Supplementary Material

Corporate Social Responsibility and Perceived Sustainability Performance in Greece: Evidence from a Cross-Sectional Survey of Employees and Managers

Stavros Kalogiannidis, Grigoris Giannarakis, Konstantinos Spinthiropoulos, Dimitrios Parris and Anastasios Konstantinidis

This file contains the item-level response distributions (Tables S1–S5), the exploratory factor analysis pattern matrix (Table S6, Promax solution as reported in the main text; Table S6b, unsuppressed direct-oblimin re-estimation), the standardized loadings of the five-factor confirmatory factor analysis (Table S7), the discriminant-validity matrices (Table S8) and the full coefficient tables of the sensitivity regressions (Tables S9 and S10). N = 322 individual respondents in all tables; all variables are respondent-reported and the dependent variable is perceived sustainability performance.

Table S1. Item-Level Response Distributions: Environmental Sustainability Practices (ESP1–ESP7) (N = 322). Frequency (percentage).

Item	Statement	SD	D	N	A	SA
ESP1	I actively reduce waste in my organization.	18 (5.6)	32 (9.9)	46 (14.3)	132 (41.0)	94 (29.2)
ESP2	I promote energy-efficient practices at work.	14 (4.3)	28 (8.7)	40 (12.4)	146 (45.3)	94 (29.2)
ESP3	My organization invests in environmentally friendly technologies.	20 (6.2)	36 (11.2)	54 (16.8)	128 (39.8)	84 (26.1)
ESP4	I ensure compliance with environmental regulations.	10 (3.1)	24 (7.5)	42 (13.0)	148 (46.0)	98 (30.4)
ESP5	I support initiatives that reduce carbon emissions.	16 (5.0)	30 (9.3)	48 (14.9)	134 (41.6)	94 (29.2)
ESP6	Environmental responsibility improves long-term performance.	12 (3.7)	22 (6.8)	34 (10.6)	144 (44.7)	110 (34.2)
ESP7	Environmental CSR enhances organizational reputation.	8 (2.5)	20 (6.2)	36 (11.2)	150 (46.6)	108 (33.5)

Table S2. Item-Level Response Distributions: Employee Welfare and Labor Practices (EWP1–EWP7) (N = 322). Frequency (percentage).

Item	Statement	SD	D	N	A	SA
EWP1	I work in a safe and healthy environment.	14 (4.3)	26 (8.1)	38 (11.8)	146 (45.3)	98 (30.4)
EWP2	My organization promotes work–life balance.	18 (5.6)	34 (10.6)	52 (16.1)	134 (41.6)	84 (26.1)
EWP3	Employees receive fair compensation.	22 (6.8)	38 (11.8)	46 (14.3)	128 (39.8)	88 (27.3)
EWP4	Training and development are encouraged.	12 (3.7)	28 (8.7)	44 (13.7)	144 (44.7)	94 (29.2)
EWP5	Diversity and inclusion are supported.	16 (5.0)	30 (9.3)	50 (15.5)	134 (41.6)	92 (28.6)
EWP6	Employee welfare improves productivity.	10 (3.1)	24 (7.5)	36 (11.2)	146 (45.3)	106 (32.9)

EWP7	Good labour practices enhance sustainability.	8 (2.5)	18 (5.6)	34 (10.6)	152 (47.2)	110 (34.2)

Table S3. Item-Level Response Distributions: Ethical Business Practices (EBP1–EBP7) (N = 322). Frequency (percentage).

Item	Statement	SD	D	N	A	SA
EBP1	I observe ethical standards at work.	6 (1.9)	18 (5.6)	30 (9.3)	156 (48.4)	112 (34.8)
EBP2	Transparency is encouraged in my organization.	10 (3.1)	26 (8.1)	40 (12.4)	142 (44.1)	104 (32.3)
EBP3	Corruption is not tolerated.	8 (2.5)	20 (6.2)	36 (11.2)	146 (45.3)	112 (34.8)
EBP4	Ethical leadership is practiced.	14 (4.3)	30 (9.3)	48 (14.9)	132 (41.0)	98 (30.4)
EBP5	Ethical behavior improves stakeholder trust.	6 (1.9)	16 (5.0)	28 (8.7)	150 (46.6)	122 (37.9)
EBP6	Ethics improve long-term sustainability.	8 (2.5)	18 (5.6)	32 (9.9)	146 (45.3)	118 (36.6)
EBP7	Ethical CSR enhances firm credibility.	6 (1.9)	14 (4.3)	30 (9.3)	154 (47.8)	118 (36.6)

Table S4. Item-Level Response Distributions: Community Engagement and Social Development (CE1–CE7) (N = 322). Frequency (percentage).

