

GENERAL MANAGER'S PERCEPTION OF CORPORATE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY
CULTURE OF FLORIDA HOTELS

Judy L. Holcomb
School of Business
International Hospitality & Tourism Management Program
Saint Leo University

INTRODUCTION

With each passing day, many forms of CSR have been called to the forefront by the media, and pressure from society has continued to increase. The hospitality industry, and more specifically the hotel industry, has not been immune to this pressure. However, the industry has just begun to recognize the importance of CSR and what role it can play on a corporate as well as a property level. Research that has been conducted in CSR in the field of hospitality has been scarce outside of the environmental realm. No attempt has been made to determine the perspectives of hotel general managers regarding their corporations' CSR culture and initiatives.

As the ultimate decision maker for all property performance issues, the general manager's perception of the company's CSR culture is critical. Although the implementation of the corporate CSR directives at the property level were outside the scope of this research, managerial perceptions are important to understand since they can ultimately affect property level CSR directives and their implementation.

This study aimed to improve understanding of how general managers perceived their corporations' CSR culture. With this understanding, corporations can have a clearer picture as to how CSR culture is being communicated to the property manager and how the GM perceives CSR. This can ultimately affect how CSR directives are being carried out at the property level. Hence, the objective of the study was to identify corporate level CSR culture and its ensuing policies. This gap was hypothesized to be a function of a number of personal characteristics of the GM coupled with the organizational profile of the hotel.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Over the past few years, social responsibility has been at the forefront of the nation's interest with the scandals such as Enron and WorldCom. Whether internally or externally motivated, there have been companies that consider social responsible behavior to be a priority. The debate has continued, however, as to whether the company or the recipient really benefits from socially responsible behavior.

Defining Corporate Social Responsibility

Though corporate social responsibility (CSR) is a subject that has been widely researched, no uniform definition has emerged. Matten and Moon (2008) have indicated that because CSR is a term that overlaps other terms and is used synonymously with others, it is not easily defined. One of the more frequently cited definitions of CSR has been that of Carroll (1979) who wrote that "The social responsibility of business encompasses the economic, legal, ethical and discretionary (philanthropic) expectations that society has of organizations at a given point in time" (p. 499). Carroll's definition and his research have formed the foundation for examination of CSR issues and debated elements.

This research attempts to aid in the understanding of how CSR is socially constructed in the context of the hotel environment. The conceptual definition of CSR which will be used in the present study incorporates Dahlsrud's five dimensions, the essence of several other widely used definitions of CSR. This study's operational definition is as follows:

CSR is comprised of those activities of a firm which affect various internal and external stakeholders that enhance the quality of the environment and society, while providing economic wealth to stakeholders.

The Foundation of Current CSR Research

The foundation of CSR lies in research dating back as early as the 1950's and the work of Bowen (1953). He posed a question which has been pondered up to the present time, "What responsibilities to society may businessmen reasonably be expected to assume?" (p. xi). The work of Fredrick (1960) has been cited as seminal work in the field of CSR. He advocated for business managers assuming responsibility for the administration of businesses which he viewed as economic producers that had a broad responsibility to society. Davis (1960) also viewed CSR from a managerial context. He believed that socially responsible actions taken by a firm make sense since they can provide long-term economic gains. McGuire (1963), like Davis, viewed responsibilities of the firm as stretching beyond financial to legal and societal obligations.

In the 1970s, Carroll (1979) introduced his three dimensional social performance model. The subsequent development of this model has provided a foundation for various CSR researchers through several decades. Building on previous definitions of CSR, Carroll stated that a firm's obligation must include the economic, legal, ethical and discretionary categories.

Credited as one of those who assisted in the evolution of social responsibility as a response process, Sethi (1975, 1979) developed dimensions of social performance. These dimensions described corporate behavior as social obligation, social responsibility and social responsiveness. He equated social obligation with legal and economic requirements and social responsiveness with actions that comply with social norms, values, and expectations.

Wartick and Cochran (1985) further developed three aspects of Carroll's (1979) work: (a) corporate social responsibilities, (b) corporate social responsiveness, and (c) social issues. They developed a framework of principles, processes, and policies into a corporate social performance model. Research by Wood (1991), Carroll (1991), Clarkson (1995) and Jones

(1995) applied stakeholder theory in a CSR context. Adapting CSR into the framework of stakeholder theory provided a clearer meaning for the concept and resulted in the broadening of the meaning a scope of CSR (Lee, 2008).

General Manager's Perception of CSR

According to Turker (2009), CSR measurement can be defined in four categories: (a) reputation indices and databases, (b) single or multiple issue indicators, (c) content analysis, and (d) perception scales. Although each of the four methods have their limitations, it is important to recognize that CSR activities cannot be performed without individuals.

