

THE INFLUENCE OF GENDER ON CORPORATE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY
ORIENTATION

By

TAMEKIA MASSALINE

A THESIS PRESENTED TO THE GRADUATE SCHOOL
OF THE UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT
OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
MASTER OF ARTS IN MASS COMMUNICATION

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA

2011

1

© 2011 Tamekia Massaline

To my mom

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to express a heartfelt thank you to my committee chair Dr. Mary Ann Ferguson for her guidance, encouragement and support. Her eagerness to help and encouraging words truly kept me going throughout this process. I would also like to thank my committee members Dr. Linda Hon and Dr. Moon Lee for their advice and insight.

I am forever grateful to my family and friends for their unconditional love and ongoing support throughout this journey. Their faith in my ability to succeed motivated me to push forward and keep going.

Finally, I would like to thank my Lord and Savior Jesus Christ for guiding me and truly being the co-author of this thesis.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>page</u>
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	4
LIST OF TABLES.....	7
ABSTRACT	8
CHAPTER	
1 INTRODUCTION	9
What is CSR?	9
Background.....	10
CSR as Gender Issue.....	11
Gender and Ethics.....	11
Theory.....	12
Statement of Purpose	12
2 LITERATURE REVIEW	14
History of CSR	14
Public Relations and CSR.....	17
Public Relations Models.....	18
Issues for Public Relations.....	19
Gender Issues in Public Relations	20
Components of CSR.....	22
Corporate Social Responsibility Orientation.....	24
Item Selection and Content Validity	25
Studies Using CSRO Instrument.....	25
Gender.....	27
Androgyny.....	27
Gender Roles.....	29
Gender Schema Theory	29
Gender Identity Theory.....	30
Social Role Theory	31
Gender and Ethics.....	32
BSRI.....	33
BSRI Criticisms	34
Hypotheses and Rationale.....	37
Research Questions	38
3 METHODOLOGY.....	39
4 RESULTS	42

Descriptive Analysis.....	42
Reliability of Scales.....	43
Hypothesis Testing	51
Summary of Findings	73
5 DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS.....	74
Implications.....	75
Limitations and Future Research	77
APPENDIX: FORMS AND SURVEYS.....	79
LIST OF REFERENCES	91
BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH.....	98

LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table</u>	<u>page</u>
4-1 Descriptive statistics	43
4-2 Factor analysis CSR orientation statements.....	44
4-3 Factor analysis masculinity, femininity and neutral constructs.....	48
4-4 ANOVA sex role by sex	51
4-5 ANOVA sex role by androgyny	51
4-6 ANOVA- CSR orientation by sex	52
4-7 Correlations CSR components and sex role.....	54
4-8 Significance of difference of correlation tests	55
4-9 Correlations 4 years of college or less.....	57
4-10 Correlations- practitioners with advanced degrees.....	59
4-11 Correlations- sector- private	61
4-12 Correlations- sector- not-for-profit.....	62
4-13 Correlations- industry- PR agency.....	64
4-14 Correlations- industry- government	66
4-15 Correlations-industry - non-profit	68
4-16 Correlations- industry- health related/trade associations.....	70
4-17 Correlations- industry- independent PR consultants.....	72

Abstract of Thesis Presented to the Graduate School
of the University of Florida in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of Master of Arts in Mass Communication

THE INFLUENCE OF GENDER ON CORPORATE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY
ORIENTATION

By

Tamekia Massaline

August 2011

Chair: Mary Ann Ferguson
Major: Mass Communication

This paper explored the effects of sex role on the corporate social responsibility orientation of public relations practitioners. A sample of 123 practitioners were recruited to participate in the current survey. Participants were asked to complete a questionnaire measuring sex role and CSR orientation. Previous studies have looked at CSR orientation through the lens of sex, major, and religiosity but the present study looked at CSR orientation in terms of gender. Results indicated that practitioners who scored high on the femininity index were found to more highly favor ethical and discretionary CSR components and those who scored high on the masculinity index were found to more highly favor the legal CSR component. In addition to sex, the study also looked at additional factors that affect the likelihood to value certain CSR dimensions over others. Specifically level of education, sector of employment, and organization of employment were studied. The study concludes with a discussion of the implications for practitioners and theory building.

CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION

Corporate social responsibility (CSR) has evolved vastly over the years. CSR has grown from a narrow one-dimensional notion of philanthropy to a complex multifaceted-concept that is central to much corporate decision making (Cochran, 2007). The fact that over 80% of Fortune 500 companies feature CSR issues on their company Web sites further demonstrates the growth of corporate CSR initiatives and the value that companies are now seeing in CSR activities (Drumwright & Murphy, 2001).

What is CSR?

Mohr, Webb and Harris (2001) define CSR as "a company's commitment to minimizing or eliminating any harmful effects and maximizing its long-run beneficial impact on society" (p.47). Davis (1973) offered a definition of CSR as "the firm's consideration of, and response to, issues beyond the narrow economic, technical, and legal requirements of the firm to accomplish social benefits along with the traditional economic gains which the firm seeks" (p. 312).

Carroll (1983) describes CSR as the conducting of business that is profitable, ethical, law abiding, and socially responsible. He defines social responsibility by the extent to which a corporation contributes to society financially, with its resources and with its time. Carroll (1979) further explained that for social responsibility to fully address the entire range of obligations a business has to society, it must embody the economic, legal, ethical, and discretionary categories of business performance. These four categories of social responsibility reflect definitions of many different scholars and show how social responsibility is believed to include more than economic and legal concerns, which were formerly the focus throughout much of the history of business. CSR

assumes that corporations do more than simply adhere to the law in conducting business by looking beyond the financial interest of their stockholders and onto the societal impact of their existence.

Background

Decreased trust in government and increased power of corporations have heightened the role that corporations now play in society (Ucello, 2009). No longer can corporations exist with the sole purpose of producing a profit. Consumers now expect more from the companies in which they spend their hard-earned money. There are numerous incentives for corporations to be socially responsible. Consumers are more likely to identify with a company that promotes a positive social identity. Consumers who identify with a company have more loyalty and also are more likely to promote the company to others, and furthermore are more resistant to negative attacks against that company (Mohr & Webb, 2005).

According to Marin et al. (2008), "One of the reasons for this growing interest in CSR is because of its influence on consumer behavior at a time when consumers are demanding more out of organizations than simply a quality product at a low price" (p. 65).

For some time the question was whether corporate decision makers should be concerned with issues that extended beyond the bottom line. Friedman (1970) contended that the only stakeholder who corporations are accountable to is stockholders. Friedman writes:

There is one and only one social responsibility of business – to use it resources and engage in activities designed to increase its profits so long as it stays within the rules of the game, which is to say, engages in open and free competition without deception or fraud (Friedman, 1970 p. 178).

This view is now only held by the minority and increasingly most large companies are recognizing both the value and necessity of CSR (Carroll, 1999).

CSR as Gender Issue

While the body of knowledge on CSR is extensive and scholars have examined CSR from many perspectives, little research has examined CSR as a gender issue. With practitioners increasingly understanding the importance of CSR, it is interesting to investigate the CSR orientation between male and female public relations practitioners.

Differences between men and women extend to not only to the biological level but also are apparent psychologically. Bem (1974) describes, "In general, masculinity has been associated with an instrumental orientation, a cognitive focus on "getting the job done" and femininity has been associated with an expressive orientation, an affective concern for the welfare of others." These traditional role assignments often have implications in the roles and duties that men and women assume in the workplace and also in their approaches to carrying out these duties.

Gender and Ethics

Many studies have explored gender issues within the field of public relations. As reported in Aldoory and Toth (2002) although the public relations field is nearly 70% female, men nevertheless are favored in hiring, elevated salaries, and promotion to management positions. Research has given numerous explanations for this phenomenon. One of those explanations is the varied ethical decision making between men and women. Mason and Murack (1996) conducted a survey of business students and findings indicated that female business students answered the questions in a "more ethical" manner than their male counterparts. Numerous studies have supported this

inference that men and women hold different ethical values (Betz, O'Connell, & Shepherd, 1989; White and Manolis, 1997; Gilligan, 1982).

Other researchers have criticized gender-related research suggesting that it only reinforces stereotypical images. Dobbins and Platz (1986) report that they found no differences in the way men and women managers responded to work situations.

Theory

Social role theory helps to explain the varying roles between the sexes. Social role theory posits that differential social roles arise from the separate social roles that society has traditionally assumed for the sexes (Harrison & Lynch, 2005). These roles are perpetuated in the work place through assignments of sex-appropriate roles and are often apparent in occupational decision making.

Statement of Purpose

With findings showing that men and women have varying ethical codes it is important to explore how this orientation affects approaches to CSR. As the number of women in the public relations profession continues to rise, the question is whether the manner in which CSR is practiced has changed because of this shift.

Many previous studies have examined ethical differences between men and women in varying occupations. Previous studies on the factors affecting CSR orientation focus on the demographic characteristics of managers, such as sex, religion, major, etc. This paper will explore the effects of sex role on the CSR orientation of public relations practitioners. This study will explore whether sex role may be a better predictor of CSR orientation than sex. This information will prove important for practitioners and theory building. The Bem Sex-Role Inventory (BSRI) will be used as a masculinity femininity scale to determine sex role and Aupperle's (1982) corporate

social responsibility scale will be used to observe how these traits determine CSR orientation among practitioners based on Carroll's (1983) four CSR components. This study will also look at how public relations education, sector, and industry employment of public relations practitioners affects their corporate social responsibility orientations.

CHAPTER 2 LITERATURE REVIEW

History of CSR

As the study is focused on U.S. practitioners, this section will focus on primarily the U.S. history of CSR. As early as the turn of the 20th century glimpses of CSR could be seen on an individual basis through philanthropy. Wealthy individuals such as Andrew Carnegie and Henry Ford donated generously to the needy in a time when the poor did not have Medicare or Social Security to assist them. With an increasing need for more assistance due to population increases and as a result of the aftermath of World War I, the burden to help the poor was too much for individuals and businesses began to share in the responsibility (Clark, 2000).

The 1950s can be considered the beginning of the modern era of corporate social responsibility. Carroll (2009) identifies the period prior to the 1950s as the philanthropic era in which companies primarily donated to charities. Bowen's (1953) seminal book *Social Responsibilities of the Businessman* marks the beginning of modern literature on corporate social responsibility. In the book Bowen notes the power of large businesses in decision making that touches the lives of society. In this book published more than 50 years ago Bowen predicted that corporate social responsibility was not a passing trend but would be an important concept that would guide business in the future. Carroll (2009) characterizes the 1950s as a period of "more talk than action" as business executives were getting more comfortable with the concept of CSR (p. 26).

The late 1950s to the 1960s marked a decrease in public faith in the government as a result of government initiatives that failed to alleviate community needs. With less faith in the government's ability to meet social needs the public turned to corporations to

fill in the government's role. This asserted pressure on companies to enact CSR initiatives to fill the void. In this decade some companies also began producing social reports (Clark, 2000).

Also in the 1960s, capitalism looked to establish legitimacy. As a result there was a growing concern with corporate ethics and social responsibility. This period saw an emergence of businessmen more willing to support the concept of CSR (Nehme & Wee, 2008). The 1960s marked a growth to formulate what CSR really means. The idea that CSR could spur profitability in the long term was derived during this period (Davis, 1960).

Friedman asserted a counterargument to the movement towards corporate social responsibility. He asked the question, "Should companies take responsibility for social issues?" He declared, "Few trends could so thoroughly undermine the very foundations of our free society as the acceptance by corporate officials of a social responsibility other than to make as much money for their stockholders as possible" (p. 133). As an economist, he believed that social matters were not the concern of businesses and such problems should resolve themselves in a free market.

Friedman affirms that managers are required only to use economic and legal analysis and that an ethical analysis is not necessary in making decisions (Kok et al., 2001). Critics of this viewpoint argue that a business must consider in addition to its profit the long range social costs of its activities (Shaw and Barry, 1992, p. 213). "The justification for the existence of any corporation is that it serves its purpose: to benefit society" (Kok et al., 2001, p. 286).

Despite Friedman's argument, public interest in CSR continued to increase throughout the 1970s and corporate social responsibility became a more commonly used phrase in business circles (Nehme & Wee, 2008). In the 1970s, there were references to corporate social responsiveness and corporate social performance in addition to corporate social responsibility.

According to Clark (2000) the rise of CSR, in the late 1970s and early 1980s, coincided with increased concern for corporate image. In the 1980s, CSR continued to be redefined and academics began developing alternative and complementary concepts to corporate social responsibility. There was a shift in research from studying how CSR should be practiced to actually discovering ethical means to respond to social issues (Clark, 2000). The idea of corporate social performance continued to grow in this decade. Issues that rose to importance were environmental pollution, employment discrimination, employee safety, quality of work life, deterioration of urban life and abusive practices of multinational corporations (Carroll, 2009).

In the 1990s sustainability was an emerging theme. There was an increase in global companies' management positions being established solely dedicated to managing corporate giving. In the early 1990s corporate social performance became an increasingly popular notion. Wood (1991) revisited the Carroll (1979) model and the Wartick and Cochran (1985) model and placed CSR in a broader context emphasizing outcomes, which were implicit in previous models.