Item	Statement	SD	D	N	A	SA
CE1	I participate in community development initiatives.	22 (6.8)	36 (11.2)	48 (14.9)	130 (40.4)	86 (26.7)
CE2	My organization supports local communities.	14 (4.3)	28 (8.7)	44 (13.7)	146 (45.3)	90 (28.0)
CE3	CSR improves community–company relations.	10 (3.1)	22 (6.8)	38 (11.8)	148 (46.0)	104 (32.3)
CE4	Community CSR enhances brand reputation.	8 (2.5)	20 (6.2)	36 (11.2)	150 (46.6)	108 (33.5)
CE5	Community investment supports sustainability.	12 (3.7)	24 (7.5)	40 (12.4)	144 (44.7)	102 (31.7)
CE6	Social initiatives improve firm legitimacy.	10 (3.1)	18 (5.6)	34 (10.6)	152 (47.2)	108 (33.5)
CE7	Community engagement drives long-term success.	8 (2.5)	16 (5.0)	30 (9.3)	154 (47.8)	114 (35.4)

Table S5. Item-Level Response Distributions: Perceived Sustainability Performance (SP1–SP7) (N = 322). Frequency (percentage).

Item	Statement	SD	D	N	A	SA
SP1	Our organization meets its environmental performance targets.	7 (2.2)	17 (5.3)	33 (10.2)	151 (46.9)	114 (35.4)
SP2	Our organization contributes positively to social well-being.	9 (2.8)	21 (6.5)	37 (11.5)	145 (45.0)	110 (34.2)
SP3	Our organization maintains long-term economic viability.	5 (1.6)	15 (4.7)	29 (9.0)	157 (48.8)	116 (36.0)

SP4	Resource and energy efficiency have improved over time.	11 (3.4)	23 (7.1)	35 (10.9)	147 (45.7)	106 (32.9)
SP5	Economic, social and environmental objectives are balanced.	7 (2.2)	19 (5.9)	31 (9.6)	149 (46.3)	116 (36.0)
SP6	Stakeholders regard our organization as sustainable.	6 (1.9)	16 (5.0)	30 (9.3)	153 (47.5)	117 (36.3)
SP7	Overall sustainability performance has improved in recent years.	8 (2.5)	18 (5.6)	32 (9.9)	148 (46.0)	116 (36.0)

Note: SD = strongly disagree; D = disagree; N = neutral; A = agree; SA = strongly agree. Item codes correspond to Appendix A of the main text. Items ESP6–ESP7, EWP6–EWP7, EBP5–EBP7 and CE3–CE7 refer to perceived consequences of CSR rather than to practices (see Section 3.5 and Appendix A).

Table S6. Pattern Matrix of the Five-Factor Exploratory Factor Analysis of the 35 Scored Items as Reported in the Main Text (Principal Axis Factoring, Promax Rotation, κ = 4, Kaiser Normalization; N = 322).

Item	Item wording	F1	F2	F3	F4	F5
EBP1	I observe ethical standards at work.	0.773	—	—	—	—
EBP4	Ethical leadership is practiced.	0.703	—	—	—	—
EBP7	Ethical CSR enhances firm credibility.	0.698	—	—	—	—
EBP6	Ethics improve long-term sustainability.	0.670	—	—	—	—
EBP2	Transparency is encouraged in my organization.	0.656	—	—	—	—
EBP3	Corruption is not tolerated.	0.621	—	—	—	—
EBP5	Ethical behavior improves stakeholder trust.	0.577	—	—	—	—
CE7	Community engagement drives long-term success.	—	0.740	—	—	—
CE2	My organization supports local communities.	—	0.740	—	—	—
CE6	Social initiatives improve firm legitimacy.	—	0.723	—	—	—
CE5	Community investment supports sustainability.	—	0.695	—	—	—
CE3	CSR improves community-company relations.	—	0.644	—	—	—
CE1	I participate in community development initiatives.	—	0.640	—	—	—
CE4	Community CSR enhances brand reputation.	—	0.581	—	—	—
ESP7	Environmental CSR enhances organizational reputation.	—	—	0.702	—	—
ESP2	I promote energy-efficient practices at work.	—	—	0.693	—	—
ESP4	I ensure compliance with environmental regulations.	—	—	0.616	—	—
ESP6	Environmental responsibility improves long-term performance.	—	—	0.593	—	—
ESP5	I support initiatives that reduce carbon emissions.	—	—	0.573	—	—
ESP3	My organization invests in environmentally friendly technologies.	—	—	0.569	—	—