Management personnel have been instrumental in formulating policies and assessing various phases of CSR. Their opinions, beliefs and attitudes are an integral part of how these processes are developed and implemented (Wood, 1991). Hence, this research uses the perception of managers to attempt to measure SR in hotels.

As stated above, managerial perceptions have been chosen to measure CSR in this study. How a general manager perceives his/her corporate integrated CSR culture can affect his/her perceived role as a decision maker of CSR issue at the unit (property) level. Some of the earliest work performed assessing managerial perceptions on CSR was performed by Davis (1975). The general manager is responsible for implementation of various and possible competing corporate directives. Thus, it has been important to ascertain how the unit/general manager perceives these directives. How a general manager perceives his/her corporate integrated CSR culture can affect his/her perceived role as a decision maker of CSR issue at the unit (property) level.

CSR in Hospitality and Tourism

Hospitality and tourism researchers have just begun to investigate CSR outside of the environmental realm. Much of the research conducted in the hospitality and tourism industry has

addressed the subject of the sustainability of tourist destinations with an emphasis on environmental issues (Holden, 2000; Hunter & Shaw, 2007; Scanlon, 2007). It has only been since 2006 that research has focused on non-environmental micro level CSR issues relating to hotels, restaurants and casinos.

Research of CSR issues in hospitality and tourism can be viewed from both macro and micro levels. There has been limited research addressing CSR issues in hospitality, outside the environmental aspect, that has been performed on the micro level. One of the most researched topics in the CSR hospitality realm has been the analysis of CSR to financial performance. Outside of the industry, there have been mixed results as researchers have attempted to link social and environmental responsibility (SER) and financial performance. One of the first studies performed which analyzed hotels and CSR is a study by Rodrigues & Cruz (2007) which attempted to measure hotel's social-environmental responsibility. A major limitation of the study was the attempt to measure SER by surveying the opinions of hotel managers regarding competing hotels' SER performance which provided little credibility to the study. Lee and Park (2009) in their study of hotel and casinos found that firm value and profitability of hotels increased with CSR activity; however, results for casino hotels showed no relationship (Lee & Park). In another attempt to link the two, Lee and Heo (2009) found that "positive CSR activities appear to make a positive impact on both customer satisfaction and firm value" (Lee & Heo, p. 4). In the same year Park and Lee (2009) analyzed this relationship, using 30 publicly traded restaurant chains. Their results showed that market value for the 30 restaurant firms did not increase with an increased CSR score. However, in the long term return on equity improved. Kang, Lee, and Huh (2010), similar to many other studies testing this relationship, examined the relationship between positive and negative CSR activities in hotels, casinos, restaurants and airlines. Results showed evidence that increased positive CSR activities for hotels and restaurants and decreased social irresponsibility for airlines may enhance firm value. Airlines

were the focus of a study by Lee and Park (2010) using similar methodology to the Park and Lee (2009) study. The results indicated value performance in a linear manner implying that as airline companies increase CSR activities, short and long term firm value may increase as a result. Jackson & Hua (2009) used the *Fortune* CSR listing to analyze CSR and financial performance of hotels and casinos. It was also determined that these firms out performed firms that did not appear on the *Fortune* CSR listing.

Another method commonly used to analyze CSR is content analysis. Jones, Comfort and Hillier (2006) used this approach to examine CSR in reporting on United Kingdom pub operators. The majority of the pubs examined reported on their commitments to CSR activities. Holcomb, Upchurch, and Okumus (2007) performed an analysis of top hotel firms' CSR. The following categories were developed applicable to CSR reporting of hotels: community, environment, marketplace, visions and values, and workforce. The results revealed that nine of the top 10 hotels reported on at least three CSR issues with most of the hotels reporting on more than eight. A total of 80% of the hotels provided information on their charitable donations, while 60% reported on employee diversity as well as supplier/business partner diversity. Jones, Hillier & Comfort (2008) repeated this methodology by analyzing online and reporting sources of United Kingdom gaming companies indicating that only a few of the gaming companies actually produced specific CSR reports and key performance indicators were not used to measure or monitor CSR.

Several studies analyzed CSR from a stakeholder perspective within the hotel industry. Jago and Steward (2007) analyzing on Australian hotel employees over a two year period found high levels of commitment in early years which later declined; employees expressed feelings of being treated fairly and were satisfied with their work to life balance. Bohdanowicz and Zientara, (2009), addressing CSR from the community and employee stakeholder view found that being a passive participant in CSR did not reap the full benefits of active participation. However,

engaging employees in community efforts reaped benefits for the hotel including becoming an employer of choice.