The concern for CSR accelerated after the fall of the Berlin Wall which represented the fall of communism and accelerated globalization (Hopkins, 2006). Communism was seen as a threat to the American way of life and, in response,

businesses leaders decided that their obligation was not only to their own company but also to society.

In the 2000s, corporate irresponsibility in cases such as Enron and World Com and increase in environmental concerns fueled public interest in CSR and in holding corporations more accountable. Also the internet made it easier to gain access to information regarding company's social and environmental activities (Hopkins, 2006). The 2000s also brought rise to more empirical research on the topic of CSR.

Uccello (2009) noted a shift due to globalization. As corporations gain power and importance in the global marketplace, so does the importance of CSR. In the past decades, enterprises were local businesses and mom and pop shops that were integral components in the community. These family-owned and operated businesses were indebted and dependent on the surrounding community for survival, and consequently their businesses practices reflected a positive regard for community well-being because of these personal relationships. With globalization the influence and power of corporations have grown significantly. Corporations are in the position to provide jobs and positively affect the social conditions of communities around the world (Uccello, 2009).

Public Relations and CSR

Public relations is defined as "the management function that establishes and maintains mutually beneficial relationships between an organization and publics on whom its success or failure depends" (Broom, Center, Cutlip, 2005 p.3). Dozier (1992) notes public relations practitioner's role as an indicator of the power of the public relations unit in an organization.

Arthur W. Page, one of the early pioneers of the public relations field, coined many concepts that remain true today in approaching both public relations and CSR activities. One of those ideas in particular provides important insight and remains useful in the 21st century. According to Page, “All business in a democratic country begins with the public’s permission and exists by public approval” (Griswold, 1967).

Waeraas (2007) drawing on the work of German sociologist Max Weber, defined public relations as “a means of acquiring and preserving organizational legitimacy; that is, of having and retaining sufficient external support to continue to exist” (p. 281). This definition aligns with Page’s important concept of operating with the permission of the public. This definition of public relations also provides a basis for the foundation of CSR as a legitimate activity of public relations.

L’Etang (1994) explains the relationship between public relations and CSR. She asserts that public relations and CSR are not activities which should be evaluated separately. The author suggests that all too often the two activities are interconnected in such a way that CSR becomes a tool for public relations.

L’Etang (1994) further describes public relations role in corporate social responsibility:

Corporate social responsibility has become important to public relations because such programs offer the opportunity to build good will by promoting the benefits of the company to its stakeholders. In addition to its advisory management role public relations also provides the techniques to communicate these activities to target publics which may include the media and individuals seen to be of influence to the organization. (p.115)

Public Relations Models

An understanding of public relations models is helpful in understanding issues that public relations practitioners face in CSR. Grunig and Hunt (1984) introduced the

concept of models to help explain ways in which organizations relate to publics. The authors outlined four models of public relations: press agency, public information, two-way asymmetrical and two-way symmetrical. Press agency and public information are one-way models with the sole focus on organizational gain. Grunig and Hunt discuss press agency as the oldest model which serves the purpose of creating and disseminating favorable information in order to manipulate public opinion.

The authors explain the public information model values the truth but only disseminates information selectively from the organization to the public. In contrast, the two-way asymmetrical model involves research gathering on issues salient to the public. This information is then disseminated with the goal of persuading the public.

Finally, the two-way symmetrical model is similar to the asymmetrical model in that it gathers and disseminates information but the goal is instead to provide mutual gain for both the organization and public. The two-way symmetrical model is ideal in practice because it results in long-term relationships and mutual gain for the organization and its public.

Issues for Public Relations

In addition to the role that practitioners play in advising top management, practitioners also provide the techniques to communicate these activities to target publics which include the media, individuals and other groups of influence to the organization. The role of public relations then is both to facilitate the activity and communicate the activity for the benefit of all (L'Etang, 1994).

CSR in itself can be seen as an example of symmetrical public relations but once communicated to a third party it can be seen as publicity. This publicity raises ethical questions and can be a moral dilemma to a company. The publicizing of a CSR initiative

brings rise to questions over the moral motivation of the initiative. The question is whether the corporation and practitioners are motivated by a self-interested desire to achieve publicity or a sincere obligation to society. With measuring the effectiveness of a CSR program by the means of media hits and attention and not the outcomes related in the enacted program the company suggests a motivation grounded in self interest.

Practitioners that openly and honestly communicate the self-interest in the CSR activity can then be seen as operating in the public information model, because there is in fact no action on behalf of the organization as result of the disseminated information. Symmetry is more closely achieved once the claim to being a good corporate citizen is no longer measured by media hits but success is measured by achieving the intended goal on the beneficiaries which the initiatives seek to impact. The role of the practitioner is important because the practitioner has the ability from the inception of the initiative to cultivate the direction that the corporation will take (L'Etang, 1994).

Gender Issues in Public Relations

Gender issues in public relations are well represented in public relations literature. In the 1940s, women in the public relations industry were fighting for equal pay and also combating the perception that having women in public relations management positions would diminish the value of the profession (Cheryl, 2006). In 1968, only one in every 10 members of PRSA was female. That ratio was one in every seven in 1975 (Broom, 1982). By the 1980s the field was 50 % female (Aldoory & Toth, 2002). In 2000, 70% to 80% of students in U.S. college public relations classes were women (Grunig, et. al, 2000). Aldoory and Toth (2002) reported that similar to public relations classes, the profession is nearly 70% female.

There is extensive literature exploring gender issues in public relations. Aldoory and Toth (2002) show in their study that both men and women believe that men are promoted more quickly and that it is more difficult for women than men to reach top-level positions. The Toth and Cline (1991) study found that both men and women found it “unlikely” that men and women have the same opportunity for advancement. The few number of men in the field position them as valuable assets to their organization and male and female management often reward men with promotions with hopes of retention of the valued males.

The Aldoory and Toth (2002) study found that men are socialized to feel like they are entitled to move up in an organization and feel more confident in asking for a promotion. Socialization has a major impact on negotiation skills in men and women. Men are socialized to be aggressive and assertive at a young age. Men take these skills into salary negotiations, resulting in higher pay and higher promotion rates. Men feel less fear and apprehensions in asking for promotions because of their comfort in approaching negotiation situations. Women are more timid and feel that their work is not deserving of a promotion. Negotiation situations in general are less familiar for women.

Toth and Cline (1991) found that nearly half of men found their gender helpful to their careers. Less than 20% of women, on the other hand, found their gender helpful. Twice as many women as men reported gender to be unhelpful in their careers. This shows that men find their gender advantageous where women believe their gender to be disadvantageous in the industry. Nearly half of respondents in Toth and Grunig’s (1993) survey showed concern that the increase in the number of women in public relations would drive down salaries of all practitioners.

Grunig, et al. (2000) argue that public relations is an industry founded on feminist values. These values include qualities such as such as honesty, justice, and sensitivity. With the utilization of these values, practitioners are able to better practice symmetrical communication. The authors argue that the two-way symmetrical model of public relations, the model defined as including conflict resolution and relationship building, is an intrinsically feminist value (Grunig, et al., 2000).

Scholars (e.g., J. E. Grunig, 1992) suggest that a feminine world view produces the most effective public relations. This feminine world view can be seen through a balanced, two-way communication between an organization and its stakeholders and is believed to make the greatest contribution to organizational effectiveness. Some values that are considered feminine values are listed as following: altruism, caring, commitment, equality, equity, ethics, fairness, forgiveness, integrity, justice, loyalty, morality, nurturance, perfection, quality of life, reciprocity, respect, standards, tolerance, and cherishing children (Grunig, et al., 2000).

The literature suggests that women possess characteristics and values best suited for the practice of public relations. Grunig, et al. (2000) suggests that given this, practitioners with feminine values should be the most socially responsible practitioners.

Components of CSR

According to Carroll (1979) the four components: economic, legal, ethical, and discretionary “address the entire spectrum of obligations business has to society” (p. 40).

Legal responsibilities require that companies operate within the limitations of the law. As businesses have agreed to a “social contract” society expects that businesses carry out this contract within the confines of the law. This requirement includes

adherence to all laws and regulations relevant to the company. This element aligns with Page's assertion of the obligation that businesses possess in a democratic country to exist by public approval (Carroll, 1979).

Ethical responsibilities go beyond what is required by the law and includes acting with fairness and behaving in accordance with social values. This extends beyond what companies must do to what companies should do for the best interest of society. Societal expectations for ethical behavior hold companies to a standard higher than that of basic legal requirements. These behaviors include behaviors that are expected by society and are often the most difficult to define (Carroll, 1979).

Discretionary responsibilities include those activities that are consistent with charitable expectation of society. These include activities that work towards improving the quality of life of the community in which the company exists (Carroll, 1979).

Economic responsibilities include producing goods and services that consumers need and want in order to make a profit. All other business responsibilities are dependent on this responsibility because without it the other responsibilities cannot be carried out (Carroll, 1979).

Carroll (1991) later depicted the four components of CSR using a pyramid with the economic responsibility forming the base of the pyramid. The next level is legal followed by ethical and finally discretionary responsibilities, which form the top of the pyramid. He states that his four dimensions are more exhaustive than previous models although they are not mutually exclusive (Carroll, 1979).

Carroll (1991) emphasizes the importance of all four dimensions:

In summary, the total corporate social responsibility of business entails the simultaneous fulfillment of the firm's economic, legal, ethical, and

philanthropic responsibilities. Stated in more pragmatic and managerial terms, the CSR firm should strive to make a profit, obey the law, be ethical, and be a good corporate citizen. (p. 229)

Corporate Social Responsibility Orientation

Because managers have discretion in choosing specific initiatives that they prefer to enact, their own personal philosophy in decision-making regarding CSR becomes important. Given this, examining factors that affect particular orientation to certain CSR responsibilities is a necessary area of research.

Aupperle, Carroll and Hatfield (1985) describe the initial purpose of their study was to develop an instrument to measure degree of orientation to social responsibility based upon a model defining corporate social responsibility that had appeared in the literature. Although the authors recognized that there was no universally accepted definition for CSR, Carroll's (1979) definition was used in this study for instrument development because Carroll's conceptualization had multiple components that lend themselves to measurement and testing.

Carroll (1979) proposed that there was a clear ordering of priorities for the four components of responsibilities and relatively the importance of each responsibility was fairly consistent. The approximate weightings of the four CSR responsibilities: economic, legal, ethical, and philanthropic, were 4:3:2:1 respectively. Corporate Social Responsibility Orientation (CSRO) is important because it can indicate the areas considered most important to managers in their decision making. To measure CSR orientation Aupperle (1982, 1984) drawing on the work of Carroll (1979) created an instrument to measure individuals' CSRO.

Item Selection and Content Validity

The first concern in the creation of this instrument was construct validity. In order to ensure that statements on corporate social responsibility were representative, an exhaustive list of statements representing the three non-economic components of Carroll's components were derived from five studies: Eilbirt and Parket (1973), Corson and Steiner (1974), Paluszek (1976), Holmes (1977), and Ostlund (1977). Industry-specific items were removed in order to ensure meaningful ratings across industries. Items selected to represent the economic component were extracted from performance measures typically found in corporate sections of Business Week and Forbes, being well established economic measure in managerial finance texts. An inventory of 117 statements was developed for each of the four components. A panel of six independent judges screened the 117 statements making certain that each statement represented one of Carroll's four components and that each statement was differentiated from the other categories. A consensus for a statement was granted when at least five judges agreed. Panel judges reviewed each to ensure that the statement had equal levels of social desirability. Statements were randomly ordered to reduce response bias (Aupperle, Carroll & Hatfield, 1985).

Studies Using CSRO Instrument

Smith and Blackburn (1988) and Burton and Hegarty (1999) conducted a study using the Aupperle's CSRO instrument. The study examined gender, Machiavellian orientation, and socially desirable reporting on respondent's orientation toward corporate social responsibility. Machiavellianism is a strategy for dealing with people that is described as emotional detachment and a view of people as being manipulative. Social desirability is a long recognized problem in self-report surveys. It is assumed that

with social responsibility respondents give answers that conform to currently accepted societal attitudes, even if that point of view is not congruent with their own personal belief. Burton and Hegarty found that females saw economic responsibilities as less important than males and found no difference in legal and discretionary responsibilities. As far as Machiavellianism, the researchers found that the importance of economic responsibilities rose with the increasing levels of Machiavellianism.

McDonald and Scott (1997) used the Aupperle scale to examine the attitudes of business and non-business students' economic, legal, ethical, and discretionary corporate actions. The study specified differences according to three variables: gender, major, and race. Findings reported that female students had a stronger orientation than male students toward discretionary and ethical corporate actions and that males students held a stronger economic orientation than females. Business majors had a stronger economic orientation than non-business majors and non-white students had stronger discretionary orientation.

Ibrahim, Howard and Angelidis (2008) used the instrument to determine a relationship between an individual's degree of religiousness and his or her CSR orientation. After surveying both students and managers the authors reported that that religiousness did influence students' orientation toward the economic, ethical, and philanthropic responsibilities of business. However, level of religiousness did not have a significant impact on managers' attitudes. The study ultimately, corroborated previous studies reporting that an individual's level of religiousness does not have an impact on ethical decision-making.

