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Abstract

The purpose of this study was to investigate the importance and impact of espoused Corporate Social Performance (CSP) on job-seeker attitudes towards organisational attraction, and to then extend this inquiry further to determining ‘why’ such attraction may, or may not, occur. The research question is: “to what extent do job-seekers find Corporate Social Performance, and its elements, to be attractive in a potential employer?” The five sub-dimensions/elements of CSP investigated were: employee relations, treatment of women and minorities, concern for the environment, product quality, and community relations. CSP was not only explored in its entirety and as individual elements but contrasted and evaluated for relative importance against five more traditional organisational attributes; challenging work, training and development, pay compensation and benefits, career advancement, and job security.

This study was conducted using a sample population of Undergraduate Business Degree students from a large institute of technology. A survey questionnaire was distributed both electronically and in paper copy format for voluntary participation by students. Participants were asked to assess the value of CSP in a potential employer, and rank and scale the individual elements in order of importance. The survey sought participant views and opinions as to the reason for their selections and rankings of importance. All data collected from correctly returned questionnaires was collated for analysis.

From this analysis while it was found that overall traditional job factors hold more importance than CSP to job-seekers in a potential employer, the element ‘employee relations’ was prominent and universally valued in an employer. Of the five CSP elements measured in this study ‘employee relations’ and ‘product quality’ ranked first and second most important in a potential employer respectively. It was also found that different job-seeking populations may value certain CSP elements differently. Additionally, the findings of this study indicate that job-seekers value CSP elements that have direct impact, and are more closely linked to daily work life more highly than those seemingly more removed. The findings of this study suggest that there are many and
varied influences that impact on job-seeker perceptions of the importance of CSP in a potential employer, and a number of theoretical rationales. A key finding was that job-seekers may perceive CSP as a ‘commitment’ to them by employers. Furthermore, from a theoretical standpoint social identity theory and signalling theory appeared to offer explanatory assessment. This study found support for the perceived attraction, value and importance of espoused organisational CSP activity in potential employers by job-seekers.
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Chapter One

1.0 Introduction

1.1 Overview: The lead up to this project

In 2009 an economic downturn was witnessed that has been likened to that of the Great Depression of the 1920’s and 30’s (O’Rourke & Eichengreen, 2009). While New Zealand has increasingly found itself in the midst of this economic downturn, and unemployment has risen from an all time low of 3.4% in December 2007 to 5% in the March 2009 (stats.govt.nz, 2009), it still finds itself in short supply of, and unable to attract, the quality skilled labour needed to flourish in a global free market economy. This has been highlighted by organisations such as Transpower, which is not only recruiting from overseas but speeding up graduate and cadet recruitment schemes due to a shortage of skilled engineers (newstalkzb, 08.06.2009). Furthermore, while it appears that the employment pendulum is making yet another correction from, as Sutherland, Torricelli and Karg (2002) proposed, a sellers’ market, and bearing in mind that between 2-4% is considered full employment (Birks & Chatterjee, 2001), New Zealand has fared better than other developed countries such as the United Kingdom where unemployment reached 7.1% in March 2009 (statistics.govt.uk).

Therefore, even in today’s volatile business environment it can be perceived that competition for resources is still high on the agendas of most organisations given the need to obtain, and maintain, competitive advantage. Amid the most difficult of resources for organisations to secure is that of a quality skilled labour force. The demand for quality labour resources has left some organisations floundering and with no real differentiation, or the arsenal, needed to win the talent war (Sutherland et al, 2002). Leonard (2000) went as far as to say that businesses will live and die based on their ability to attract the right talent. Given this concept of employees being of such importance, a stance favoured by followers of ‘Resource Based View’ (Branco & Rodrigues, 2006; Holland, Sheehan, & De Cieri, 2007), it stands to reason that there is
a need for organisations to invest in securing the human resources necessary to remain competitive and gain an advantage.

Literature suggests that the cost of securing skilled labour is not, and should not, be confined to traditional monetary and job/organisational factors alone (Lievens & Highhouse, 2003; K. M. Thomas & Wise, 1999). Lievens and Highhouse (2003) further propose that job-seekers are attracted to organisations by a package, or bundle, of varied rewards and benefits that include organisational attributes such as reputation, image and culture in addition to those of a more customary nature. In considering an organisation’s ‘reputation and image’ an association with the domain of marketing is often made (Lievens & Highhouse, 2003). While this may be true, it is increasingly being acknowledged that a ‘marketing based angle’ can equally be applied to the early stages of recruitment so as to attract and target potential groups (Lievens & Highhouse, 2003; Sutherland et al., 2002). In fact, Sutherland et al (2002) has proposed that “the hiring process has become nearly indistinguishable from the marketing process” (p. 13).