Various other studies analyzed hotel CSR from various other perspectives such as exploring Phuket hotels after the 2001 Indian Ocean tsunami. Descriptive in nature, this study provided some excellent data relating to some of the initiatives taken by hotel companies after the Tsunami (Henderson 2007). McGhee, Wattanakamolchai, Perdue and Calvert (2009), addressed corporate giving in the U.S. lodging industry and found that on average, contributions for the sample hotels were 3.5% of sales compared to an industry norm of 5%. Results also indicated a positive correlation between average room rates, property size, and position in the chain and contributions. Tsai, Hsu, Chen, Lin, and Chen (2010) using an integrated analytical approach, analyzed the CSR decision making process in International hotels. Results revealed the major driving force for International tourist hotels to integrate CSR initiatives was image enhancement.

Original research analyzing Canadian mass tour operators and their awareness of CSR was conducted by Dodds and Kuehnel (2010) surveying mass tour operators in the Canadian market it was found that most tour operators had no structured CSR policies in place; however, awareness of CSR issues seems to be on the rise. The authors speculated that pressure from consumers regarding CSR compliance would drive more tour operators to adopt firmer policies in the future.

Research was performed by Holcomb, Okumus, and Bilgihan (2010) analyzing CSR in Central Florida Theme Parks, an area of CSR which has not been attempted. The top three theme parks in Orlando were analyzed through a content analysis, of three CSR dimensions: environment, community and customers. It was found that reporting of employee welfare programs, diversity policies and volunteerism was prominent among theme parks and Walt Disney World provided the most detailed CSR reporting.

Although some excellent research has been conducted in the hospitality industry relating to CSR, limitations of these and many other studies outside of hospitality attempted to measure CSR using a single indicator. CSR is a multidimensional concept which, as stated previously is difficult to define as well as measure. However, these studies are useful in creating public awareness for industries such as hospitality that have typically not been known for their CSR initiatives.

METHODOLOGY

Survey Instrument and Measures

An on-line, self-report survey was administered using Survey Methods software. To reduce social desirability bias, the survey was anonymous and this fact was emphasized to the respondents in the initial correspondence as well as at the beginning of the survey.

The perception of the general managers' corporate social responsibility of their own corporation was measured using the CSR scale developed by Turker (2009). Turker developed this scale based upon her conceptual definition of CSR as follows: "CSR is defined as corporate behaviors that aim to affect stakeholders positively and that go beyond its economic interest." (p. 414).

The original Turker scale has been slightly modified for this research to take into account questions from a hotel perspective and to ensure that the general managers will answer the questions considering their corporation's CSR culture. The questions in this section were measured using a 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 = strongly agree, 2 = agree, 3 = neither agree nor disagree, 4 = disagree and 5 = strongly disagree. The Turker CSR scale tested as highly reliable with a Cronbach's Alpha of .9013. In order to determine validity, factor analysis was performed by Turker and the scale items were found to be highly correlated at a significance level of 0.0001.

The GMs' attitudes towards social responsibility in general were measured using the Social Responsibility Attitude Scale developed by Hunt, Keicker, and Chonko (1990). This scale was developed to measure the respondents' attitudes towards CSR. Hunt et al.(1990) conceptualized that "Socially responsible behaviors are driven by socially responsible attitudes" (p. 241) Construct unidimensionality was supported for this scale using Principal Component analysis with factor loadings of .55, .39, .59, and .44 respectively.

Reliability and Validity Assessments

In an effort to enhance reliability of the measure, a Cronbach's (1951) Coefficient Alpha test was performed. Reliability analysis for the Turker scale indicated an alpha of .801. In order to assess the representativeness of the sample to the population of hotels in Florida, an analysis was performed using the Florida Department of Business and Professional Regulation (FDBPR) data on hotels in Florida based upon number of rooms. The study sample and FDBPR data were compared to determine the representativeness of the study against the population of hotels in the state of Florida. It was found that, when analyzing categories of rooms by increments of 100, the two frequency distributions were not identical. The reason for the difference between the sample and the population was due to the fact that the FDBPR data contained a large number of non-corporate single property hotels which could not be separated from the data file, and the study sample contained only multi-unit corporate hotels which were part of a chain.

To ensure content validity of the instrument, four research experts and two industry professionals reviewed the survey instrument and provided feedback. This feedback was incorporated into the survey instrument before its implementation. Mixed results for the scale reliability and factor analysis were found when analyzing the CSR scale items. Due to these

mixed results, it was decided to adopt the original factors used in the Turker study since they were conceptually logical.

Sampling

A random sample was taken from a population of multi-unit corporate hotels in the state of Florida, most of which were located in the Central Florida region. The Central Florida hotel market is one of the largest in the world with over 438 hotels and over 111,700 hotel rooms (OOCCVB, 2009). A tourist as well as a convention destination, Central Florida contains a vast array of hotels ranging in size, service level and ownership structure.

