The inclusion of enterprise community involvement in workplace wellbeing instruments: a scoping review

Source: frontiers-orgpsych | **Author:** Jean H. Kim | **Published:** July 27, 2026 | **PMS Relevance:** PMS RELATED | **Type:** Meta-Analysis/Review | **Geography:** Global

Source URL: https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/forgp.2026.1883866

Executive Summary

This scoping review addresses the underrepresentation of Enterprise Community Involvement (ECI) — defined by the WHO as an organization's voluntary actions supporting community wellbeing — within existing workplace wellbeing (WWB) measurement instruments. The authors argue that despite the WHO's Healthy Workplace Framework identifying ECI as one of four core avenues of healthy workplaces, existing WWB instruments have systematically neglected this domain. Following PRISMA-ScR guidelines, the authors searched six databases (1960–2022) and identified 886 unique WWB instruments, examining each for the presence of at least one ECI-related item. Results revealed that only 13 instruments (1.5%) contained any ECI content, with Employee-Family Wellbeing and Eco-Friendly CSR being the most represented subthemes (each in 6 instruments), followed by Societal Philanthropy (5 instruments) and Protection of Vulnerable Groups (3 instruments). Psychometric validation of ECI-specific items was nearly absent across all identified instruments. The authors propose a preliminary four-subtheme descriptive framework intended to guide future ECI scale development, explicitly noting it is not an empirically validated measurement instrument. The review concludes that ECI represents a theoretically recognized but empirically neglected dimension of WWB assessment.

Key Insights

1. Only 1.5% (13 of 886) of identified workplace wellbeing instruments contain any item measuring Enterprise Community Involvement, indicating a near-total absence of ECI operationalization in current WWB measurement tools.

2. ECI items that do exist are typically embedded within broader CSR, ethical climate, or human resource scales rather than as standalone validated subscales, and almost none have psychometric validation specific to ECI content.

3. Four inductively derived ECI subthemes were identified from existing instruments: Employee-Family Wellbeing, Eco-Friendly CSR, Societal Philanthropy, and Protection of Vulnerable Groups — the first two being the most frequently represented, the last being the least.

Practical Takeaways

• Organizations assessing workplace wellbeing with existing instruments are likely missing the ECI dimension entirely, meaning the impact of community-oriented organizational activities on employee outcomes remains unmeasured in standard assessments.

• The four-subtheme framework (Societal Philanthropy, Eco-Friendly CSR, Employee-Family Wellbeing, Protection of Vulnerable Groups) offers a preliminary conceptual scaffold for organizations and researchers seeking to develop or augment WWB instruments with ECI content, pending rigorous psychometric validation.

Frameworks Mentioned

WHO Healthy Workplace Framework — World Health Organization framework outlining four avenues of workplace wellbeing: physical work environment, psychosocial environment, personal health resources, and enterprise community involvement.

Conservation of Resources (COR) Theory — Theoretical model proposing that stress results from the actual or threatened loss of personal resources, used here to explain indirect pathways through which ECI may enhance worker wellbeing.

PRISMA-ScR — Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses extension for Scoping Reviews; the methodological reporting guideline used to structure this review.

COSMIN — COnsensus-based Standards for the selection of health Measurement INstruments; a guideline framework referenced for future ECI scale development and psychometric validation.

Critical Analysis

Strengths: The study employs a rigorous and transparent scoping review methodology (PRISMA-ScR), searches six databases over a 62-year span, and achieves a large sample of 886 instruments. The finding of near-total ECI absence is based on a clearly operationalized inclusion criterion and independently verified by two coders with high agreement (>95%). The authors demonstrate appropriate epistemic humility by explicitly framing the proposed framework as preliminary and not validated. Limitations: The review is restricted to English-language publications, potentially introducing cultural and linguistic bias. Occupation-specific instruments were excluded, which may have omitted sectors (e.g., healthcare, community services) where ECI is inherently more integrated. The small number of ECI-containing instruments (n=13) limits the robustness of subtheme derivations. Formal inter-rater reliability statistics (e.g., Cohen's kappa) were not calculated, reducing the rigor of the coding process. Publication bias may have caused underestimation of ECI instrument prevalence, as poorly validated instruments are less likely to appear in published literature. The four-subtheme framework lacks empirical validation, factor-analytic support, or criterion validity, constraining its immediate utility. The review protocol was not pre-registered, which is a transparency limitation though acknowledged by the authors.

Organizational Practice

The review identifies that a small number of organizations have embedded ECI-related measurement within broader HR, CSR, or ethical climate surveys. Documented practices include measuring employee access to onsite childcare and flextime, assessing organizational environmental responsibility, surveying participation in company-sponsored community service events, and evaluating human rights and labor rights perceptions within CSR scales. These practices appear primarily in hospitality, manufacturing, higher education, and public sector organizational contexts, based on the 13 instruments identified.

Strategic Implications

The near-total absence of ECI from validated WWB instruments suggests that performance management and employee wellbeing assessment systems are systematically oriented toward internal organizational factors, potentially rendering community-oriented HR and CSR activities invisible in workforce analytics.

As ESG reporting obligations and social sustainability expectations grow, the gap between what organizations do in the community and what they measure in terms of employee impact may become increasingly consequential for comprehensive wellbeing strategy evaluation. The temporal trend noted in the study — ECI items emerging only post-2000 and accelerating post-2020 — suggests that measurement practices may gradually align with broader societal and regulatory expectations, but currently lag behind conceptual frameworks such as the WHO Healthy Workplace model.

Validation Status: passed