Gender

Exploring and defining gender are imperative in understanding the importance of the present study. The terms sex and gender are often used interchangeably without much differentiation between the meanings of the two terms. However, the definition offered by Wood (1997) best describes the difference between the two terms. Wood explains: "Sex is a designation based on biology, while gender is socially and psychologically constructed" (p. 23). Gender is more complex than sex which is determined at birth. While we are born male or female, gender is defined by society and expressed through interactions with others (Woods, 1997). Gender, unlike sex, is not stable and can change over time.

Wood (1997) further explains:

In most cases, sex and gender go together; most men are primarily masculine, and most women are primarily feminine. In some cases, however, a male expresses himself more femininely than most men, or a woman expresses herself in more masculine ways than most women.

Many gender theories have been developed to help explain male and female differences.

Androgyny

The concept of androgyny is less commonly discussed and should be more thoroughly defined for the purpose of this study. In the 1970s, researchers coined the word androgyny by combining the Greek word aner or andros, meaning "man," and the Greek word gyne, meaning "woman" (Wood, 1997). Bem (1974, 1975) defines the concept of androgyny, referring to a high propensity of both feminine and masculine characteristic in an individual. Bem explains that this heightened propensity represents a more flexible standard of psychological health than most sex-typed individuals.

Broverman, Vogel, Broverman, Clarkson, & Rosenkrantz (1972) explain that sex-role stereotypes strongly influence individuals' standards and evaluations of behavior. They report that men and masculine characteristics are more highly valued than women and feminine characteristics. According to their findings, both males and females agreed masculine characteristics are more socially desirable. Schein (1973, 1975) also found agreement by male and female managers on a masculine profile as a favorable profile for a successful manager. Basil (1973) reported that attributes rated as highly important in upper management levels also were perceived as more likely to be found in men than women.

Bem (1975) suggests that people should no longer be socialized to conform to outdated notions of masculinity and femininity but instead be encouraged to be androgynous. Androgynous individuals are more likely to display sex role adaptability and engage in situationally appropriate behavior without regard to stereotypes of sex-appropriate behavior. Brenner and Greenhaus (1979) in a study of male and female managers and non-managers found that traits such as aggression, dominance, and achievement orientation, which have been attributed to male managers, are more likely to be associated with both men and women who have attained managerial positions.

Powell and Butterfield (1979) report that as more women become managers, it is possible that traditional masculine-oriented standards for managerial behavior are being replaced by androgynous standards. They also suggest that it is also possible that new female managers take on masculine traits and behaviors typical of male managers to succeed in the masculine working world (Powell & Butterfield 1979).

Caudill, Hathorn, and O'Brien (1977) believe androgynous males to be more inclined to display discrete masculine or feminine behaviors across situations, whereas androgynous females would more likely blend sex role behaviors. Heilbrun (1986) proposed that males are more likely than females to utilize either masculine or feminine behavior in order to maximize social reinforcement from one situation to the next. Androgynous females, on the other hand, are more likely to blend sex role behaviors across situations.

Heilbrun (1986) suggests androgyny to be more important for women than it is for men because androgynous women have proven more effective than women displaying other sex types. Androgynous men have not been found to be more or less effective. Ellis and Range (1988) propose that androgynous individuals demonstrate more reasons for living than gender-typed individuals. Androgynous individuals function more adaptively in modern living and also are more psychologically healthy.

Gender Roles

Gender serves an important role in culture and each culture has developed a network of associations that surround the concept of what we classify as “maleness” and femaleness” (Schmitt, Leclerc & Rioux, 1988). While cultures assign varying gender-appropriate tasks based on sex, all cultures are alike in the fact that these roles are taught in childhood through socialization (Bem, 1981). Bem describes the process by which society teaches this socialization of “male and female into masculine and feminine” as sex typing (p. 354).

Gender Schema Theory

Bem (1981) describes gender schema:

The theory proposes that sex typing results, in part, from the fact that the self-concept itself gets assimilated into the gender schema. As children learn the contents of the society's gender schema, they learn which attributes are to be linked with their own sex and, hence, with themselves.

Engrained in the very essence of child rearing is the idea of gender favorable concepts. Little girls are praised for properly nurturing their baby dolls, while little boys are complimented on how big and strong they are becoming. According to Maltz and Borker (1982), when boys play their play is more group-oriented, competitive and status-oriented compared to girls who are more dyadic, cooperative and egalitarian. These comments of gender-appropriate sex attributes carry on into adulthood and these attributes are selected above other less appropriate traits. Self-concept is built, based on the ability to fulfill the created gender schema (Bem, 1981).

Aries (1996) reports that men are more likely to dominate in groups by talking and interrupting, to emerge as leaders and to be oriented to solving problems. Women, on the other hand, are more expressive, supportive, facilitative, and cooperative and develop more personal relationships.

Gender Identity Theory

An additional theory that supports Bem's assertion about gender being individually constructed is gender identity theory. Stoller (1964) describes that gender identity is established by age three through the relationship between mother and child. This relationship is experienced differently for boys and girls. From that time on, gender identity, which is the core of personality, is irreversible and unchanging.

Gender identity consists of biological sex, instrumental and expressive psychological traits and gender role attitudes. Psychological gender refers to the masculine and feminine traits associated with males and females. Gender-role attitudes

refer to individuals' beliefs about which roles are gender appropriate to endorse or reject for men and women (McCabe et. al.2006).

Social Role Theory

Social role theory helps to better explain the link between sex and workplace expectations. Social role theory suggests that differential social roles arise from the separate social roles that society has traditionally assumed for the sexes (Harrison & Lynch, 2005). Social role theory was developed out of an effort to better understand the causes of sex differences and similarities in social behavior. According to Eckes and Trautner (2000), “This theory argues that the beliefs that people hold about the sexes are derived from observations of the role performances of men and women and thus reflect the sexual division of labor and gender hierarchy of society” (p. 124).

Historically, men and women were assigned labor tasks that were consistent with their physical attributes. Men were assigned roles that required speed and strength while women had the primary responsibility of caring for home and family. In time these social roles became gender role expectations for men and women. Men and women who do not adhere to traditional gender roles often experience social disapproval (Harrison & Lynch, 2005).

Betz et al. (1989) indicates that gender differences in ethical perceptions decline with increasing work experience. For example Ragins and Sundstrom (1990) concluded that students with the absence of work experience are more likely to base their perceptions of managers on sex-role stereotypes, whereas employees are more likely to rely on actual information about their managers in forming perceptions.

Gender and Ethics

Many researchers have sought to find a link between sex and ethics. Results have reported a link in ethical beliefs, values, and behavior. General conclusions of the research report that men are more willing than women to behave unethically and women are more likely to deem questionable acts as unethical. Several studies report sex differences in ethical perceptions of business leaders (Mason & Mudrack, 1996; Arlow, 1991; Boyd 1981) while others have reported that there is no pattern that links gender and ethics (Davis & Welton, 1991; Dubinsky & Levy 1985; Singhapakadi & Vitell 1990; McCuddy & Peery, 1996). With conflicting evidence supporting both sides the verdict is still out on whether a link does indeed exist.

Gilligan (1982) states males and females have distinctly different moral orientations. Women conceptualize moral questions as problems of care while men conceptualize moral questions as problems of rights. Schminke, Ambrose, and Miles (2003) examined how gender and setting affect individuals' perceptions of others' ethics by interviewing 300 undergraduate students. The research showed that men and women share similar perceptions of own-gender and other-gender ethics, but the perceptions in reality were inaccurate reflections of their ethical orientation. Women held more accurate ethical perceptions than men. Both men and women were more accurate in their perceptions of women's ethical orientation.

Ameen, Guffet and McMillan (1996) found female accounting students more sensitive and less tolerant of unethical academic misconduct. The female accounting students in this study were found to be less tolerant of unethical behaviors and less likely to engage in unethical academic activities than their male counterparts.

Betz et al. (1989) found that the gap between the sexes was widest in questions pertaining to unethical behavior. Their study found that men were more than two times likely than women to engage in actions regarded as unethical. In their sample of 213 business students they found distinct differences in work-related values and tendency toward unethical behavior. Ibrahim and Angelidis (1991) found in their study, which surveyed female members of boards of directors, for females to be more oriented towards discretionary responsibilities and less economically driven than men.

White and Manolis (1997) utilized both qualitative and quantitative methods on 258 first-year law students. Findings were consistent with those of Gilligan (1982) reporting that a positive relationship between gender and the use of care and justice ethics. Findings reported that female students were most likely to utilize the ethic of care while male students were most likely to utilize the ethic of justice.

BSRI

While sex has been used in numerous previous studies to explore differences between men and women, the present study will look at sex role as determined by the Bem Sex Role Inventory (BSRI). The BSRI is an instrument that is used to identify sex typed individuals on the basis of their self-concepts or self-ratings of their personal attributes. (Bem, 1974). Bem developed a measure of masculinity and femininity based on American cultural definitions of appropriate and inappropriate behaviors of sexes.

According to each respondent's response each person receives three major scores: masculinity, femininity, and androgyny. Masculinity and femininity scores indicate the extent to which a person endorses masculine and feminine personality traits. Masculinity equals the mean self rating for all masculine items and femininity the mean self rating for all feminine items. The two scores are independent of one another.

A masculine sex role represents not only the endorsement of masculine attributes but simultaneously the rejection of feminine attributes (Bem 1974).

In constructing the scales Bem used judges to rate the desirability of personality traits either for a man or a woman in American society. Items were selected through a process of identifying personality characteristics that were positive in value in either femininity or masculinity. From an initial list of 400, 40 final items were selected by using the criteria of more desirability in American culture for one sex over the other Bem (1974). Twenty traits were selected for the masculinity scale and 20 were selected for the femininity scale. A trait was determined to be masculine if it was independently judged by males and females to be significantly more desirable for a man than a woman. Likewise, a trait was determined to be feminine if it was independently judged by males and females to be significantly more desirable for a woman than a man. Additionally 20 traits whose mean ratings did not differ significantly were classified as neutral. The 20 neutral items serve as an index of social desirability (Harris, 1994). The BSRI asks the respondent to indicate on a 7-point scale how well each of 60 attributes describes himself or herself.

BSRI Criticisms

American society since the 1970s has changed greatly and the current validity of the BSRI has been questioned given the changing roles of men and women in society. Women have entered the work force changing their attitudes and gender role orientations. As a result, men have also adjusted their gender role orientations. Many researchers have had concern with the BSRI and have attempted to replicate or validate the instrument.

Edwards and Ashworth (1977) attempted to replicate the item selection of the BSRI. The items were rated by college students for social desirability in an American male or female. Criterion for the original BSRI item selection was based on each item being rated by both male and female judges as significantly more desirable in a male than in a female for masculine items or significantly more desirable in a female than in a male for feminine items. Only the two items masculine and feminine were judged to meet this criterion. Edwards and Ashworth (1977) drew the conclusion that the “conception of the feminine and masculine sex roles and sex-role stereotypes has changed since the time Bem collected her ratings of social desirability (p.506). Holt and Ellis (1998) criticize these findings because face-to-face interviews were used to collect the data which may have had an influence on the results through social desirability effects.

Concerns regarding the validity of the adjectives used in the BSRI, given the changes in American culture since the 1970s prompted Holt and Ellis (1998) to conduct a partial replication of the method that Bem (1974) used to validate the masculine and feminine adjectives. The researchers looked to examine whether the adjectives were presently valid representations of gender role perceptions in terms of masculinity and femininity.

Holt and Ellis (1998) conducted a study using 138 individuals (68 men and 70 women). The participants were asked to measure on a seven-point Likert scale “How desirable is it in American society for a man or woman to possess each of these characteristics,” just as Bem had asked. The procedure, instructions, and materials used were all identical to what the Bem (1974) study used to validate the adjectives with

the exception that the 20 neutral items from the BSRI were not included because the study was only looking to assess changes in perceived gender roles in terms of the masculine and feminine adjectives.

Results revealed that all of the 20 masculine adjectives rated as significantly more desirable for a man than for a woman. All but two of the feminine adjectives were rated as significantly more desirable for a woman than a man. The feminine adjectives “loyal” and “childlike” were only marginally rated as more desirable for a woman. The researchers concluded “Gender role perceptions have changed over the years, but not enough to invalidate the BSRI at this time” (Holt & Ellis, 1998, p. 939). Additionally Harris (1994) found that all 19 masculine traits (the trait “masculine” was excluded) and 16 of 19 feminine traits (the trait “feminine” was excluded) met Bem’s (1974) criteria for inclusion.

Ballard-Reisch and Elton (1992) also conducted a study examining the reliability of the factor structure of the BSRI. Results indicated that the original factors are reliable but that the assumption that masculine and feminine items of the BSRI are both positive and perceived as relating to one gender orientation was not supported. This was due to the finding that although many of the BSRI items were considered positive, only the terms “masculine” and “feminine” were considered masculine or feminine. The researchers concluded that these results indicate that the BSRI is measuring personality characteristics that may no longer have anything to do with traditional sex role stereotypes of masculinity and femininity. The researchers suggest “self-directed” and “other-directed” as more descriptive categories.