The target respondents were general managers of Florida hotels who were members of either the Central Florida Hotel and Lodging Association (CFHLA) or the Florida Restaurant and Lodging Association (FRLA). Only those GMs of hotels that had a significant corporate policy on CSR were included in the study. In an effort to determine which hotel GMs qualified, an absolute value score for the first section of the survey regarding GMs' perceptions of their corporations' CSR policies was calculated.

Data Collection

Using the Dillman (2000) dual coverage method, a pre-notification post card was mailed to potential respondents informing them that they would be receiving an email within the next week requesting their participation. Subsequently, respondents received an email from one of two organizations, Central Florida Hotel and Lodging Association or the Florida Hotel and Restaurant Association, requesting participation in and support for the survey. Included in the email was a hyperlink to the website for the survey.

RESULTS

In total, 564 hotel GMs were contacted by email by their perspective associations and invited to participate in the study. A total of 123 surveys were returned which equated to a 22% response rate.

Demographic Profile of Hotel General Managers

As shown in Table 1, the sample of hotel GMs (GM) included 79.8% (n = 95) male and 20.2% (n = 24) female. A little less than half of the GMs fell into the between 41 to 50 age group which represented 44.5% of the sample followed by the 51 to 60 age group with 29.4%. The education level of the respondents was as follows: 68.1% (n = 81) held a bachelor's degree and 10.9% (n = 13) held a master's degree or higher.

Table 1
Demographic Characteristics of Respondents

	Characteristics	Count	% of Total
Gender			
Male		95	79.8
Female		24	20.2
Total		119	100.0
Age			
18-30		3	2.5
31-40		15	12.6
41-50		53	44.5
51-60		35	29.4
60+		13	10.9
Education			
High School Diploma		7	5.9
Associate of Science/Associate of Arts Degree		18	15.1
Bachelor's Degree		81	68.1
Master's Degree		13	10.9
Total		119	100.0

=

Profile of Hotels

As shown in Table 2, the majority of the respondents' hotels, (68.1%) had fewer than 400 rooms, 31% had less than 200 rooms, and 37% had between 201 and 400 rooms. There were a total of 43 (36.1%) independently owned hotels (non-publicly held) in the study and 38 (31.9%) which were operated by a publicly held corporation. Of the remainder of the hotels, 30 (25.2%) were franchisees and the rest were classified as "other." The majority of the hotels, 63.8% (n = 76), had average daily rates (ADR) ranging between \$75 and \$150, and 35 (29.4%) of the hotels had an ADR above \$150 with 20 (16.8%) of them over \$176.

Table 2
General Managers' Hotel Size, Ownership, and Average Daily Rate (ADR) of Properties

Hotel Descriptors	Count	% of Total
Number of Rooms		
Less than 200 Rooms	37	31.1
Between 201 and 400 Rooms	44	37.0
Between 401 and 600 Rooms	17	14.3
Between 601 and 800 Rooms	9	7.6
Between 801 and 1000 Rooms	6	5.0
Over 1001 Rooms	6	5.0
Total	119	100.0
Hotel Ownership Structure		
Independently Owned	43	36.1
Operated by a publicly held corporation	38	31.9
Franchise	30	25.2
Other	8	6.7
Total	119	99.0
Average Daily Rate (ADR)		
Below \$50	2	1.7
Between \$51 - \$75	6	5.0
Between \$75 - \$100	16	13.4
Between \$101 - \$125	33	27.7
Between \$126 - \$150	27	22.7
Between \$151 - \$175	15	12.6
Over \$176	20	16.8
Total	119	99.9

Note. Percentages may not total 100% due to rounding.

Data Analysis

The mean and standard deviation for each scale item for GMs' perceptions of the corporation's CSR culture are displayed in Table 3.

Table 3
Statistics for General Managers' Perceptions of Corporation's CSR Culture

Survey Items	Mean	Standard Deviation
1. Our corporation supports employees who want to acquire additional education.	1.613	.884
2. Our corporate policies encourage employees to develop their skills and careers.	1.369	.674
3. Our corporation does not have flexible policies that provide a work & life balance for its employees. (Work-Life balance is defined as: people having a measure of control over when, where and how they work.)	2.512	1.247
4. The management of our corporation is primarily concerned with employees' needs and wants.	2.184	.956
5. The employee-related managerial decisions of our corporation are usually fair.	1.495	.746
6. Our corporation provides full and accurate information about its products and services to its customers.	1.226	.494
7. Our corporation doesn't always respect consumer rights beyond the legal requirements.	1.571	1.062
8. Customer satisfaction is highly important for our corporation.	1.058	.236
9. Our corporation makes investment to create a better life for future generations.	2.016	.911
10. Our corporation endeavors to create employment opportunities for minorities, the disabled and socially disadvantaged.	1.806	.826
11. Our corporation always pays its taxes on a regular and continuing basis.	1.058	.269
12. Our corporation complies with legal regulations completely and promptly.	1.025	.157
13. Our corporation implements programs to minimize its negative impact on the natural environment.	1.579	.644
14. Our corporation participates in activities which aim to protect and improve the quality of the natural environment.	1.672	.690
15. Our corporation does not support sustainable growth which considers future generations.	1.680	.919
16. Our corporation encourages its employees to participate in voluntary activities.	1.588	.729
17. Our corporation supports non-governmental organizations (voluntary and non-profit groups) working in problematic areas.	1.823	.840