When looking at organisational branding from a recruitment angle and focusing in particular on reputation and image, there is an increasing awareness of espoused organisational ‘Corporate Social Performance’ (Albinger & Freeman, 2000; Backhaus, 2004; Backhaus, Stone, & Heiner, 2002; Greening & Turban, 2000; Luce, Barber, & Hillman, 2001; Sen, 2006; Turban & Greening, 1997). Traditionally, the concept of Corporate Social Performance was linked with conforming to government regulations, profit maximisation, and consumer moral and ethical awareness (Alsop, 2004; Argenti & Druckenmiller, 2004; Carroll, 1999; Griffin & Mahon, 1997; Marquez & Fombrun, 2005; Meijer, De Bakker, Smit, & Schuyt, 2006). However, it has been suggested that firms can, and should, consider CSP as a means of expressing organisational values that will provide a return constituting more than mere profits and consumer loyalty (Turban & Greening, 1997). This is to say, the impact and effects of and for CSP has grown more diverse, and inclusive of ‘all’ stakeholders.

It is from this stakeholder inclusiveness that employees’, and more importantly here, employee attraction, are now beginning to emerge and form an integral part of some
organisation’s CSP intent within their overall corporate and recruitment strategy (Dentchev, 2004; Graves & Waddock, 2000). In order to indicate the importance of this, it has been proposed that the espoused ‘Corporate Social Performance’ of a firm can act as an indicator, or signal, of what they would be like to work for, and that when coupled with job-seekers’ desire to identify with, and fit into, an organisation they may act as antecedents to attractiveness (Backhaus et al., 2002; Greening & Turban, 2000; Turban & Greening, 1997).

Accordingly, as organisational branding and its sub themes are progressively highlighted as a useful tool in the recruitment process and becoming an employer of choice (Lievens & Highhouse, 2003; Slaughter, Zickar, Highhouse, & Mohr, 2004), it is felt that organisational values by way of CSP may form a fundamental part of the overall package desired by job-seekers (Turban & Greening, 1997). Given this, and the need for firms to secure a skilled workforce, this thesis endeavours to investigate the suggested link between espoused organisational Corporate Social Performance (CSP) and job-seeker attraction. Ultimately this research will attempt to give organisations, with particular consideration given to the Human Resources function, a further tool to aid in winning the talent war, and therefore potentially gain competitive advantage.

1.2. Aims and objectives of this research

As alluded to earlier, even though the employment pendulum may be shifting once again, and there are more job-seekers on the market from which organisations can draw, the need to secure quality skilled human resources still remains of high importance. If we add to this that traditional recruitment methods and job factors on offer are perceivably similar across most organisations, there is need to generate a point of difference and fashion new avenues of opportunity that draw attention to firms as being a desirable place to work (M. Johnson, 2002; Lievens & Highhouse, 2003). Additionally, it is proposed that as available workforce demographics continue to change (Holland & De Cieri, 2006) it will become increasingly important for organisations and Human Resource practitioners alike, to be able to profile and identify what attributes over and
above traditional job factors hold influence and are desirable within different job-seeking populations (Holland & De Cieri, 2006; Wiesner, 2003).

This research attempts to assist organisations in this by investigating not only ‘if’ CSP can influence job-seeker employment pursuance decisions, but ‘what’ elements within CSP are most sought and ‘why’. This research will add to, and build on, the current growing body of literature around espoused CSP as an attractor to job-seekers. As well as identifying the key CSP elements desired by job-seekers, this research will explore if, when they are attached to a hierarchy of traditionally recognised organisational/job factors such as training and development, career advancement, and remuneration, they could add a possible competitive advantage. This is to say that this research will endeavour to have an outcome that identifies the integral parts of the package, or bundle, of organisational attributes that job-seekers find attractive in a potential employer.

The foundation of this project is inspired by a study carried out by Turban and Greening (1997) where they discovered that a firm’s CSP was positively related to its reputation, and employee attractiveness. Turban and Greening’s (1997) research has been explored further by Greening and Turban (2000), Luce et al. (2001) and Backhaus (2002). While these studies answer many questions regarding the influence of organisational CSP and its consequent association in attracting job-seekers, the following areas were left, and suggested as, needing further investigation:

- Individual level analysis of the importance of CSP to job-seekers (Backhaus et al., 2002; Turban & Greening, 1997).
- The exploration into the relative importance of CSP dimensions compared to other organisational attributes (Backhaus et al., 2002).
- How job-seekers search out information regarding a firm’s CSP (Backhaus et al., 2002).