Hypotheses and Rationale

H1a-d Sex role rather than sex is more predictive of CSR orientation. Past studies have looked at the relationship between sex and CSR orientation. Gender unlike sex is defined by society and expressed through interactions with others (Woods, 1997). Stoller (1964) describes gender identity as the core of personality. Gender identity theory suggests that gender consists of: biological sex, instrumental and expressive psychological traits and, gender role attitudes (McCabe et. al.2006). Therefore, by looking at sex-role instead of sex one can better make predictions concerning practitioner's CSR orientation.

H2a-b Practitioners identified as feminine will value ethical and discretionary CSR activities more than those identified as masculine. H3a-b Practitioners identified as masculine will value economic and legal CSR activities more than those identified as feminine. As a result of the discretion given to management in choosing specific initiatives that they prefer to enact, their own personal philosophy in decision-making regarding CSR becomes important. Kohlberg (1966) explains that sex-typed individuals are motivated to keep their behavior consistent with an internalized sex-role standard. This goal that is presumably accomplishes by suppressing any behavior that might be considered undesirable or inappropriate for his sex. Therefore a narrowly masculine self-concept might restrict behaviors that are stereotyped as feminine, and a narrowly feminine self-concept might restrict behaviors that are stereotyped as masculine. Bem (1974) describes masculinity as being associated with “a cognitive focus on getting the job done” and femininity as an “expressive orientation, an affective concern for the welfare of others.” Thus, the following hypotheses were developed:

H4, 5 a-d Androgyny will be more strongly correlated with all four CSR components than will femininity or masculinity. Androgynous individuals are more likely to display sex role adaptability and engage in situationally appropriate behavior without regard to stereotypes of sex-appropriate behavior. Kohlber (1966) explains that an androgynous self-concept allows an individual to freely engage in both "masculine" and "feminine" behaviors. Androgynous individuals function more adaptively in modern living and also have improved psychological health.

Research Questions

The following research questions will be examined because while gender and sex are the primary focus of this study, it is interesting to see the impact of additional factors on CSR orientation. Specifically by examining the impact of advanced degrees, for profit versus non-profit, and industry of employment this research will gain further insight into factors contributing to CSR orientation.

- 1) How will advanced degrees mediate the impact of sex role on CSR orientation?
- 2) How will for-profit versus not-for-profit sector mediate the role of sex role on CSR orientation?
- 3) How will industry of employment mediate the impact of sex role on CSR orientation?

CHAPTER 3 METHODOLOGY

For the present study an online survey with a self-administered questionnaire was conducted. The advantages of using an online survey are cost savings in avoiding printing and mailing costs and the short time frame for the collection of responses (Cobanoglu, Warae & Morec, 2001). Lefever, Dal, and Matthíasdóttir (2007) point out that online data collection protects against the loss of data and simplifies the transfer of data into a database for analysis. Another advantage of an online survey is that respondents can decide when and where to complete the survey and can participate at their own convenience.

Respondents were recruited through several methods. The first method used was an e-mail list server for public relations practitioners. Mertler (2002) discusses a benefit of using email for direct contact with members of the sample population as being able to publicize a web-based survey and encourage participation through email. This enables the researcher to determine the response rate and allows an increased confidence in the generalizability of the research results. The researcher e-mailed a link to the survey to members of the Florida Public Relations Association. Additionally, requests to send the survey over the chapter e-mail list server were sent to all 116 PRSA Chapters. Respondents were also recruited through Facebook™ (4 Group titled “Public Relations” and “The Official Facebook Public Relations Group”) and LinkedIn™ (#PRintern | #EntryPR, Black Public Relations Society of Atlanta, Florida Public Relations Association , Innovative Marketing, PR, Sales, Word-of-Mouth & Buzz Innovators, National Black Public Relations Society, Inc., Network of PR Professionals, PRSSA, Public Relations Society of America National, Public Relations Professionals, Corporate

Social Responsibility, Corporate Social Responsibility CSR and Sustainable Development) groups. In order to increase response rate the researcher offered an incentive to respondents. Every 50th respondent received a \$20 donation to a charity of his or her choice as an incentive to increase response rate.

The survey was launched February 14, 2011, via Facebook™ and LinkedIn™. Initial e-mails to the FPRA members were sent March 11 and follow-up e-mails were sent on April 11. E-mail requests were sent to PRSA chapters March 20. The survey was closed May 25.

Because the purpose of this study is to examine how gender influences CSR orientation the instrument used in this study included three parts. The first part of the instrument included the Aupperle (1984) survey.

This survey instrument was chosen because of its reliability in past studies (Ibrahim & Angelidis, 1993, 1995; Pinkston and Carroll, 1996) and because it is grounded in Carroll's (1979) well recognized four-part CSR definition. This instrument is utilized because it is capable of clearly assessing a respondent's CSR orientation. Also, the forced-choice format of the instrument helps to minimize response bias, an important element of concern with self-report data. Participants were asked to allocate up to 10 points among four statements in each of several sets of statements. Each of the four statements in a set represents a different dimension of Carroll's four-part CSR definition (Aupperle, 1989).

The second part of the instrument included the Bem Sex-Role Inventory scale. The BSRI is used to measure sex-role orientation. The BSRI identifies respondents as masculine, feminine or androgynous based on their inventory score. This inventory was

chosen for use because it includes a separate masculine and feminine scale, defined in terms of cultural desirability, for males and females (Bem, 1974). This inventory was chosen as opposed to other masculinity femininity scales such as the Personal Attributes Questionnaire (Schmitt, Leclerc & Rioux, 1988) and the California Psychological Inventory (Gough, 1957) because as Bem (1974) describes :

The BSRI was founded on a conception of the sex-typed person as someone who has internalized society's sex-typed standards of desirable behavior for men and women, these personality characteristics were selected as masculine or feminine on the basis of sex-typed social desirability and not on the basis of differential endorsement by males and females as most other inventories have done (155).

The final part of the instrument includes demographic questions, specifically, questions identifying education level, industry, and sector (for-profit, not-for profit, private) of employment.

CHAPTER 4 RESULTS

Descriptive Analysis

This research explored the effects of sex role on the CSR orientation of public relations practitioners (n = 122). Twenty five percent (n = 31) of respondents were male with 75% (n = 91) were female. This is representative of the gender imbalance in the field.

Among the respondents, 64% (n = 80) had four years of college or less and 33.6% (n=42) of respondents held an advanced degree. Given the subjects are primarily practitioners, this is lower than the (2006) study reporting 52.7% of practitioners holding advanced degrees. Nineteen percent (n = 23) work in the public sector, 46% (n = 59) work in the private sector, and 30% (n=36) work in the not-for-profit sector.

Of the respondents 22.1% (n=27) worked for corporations, 17.2% (n = 21) for a PR agency, 9.8% (n = 12) for government, 19.7% (n = 24) for a non-profit organization, 10.7% (n = 13) for an education-related organization, 9.8% (n = 12) for health-related and trade associations, and 10.7% (n = 13) worked as independent PR consultants. Table 4-1 shows the descriptive statistics for the subjects.

Table 4-1. Descriptive statistics

	Characteristics	Frequency	Percent
Sex	Male	31	25.0%
	Female	91	75.0%
Age	18-25	8	6.6%
	26-34	41	33.6%
	35-54	44	36.1%
	55-64	25	20.5%
	65 or over	4	3.3%
Education	4-year College Degree or Less	80	65.6%
	Advanced Degree	42	34.4%
Organization	Corporation	27	22.1%
	PR Agency	21	17.2%
	Government	12	9.8%
	Non-profit Organization	24	19.7%
	Education Related	13	10.7%
	Health Related/ Trade Association	12	9.8%
	Independent PR Consultant	13	10.7%
Sector	Public	24	20.2%
	Private	59	49.6%
	Not-for-profit	36	30.3%

Reliability of Scales

For all of the constructs, reliability testing was conducted in order to test the reliability of the scales. Indices were constructed using factor scores so that there were standardized variables with a mean of zero and a standard deviation of 1. A principal axis factor analysis with an oblique rotation was used interpreting the pattern matrix for Carroll's four CSR components: economic, legal, ethical, and discretionary. The results show a four-factor solution. The component correlation matrix also found that the factors were not highly correlated, thus showing that there are four distinct factors. The reliability of these items is shown in Table 4-2. All 15 economic items loaded on the economic component, 14 discretionary items loaded on the discretionary component, and 14 legal items loaded on the legal component. One ethical item loaded as

discretionary and both a legal and discretionary item loaded in the ethical component.

Two legal and one ethical item cross loaded but the primary loadings were all near or above .5; therefore no items were eliminated.

Table 4-2. Factor analysis CSR orientation statements

	Component			
	Economic	Discretionary	Legal	Ethical
Q5_1econ - allocate resources on their ability to improve long-term profitability.	-.827			
Q4_2econ -long-term return on investment is maximized.	-.824			
Q2_1econ -being as profitable as possible.	-.794			
Q8_1econ -pursue opportunities which will enhance earnings per share.	-.787			
Q7_1econ It is important that a successful firm be defined as one which:-is consistently profitable.	-.779			
Q9_3econ monitor new opportunities which can enhance the organization's-financial health.	-.777			
Q6_2econ - ensure a high level of operating efficiency is maintained.	-.764			
Q13_4econ -allocate organizational resources as efficiently as possible.	-.747			
Q12_3econ - maintain a high level of operating efficiency.	-.738			
Q15_3econ -profit margins remain strong relative to major competitors.	-.709			
Q11_2econ- consistent profitability as a useful measure of corporate performance.	-.706			
Q1_1econ- expectations of maximizing earnings per share.	-.693			
Q10_4econ -being as profitable as possible.	-.682			
Q14_1econ -pursue only those opportunities which provide the best rate of return.	-.660			
Q3_4econ-maintain a strong competitive position.	-.636			

Table 4-2. Continued

	Component			
	Economic	Discretionary	Legal	Ethical
Q4_3discr -managers and employees participate in voluntary and charitable activities within their local communities.		.832		
Q2_2discr-voluntary and charitable activities.		.814		
Q7_4discr-fulfills its philanthropic and charitable responsibilities.		.814		
Q12_4discr -maintain a policy of increasing charitable and voluntary efforts over time.		.732		
Q3_3discr -assist the fine and performing arts.		.707		
Q5_3discr-examine regularly new opportunities and programs which can improve urban and community life.		.697		
Q1_3ethic-the philanthropic and charitable expectations of society.		.690		
Q8_3discr-support, assist and work with minority-owned businesses.		.689		
Q6_1disc -provide assistance to private and public educational institutions.		.683		
Q15_1discr-philanthropic and voluntary efforts continue to be expanded consistently over time.		.679		
Q13_1discr-assist voluntarily those projects which enhance a community's 'quality of life.'		.627		
Q11_1discr--philanthropic behavior as a useful measure of corporate performance.		.537		
Q14_2discr -provide employment opportunities to the hard-core unemployed.	-.329	.509		
Q9_4discr monitor new opportunities which can enhance the organization's-ability to help solve social problems.		.453		
Q7_2legal -fulfills its legal obligations.			.817	

Table 4-2. Continued

	Component			Ethical
	Economic	Discretionary	Legal	
Q9_2legal- monitors new opportunities which can enhance the organization's-compliance with local, state, and federal statutes.			.770	
Q5_2legal -comply promptly with new laws and court rulings.			.769	
Q2_3legal -abiding by laws and regulations.			.743	
Q4_1legal-legal responsibilities are seriously fulfilled.			.705	
Q10_1legal- doing what the law expects.			.696	
Q1_2legal -expectations of government and the law.			.694	
Q13_2legal -provide goods and services which at least meet minimal legal requirements.			.684	
Q3_2legalcomply with various federal regulations.			.672	
Q14_3legal-comply fully and honestly with enacted laws, regulations, and court rulings.			.653	
Q11_3legal-compliance with the law as a useful measure of corporate performance.			.638	
Q12_2legal -fulfill all corporate tax obligations.	-.420		.606	
Q12_2legal -fulfill all corporate tax obligations.			.594	
Q8_2legal -avoid discriminating against women and minorities.			.426	
Q2_4ethic -moral and ethical behavior.				.770
Q1_4discr -expectations of societal mores and ethical norms.				.759
Q14_4ethic -recognize that society's unwritten laws and codes can often be as important as the written.				.753
Q7_3ethic -fulfills its ethical and moral responsibilities.				.711

Table 4-2. Continued

	Component			Ethical
	Economic	Discretionary	Legal	
Q12_1ethic-recognize that corporate integrity and ethical behavior go beyond mere compliance with laws and regulations.				.652
Q13_3ethic -avoid compromising societal norms and ethics in order to achieve goals.				.619
Q8_4ethic-prevent social norms from being compromised in order to achieve corporate goals.				.566
Q5_4ethic-recognize and respect new or evolving ethical/moral norms adopted by society.				.539
Q11_4ethic-compliance with the norms, mores, and unwritten laws of society as useful measures of corporate performance.				.536
Q3_1ethic-recognize that the ends do not always justify the means.				.525
Q10_3ethic -doing what is expected morally and ethically.				.519
Q9_1ethic- monitor new opportunities which can enhance the organization's-moral and ethical image in society.		.352		.478
Q4_4ethic-when securing new business, promises are not made which are not intended to be fulfilled.				.478
Q15_2legal-contract and safety violations are not ignored in order to complete or expedite a project.			.365	.432
Q6_4ethic -advertise goods and services in an ethically fair and responsible manner.				.405
Q15_4ethic -'whistle blowing' not be discouraged at any corporate level.				.391
Q10_2discr -providing voluntary assistance to charities and community organizations.				