Based upon a Likert scale of 1 = Strongly Agree to 5 = Strongly Disagree, we can see from the table above that of the lowest responses were the questions relating to paying taxes on a regular basis (question 11) and legal regulations (question 12) ($M=1.058$, $SD = .269$, $M=1.025$, $SD = .1570$. These results are not unexpected as it would be expected that hotels would comply government regulations and laws. The results also indicate that GM's perceive their

corporation's policy's regarding customer satisfaction to be highly important with a mean of 1.058. On the other end of the spectrum we see that question 3 relating to work-life balance for employees resulted in a mean of 2.512, SD = .911, which indicates that GM's somewhat agree or are neutral that their corporation does not have flexible work-life balance policies. Due to the 24-7 nature of the hotel business this is not an unexpected result.

Based on their responses to the Social Responsibility Attitude Scale developed by Hunt et al., (1990), GMs in this study had generally positive attitudes towards CSR. Over half (52%) of GMs agreed that the socially responsible manager must occasionally place the interests of society over the interests of the property." GMs disagreed that, "Management's only responsibility is to maximize the return to shareholders on their investment" (reverse scored) with two-thirds (66%) of the hotel GMs disagreeing with this statement. The third scale item had the most overwhelming positive response with 86% of the GMs surveyed agreeing that, "The fact that corporations have great economic power in our society means that they have a social responsibility beyond the interests of their shareholders." In addition, 84% of the respondents agreed that managers have a responsibility beyond the immediate interests of the shareholders as long as corporations generate acceptable shareholder return.

In analyzing the correlation between CSR Attitude Scale and GM's perception of their corporation's CSR policies results indicate that there are only one of the scale items that show significance. As shown in Table 4, the question "Management's only responsibility is to maximize the return to shareholders on their investment" (reversed scored) indicated significance $r(118) = -.243, p < .05$, however the remaining three questions were not significant.

Table 4
Pearson Correlations: Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) Attitude Scale

Personal Attitude Scale Items	
1. Interests of society	-.024
2. Maximize the return to shareholders	.243
3. Social responsibility beyond the interests of their shareholders	-.077*
4. Generate acceptable shareholder returns	.014

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

A Pearson Correlation was computed to assess the relationship between GM's perception of corporate CSR culture and the number of rooms in their hotel or size of the property. Results, presented in Table 5, indicated a reverse positive correlation between the two variables $r(118) = -.202, p < .05$. This poses an interesting result indicating that as the number of rooms decrease, GM's perception of their corporate CSR culture increases.

Table 5
Pearson Correlations: Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) Number of Hotel Rooms

Number of Hotel Rooms	
	-.202*

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

The t-test reveals a significant difference between the perceptions of the GM's corporate CSR policies and publicly held vs. non-publicly held properties $t(117) = .45.89$,

p>.05), as indicated in Table 6. Hence, results indicate that hotel ownership structure has an effect on GMs' perceptions of corporate CSR policy.

Table 6
One Sample T-Test
GM's Perception of Corporate CSR Culture and Ownership Structure

	T	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference
GM Corporate CSR Culture Perception	45.89	118	.000	27.22
Publicly Held	37.05	118	.000	1.638

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Results for this study provide a positive outlook regarding CSR in the hotel industry.

Regarding the CSR scale, we can see that in general, hotel GM's perceive their corporation's CSR policies is a positive light. This is excellent news for corporate offices of hotel chains which implement CSR policies in hopes that they are followed at the property level. In addition, results indicate that hotel GM's generally have a positive attitude towards CSR. This result provides an optimistic outlook for CSR in hotels as well as hospitality in general. Many researchers have advocated the link between socially responsible attitudes and behavior. According to Hunt et al. (1990), socially responsible attitudes of managers are driven by socially responsible behaviors. Supporting this premise, Singhapakdi, Vitell, Rallapalli, and Kraft (1996) purported that managers "must perceive ethics and social responsibility to be important before their behaviors are likely to become more ethical and reflect greater social responsibility" (p. 1,132).