ESP1	I actively reduce waste in my organization.	—	—	0.551	—	—
EWP2	My organization promotes work-life balance.	—	—	—	0.654	—
EWP4	Training and development are encouraged.	—	—	—	0.646	—
EWP5	Diversity and inclusion are supported.	—	—	—	0.610	—
EWP3	Employees receive fair compensation.	—	—	—	0.527	—
EWP7	Good labour practices enhance sustainability.	—	—	—	0.480	—
EWP6	Employee welfare improves productivity.	—	—	—	0.462	—
EWP1	I work in a safe and healthy environment.	—	—	—	0.422	—
SP2	Our organization contributes positively to social well-being.	—	—	—	—	0.665
SP5	Economic, social and environmental objectives are balanced.	—	—	—	—	0.646
SP4	Resource and energy efficiency have improved over time.	—	—	—	—	0.637
SP6	Stakeholders regard our organization as sustainable.	—	—	—	—	0.511
SP7	Overall sustainability performance has improved in recent years.	—	—	—	—	0.469
SP3	Our organization maintains long-term economic viability.	—	—	—	—	0.449
SP1	Our organization meets its environmental performance targets.	—	—	—	—	0.438

Note: Standardized pattern coefficients from the SPSS output of the original analysis (rotation converged in 6 iterations); factors are numbered as returned by the software (F1 = ethical business practices; F2 = community engagement; F3 = environmental sustainability practices; F4 = employee welfare practices; F5 = perceived sustainability performance). Coefficients with absolute value below 0.40 were suppressed in the saved output and are shown as "—"; every item has exactly one coefficient ≥ 0.40, on its theoretically expected factor (range 0.422–0.773). KMO = 0.941; Bartlett's $\chi^2(595) = 5026.545$, $p < 0.001$; five factors retained (initial eigenvalues 12.072, 2.235, 1.875, 1.570, 1.129; sixth 0.926); the five factors account for 46.3% of total variance; factor correlations 0.487–0.696. Table S6b gives the complete, unsuppressed coefficients from a re-estimation of the same extraction with direct oblimin rotation.

Table S6b. Complete (Unsuppressed) Pattern Matrix from a Re-Estimation of the Same Five-Factor Principal-Axis Solution with Direct Oblimin Rotation (Kaiser Normalization; N = 322).

Item	Item wording	F1	F2	F3	F4	F5
SP2	Our organization contributes positively to social well-being.	0.456	0.158	0.034	0.173	0.147
SP5	Economic, social and environmental objectives are balanced.	0.441	0.049	0.215	0.087	0.080
SP4	Resource and energy efficiency have improved over time.	0.436	0.134	0.169	0.114	0.065
SP6	Stakeholders regard our organization as sustainable.	0.351	0.097	0.096	0.096	0.218
SP7	Overall sustainability performance has improved in recent years.	0.322	0.162	0.178	0.117	0.140
SP3	Our organization maintains long-term economic viability.	0.309	0.194	0.005	0.176	0.193
SP1	Our organization meets its environmental performance targets.	0.303	0.109	0.080	0.099	0.297
ESP7	Environmental CSR enhances organizational reputation.	-0.070	0.655	0.030	0.023	0.016