For masculinity, femininity and the neutral constructs used in the BSRI a factor analysis was also conducted. (Table 4-3). The factor analysis showed that the 20 item masculine scale had high internal consistency with Cronbach's alpha= .868. The 20 item feminine scale also proved internally consistency with Cronbach's alpha = .728. The component correlation matrix additionally showed that there were three separate components. Average scores were created for sex role variables indicating the extent to which a person endorses masculine and feminine personality traits. The reliability of these items is shown in Table 4-3.

Table 4-3. Factor analysis masculinity, femininity and neutral constructs

	Feminine	Component Masculine	Neutral
Q34_11fem -sensitive to the needs of others	.743		
Q35_11fem -warm	.740		
Q35_2fem -compassionate	.739		
Q34_14fem -understanding	.720		
Q20_5fem -cheerful	.671		-.436
Q35_3neu -sincere	.662		
Q35_15neu -friendly	.646		
Q20_15neu -happy	.639		-.338
Q36_14fem -gentle	.634		
Q20_3neu -helpful	.585		
Q35_14fem -tender	.584		
Q36_12neu -tactful	.572		
Q35_9neu -likable	.542		
Q34_8fem -sympathetic	.494		
Q36_11fem -loves children	.477		
Q20_11fem -affectionate	.477		
Q35_6neu -conceited	-.474	.316	
Q20_6neu -moody	-.430		
Q36_3neu -inefficient	-.422		
Q20_9neu -conscientious	.412		
Q34_6neu -reliable	.403		

Table 4-3. Continued

	Feminine	Component Masculine	Neutral
Q35_5fem -eager to soothe hurt feelings	.391		
Q34_12neu -truthful	.367		
Q34_2fem -loyal	.366		
Q34_9neu -jealous	-.350		
Q36_6neu -adaptable	.335		
Q36_8fem -does not use harsh language			
Q20_13masc -assertive		.766	
Q35_7masc -dominant		.719	
Q36_4masc -act as a leader	.308	.715	
Q36_1masc -aggressive		.703	
Q34_1masc -strong personality		.686	
Q35_13masc -willing to take a stand		.684	
Q34_4masc -forceful		.673	
Q34_13masc -willing to take risks		.653	
Q36_10masc -competitive		.619	
Q34_10masc -has leadership abilities	.474	.597	
Q35_4masc -self-sufficient		.506	.333
Q35_1masc -makes decisions easily		.498	
Q36_13masc -ambitious		.481	
Q20_4masc -defends own beliefs		.460	
Q35_10masc -masculine		.407	.315
Q20_10masc -athletic		.378	
Q20_1masc -self-reliant		.376	.362
Q20_7masc -independent		.365	.329
Q34_3neu -unpredictable		.354	
Q36_15neu -conventional			
Q36_7masc -individualistic			
Q34_15neu -secretive			
Q20_14fem -flatterable			
Q35_12neu -solemn			.670
Q35_8fem -soft-spoken		-.305	.558
Q34_7masc -analytical			.543

Table 4-3. Continued

	Feminine	Component Masculine	Neutral
Q20_8fem -shy		-.474	.521
Q36_2fem -gullible			-.328
Q20_2fem -yielding			.325
Q36_5fem -childlike			-.323
Q34_5fem -feminine			
Q20_12neu -theatrical			
Q36_9neu -unsystematic			

ANOVA (Table 4-4) shows that within the masculine sex role group, males and females show a statistically significant difference ($F(1,120) = 10.84, p \leq .001$). Females score lower on the masculine sex role index than do males ($M = 5.0$ $SD = .65$ vs. $M = 5.4$ $SD = .68$). However, for the feminine sex role scores males ($M = 4.6$ $SD = .46$) and females ($M = 4.8$ $SD = .53$) are not significantly different at the .05 level. ($F(1, 120) = .067, p \leq .144$). As anticipated, sex role is not related to sex for the neutral scores ($p \leq .796$).

Androgyny difference scores were calculated by utilizing the androgyny score (Femininity-Masculinity), the index of androgyny, and multiplying the score by 2.322. This formula was derived by Bem (1974). Sex does not have a significant relationship to the androgyny scores ($F(1,120) = .811, p \leq .370$). See (Table 4-5).

Table 4-4. ANOVA sex role by sex

		df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Masculine	Between Groups	1	4.719	10.839	.001
	Within Groups	120	.435		
	Total	121			
Feminine	Between Groups	1	.562	2.166	.144
	Within Groups	120	.259		
	Total	121			
Neutral	Between Groups	1	.018	.067	.796
	Within Groups	120	.276		
	Total	121			

Table 4-5. ANOVA sex role by androgyny

	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	1	1.601	.811	.370
Within Groups	120	1.973		
Total	121			

Hypothesis Testing

H1 expected that sex role would be more predictive than sex for all four CSR components. ANOVA for CSR Orientation by sex (Table 4-6) shows no significant difference between males and females with respect to the economic, discretionary, and legal CSR components. A statistically significant difference was found only with females scoring higher than males on the ethical CSR component ($F(1,120) = 4.01, p = .048$).

H1 a-c is supported with there being no statistical significance for economic, discretionary, and legal components.

Table 4-6. ANOVA- CSR orientation by sex

		df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Economic_CSR	Between Groups	1	2.795	2.776	.098
	Within Groups	120	1.007		
	Total	121			
Discretionary_CSR	Between Groups	1	.707	.692	.407
	Within Groups	120	1.022		
	Total	121			
Legal_CSR	Between Groups	1	.272	.264	.608
	Within Groups	120	1.028		
	Total	121			
Ethical_CSR	Between Groups	1	3.984	4.008	.048
	Within Groups	120	.994		
	Total	121			

Table 4-7 shows correlations between the CSR components and sex roles. The discretionary CSR component is slightly negatively correlated with masculine and the association is significant ($r = -0.18$) ($p \leq .05$), and the ethical component is slightly negatively correlated with masculine ($r = -0.18$) ($p \leq .05$). Also, the discretionary CSR component is slightly positively correlated with feminine ($r = .25$) ($p \leq .01$). The difference of correlation test (Table 4- 8) shows that there is a significantly stronger correlation between feminine and ethical and discretionary CSR components than masculine and ethical and discretionary components. Thus H2a-b is supported.

Other statistically significant findings show that the legal component is slightly negatively correlated with feminine ($r = -.20$) ($p \leq .05$). H3b is supported but H3a cannot be supported with the data.

Table 4-7. Correlations CSR components and sex role

		Masculine	Feminine	Androgyny	Economic_ CSR	Discretionar_ CSR	Legal_ CSR	Ethical_ CSR
Masculine	Pearson	1						
	Correlation							
	Sig. (1-tailed)							
Feminine	Pearson	-.130	1					
	Correlation							
	Sig. (1-tailed)	.075						
Androgyny	Pearson	.267**	-.198*	1				
	Correlation							
	Sig. (1-tailed)	.001	.014					
Economic_CSR	Pearson	-.023	.021	-.249**	1			
	Correlation							
	Sig. (1-tailed)	.399	.411	.003				
Discretionary_ CSR	Pearson	-.183*	.253**	.021	.092	1		
	Correlation							
	Sig. (1-tailed)	.021	.002	.410	.154			
Legal_CSR	Pearson	-.104	-.198*	.162*	.102	-.006	1	
	Correlation							
	Sig. (1-tailed)	.125	.014	.037	.130	.472		
Ethical_CSR	Pearson	-.184*	.136	-.026	.207*	.274**	.162*	1
	Correlation							
	Sig. (1-tailed)	.021	.067	.387	.010	.001	.035	

N=123

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (1-tailed).

* . Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (1-tailed).

Table 4-8. Significance of difference of correlation tests

	Ethical		Discretionary		Economic		Legal	
	Fem	Mas	Fem	Mas	Fem	Mas	Fem	Mas
Androgyny	.009	NS	.03	NS	.002	.04	.002	.02
Feminine (p <)	--	.006	--	.0006	--	NS	--	NS

H4a-d expected that androgyny would be more strongly correlated with all four CSR components than both feminine or masculine. Correlations between sex roles and CSR components (Table 4-7) show androgyny to only be negatively correlated with the economic CSR component ($r = -.25$) ($p = .01$). Difference of correlations test (Table 4-8) does not show significant correlations for androgyny.

Answering H5a-d, feminine was positively correlated with the discretionary CSR component ($r = .25$) ($p < .01$) and negatively correlated with the legal CSR component ($r = -.198$) ($p < .05$). Masculine was negatively correlated with the discretionary CSR component ($r = -.183$) ($p \leq .05$) and also negatively correlated with the ethical CSR component ($r = -.184$) ($p \leq .05$). H5a-d also affirms H1. Difference of correlations tests (Table 4-8) show femininity is more strongly correlated to all four CSR components than androgyny and androgyny correlations with masculinity only are significant for the legal CSR component. H4a-d and H5a-d are rejected.

To answer RQ1 Table 4-9 shows correlations between the CSR components and education for practitioners with four years of college or less. Correlations show that for practitioners with four years of college or less androgyny and economic are moderately negatively correlated ($r = -0.246$) ($p \leq .05$), feminine and discretionary are slightly positively correlated ($r = .218$) ($p \leq .05$), androgyny and legal are moderately positively

correlated ($r = .263$) ($p \leq .01$), and masculine is moderately negatively correlated with ethical ($r = -0.244$) ($p \leq .05$).

Table 4-9. Correlations 4 years of college or less

		Masculine	Feminine	Androgyny	Economic_ CSR	Discretionary_ CSR	Legal_ CSR	Ethical_ CSR
Masculine	Pearson	1						
	Correlation							
	Sig. (1-tailed)							
Feminine	Pearson	-.088	1					
	Correlation							
	Sig. (1-tailed)	.219						
Androgyny	Pearson	.088	-.059	1				
	Correlation							
	Sig. (1-tailed)	.220	.302					
Economic_CSR	Pearson	.049	-.062	-.246*	1			
	Correlation							
	Sig. (1-tailed)	.332	.293	.014				
Discretionary_ CSR	Pearson	-.181	.218*	.134	.069	1		
	Correlation							
	Sig. (1-tailed)	.054	.026	.118	.272			
Legal_CSR	Pearson	-.151	-.141	.263**	-.009	.302**	1	
	Correlation							
	Sig. (1-tailed)	.091	.107	.009	.468	.003		
Ethical_CSR	Pearson	-.244*	.082	-.049	.080	.370**	.334**	1
	Correlation							
	Sig. (1-tailed)	.015	.236	.332	.241	.000	.001	

N=80

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (1-tailed).

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (1-tailed).

Additionally for RQ1, practitioners with advanced degrees (Table 4-10) androgyny is moderately negatively correlated with economic ($r = -0.259$) ($p \leq .05$), feminine is moderately positively correlated with the discretionary CSR component ($r = 0.262$) ($p \leq .05$), negatively correlated with the legal component ($r = -0.271$) ($p \leq .05$), and moderately positively correlated with the ethical component ($r = .263$) ($p \leq .05$). None of the correlations with masculine were statistically significant. Difference of correlation tests showed that none of the differences in orientation for practitioners with four years of college or less and those with advanced degrees is significant.

Table 4-10. Correlations- practitioners with advanced degrees

		Masculine	Feminine	Androgyny	Economic_ CSR	Discretionary_ CSR	Legal_ CSR	Ethical_ CSR
Masculine	Pearson	1						
	Correlation Sig. (1-tailed)							
Feminine	Pearson	-.197	1					
	Correlation Sig. (1-tailed)	.105						
Androgyny	Pearson	.671**	-.482**	1				
	Correlation Sig. (1-tailed)	.000	.001					
Economic_CSR	Pearson	-.190	.199	-.259*	1			
	Correlation Sig. (1-tailed)	.114	.103	.049				
Discretionary_CSR	Pearson	-.092	.262*	-.226	.158	1		
	Correlation Sig. (1-tailed)	.281	.047	.075	.158			
Legal_CSR	Pearson	-.064	-.271*	.015	.270*	-.489**	1	
	Correlation Sig. (1-tailed)	.343	.041	.463	.042	.001		
Ethical_CSR	Pearson	-.053	.263*	.021	.482**	.092	-.083	1
	Correlation Sig. (1-tailed)	.368	.046	.447	.001	.280	.300	

N=42

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (1-tailed).

* . Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (1-tailed).

Answering RQ2, correlations between the CSR components and sector show no significant correlations for practitioners in the public sector ($n = 24$). For the private sector ($n = 59$) (Table 4-11) correlations show masculine to have a moderate negative correlation with the discretionary ($r = -0.276$) ($p \leq .05$) and ethical ($r = -0.311$) ($p \leq .05$) CSR components. Androgyny is positively correlated to the legal component ($r = .421$) ($p \leq .01$). For practitioners in the not-for-profit sector ($n = 36$) (Table 4-12), only one statistically significant relationship was found with feminine being positively correlated with discretionary CSR component ($r = -.365$) ($p \leq .05$). Difference of correlation tests showed no significant difference of correlations for orientation for practitioners working in the not-for-profit sector and those working in the private sector.