Implications

This research is unique to the field of study for both hospitality and general CSR research. As such, it provides theoretical implications for both. For general CSR research, no other study had queried managers as to their perceptions of their corporate office's policies. For hospitality research, hotels specifically, it is an early contribution to the CSR knowledge base. Since CSR is in its infancy, much can be gleaned from the current research. Compared to other aspects of hotel research, there remains much to be investigated to understand this complex and relatively new topic.

There are several practical implications that businesses generally, and hotels specifically, can gain from this research. General managers, as well as corporate officers responsible for the implementation and communication of corporate CSR policies, can benefit from the insights of this study. The qualification of respondents sheds some light on the state of CSR in the hotel industry. Of the 123 GMs responding to the survey, only three were disqualified. This signifies that 97% of the participating GMs indicated that their hotels had a written or implied corporate CSR policy. If this study represents the opinion of the population, this is a promising development for the hotel industry in particular and the hospitality industry in general. Existence of a CSR policy is the first step in the implementation of such directives, and this was the first study to identify existence of such directives. Knox & Maklan (2004) indicated in their study that their respondents expressed the belief that companies should use their industry norms and expectations as a benchmark for socially responsible behavior. If this is the case, the industry has few, if any, CSR benchmarks against which hotel companies can be compared. If, however, as suggested in the present study, there are written or implied CSR policies in place, this can be seen as a first step toward benchmarking corporate social responsibility in the hotel industry. Corporate offices that do not have corporate CSR policies can see the benefit from the current research of implementing a CSR policy. Wildes (2008)

stated that one of the steps to ensuring a sound CSR policy is the implementation of a CSR audit. Because the concept of CSR is fairly new to the hotel industry, an extensive check and balance system has not been implemented to ensure that CSR directives are being understood, appreciated and followed.

Many hotels have reported some or all of their CSR initiatives to the public (Holcomb et al., 2007). These reports could be misleading to the public as well as to hotel guests if initiatives are developed at the corporate level with no follow-through at the property level. Just as important as the actual directive being followed are the GMs' perceptions of the directives as well as their perceptions of the CSR culture. These perceptions may have an effect on how directives are implemented, which directives are implemented, and even if they are initiated at all.

The results of this research can also provide some positive insight to CSR attitudes for hotel GMs. Through the results of the Hunt et al. (1990) Social Responsibility Attitude Scale, hotel GMs have expressed a positive attitude towards CSR. According to Hunt et al. (1990), socially responsible attitudes of managers are driven by socially responsible behaviors. Supporting this premise, Singhapakdi et al. (1996) purported that managers "must perceive ethics and social responsibility to be important before their behaviors are likely to become more ethical and reflect greater social responsibility" (p. 1,132).

Trends have indicated that consumers are becoming more socially conscious and making purchasing decisions based upon this consciousness (Goodwin & Francis, 2003). In a millennium poll of over 25,000 respondents in 23 countries, it was found that two out of three people expressed the desire for companies to focus their efforts beyond the bottom line and to place emphasis on societal goals (Environics, International, Ltd et al., 1999). Customer demand can be seen as a driving force of CSR. However, in these economic times it may not take center

stage. The present economically strained environment has forced companies to focus most of their attention on the bottom line. Regardless, corporate leaders must not lose sight of the industry's responsibility to society as a whole. This research is one of the first steps in understanding this perspective in the hotel industry. It can be seen, through the results of this research, that in spite of the tough economic times where demands to focus on the bottom line are greater than ever, hotel GMs have shown a positive attitude towards CSR.

Education of future hotel leaders is imperative for the industry to keep up with the forward progress of CSR. Hospitality programs must realize the importance of incorporating the various aspects of CSR into current curriculum in order to better prepare the future GMs of the industry to "serve" as well as lead. If potential hotel leaders enter the workforce with an awareness and concern for social and environmental issues, they will be better prepared for a future in which CSR will not only create a competitive advantage but may possibly be government mandated.

Limitations and Suggestions for Future Research

It is important to note that this study addressed hotel GMs' perceptions, not measurements of actual CSR initiatives being performed. As stated in previous chapters, the GM's perception of culture can affect the manager's perception of importance of CSR issues (Etheredge, 1999). These perceptions may affect the correlation between corporate CSR policies, the perceived importance of CSR activities by the GM at the property level, and ultimately the actions taken (Wood, 1991).

One of the limitations of using self-report questionnaires for ethical related topics is social desirability bias (Brønn and Vidaver-Cohen, 2009; Worthington, Ram, and Jones, 2006). Crowne & Marlowe (1960) defined social desirability as the need to ". . . obtain approval by responding in a culturally appropriate and acceptable manner" (p. 352). Social desirability bias

exists in many CSR studies but often times it is not acknowledged. Being socially responsible is desirable because it is looked upon by some as the “right” thing to do, and one would want to be seen as doing the right thing. In acknowledging social desirability bias, the researcher has taken precautions to reduce this bias by preserving anonymity of respondents. This was communicated to the respondents in an initial email and again on the survey itself. At no time was any personal identification information asked of the respondents. Online surveys provide more reassurance of anonymity to the respondent as opposed to other forms of data collection (Richman, Kiesler, Weisband and Drasgow, 1999).