ESP2	I promote energy-efficient practices at work.	-0.119	0.641	-0.010	0.137	0.037
ESP4	I ensure compliance with environmental regulations.	0.119	0.609	-0.047	0.012	0.037
ESP6	Environmental responsibility improves long-term performance.	0.074	0.576	0.154	-0.085	-0.015
ESP5	I support initiatives that reduce carbon emissions.	0.040	0.556	0.054	0.174	-0.079
ESP3	My organization invests in environmentally friendly technologies.	0.080	0.556	-0.028	-0.120	0.185
ESP1	I actively reduce waste in my organization.	0.066	0.540	0.047	0.124	-0.047
CE7	Community engagement drives long-term success.	-0.058	0.144	0.730	-0.019	-0.034
CE2	My organization supports local communities.	-0.067	-0.012	0.726	0.087	-0.075
CE6	Social initiatives improve firm legitimacy.	0.014	-0.031	0.724	0.008	0.038
CE5	Community investment supports sustainability.	0.035	-0.017	0.697	-0.132	0.112
CE3	CSR improves community-company relations.	0.011	0.002	0.647	0.046	0.033
CE1	I participate in community development initiatives.	0.022	-0.025	0.645	0.026	0.119
CE4	Community CSR enhances brand reputation.	0.154	0.014	0.612	0.066	-0.021
EWP2	My organization promotes work-life balance.	-0.000	-0.064	0.057	0.628	0.065
EWP4	Training and development are encouraged.	-0.025	-0.059	-0.012	0.617	0.149
EWP5	Diversity and inclusion are supported.	-0.011	0.081	0.047	0.587	-0.002
EWP3	Employees receive fair compensation.	0.035	0.071	0.084	0.519	0.061
EWP7	Good labour practices enhance sustainability.	0.141	0.020	0.007	0.492	-0.014
EWP1	I work in a safe and healthy environment.	0.176	0.078	-0.006	0.445	-0.027
EWP6	Employee welfare improves productivity.	-0.092	0.119	0.026	0.430	0.030
EBP1	I observe ethical standards at work.	-0.098	0.105	-0.019	0.036	0.723
EBP7	Ethical CSR enhances firm credibility.	0.062	-0.089	0.042	0.034	0.682
EBP4	Ethical leadership is practiced.	0.012	0.056	0.062	-0.016	0.677
EBP2	Transparency is encouraged in my organization.	0.130	-0.008	-0.017	0.089	0.659
EBP6	Ethics improve long-term sustainability.	-0.125	-0.033	0.078	0.131	0.621
EBP3	Corruption is not tolerated.	0.063	0.011	0.071	-0.009	0.609
EBP5	Ethical behavior improves stakeholder trust.	0.117	0.094	0.017	-0.027	0.578

Note: This re-estimation was run to provide every coefficient without suppression, as requested in review; factors are numbered as returned by the software in this run (F1 = perceived sustainability performance; F2 = environmental sustainability practices; F3 = community engagement; F4 = employee welfare practices; F5 = ethical business practices). The item–factor assignment is identical to Table S6. Under direct oblimin rotation the primary coefficients of the seven perceived-sustainability-performance items are lower (0.303–0.456) than under Promax, and no secondary coefficient reaches 0.40 (largest 0.297). The EFA and the CFA (Table S7) were estimated on the same sample and do not constitute independent validation.

Table S7. Standardized Factor Loadings of the Five-Factor Confirmatory Factor Analysis (DWLS, Robust Standard Errors; N = 322).