Table 4-11. Correlations- sector- private

		Masculine	Feminine	Androgyny	Economic_ CSR	Discretionary_ CSR	Legal_ CSR	Ethical_ CSR
Masculine	Pearson	1						
	Correlation Sig. (2-tailed)							
Feminine	Pearson	-.037	1					
	Correlation Sig. (2-tailed)	.778						
Androgyny	Pearson	.342**	-.272*	1				
	Correlation Sig. (2-tailed)	.008	.037					
Economic_CSR	Pearson	.073	.015	-.203	1			
	Correlation Sig. (2-tailed)	.583	.908	.123				
Discriminatory_ CSR	Pearson	-.276*	.218	.075	.004	1		
	Correlation Sig. (2-tailed)	.035	.097	.570	.975			
Legal_CSR	Pearson	-.072	-.166	.421**	.023	.296*	1	
	Correlation Sig. (2-tailed)	.589	.208	.001	.865	.023		
Ethical_CSR	Pearson	-.311*	.168	.075	.109	.480**	.423**	1
	Correlation Sig. (2-tailed)	.016	.203	.574	.413	.000	.001	

N=59

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Table 4-12. Correlations- sector- not-for-profit

		Masculine	Feminine	Androgyny	Economic_ CSR	Discretionary_ CSR	Legal_ CSR	Ethical_ CSR
Masculine	Pearson	1						
	Correlation							
	Sig. (2-tailed)							
Feminine	Pearson	-.166	1					
	Correlation							
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.333						
Androgyny	Pearson	-.044	-.030	1				
	Correlation							
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.799	.862					
Economic_CSR	Pearson	-.224	.255	-.089	1			
	Correlation							
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.188	.134	.605				
Discretionary_ CSR	Pearson	-.072	.365*	-.006	.479**	1		
	Correlation							
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.675	.028	.971	.003			
Legal_CSR	Pearson	-.158	-.104	.110	.072	-.344*	1	
	Correlation							
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.358	.546	.521	.678	.040		
Ethical_CSR	Pearson	.023	.012	-.230	.548**	-.218	-.160	1
	Correlation							
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.894	.944	.178	.001	.202	.350	

N=36

*.Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Answering RQ3, correlations were used to learn how industry of employment mediates the impact of sex-role on CSR orientation. The correlation showed no statistically significant values for corporations (n = 27).

With PR Agencies (n = 21) (Table 4-13) feminine was found to be negatively correlated with legal (r = -.0441) ($p \leq .05$). Androgyny is strongly positively correlated with the legal CSR component (r = 0.696) ($p \leq .01$). All other CSR components were not found to be statistically significant

Table 4-13. Correlations- industry- PR agency

		Masculine	Feminine	Androgyny	Economic_ CSR	Discretionary_ CSR	Legal_ CSR	Ethical_ CSR
Masculine	Pearson	1						
	Correlation							
	Sig. (2-tailed)							
Feminine	Pearson	.352	1					
	Correlation							
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.117						
Androgyny	Pearson	.663**	-.444*	1				
	Correlation							
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.001	.044					
Economic_CSR	Pearson	.021	-.237	.250	1			
	Correlation							
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.928	.301	.275				
Discretionary_ CSR	Pearson	.140	.322	-.085	.650**	1		
	Correlation							
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.546	.155	.714	.001		.875	.464
Legal_CSR	Pearson	.326	-.441*	.696**	.434*	-.037	1	-.134
	Correlation							
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.149	.045	.000	.049	.875		.563
Ethical_CSR	Pearson	-.317	-.302	-.060	.335	-.169	-.134	1
	Correlation							
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.162	.184	.795	.138	.464	.563	

N=21

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

For practitioners working for the government (Table 4-14) correlations found androgyny to be negatively correlated with discretionary ($r = -.578$) ($p \leq .05$). Since the sample size for government was small ($n = 12$) nonparametric Spearman's Rho was used which gives a ($r = -0.639$) for the same relationship and in addition found a strong negative correlation between masculine and legal CSR component ($r = -.704$) both with ($p \leq .05$).

Table 4-14. Correlations- industry- government

		Masculine	Feminine	Androgyny	Economic_ CSR	Discretionary_ CSR	Legal_ CSR	Ethical_ CSR
Masculine	Pearson	1						
	Correlation							
	Sig. (2-tailed)							
Feminine	Pearson	-.217	1					
	Correlation							
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.498						
Androgyny	Pearson	.534	-.390	1				
	Correlation							
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.074	.211					
Economic_CSR	Pearson	-.311	.122	-.471	1			
	Correlation							
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.324	.705	.122				
Discretionary_ CSR	Pearson	-.404	.489	-.578*	-.200	1		
	Correlation							
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.193	.107	.049	.533			
Legal_CSR	Pearson	-.488	-.279	-.048	-.204	-.037	1	
	Correlation							
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.107	.380	.882	.525	.908		
Ethical_CSR	Pearson	.065	.101	-.130	-.085	-.224	.270	1
	Correlation							
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.842	.754	.687	.793	.485	.395	

N=12

*.Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

For non-profits organizations (n = 24) (Table 4-15) feminine and the discretionary CSR component were positively correlated ($r = .473$) ($p \leq .05$). Both Pearson and Spearman's rho correlation showed no statistically significant values for practitioners working in education (n = 13).

Table 4-15. Correlations-industry - non-profit

		Masculine	Feminine	Androgyny	Economic_ CSR	Discretionary_ CSR	Legal_ CSR	Ethical_ CSR
Masculine	Pearson	1	-.237	-.086	-.379	-.118	-.129	-.069
	Correlation							
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.266	.689	.067	.582	.549	.749
Feminine	Pearson	-.237	1	-.054	.365	.473*	-.104	-.111
	Correlation							
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.266		.802	.080	.020	.628	.604
Androgyny	Pearson	-.086	-.054	1	-.013	-.039	.140	-.107
	Correlation							
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.689	.802		.952	.856	.514	.618
Economic_CSR	Pearson	-.379	.365	-.013	1	.444*	.176	.490*
	Correlation							
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.067	.080	.952		.030	.410	.015
Discretionary_ CSR	Pearson	-.118	.473*	-.039	.444*	1	-.452*	-.347
	Correlation							
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.582	.020	.856	.030		.027	.097
Legal_CSR	Pearson	-.129	-.104	.140	.176	-.452*	1	.161
	Correlation							
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.549	.628	.514	.410	.027		.453
Ethical_CSR	Pearson	-.069	-.111	-.107	.490*	-.347	.161	1
	Correlation							
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.749	.604	.618	.015	.097	.453	

N=24

*.Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

For health related and trade associations ($n = 12$) (Table 4-16). Pearson's correlation found a strong negative correlation with feminine practitioners and the legal CSR component ($r = -.747$) ($p \leq .01$). Androgyny had a strong positive correlation with the legal component ($r = .731$) ($p \leq .01$). For masculine practitioners there was strong negative correlation with ethical ($r = -0.735$) ($p \leq .01$). Non- parametric tests agree but in addition Spearman's Rho found feminine practitioners to have a strong correlation with economic ($r = .676$) ($p \leq .05$) and also feminine practitioners to be positively correlated with the ethical CSR component 0.599 ($p \leq .05$).

Table 4-16. Correlations- industry- health related/trade associations

		Masculine	Feminine	Androgyny	Economic _CSR	Discretionary_ CSR	Legal_ CSR	Ethical_ CSR
Masculine	Pearson	1						
	Correlation							
	Sig. (2-tailed)							
Feminine	Pearson	-.721**	1					
	Correlation							
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.008						
Abs_androgyny	Pearson	.648*	-.789**	1				
	Correlation							
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.023	.002					
Economic_CSR	Pearson	-.528	.438	-.484	1			
	Correlation							
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.078	.155	.111				
Discretionary_C SR	Pearson	-.466	.533	-.508	.692*	1		
	Correlation							
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.127	.074	.092	.013			
Legal_CSR	Pearson	.411	-.747**	.731**	-.154	-.294	1	
	Correlation							
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.185	.005	.007	.632	.354		
Ethical_CSR	Pearson	-.735**	.535	-.503	.417	.388	-.015	1
	Correlation							
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.006	.073	.096	.177	.212	.963	

N=12

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

For the Independent PR Consultant (n = 12) (Table 4-17) correlations show that androgyny was strongly negatively correlated with the economic CSR component ($r = -.710$) ($p \leq .01$). Additionally Spearman's Rho found a strong negative correlation of androgyny with ethical ($r = -0.657$) ($p \leq .05$).

Table 4-17. Correlations- industry- independent PR consultants

		Masculine	Feminine	Androgyny	Economic_ CSR	Discretionary_ _CSR	Legal_ CSR	Ethical_ CSR
Masculine	Pearson	1	-.040	.111	.266	.057	.043	.189
	Correlation							
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.898	.718	.381	.853	.889	.536
Feminine	Pearson	-.040	1	.471	-.322	.045	-.500	.052
	Correlation							
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.898		.104	.283	.883	.082	.865
Androgyny	Pearson	.111	.471	1	-.710**	-.048	-.268	-.537
	Correlation							
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.718	.104		.007	.875	.377	.058
Economic_CS R	Pearson	.266	-.322	-.710**	1	.387	.212	.712**
	Correlation							
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.381	.283	.007		.192	.486	.006
Discretionary_ CSR	Pearson	.057	.045	-.048	.387	1	.015	.000
	Correlation							
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.853	.883	.875	.192		.962	.999
Legal_CSR	Pearson	.043	-.500	-.268	.212	.015	1	-.418
	Correlation							
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.889	.082	.377	.486	.962		.155
Ethical_CSR	Pearson	.189	.052	-.537	.712**	.000	-.418	1
	Correlation							
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.536	.865	.058	.006	.999	.155	

N=13

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Summary of Findings

Findings show strong endorsement for males of masculinity. Practitioners who scored high on the Bem Femininity index were found to more highly favor ethical and discretionary CSR components and those who scored high on the masculinity index were found to more highly favor the legal CSR component. Those who scored high on femininity favored all four CSR components more than those who scored high on androgyny. There were no statistically significant differences for sex role when comparing practitioners with advanced degrees to those with four years of college or less. On the other hand, femininity showed strong relationships with discretionary across educational levels; those who are feminine sex-typed practitioners consistently endorse the discretionary CSR component. This also held true for those sex typed as feminine practitioners in the not-for-profit sector and also those who listed not-for-profit as their specific industry of employment. Those who sex typed as more masculine practitioners in the private sector showed more negative orientations toward discretionary and ethical CSR components.

CHAPTER 5 DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

This study intended to explore how sex role as determined by the BSRI can be used in regards to predicting CSR orientation. Although some of the findings replicated previous findings, this study adds to the research by offering an additional factor of consideration by combining the use of the BSRI and CSR orientations measures.

Means within the masculine sex typed group show men have a stronger orientation towards masculinity. The feminine and androgyny group however did not show significant differences. Higher masculine scores among men represent higher levels of male endorsement of masculine attributes. Although the literature suggests androgynous individuals to be more adaptable, the results do not show androgyny to be endorsed more by either sex. Feminine sex-typed practitioners were in fact found to more strongly endorse all four CSR components supporting Grunig et. al (2000) assertion that those possessing feminine values should be the most socially responsible practitioners.

For sex, females were found to be more strongly oriented to the ethical component than males. This corroborated previous research (Ameen, Guffet & McMillan, 1996; Betz et al., 1989; Ambrose & Miles, 2003) findings that report more of a value of ethics for women. The present study however did not find other sex connections commonly reported. Previous studies report females also being more oriented toward the discretionary components and males being more strongly oriented towards legal and economic components. However the present study did not show those orientations. This may reflect changes in practitioner's roles and role expectations. Social role theory explains that the beliefs that people hold about the

sexes are changing as men and women do not adhere to traditional role expectations and social disapproval is no longer a major consequence as a result to this lack of adherence (Harrison & Lynch, 2005).

Conversely, looking at sex role versus sex the current study found a strong association with femininity and discretionary CSR as well as ethical CSR components which supports Gilligan (1982). She described this positive relationship between females and the use of care, but the sex role of femininity may be a better indicator of this relationship. Masculine sex typed practitioners more strongly endorsed the economic component compared to feminine sex typed practitioners.

Furthermore, with the literature (Grunig, et al., 2000) suggesting feminine values best suited for public relations and stating that the most socially responsible practitioners possess feminine values, the BSRI serves as a measurement tool for identifying practitioners who possess those values.

With H4a-d the researcher expected to find strong correlations with all four CSR components but only one was found. The literature explains that androgynous individuals show more adaptability and engage independent of sex-appropriate behavior explaining why correlations did not exist. This flexibility cannot be predicted; thus, correlations were not present.

Implications

Corporate social responsibility orientation is important because it can indicate the areas considered most important to managers in their decision making. With the important role that practitioners play in cultivating and facilitating CSR initiatives as discussed earlier, this study provides valuable insight to both practitioners and theory building. In understanding the value that practitioners possess in areas of interests,

practitioners can be more confident in their decision making and better identify the values that drive decision making.

This study adds a means of looking beyond sex to make assessments about CSR orientation. In today's changing society, sex is simply a biological feature as women are increasingly aggressive and independent and men increasingly possess attributes that were once traditionally feminine (Powell and Butterfield 1979). Simply making assumptions based on gender is not the best predictor of CSR orientation. Assuming that a male will be more likely to look out for the company's bottom line or that a female will value the discretionary components is a flawed approach at making predictions regarding orientation.