Another limitation of this study's methodology, one that is also prevalent in many other survey research studies, is self-selection bias. The respondents were not randomly chosen to participate, they self-selected into the study. This method was chosen due to the difficulties anticipated with general managers taking time to fill out the survey. If a random sample would have been chosen, those GMs may not have filled out the survey, and the response rate would have been even lower.

Another limitation of this study is that the sample of the study, could not be generalized to the population because the population was unknown. The population was composed of multi-unit, corporate hotels in the state of Florida; however, since there were no available data on this population, the sample could not be compared to the population.

Suggestions for future research include using the stakeholder approach to CSR, a study could assess hotel general manager's rankings of importance of CSR initiatives against stakeholder's ranking of importance. These rankings can be compared to determine if there is a symmetry between the two to ensure that hotels are performing CSR initiatives to meet the views of stakeholders. The Turker (2009) CSR scale could be used in future studies to survey various hotel employees and/or executive committee members to determine their perceptions of their

properties' CSR cultures and compare these perceptions against the GMs' perceptions. Such studies could provide valuable insights as to how certain CSR initiatives are viewed from the employee perspective. This would be an important contribution since numerous CSR initiatives at the property level are being carried out by employees.

REFERENCES

Bohdanowicz, P., & Zientara, P. (2009). Hotel companies' contribution to improving the quality of life of local communities and the well-being of their employees. *Tourism & Hospitality Research*, 9(2), 147-158. doi:10.1057/thr.2008.46

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

Brønn, P. S., & Vidaver-Cohen, D. (2009). Corporate motives for social initiative: Legitimacy, sustainability, or the bottom line? *Journal of Business Ethics*, 87, 91-109.

Carroll, A. B. (1979). A three-dimensional conceptual model of corporate performance. *The Academy of Management Review*, 4(4), 497-505. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/257850>

Carroll, A. B. (1991). The pyramid of corporate social responsibility: Toward the moral management of organizational stakeholders. *Business Horizons*, 34(4), 39-48.

Clarkson, M. B. E. (1995). A stakeholder framework for analyzing and evaluating corporate social performance. *The Academy of Management Review*, 20(1), 92-117. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/258888>

Cronbach, L. J. (1951). Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. *Psychometrika*, 16(3), 297-334.

Crowne, D. P., & Marlowe, D. (1960). A new scale of social desirability independent of psychopathology. *Journal of Consulting Psychology*, 24(4), 349-354.

Davis, K. (1960). Can business afford to ignore social responsibilities? *California Management Review*, 2(3), 70-76.

Davis, K. (1975). Five propositions for social responsibility. *Business Horizons*, 18(June), 19-24.

Dillman, D. A. (2000). *Mail and internet surveys: The tailored design method* (2nd ed.). New York: Wiley.

Dodds, R., & Kuehnel, J. (2010). CSR among Canadian mass tour operators: Good awareness but little action. *Management*, 22(2), 221-244.

Environics International, Ltd, The Prince of Wales Business Leaders, and The Conference Board (1999), "Millennium poll on corporate social responsibility", available at www.mori.com/polls/1999/milpolls.shtml

Etheredge, J. M. (1999). The Perceived Role of Ethics and Social Responsibility: An Alternative Scale Structure. *Journal of Business Ethics*. 18(1), 51-64.

Frederick, W. C. (1960). The growing concern over business responsibility. *California Management Review*, 2(4), 54-61. Retrieved from <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=buh&AN=6520236&site=ehost-live>

Goodwin, H. & Francis, J. (2004). Ethical and responsible tourism: Consumer trends in the UK. *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, 9(3), 271-284.

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

Holcomb, J. Okumus, F. & Bilgihan, A. (2010) Corporate Social Responsibility: What are the top three Orlando Theme Parks Reporting? *Worldwide Hospitality and Tourism Themes*, 2(3), p. 316-337.

Hunt, S. D., Kiecker, P. L., & Chonko, L. B. (1990). Social responsibility and personal success: A research note. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 18(3), 239-244.

Holcomb, J. L., Upchurch, R. S., & Okumus, F. (2007). Corporate social responsibility: What are top hotel companies reporting? *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 19(6), 461-475.

Holden, A. (2003). In need of new environmental ethics for tourism? *Annals of Tourism Research*, 30(1), 94-108.

Hunter, C., & Shaw, J. (2007). The ecological footprint as a key indicator of sustainable tourism. *Tourism Management*, 28(1), 46-57.