Factor	Item	Unstandardized λ	SE	Standardized λ	95% CI (standardized)	z	p
ESP	ESP1	1.000	0.0000	0.682	[0.599, 0.764]	—	—
ESP	ESP2	1.043	0.0856	0.711	[0.633, 0.788]	12.19	<.001
ESP	ESP3	0.982	0.0831	0.669	[0.582, 0.756]	11.81	<.001
ESP	ESP4	1.028	0.0864	0.701	[0.622, 0.780]	11.91	<.001
ESP	ESP5	1.066	0.0838	0.727	[0.648, 0.805]	12.72	<.001
ESP	ESP6	1.060	0.0805	0.722	[0.647, 0.797]	13.16	<.001
ESP	ESP7	1.045	0.0830	0.712	[0.631, 0.794]	12.60	<.001
EWP	EWP1	1.000	0.0000	0.635	[0.541, 0.729]	—	—
EWP	EWP2	1.090	0.1089	0.692	[0.608, 0.777]	10.01	<.001
EWP	EWP3	1.161	0.1051	0.737	[0.657, 0.818]	11.04	<.001
EWP	EWP4	1.089	0.1061	0.692	[0.605, 0.779]	10.26	<.001
EWP	EWP5	1.020	0.1068	0.648	[0.552, 0.743]	9.55	<.001
EWP	EWP6	0.897	0.1026	0.569	[0.464, 0.675]	8.74	<.001
EWP	EWP7	0.977	0.1075	0.620	[0.523, 0.717]	9.09	<.001
EBP	EBP1	1.000	0.0000	0.778	[0.715, 0.841]	—	—
EBP	EBP2	1.051	0.0559	0.818	[0.755, 0.881]	18.79	<.001
EBP	EBP3	0.944	0.0545	0.734	[0.661, 0.807]	17.32	<.001
EBP	EBP4	1.003	0.0549	0.781	[0.717, 0.844]	18.28	<.001
EBP	EBP5	0.974	0.0560	0.758	[0.692, 0.824]	17.39	<.001
EBP	EBP6	0.909	0.0638	0.707	[0.625, 0.789]	14.24	<.001
EBP	EBP7	0.979	0.0596	0.761	[0.688, 0.835]	16.43	<.001
CE	CE1	1.000	0.0000	0.791	[0.727, 0.854]	—	—
CE	CE2	0.856	0.0590	0.677	[0.598, 0.756]	14.52	<.001
CE	CE3	0.947	0.0559	0.748	[0.678, 0.819]	16.94	<.001
CE	CE4	0.999	0.0602	0.790	[0.719, 0.861]	16.58	<.001
CE	CE5	0.902	0.0594	0.713	[0.634, 0.792]	15.19	<.001
CE	CE6	0.983	0.0577	0.778	[0.708, 0.847]	17.06	<.001

CE	CE7	0.989	0.0577	0.782	[0.718, 0.846]	17.14	<.001
SP	SP1	1.000	0.0000	0.738	[0.670, 0.806]	—	—
SP	SP2	1.063	0.0650	0.784	[0.722, 0.847]	16.35	<.001
SP	SP3	1.022	0.0682	0.754	[0.689, 0.819]	14.99	<.001
SP	SP4	0.995	0.0649	0.734	[0.665, 0.804]	15.34	<.001
SP	SP5	0.991	0.0620	0.731	[0.663, 0.799]	15.98	<.001
SP	SP6	1.010	0.0641	0.745	[0.676, 0.815]	15.77	<.001
SP	SP7	1.040	0.0640	0.768	[0.703, 0.832]	16.25	<.001

Note: First indicator of each factor fixed to 1 for identification (z and p not applicable). Estimation: jamovi 2.7, SEMLj 1.2.8 (lavaan, semTools; R 4.5); items treated as ordered categorical; DWLS with robust standard errors and mean- and variance-adjusted test statistic. Fit: scaled $\chi^2(550) = 564$, $p = 0.325$; CFI = 1.000; TLI = 1.007; robust RMSEA = 0.033 (95% CI 0.022–0.043); SRMR = 0.037; 65 iterations; converged. Reliability: Cronbach's α = 0.830/0.796/0.873/0.877/0.860; ordinal α = 0.872/0.839/0.906/0.902/0.899; McDonald's ω (ω_2) = 0.840/0.809/0.875/0.871/0.876; AVE = 0.495/0.433/0.582/0.570/0.564 for ESP/EWP/EBP/CE/SP.

Table S8. Discriminant Validity: Fornell–Larcker Comparison (Lower Triangle: Latent Correlations; Diagonal: √AVE) and HTMT Ratios (Upper Triangle).

Construct	ESP	EWP	EBP	CE	SP
ESP	0.704	0.660	0.565	0.549	0.765
EWP	0.665*	0.658	0.641	0.579	0.728
EBP	0.575	0.652	0.763	0.659	0.788
CE	0.561	0.588	0.667	0.755	0.698
SP	0.770*	0.731*	0.793*	0.706	0.751

Note: Diagonal values are the square roots of the AVE (ESP 0.704; EWP 0.658; EBP 0.763; CE 0.755; SP 0.751). Lower-triangle values are model-implied standardized latent correlations from the CFA; an asterisk marks the four pairs for which the correlation exceeds the smaller √AVE of the pair (Fornell–Larcker criterion not met: ESP–EWP, ESP–SP, EWP–SP, EBP–SP). Upper-triangle values are heterotrait–monotrait ratios; all are below 0.85 (maximum 0.788, EBP–SP).