Any research in gender brings questions about the legitimacy of the terms masculinity and femininity. Whether we can comfortably use these terms given the changes in society and gender roles has been under great debate. The most important issue is not the labels that we place on the terms but the underpinning values that the terms represent.

What is worth looking at along with the feminine and masculine constructs are the underlining values that compose the constructs. Values that Grunig, et. al (2000) listed as feminine included: altruism, loyalty, tolerance, reciprocity, and nurturance. These values prove valuable in public relations practice and in enacting CSR initiatives. These values allow for the symmetrical communication, which is considered the best model in benefitting public interest. It will prove vital to educate masculine sex-typed individuals on the importance of all CSR components for a company looking to be more CSR

focused. How to educate these practitioners on the importance of the values has not been explored in the present study.

Companies must recognize the values that are important to the organization and these values must be communicated and modeled by management and through corporate action. Companies claiming to value the ethical component must not only proclaim it as a value but also show this through every facet of the company's dealings. This is important if there is a sincere desire for there to be a fundamental change in corporate values.

Limitations and Future Research

One major limitation of the present study was the modest sample size, which limits the external validity of the study. A larger study would provide a better ground for statistical analysis and would allow for generalization of the results. With access to a public relations directory a greater number of respondents could have been reached. An additional limitation with the use of the online survey method, the survey was open to anyone who identified themselves as working in public relations or CSR and the researcher could not verify who was in fact taking the survey. Additionally, individuals who consider themselves as corporate social responsibility practitioners are not well represented in this study.

Future research should investigate CSR orientation and BSRI within this population. It would be interesting to see how practitioners who operate solely in this function would score on both of the measurement scales. While gender specifically in public relations has been explored thoroughly sex role has been less explored. Future research should also look to theory building in regards to the why feminine, masculine and androgynous individuals respond the way that they do, specifically focusing on the

values that underlie the construct that the sex roles represent. Future research also should be done to develop a new sex –role scale given the criticism given to the Bem Sex Role Inventory, which is the most valid scale to date. Additionally as discussed in implications a future study should look to explore whether individuals can be educated or trained to endorse all four CSR components.

APPENDIX FORMS AND SURVEYS

Informed Consent Form

Protocol Title: The Influence of Personal Attributes on Public Relations Beliefs

Please read this consent document carefully before you decide to participate in this study.

Purpose of the research study:

The purpose of this study is to examine the influence of personal attributes on public relations beliefs.

What you will be asked to do in the study:

You will complete a survey, which will take 10-15 minutes to complete. You will be asked to allocate up to, but not more than, 10 points to each of the 15 sets of four statements and rate yourself along a 7 point scale, according to how much each of 60 adjectives describes yourself.

Time required:

10-15 minutes

Risks and Benefits:

There are no known risks if you decide to participate in this research study. There are no direct benefits for participants.

Compensation:

There is no direct compensation to you for participating in the study.

Confidentiality:

Your identity will be kept confidential to the extent provided by the law. You will be asked to include your e-mail address when you complete the online survey so that we can notify the recipients regarding the charitable donation. You will be assigned a participant number, and only the participant number will appear with your survey responses which will be therefore anonymous.

Voluntary participation:

Your participation in this study is completely voluntary. There is no penalty for not participating.

Right to withdraw from the study:

You have the right to withdraw from the study at any time without consequence.

Whom to contact if you have questions about the study:

Principal Investigator

Tamekia Massaline, Graduate Student, Department of Journalism and Communications

Faculty Supervisor

Mary Ann Ferguson, PhD, College of Journalism and Communications

Whom to contact about your rights as a research participant in the study:

IRB02 Office

Yes

No

Statements that follow are about how you think about corporate social responsibility and the role of corporations in society. Based on their relative importance please allocate up to, but not more than 10 points to each set of four statements. For example, you could allocate points as follows

	A = 4		A = 1		A = 0	
	B = 3		B = 2		B = 4	
Either	C = 2	or	C = 0	or	C = 3	etc.
	D = 1		D = 7		D = 0	
	Total = 10 points		Total = 10 points		Total = 7 points	

Q1 It is important for corporations to perform in a manner consistent with:

- _____ expectations of maximizing earnings per share.
- _____ expectations of government and the law.
- _____ the philanthropic and charitable expectations of society.
- _____ expectations of societal mores and ethical norms.

Q2 It is important for corporations to be committed to:

- _____ being as profitable as possible.
- _____ voluntary and charitable activities.
- _____ abiding by laws and regulations.
- _____ moral and ethical behavior.

Q3 It is important for corporations to:

- _____ recognize that the ends do not always justify the means.
- _____ comply with various federal regulations.
- _____ assist the fine and performing arts.
- _____ maintain a strong competitive position.

Q4 It is important for corporations that:

- _____ legal responsibilities are seriously fulfilled.
- _____ long-term return on investment is maximized.
- _____ managers and employees participate in voluntary and charitable activities within their local communities.
- _____ when securing new business, promises are not made which are not intended to be fulfilled.

Q5 It is important to:

_____ allocate resources on their ability to improve long-term profitability.

_____ comply promptly with new laws and court rulings.

_____ examine regularly new opportunities and programs which can improve urban and community life.

_____ recognize and respect new or evolving ethical/moral norms adopted by society.

Q6 It is important to:

_____ provide assistance to private and public educational institutions.

_____ ensure a high level of operating efficiency is maintained.

_____ be a law-abiding corporate citizen.

_____ advertise goods and services in an ethically fair and responsible manner.

Q7 It is important that a successful firm be defined as one which:

_____ is consistently profitable.

_____ fulfills its legal obligations.

_____ fulfills its ethical and moral responsibilities.

_____ fulfills its philanthropic and charitable responsibilities.

Based on their relative importance please allocate up to, but not more than, 10 points to each set of three or four statements. For example, you could allocate points as follows:

	A = 4		A = 1		A = 0	
	B = 3		B = 2		B = 4	
Either	C = 2	or	C = 0	or	C = 3	etc.
	D = 1		D = 7		D = 0	
	Total = 10 points		Total = 10 points		Total = 7 points	

Q8 It is important for corporations to:

- pursue opportunities which will enhance earnings per share.
- avoid discriminating against women and minorities.
- support, assist and work with minority-owned businesses.
- prevent social norms from being compromised in order to achieve corporate goals.

Q9 It is important to monitor new opportunities which can enhance the organization's

- moral and ethical image in society.
- compliance with local, state, and federal statutes.
- financial health.
- ability to help solve social problems.

Q10 It is important that good corporate citizenship be defined as:

- doing what the law expects.
- providing voluntary assistance to charities and community organizations.
- doing what is expected morally and ethically.
- being as profitable as possible.

Q11 It is important to view:

- philanthropic behavior as a useful measure of corporate performance.
- consistent profitability as a useful measure of corporate performance.
- compliance with the law as a useful measure of corporate performance.
- compliance with the norms, mores, and unwritten laws of society as useful measures of corporate performance.

Q12 It is important to:

_____ recognize that corporate integrity and ethical behavior go beyond mere compliance with laws and regulations.

_____ fulfill all corporate tax obligations.

_____ maintain a high level of operating efficiency.

_____ maintain a policy of increasing charitable and voluntary efforts over time.

Q13 It is important to:

_____ assist voluntarily those projects which enhance a community's 'quality of life.'

_____ provide goods and services which at least meet minimal legal requirements.

_____ avoid compromising societal norms and ethics in order to achieve goals.

_____ allocate organizational resources as efficiently as possible.

Q14 It is important to:

_____ pursue only those opportunities which provide the best rate of return.

_____ provide employment opportunities to the hard-core unemployed.

_____ comply fully and honestly with enacted laws, regulations, and court rulings.

_____ recognize that society's unwritten laws and codes can often be as important as the written.

Q15 It is important that:

_____ philanthropic and voluntary efforts continue to be expanded consistently over time.

_____ contract and safety violations are not ignored in order to complete or expedite a project.

_____ profit margins remain strong relative to major competitors.

_____ 'whistle blowing' not be discouraged at any corporate level.

Q16 Indicate how well each of the characteristics below describes yourself.

	Never or almost never true	Usually not true	Sometimes but infrequently true	Occasionally true	Often true	Usually true	Always or almost always true
self-reliant	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
yielding	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
helpful	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
defends own beliefs	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
cheerful	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
moody	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
independent	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
shy	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
conscientious	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
athletic	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
affectionate	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
theatrical	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
assertive	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
flatterable	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
happy	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q17 Indicate how well each of the characteristics below describes yourself.

	Never or almost never true	Usually not true	Sometimes but infrequently	Occasionally true	Often true	Usually true	Always or almost always true
strong personality	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
loyal	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
unpredictable	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
forceful	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
feminine	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
reliable	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
analytical	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
sympathetic	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
jealous	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
has leadership abilities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
sensitive to the needs of others	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
truthful	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
willing to take risks	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
understanding	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
secretive	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q18 Indicate how well each of the characteristics below describes yourself.

	Never or almost never true	Usually not true	Sometimes but infrequently	Occasionally true	Often true	Usually true	Always or almost always true
makes decisions easily	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
compassionate	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
sincere	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
self-sufficient	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
eager to soothe hurt feelings	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
conceited	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
dominant	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
soft-spoken	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
likable	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
masculine	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
warm	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
solemn	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
willing to take a stand	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
tender	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
friendly	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q19 Please indicate how well each of the characteristics below describes yourself.

	Never or almost never true	Usually not true	Sometimes but infrequently true	Occasionally true	Often true	Usually true	Always or almost always true
aggressive	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
gullible	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
inefficient	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
act as a leader	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
childlike	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
adaptable	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
individualistic	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
does not use harsh language	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
unsystematic	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
competitive	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
loves children	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
tactful	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
ambitious	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
gentle	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
conventional	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q20 What is your sex?

- Male
- Female

Q21 What is the highest level of education you have completed?

- Less than High School
- High School / GED
- Some College
- 2-year College Degree
- 4-year College Degree
- Masters Degree
- Doctoral Degree
- Professional Degree (JD, MD)

Q22 The organization you work for is in which of the following:

- Public sector (e.g. government)
- Private sector (e.g. most businesses and individuals)
- Not-for-profit sector
- Other _____

Q23 What best describes the type of organization you work for?

- Corporation
- Public relations agency
- Government
- Non-profit Organization
- Education-related organization
- Health-related organization
- Trade association
- Independent PR Consultant
- Other _____

Q24 How old are you?

- 18-25
- 26-34
- 35-54
- 55-64
- 65 or over _____

Q25 Full-time experience in the practice of public relations (in years)

- 1-2
- 3-5
- 6-10
- 11-15
- 16-20
- 21-25
- 26-30
- over 30

Q26 What best describes your title

- CEO/President/Owner
- Vice President
- Senior Account Supervisor
- Account Supervisor
- Account Executive
- Director
- Manager
- Public Relations Specialist
- Educator
- Other _____

Q27 What is your annual income range?

- Below \$20,000
- \$20,000 - \$29,999
- \$30,000 - \$39,999
- \$40,000 - \$49,999
- \$50,000 - \$59,999
- \$60,000 - \$69,999
- \$70,000 - \$79,999
- \$80,000 - \$89,999
- \$90,000 or more

LIST OF REFERENCES

- Ahmed, P., Nanda, S., & Schnusenberg, O. (2010). Can firms do well while doing good? *Applied Financial Economics*, 20(11), 845-860. doi:10.1080/09603101003652409.
- Aldoory, L., & Toth, E. (2002). Gender discrepancies in a gendered profession: A developing theory for public relations. *Journal of Public Relations Research*, 14(2), 103–126.
- Ameen E., D. Guffet, & McMillan J. (1996). Gender differences in determining the ethical sensitivity of future accounting professionals. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 15(5), 591-597.
- Aries E. (1976). Interaction patterns and themes of male, female, and mixed groups. *Small Group Behavior*, 7, 7-18.
- Arlow, P. (1991). Personal characteristics in college students evaluations of business ethics and corporate social responsibility. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 10, 63-69.
- Aupperle, K.(1984). An empirical measure of corporate social orientation. *Research in Corporate Social Performance and Policy* 6, 27-54.
- Aupperle, K., A. Carroll, & Hatfield J. (1985). An empirical examination of the relationship between corporate social responsibility and profitability. *Academy of Management Review* 28(2), 446-463.
- Ballard-Reisch, D., & Elton, M. (1992). Gender orientation and the Bern Sex Role Inventory: A psychological construct revisited. *Sex Roles*, 27, 291-306.
- Basil, D.C. (1973) *Women in Management*. New York McGraw Hill.
- Bem, S. (1974) The measurement of psychological androgyny. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 42(2), 155-162.
- Bem, S. L. (1979). Theory and measurement of androgyny: A reply to the Pedhazur-Tetenbaum and Locksley-Colten critiques. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 37, 1047-1054.
- Bem, S. L. (1981). *Bem Sex-Role Inventory: Professional manual*. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Benn, S., Todd, L., & Pendleton, J. (2010). Public relations leadership in corporate social responsibility. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 96(3), 403-423.
- Betz, M., L. O'Connell & J. Shepard (1989). Gender differences in proclivity for unethical behavior, *Journal of Business Ethics* 8, 321–324.