Jackson, L. A. & Hua, N. (2009). Corporate social responsibility and financial performance: A snapshot from the lodging and gaming industries. *Journal of Hospitality Financial Management*, 17(1), 4.

Jago, L. and Steward, M. (2007). Corporate social responsibility in the hospitality industry. *Tourism Review International*, 11(2) 107-114.

Jones, T. M. (1995). Instrumental stakeholder theory: A synthesis of ethics and economics. *The Academy of Management Review*, 20(2), 404-437. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/258852>

Jones, P., Comfort, D., & Hillier, D. (2006). Reporting and reflecting on corporate social responsibility in the hospitality industry. *Management*, 18(4), 329-340.

Jones, P., Hillier, D., & Comfort, D. (2009). Corporate social responsibility in the UK gambling industry. *Corporate Governance*, 9 (2), 189-201.

Kang, K. H., Lee, S., & Huh, C. (2009). Impacts of positive and negative corporate social responsibility activities on company performance in the hospitality industry. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 29(1), 72-81.

Knox, S. and S. Maklan (2004), "Corporate social responsibility: Moving beyond investment towards measuring outcomes", *European Management Journal*, Vol. 22, no.5, pp. 508-516.

Lee, M. P. (2008). A review of the theories of corporate social responsibility: Its evolutionary path and the road ahead. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 10(1), 53-73. doi:10.1111/j.1468-2370.2007.00226.x

Lee, S., & Heo, C. Y. (2009). Corporate social responsibility and customer satisfaction among US publicly traded hotels and restaurants. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 28(4), 635-637.

Lee, S., & Park, S. (2009). Do socially responsible activities help hotels and casinos achieve their financial goals? *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 28(1), 105-112. doi:10.1016/j.ijhm.2008.06.003

Lee, S., & Park, S. Y. (2010). Financial impacts of socially responsible activities on airline companies. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*, 34 (2), 185-203., ,

Matten, D., & Moon, J. (2008). "Implicit" and "explicit" CSR: A conceptual framework for a comparative understanding of corporate social responsibility. *Academy of Management Review*, 33(2), 404-424. Retrieved from <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=buh&AN=31193458&site=ehost-live>

McGhee, N.G., Wattanakamolchai, S., Perdue, R.R., & Calvert, E.O. (2009). Corporate social responsibility within the US lodging industry: An exploratory study. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*, 33, 417-437.

Orlando/Orange County Convention and Visitors Bureau, Inc. Retrieved 09/10, 2009, from <http://www.orlandoinfo.com/research/lodging/inventory.cfm>

Park, S. Y., & Lee, S. (2009). Financial rewards for social responsibility: A mixed picture for restaurant companies. *Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly*, 50(2), 168-179.

Richman, W. L., Kiesler, S., Weisband, S., & Drasgow, F. (1999). A meta-analytic study of social desirability distortion in computer-administered questionnaires, traditional questionnaires, and interviews. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 84, 754-775.

Rodríguez, F. J. G., & del Mar Armas Cruz, Y. (2007). Relation between social-environmental responsibility and performance in hotel firms. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 26(4), 824-839.

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

Scanlon, N. L. (2007). An analysis and assessment of environmental operating practices in hotel and resort properties. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 26(3), 711-723. doi:DOI: 10.1016/j.ijhm.2006.07.003

Sethi, P. S. (1975). Dimensions of corporate social performance: An analytical framework. *California Management Review*, 17(Spring), 58-64.

Singhapakdi, A., Vitell, S. J., Rallapalli, K. C., & Kraft, K. L. (1996). The perceived role of ethics and social responsibility: A scale development. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 15(11), 1131-1140.

Sethi, S. P. (1979). A conceptual framework for environmental analysis of social issues and evaluation of business response patterns. *The Academy of Management Review*, 4(1), 63-74. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/257404>

Tsai, W. H., Hsu, J. L., Chen, C. H., Lin, W. R., & Chen, S. P. (2009). An integrated approach for selecting corporate social responsibility programs and costs evaluation in the international tourist hotel. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 29(3), 385-396.

Turker, D. (2009). Measuring corporate social responsibility: A scale development study. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 85(4), 411-427. doi:10.1007/s10551-008-9780-6

Wartick, S. L., & Cochran, P. L. (1985). The evolution of the corporate social performance model. *The Academy of Management Review*, 10(4), 758-769. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/258044>

Wildes, V. J. (2008). How can organizational leaders really lead and serve at the same time? *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 20(1), 67-78. Retrieved from <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=buh&AN=31279599&site=ehost-live>

Wood, D. J. (1991). Corporate social performance revisited. *The Academy of Management Review*, 16(4), 691-718. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/258977>

Worthington, I., Ram, M., & Jones, T. (2006). Exploring corporate social responsibility in the UK Asian small business community. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 67(2), 201-217.