This research investigates and explores the relationship of espoused organisational values, by way of CSP, and how they are unified to job-seeker wants in a potential employer through social identity theory and signalling theory. Also, though to a lesser
extent, additional related theories such as person-organisation fit and motivational theory will also be discussed as they become relevant. While CSP can be viewed as one construct, this research will extend this and also explore its individual sub-dimensions/elements. This will involve the utilisation of five CSP dimensions identified in the seminal writings of Turban and Greening (1997). The five CSP elements to be explored are: employee relations, treatment of women and minorities (diversity), concern for the environment, product quality, and community relations. Furthermore, given the subjective nature of the desirability of CSP views and opinions are solicited from the sample population to assist in the unearthing of ‘why’ CSP and its individual elements may be of importance to job-seekers in a potential employer. It is perceived that through analysis of this qualitative component, any key themes and relationships to emerge will not only help to explain the impact of CSP on job-seeker and employer attraction, but can in turn be explored and referred to dominant explanatory and supporting theory as a basis to offer further depth of understanding.

As stated earlier, the primary aim of this project is to ascertain ‘if’ CSP and ‘what’ elements/dimensions influence organisational attractiveness in job-seekers. It is felt that through the achievement of this aim that the following objectives will be obtained:

- To identify those espoused organisational CSP dimensions most desired by job-seekers.
- To determine the relative importance of CSP in relation to traditional organisational/job factors as predictors of pursuance to employment.
- To apply appropriate theory to explain job-seeker priority of CSP dimensions – social identity theory, signalling theory, person-organisational fit.
- To apply appropriate theory to explain any trends, associations, variance, and/or correlation identified – social identity theory, signalling theory, person-organisational fit.
- To determine if CSP adds notably to overall organisational attractiveness.

This project also aims to identify and rank in order of importance CSP dimensions and traditional job factors as one unit according to their relevance to the sample population.
Additionally, this research has the objective to further expand on, and utilise, the original research of Turban and Greening (1997). This current research is not to determine supply of job-seekers, nor evaluate well-rehearsed traditional recruitment methods, but rather to understand what will generate interest in organisations as a preferred employer and procure point of difference by adding Corporate Social Performance to the employer branding mix. Moreover, this research attempts to surpass a singular belief in a traditional recruitment focus while increasing knowledge and insight towards solving the business problem of ‘attracting quality job-seekers’.

It is believed that this research will assist in the understanding of the impact of CSP on job-seeker decisions to pursue an employer or not, and their comparative importance to more traditional organisational attributes. Additionally, it is felt that all too often what firms perceive as job-seeker desires and what job-seekers actually desire can differ substantially (Bertels & Peloza, 2008). Therefore, this research attempts not only to identify and highlight the potential gap between these two parties but allow organisations to modify ‘their perceptions’.

1.2.1. Definitions

Employment branding:

Organisational branding in its wider sense has traditionally fallen under the domain of marketing, and can be explained as straightforwardly as ‘the creation of an identity that aids in stakeholder orientation and interest’ (Boone & Kurtz, 2002). However, over time the field of branding has grown and diversified, and for the purpose of this thesis will be viewed from the human resource perspective ‘employment branding’. Where, once again the definition can be straightforward and is proposed by Lloyd (2002) as “the sum of a company’s efforts to communicate to existing and prospective employees that it is a desirable place to work” (p64). More significantly however, is the suggestion that employer branding sets an expectation and is likened to a promise (Argenti & Druckenmiller, 2004) whereby traditional marketing techniques are applied to attain the status of employer of choice (Sutherland et al., 2002). While these definitions are simple yet encompassing, it should be noted that Argenti and Druckenmiller (2004) also put
forward the concept that branding itself is not a totality but more one of four differentiating and identifiable themes; identity, corporate brand, image, and reputation. Whichever the case, a totality or a component, employer branding has allowed CSP to emerge as a possible leverage in the recruitment process.

**Corporate Social Performance:**

The term ‘Corporate Social Performance’ has become increasingly complex, and developed to be interchangeable with its precursor and counterpart ‘Corporate Social Responsibility’ (Carroll, 1999). In fact Carroll (1999) suggests the use of the word ‘corporate’ in this phrase is recent in itself, and CSP, albeit by another name and tracing back centuries, only truly began to evolve and become recognised as a construct in the latter part of the twentieth century. It could be argued that independently the two words ‘responsibility’ and ‘performance’ span a continuum as one suggests accountability and control over, while the other proposes a manner or quality of functioning, conduct or behaviour and therefore inferring measurability (Collins paperback English dictionary, 1999). However, for the purpose of this thesis ‘corporate social performance’ and ‘corporate social responsibility’ will be discussed as one and the same as they appear to have evolved together over time.