- Bhattacharya, C., & Sen, S. (2004). Doing better at doing good: When, who, and how consumers respond to corporate social initiatives. *California Management Review*, 47(1), 9-24. Retrieved from Business Source Premier database.
- Boyd, D. P. (1981). Improving ethical awareness through the business and society course. *Business and Society* 20(2), 27-31.
- Bowen, H. R. (1953). *Social Responsibilities of the Businessman*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Brenner, O. C., & Greenhaus, J. H. (1979). Managerial status, sex, and selected personality characteristics. *Journal of Management*, 5, 107-113.
- Broom, G. M., Center, A. H., & Cutlip, S. M. (2005). *Effective Public Relations*. Alexandria, VA: Prentice Hall.
- Broom, G. M. & Dozier, D. M. (1986). Advancement for public relations role models. *Public Relations Review*, 17-56.
- Broverman, L, Vogel, S., Broverman, D., Clarkson, F. E., & Rosenkrantz. (1972). P. S. Sex-role stereotypes: A current appraisal. *Journal of Social Issues*, 28, 59-78
- Burton, B. K. & Hegarty W. H. (1999). Some Determinants of Student Corporate Social Responsibility Orientation, *Business and Society* 38(2), 188-205.
- Cochran, P. (2007). The evolution of corporate social responsibility. *Business Horizons*, 50(6), 449-454. Retrieved August 12, 2010, from the Science Direct database.
- Carroll, A. (1979). A three-dimensional conceptual model of corporate performance. *Academy of Management Review* 4(4), 497-505.
- Carroll, A. (1983). Corporate Social Responsibility. *Vital Speeches of the Day*, 49(19), 604. Retrieved from Academic Search Premier Database.
- Carroll, A. (1991). The pyramid of corporate social responsibility: toward the moral management of organizational stakeholders, *Business Horizon*, 39-48.
- Carroll, A. (1999). Corporate social responsibility. *Business and Society*, 38(3), 268-295. Retrieved October 22, 2010, from ABI/INFORM Global. (Document ID: 44660325).
- Carroll, A. (2009). A History of Corporate Social Responsibility Concepts and Practices . *The Oxford Handbook of Corporate Social Responsibility (Oxford Handbooks in Business and Management)* (pp. 19-46). New York: Oxford University Press, USA.
- Clark, C. (2000). Differences between public relations and corporate social responsibility: An analysis. *Public Relations Review*, 26(3), 363–38.

- Cobanoglu, Cihan, Warde, & Moreo P. (2001). A comparison of mail, fax, and web survey methods. *International Journal of Market Research*, 43, 441-52.
- Corson, J. J., & Steiner, G. A. (1974). Measuring business' social performance: The corporate social audit. New York: Committee for Economic Development.
- Davis, J.R. & Welton, R.E. (1991), Professional ethics: business students' perceptions. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 10, 451-463.
- Davis, K. (1973). The case for and against business assumption of social responsibilities. *Academy of Management Journal*, 16, 312-322.
- Dawson, L. M. (1997). Ethical differences between men and women in the sales profession, *Journal of Business Ethics* 16(1), 1143-1152.
- Dobbins, G. H., & Platz, S. J. (1986). Sex differences in leadership: How real are they? *Academy of Management Review*, 11, 118-127.
- Dozier, D. M., & Broom, G. M. (1995). Evolution of the manager role in public relations practice. *Journal of Public Relations Research*, 7, 3–26.
- Drumwright, M. E., & Murphy, P. E. (2001). Corporate societal marketing. In Paul N. Bloom & Gregory T. Gundlach (Eds.), *Handbook of marketing and society* (pp. 162–183). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Dubinsky, A. J. & Ingram T. N. (1984). Ethics in retailing: Perceptions of retail salespeople. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science* 13, 1–16.
- Eckes, T., & Trautner, H. M. (2000). Social role theory of sex differences and Similarities. *The developmental social psychology of gender* (pp. 123-157). Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Edwards, A. L., & Ashworth, C. D. (1977). A replication study of item selection for the Bem Sex-Role Inventory. *Applied Psychological Measurement*, 1, 501-507.
- Eilbirt, H., & Parket, R. I. (1973). The practice of business: The current status of corporate social responsibility. *Business Horizons*, 16 (4), 5-14.
- Ellis, J., & Range, L. (1988). Femininity and reasons for living. *Educational and Psychological Research*, 8, 19-24.
- Friedman, M. (1962). *Capitalism and freedom*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Friedman, M. (1970) The Social Responsibility of Business Is To Increase Its Profit. *New York Times*. Sept. 13, 122-126.
- Gilligan, C. (1982). *In a Different Voice*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

- Gough, H. G. (1957). *Manual for the California Psychological Inventory*. Palo Alto, Calif.: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Griswold, G., Jr. (1967). How AT&T public relations policies developed. *Public Relations Quarterly*, 12, 7–16.
- Grunig, J. E. (1984). Organizations, Environments, and Models of Public Relations. *Public Relations Research & Education*, 1, 6-29.
- Grunig, J. E., & IABC Research Foundation. (1992). *Excellence in public relations and communication management*. Communication textbook series. Hillsdale, N.J: L. Erlbaum Associates.
- Grunig, J. E., & Hunt, T. (1984). *Managing Public Relations*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Grunig, L., Toth, E., & Hon, L. (2000). Feminist values in Public Relations. *Journal of Public Relations Research*, 12(1), 49–68.
- Harris, A. (1994). Ethnicity as a determinant of sex role identity: A replication study of item selection for the Bem Sex Role Inventory. *Sex Roles*, 31, 241–273.
- Harrison, L., & Lynch, A. (2005). Social Role Theory and the Perceived Gender Role Orientation of Athletes. *Sex Roles*, 52(3/4), 227-236. doi:10.1007/s11199-005-1297-1.
- Heilbrun, A. (1986). Androgyny as type and androgyny as behavior: Implications for gender schema in male s and females. *Sex Roles*, 14, 123-139.
- Hoffman, R., & Borders, L. (2001). Twenty-five years after the Bem Sex-Role Inventory: a reassessment and new issues regarding classification variability. *Measurement & Evaluation in Counseling & Development (American Counseling Association)*, 34(1), 39. Retrieved from Academic Search Premier Database.
- Holmes, S. L. (1977). Corporate social performance: Past and present areas of commitment. *Academy of Management Journal*, 20, 433-538.
- Holt, C. L., & Ellis, J. B. (1998). Assessing the current validity of the Bem Sex-Role Inventory. *Sex Roles*, 39, 929–941.
- Hopkins, M. (2006). What is corporate social responsibility all about? *Journal of Public Affairs (14723891)*, 6(3/4), 298-306. doi:10.1002/pa.238.
- Ibrahim, N., & Angelidis, J.P. (1991). Effects of board members, gender on level of involvement in strategic management and corporate social responsiveness orientation. *Proceeding of the Northeast Decision Sciences Institute*, 208-210.

- Ibrahim, N., & Angelidis J. P. (1995). The corporate social responsiveness orientation of board members: Are there differences between inside and outside directors? *Journal of Business Ethics* 14, 405–410.
- Ibrahim, N., Howard & Angelidis J. P. (2008). The relationship between religiousness and corporate social responsibility orientation: Are There Differences Between Business Managers and Students? *Journal of Business Ethics* 78, 165–174.
- Katz, D., & Kahn, R. L. (1978). *The social psychology of organizations* (2nd ed) New York Wiley.
- Kelly, J. A., Caudill, S., Hawthorn, S., & O'Brien, C. G. (1977). Socially undesirable sex-correlated characteristics: Implications for androgyny and adjustment. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 45, 1185-1186.
- Kohlberg, L. (1966). A cognitive-developmental analysis of children's sex-role concepts and attitudes. In Maccoby, E. E., editor, *The Development of Sex Differences*. Stanford University Press, Stanford CA.
- Kok, P., T. V. D. Weile, R. McKenna & Brown A. (2001). A corporate social responsibility audit within a quality management framework, *Journal of Business Ethics* 31(4), 285-297.
- L'Etang, J. (1994), Public relations and corporate social responsibility; some issues arising, *Journal of Business Ethics*, 111-23.
- Lefever, S., Dal, M., & Matthíasdóttir, Á. (2007). Online data collection in academic research: advantages and limitations. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 38(4), 574-582. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8535.2006.00638.x.
- Maltz, D. , & Borker, R. (1982). A cultural approach to male-female miscommunication. In J. J. Gumpertz (ed.) *Language and social identity* (pp. 196-216). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Mason, S., & Mucrack, P. (1996). Gender and Ethical Orientation: A Test of Gender and Occupational Socialization Theories. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 15(6), 599-604.
- McCabe, C. M., R. Ingram & Conway M. (2006). The business of ethics and gender, *Journal of Business Ethics*. 64, 101-116.
- McCuddy, M.K., & Peery, B. L. (1996). Selected individual differences and collegians' ethical beliefs. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 15, 261-272.
- McDonald, R. & Scott, V. (1997). Attitudes of business and non-business students toward corporate actions. *Teaching Business Ethics*, 1, 213–225.

- Mertler, C. (2002). Demonstrating the potential For web-based survey methodology with a case study. *American Secondary Education*, 30(2), 49. Retrieved from Academic Search Premier Database.
- Mohr, L., & Webb, D. (2005). The Effects of Corporate Social Responsibility and Price on Consumer Responses. *Journal of Consumer Affairs*, 39(1), 121-147. Retrieved from Academic Search Premier Database.
- Mohr, Lois A., Deborah J. Webb, & Harris K. E. (2001). Do consumers expect companies to be socially responsible? The Impact of Corporate Social Responsibility on Buying Behavior. *Journal of Consumer Affairs*. 35 (1), 45-72.
- Nehme, M., & Wee, C. (2008). Tracing the historical development of corporate social responsibility and corporate social reporting. *James Cook University Law Review*, (15), 129-168. Retrieved from Academic Search Premier Database.
- Ostlund, L. E. (1977). Attitudes of managers toward corporate social policy. *California Management Review*, 19 (4), 35-49.
- Paluszek, J. L. (1976). *Business and society: 1976-2000, an AMA report*. New York: AMACOM.
- Pinkston, T. S. & Carroll A. B. (1996). A Retrospective Examination of CSR Orientations: Have They Changed?, *Journal of Business Ethics* 15, 199–206.
- Powell, G. N., & Butterfield, D. A. (1979). The “good manager”: Masculine or androgynous? *Academy of Management Journal*, 22, 395–403.
- Procter-Rogers, C. (2006). Celebrating women's role in PR. *PRweek*, 9(13).
- Schein, V. E.(1973). The relationship between sex role stereotypes and requisite management characteristics. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 57, 95 -100.
- Schein, V. E.(1975). Relationships between sex role stereotypes and requisite management characteristics among female managers. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 60, 340-344.
- Schminke, M. Ambrose, M. & Miles, J. A. (2003). The impact of gender and setting on perceptions of others' ethics, *Sex Roles*, 48(7/8), 361-375.
- Schmitt, B., Leclerc, F., & Dubé-Rioux, L. (1988). Sex typing and consumer behavior: A test of gender schema theory. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 15(1), 122-128. Retrieved from Academic Search Premier Database.
- Shaw, W. H. & Barry V. (1992), *Moral Issues in Business*, 5th edition Wadsworth Publishing, Belmont, CA.

- Smith, W., & Blackburn R. (1988). Corporate social responsibility: A psychometric examination of a management instrument. *Proceedings of the Southern Management Association*, pp. 293–295.
- Singhapakdi, A., & Vitell S. J. (1990). Marketing ethics: Factors influencing perceptions of ethical problems and alternatives. *Journal of Macromarketing* 10, 4–18.
- Stoller, R. J. (1964). A contribution to the study of gender identity. *International Journal of Psycho-Analysis* 45, 220–226.
- Toth, E. L., & Cline, C. G. (1991). Public relations practitioner attitudes toward gender issues: A benchmark study. *Public Relations Review*, 17(2), 161-175.
- Toth, E. L., & Grunig, L. A. (1993). The missing story of women in public relations. *Journal of Public Relations Research*, 5, 153–176.
- Uccello, C. (2009). Social interest and social responsibility in contemporary corporate environments. *Journal of Individual Psychology*, 65(4), 412-419. Retrieved from Academic Search Premier Database.
- Wartick, S. L., & Cochran, P. L. 1985. The evolution of the corporate social performance model. *Academy of Management Review*, 4,758-769.
- Wæraas, A. (2007). The re-enchantment of social institutions: Max Weber and public relations. *Public Relations Review*, 33(3), 281-286.
doi:10.1016/j.pubrev.2007.05.007.
- White, J., & Manolis, C. (1997). Individual differences In ethical reasoning among law students. *Social Behavior & Personality: An International Journal*, 25(1), 19. Retrieved from Academic Search Premier Database.
- Wood, D.J. (1991). Corporate social performance revisited. *Academy of Management Review*, 16, 691-718.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Tamekia Massaline is from Sebring, FL. She attended the University of Florida earning a Bachelor of Science in 2009, with a major in public relations and a minor in education. She began her graduate studies at the University of Florida in August 2009 pursuing a Master of Arts in Mass Communications with a specialization in public relations.