values of your organization’s CSR initiatives?

2. To what degree do you agree with the CSR initiatives of your organization?

3. To what degree are your values aligned with your organization’s CSR initiatives?

4. To what degree do you strive for what your organization’s CSR initiatives strive for?

Using the scale below, please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. The values of my organization’s CSR initiatives align with my personal values.
6. I believe that my organization’s CSR initiatives benefit our society.

7. I support my organization’s CSR initiatives.

8. CSR improves my company’s image.

9. I value my organization because of its CSR initiatives.

10. I strive to help my organization achieve its CSR initiative goals.

11. My company’s CSR initiatives make me want to continue working for it.

12. I like to get involved in my organization’s CSR initiatives.

13. I am aware of the CSR initiatives my company is involved in.

**Organizational CSR ethics engagement**

14. I feel that it is important for my organization to behave in an ethical manner.

15. The dignity and welfare of its members should be a concern in any organization.

**Organizational CSR behavior**

16. My organization takes appropriate steps to rectify negative impacts on society.

17. My organization takes responsibility of any negative impact it makes on society.

**Manipulation Check**

18. Please answer ‘Somewhat Agree’ to this question.

Social Responsible Attitudes

Using the scale below, please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each statement.

1  2  3  4  5  6  7
Strongly Disagree  No Opinion  Strongly Agree

1. The social responsible manager must occasionally place the interests of society over the interests of the company.

2. Management’s only responsibility is to maximize the return to shareholders on their investment. (R)

3. The fact that corporations have great economic power in your society means that they have a social responsibility beyond the interests of their shareholders.

4. As long as corporations generate acceptable returns managers have a social responsibility beyond the interests of shareholders.

5. I look for organizations whose CSR initiatives match my values.

6. It is important I work for an organization whose CSR initiatives I agree with.

7. I think about an organization’s CSR initiatives before I apply to the organization.

8. It is important that people’s values match an organization’s CSR initiatives.

(R) = Reverse Coded

Organizational Identification

With the exception of sentimentality, all the variables were changed to “my organization”, referring to whichever organization they listed in the demographics section. As Mael and Ashforth noted, this type of change can be done accordingly.

Using the scale below, please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. When someone criticizes my organization, it feels like a personal insult.

2. I am very interested in what others think about my organization.

3. When I talk about my organization, I usually say ‘we’ rather than ‘they’.

4. My organization’s successes are my successes.

5. When someone praising my organization, it feels like a personal compliment.

6. If a story in the media criticized my organization, I would feel embarrassed.

Organizational Commitment

Using the scale below, please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Strongly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Opinion</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Affective Organizational Commitment

1. I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career with this organization.

2. I really feel as if this organization’s problems are my own.

3. I do not feel like “part of the family” at my organization. (R)

4. I do not feel “emotionally attached” to this organization. (R)

5. This organization has a great deal of personal meaning for me.

6. I do not feel a strong sense of belonging to my organization. (R)

Normative Organizational Commitment

7. I do not feel any obligation to remain with my current employer. (R)

8. Even if it were to my advantage, I do not feel it would be right to leave my organization now.

9. I would feel guilty if I left my organization now.

10. This organization deserves my loyalty.

11. I would not leave my organization right now because I have sense of obligation to the people in it.

12. I owe a great deal to this organization.
Continuance Organizational Commitment

13. It would be very hard for me to leave my organization right now, even if I wanted to.

14. Too much in my life would be disrupted if I decided I wanted to leave my organization now.

15. Right now staying with my organization is a matter of necessity as much as desire.

16. I feel that I have too few options to consider leaving this organization.

17. One of the few serious consequences of leaving this organization would be the scarcity of available alternatives.

18. One of the major reasons I continue to work for this organization is that leaving would require considerable personal sacrifice—another organization may not match the overall benefits that I have here.

(R) = Reverse Coded

Overall Job Satisfaction

Using the scale below, please indicate the extent to which you are satisfied or dissatisfied with each statement.

1. All in all, how satisfied are you with the persons in your work group?
2. All in all, how satisfied are you with your supervisor?
3. All in all, how satisfied are you with your job?
4. All in all, how satisfied are you with this organization, compared to most?
5. Considering your skills and the effort you put into your work, how satisfied are you with you pay?
6. How satisfied do you feel with the progress you have made in this organization up to now?
7. How satisfied do you feel with your chance for getting ahead in this organization in the future?

Organizational Citizenship Behavior

Using the scale below, please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each statement.

1  2  3  4  5  6  7

Strongly  No  Strongly
Disagree   Opinion     Agree

Interpersonal helping items

1. I go out of my way to help co-workers with work-related problems.

2. I voluntarily help new employees settle into job.

3. I frequently adjust my work schedule to accommodate other employees’ request for time off.

4. I always go out of the way to make newer employees feel welcome in the work group.

5. I shows genuine concern and courtesy toward co-workers, even under the most trying business or personal situation.

Individual initiative items

6. For issues that may have serious consequences, I express opinions honestly even when others may disagree.

7. I often motivate others to express their ideas and opinions.

8. I encourage hesitant or quiet co-workers to voice their opinions when they otherwise might not speak up.

9. I do not feel “emotionally attached” to my organization. (R)

10. I frequently communicate to co-workers suggestions on how the group can improve.

Personality industry items

11. I rarely miss work even when I have a legitimate reason for doing so.
12. I perform my duties with unusually few errors.

13. I perform my duties with extra-special care.

14. I always meet or beat deadlines for completing work.

*Manipulation Check*

15. Please answer ‘agree’ to this question.

*Loyal boosterism items*

16. I defend the organization when other employees criticize it.

17. I encourage friends and family to utilize the organization’s products.

18. I defend the organization when outsiders criticize it.

19. I show pride when representing the organization in public.

20. I actively promote the organization’s products and services to potential users

(R) = Reverse Coded

APPENDIX C
DEBRIEFING STATEMENT
Thank you for participating in our study designed to investigate Person-Corporate Social Responsibility Fit. This study is being conducted by Brittney Winters, a graduate student of the Industrial-Organizational Psychology M.S. program at California State University, San Bernardino, under the supervision of Dr. Janelle Gilbert. This study has been approved by the Department of Psychology Institutional Review Board Sub-Committee of California State University, San Bernardino.

This study involves no risks beyond those of everyday life, nor any direct benefits to you as an individual beyond the participation in psychological research. In order to ensure the validity of our study, we ask that you do not discuss this with other participants or individuals who may also serve as participants.

If you have any questions or concerns about this study, please feel free to contact Dr. Janelle Gilbert at 909-537-5587 or via email at Janelle@csusb.edu.
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