When looking at the history of CSP it was Howard Bowen’s 1953 book ‘Social Responsibilities of the Businessman’ that appears to have first stamped a mark and asked “what responsibility to society may businessmen reasonably be expected to assume?” (Bowen 1953 as cited in Carroll, 1999, p. 270). Taking the lead from these seminal writings, McGuire stated in his book ‘Business and Society’ (1963) that “the idea of social responsibilities supposes that the corporation has not only economic and legal obligations but also certain responsibilities to society which extend beyond these obligations” (p. 144). Davis and Blomstrom (1966) expand on this when they suggested that “businessmen apply social responsibility when they consider the needs and interest of others who may be affected by business actions. In so doing, they look beyond their firm’s narrow economic and technical interests” (p. 12).
These early testimonials were informative and expressive of issues such as the environment and workers welfare and those stakeholders considered important at the time. However, they do not fully expand the concept of CSP to include ‘all’ stakeholders, namely potential employees (Turban & Greening, 1997; Wood, 1991). Wood (1991) defines CSP as “a business organisation’s configuration of principles of social responsibility, processes of social responsiveness, and policies, programs, and observable outcomes as they relate to the firm's societal relationships” (p693), and can be generally be seen as the organisations responsiveness to the needs of its stakeholders. Sen (2006) confirms this description by proposing that CSP is related to an organisation’s commitment to societal obligations that can be leveraged and result in outcomes.

The connotation that a firm’s commitment towards CSP contributes to outcomes is of interest to this research. Therefore it is important to recognise how this is currently, and has previously, been measured. Having given consideration to this, and drawing on previous literature, it is believed that the Kinder, Lydenberg, Domini and Co (KLD) Company Profiles are considered to be the most widely endorsed and recognised CSP measurement (Backhaus et al., 2002; Chatterji, Levine, & Toffel, 2009; Graves & Waddock, 2000; Turban & Greening, 1997). From the KLD Company Profiles the five key indicators/dimensions of employee relations, treatment of women and minorities, concern for the environment, product quality, and community relations have been consistently adopted by researchers of CSP (Backhaus et al., 2002; Chatterji et al., 2009; Luce et al., 2001; Turban & Greening, 1997) and have been subsequently chosen for this project. These five CSP dimensions or elements, as they will also be referred to in this research, can be explained as:

1. **Employee relations**: an organisation’s relationship with unions; employee sense of ownership; concern for employee wellbeing; and employee participation in management decision-making processes.
2. **Treatment of women and minorities**: an organisation’s employment and promotion policies and practices; diversity programs; and representation of women and minorities in senior management positions.

3. **Concern for the environment**: organisational maintenance of property, plant, and equipment; organisational environmental practices and their use of toxic chemicals in production, and product packaging.

4. **Product quality**: an organisation’s product and/or service reputation; safety record; innovation; and reputable marketing and production practices.

5. **Community relations**: an organisation’s involvement in local community; support of local community projects; donations to charity; encouragement and support for employee charity and volunteer participation; and corporate citizenship

Further definitions, namely those of key theory related to this study, will be offered as part of the literature review segment of this thesis.

### 1.3. Research Statement

As the demands of an ever quickening and dynamic business environment continue, and the struggle for organisations to find new means of securing quality skilled human resources heightens, the research question asked here becomes increasingly pertinent. It can be argued that traditional recruitment methods are not only failing to deliver differentiation for organisations (M. Johnson, 2002; Lievens & Highhouse, 2003; Sutherland et al., 2002; K. M. Thomas & Wise, 1999), but in doing so are conceivably restricting potential employees’ ability to make decisions regarding an employer of choice. Literature is beginning to mount that suggests organisations should assimilate marketing and organisational branding principles into their recruitment strategy and target particular job-seeker market segments so as to capture those of a high calibre and that complement the organisation (Lievens & Highhouse, 2003; Sutherland et al., 2002). In order to do this there is the need to understand what it is these job-seekers are looking for that will make a point of difference over and above traditional
job/organisational factors. However, to ensure the term ‘point of difference’ is more than just a buzz word, organisations need to recognise and understand their potential employee target market, and what it is that will make them stand out as an employer of choice.

The research theme undertaken in this project investigates and analyses ‘the extent to which CSP and its sub-dimensions influence job-seekers’ attraction to an employer’. During the course of this project the five selected CSP dimensions of employee relations, treatment of women and minorities (diversity), concern for the environment, product quality, and community relations are explored as to their relative importance to job-seekers in their employment decision-making process. In addition to this, traditional organisational/job factors are comparatively introduced against CSP to evaluated and investigate for any significant additional value in acting as a predictor towards organisational attraction and an employer of choice.