Table S9. Practice-Only Sensitivity Regression (Predictors: ESP1–ESP5, EWP1–EWP5, EBP1–EBP4, CE1–CE2; Dependent Variable: Perceived Sustainability Performance, SP1–SP7; N = 322).

Predictor	B	SE	β	t	p	95% CI for B	Tolerance	VIF
(Constant)	0.749	0.145	—	5.15	< 0.001	[0.463, 1.035]	—	—
ESP (5 items; α = 0.778)	0.269	0.036	0.309	7.42	< 0.001	[0.198, 0.340]	0.678	1.476
EWP (5 items; α = 0.758)	0.180	0.039	0.204	4.64	< 0.001	[0.103, 0.256]	0.608	1.645
EBP (4 items; α = 0.816)	0.292	0.038	0.337	7.74	< 0.001	[0.218, 0.366]	0.619	1.617
CE (2 items; α = 0.625)	0.120	0.029	0.165	4.08	< 0.001	[0.062, 0.177]	0.720	1.388

Note: R = 0.793; R^2 = 0.628; adjusted R^2 = 0.624; SE of estimate = 0.427; F(4, 317) = 133.97, p < 0.001; Durbin–Watson = 2.12; regression SS = 97.584, residual SS = 57.726, total SS = 155.310. Standardized residuals ranged from −3.68 to 2.50. Compared with the primary model (R^2 = 0.654), the reduction in explained variance indicates that part of the primary model's R^2 is attributable to outcome-oriented item content.

Table S10. Role- and Sector-Adjusted Regressions (Dependent Variable: Perceived Sustainability Performance; Full Seven-Item CSR Scales; N = 322).

Predictor	B	SE	β	t	p	95% CI for B
Model A: primary + role						
(Constant)	0.410	0.174	—	2.36	0.019	[0.068, 0.752]
ESP	0.274	0.038	0.296	7.15	< 0.001	[0.199, 0.349]
EWP	0.171	0.042	0.177	4.06	< 0.001	[0.088, 0.254]
EBP	0.322	0.042	0.337	7.68	< 0.001	[0.239, 0.404]
CE	0.182	0.038	0.202	4.79	< 0.001	[0.107, 0.256]
Role (management vs non-management)	−0.048	0.047	−0.035	−1.02	0.307	[−0.141, 0.045]
Model B: primary + sector + role						
(Constant)	0.275	0.166	—	1.66	0.099	[−0.052, 0.601]
ESP	0.275	0.038	0.298	7.16	< 0.001	[0.200, 0.351]
EWP	0.173	0.042	0.178	4.07	< 0.001	[0.089, 0.256]
EBP	0.319	0.042	0.334	7.57	< 0.001	[0.236, 0.402]
CE	0.185	0.038	0.206	4.86	< 0.001	[0.110, 0.259]
Other services (vs manufacturing)	0.095	0.066	0.062	1.44	0.151	[−0.035, 0.224]
Finance (vs manufacturing)	0.140	0.076	0.074	1.84	0.067	[−0.010, 0.291]
Healthcare (vs manufacturing)	0.073	0.077	0.038	0.94	0.346	[−0.079, 0.224]
Public administration (vs manufacturing)	0.078	0.074	0.043	1.05	0.293	[−0.068, 0.224]
Role (management vs non-management)	−0.053	0.047	−0.038	−1.13	0.261	[−0.147, 0.040]

Note: Model A: R^2 = 0.655, adjusted R^2 = 0.649; ΔR^2 versus primary model = 0.001, F-change(1, 316) = 1.05, p = 0.307. Model B: R^2 = 0.659, adjusted R^2 = 0.649; ΔR^2 versus primary model = 0.005, F-change(5, 312) = 0.96, p = 0.444; F(9, 312) = 66.93, p < 0.001. Sector indicators use manufacturing (n = 68) as the reference category; other services n = 94, finance n = 52, healthcare n = 50, public administration n = 58; management n = 184, non-management n = 138. Ordinary least squares with conventional standard errors; organization identifiers were not retained, so no clustering adjustment was possible. Independent-samples comparison of scale means by role: ESP t(320) = −0.82, p = 0.415; EWP Welch t(310.9) = 2.29, p = 0.023 (mean difference 0.18, non-management higher); EBP t(320) = 0.06, p = 0.950; CE t(320) = 0.23, p = 0.818; SP t(320) = 0.84, p = 0.402.