The research question to be explored and investigated in this thesis is:

“To what extent do job-seekers find Corporate Social Performance, and its elements, to be attractive in a potential employer?”

So as to give depth and offer a comprehensive conclusion to this research question, several additional questions have been revealed. These questions are:

- What CSP elements are valued most by job-seekers, and why?
- Is positive CSP publicity more influential than negative CSP?
- Does a firm’s espoused CSP have the potential to influence the decision-making process of job-seekers, and why?
- Where do job-seekers chiefly expect to learn about an organisation’s CSP?
- Where do CSP dimensions rank in value compared to more traditionally measured organisational attributes?
- Do CSP dimensions add significantly to organisational/job factors as predictors of an employer of choice?
In order to investigate these questions this study was conducted on a sample population of Undergraduate Business Degree students. This sample population will also be referred to and denoted as ‘job-seekers’. A survey questionnaire was elected as the best means of exploration and was distributed both electronically and in paper copy format for voluntary participation by students. This survey contained three sections. Section one solicited basic background demographic information from participants while section two asked participants to assess the value of CSP in a potential employer, and rank and scale individual elements in order of importance. Section three of the questionnaire introduced CSP and the job factors in conjunction with each other for evaluation and contrast as to their relative importance in a potential employer. Sections two and three contained questions that were both open ended and closed, and whereby participant views and opinions as to the reason for their selections and rankings of importance were sought.

It is worth mentioning at this time that while there is a growing body of literature around HR recruitment processes and its connection with organisational branding and employer of choice portfolios, it is proposed that the full potential of CSP in these processes has not been recognised (Backhaus, 2004). Further to this, while current literature is in agreement that job/organisational factors such as challenging work, training and development, pay and benefits, career development are of importance to job-seekers (Sutherland et al., 2002), limited research has been presented around the added value of CSP (Greening & Turban, 2000; Turban & Greening, 1997). Therefore this project will take these points into consideration but will not however investigate organisational branding in its totality, or basic job factors, in any depth.

It should be noted that during the course of this document the terms organisation, firm, company, and employer will be used interchangeably. And, while the term element will principally be used to denote the sub-dimensions of Corporate Social Performance they will at times be referred to as dimensions.
1.4. Outline of thesis

This thesis consists of six chapters.

Chapter One has provided an introduction to this research. Firstly an overview of the study undertaken was presented. This was followed by the objectives of the research being discussed along with its purpose and aim. Definitions of key aspects relevant to this research were then given so as to offer greater understanding. Chapter One concluded with the research statement pertaining to this project being explained and set out.

Chapter Two establishes leading literature and key theory important to this research so as to enable critical examination of the current status of knowledge on, and related to, the topic of CSP. Some of the aspects discussed in this literature review are: The historical background to CSP; the current state of recruitment; Social Identity Theory; Signalling Theory; CSP measures; and CSP as a strategy.

Chapter Three presents the research methodology and design approach decided upon and undertaken by the researcher. This chapter also explains the data collection and analysis method employed in this study. Chapter Three concludes by discussing the ethical implications of this research.

Chapter Four sets out the findings and results drawn from the data collected and analysed during this study.

Chapter Five provides an in-depth interpretation and critical analysis of the results of this study.

Chapter Six concludes this thesis, and offers a synthesis of this study along with its limitations, directions for further research, and a closing statement.
Chapter Two

2.0 Literature Review

2.1 Overview

This chapter explores existing relevant literature pertaining to the espoused Corporate Social Performance of organisations and its relationship to stakeholder attraction, and job-seekers in particular. In doing so, the aim is to assist in answering the research question “to what extent do job-seekers find Corporate Social Performance, and its elements, to be attractive in a potential employer?” There are two theoretical foundations singled out for comprehensive investigation in this review; signalling theory and social identity theory. These two theoretical foundations are central to this research as it is perceived they will assist analysis and in the understanding of ‘why’ the CSP of firms may be important to job-seekers. Additionally, this chapter gives consideration to the 1997 research of Turban and Greening and its direct subsequent research as a point of departure of this current study. This was done because of the limited research which drew CSP into the recruitment process in existence prior to that of Turban and Greening, whereas it had for the most part previously been viewed as a legal obligation and as a means of attracting investment and customers (Carroll, 1999).

This literature review offers a background on the emergence, development and progress of CSP, along with how far it has come as construct. Furthermore, key themes and trends are identified from previous studies and research, and any perceived gaps in the knowledge based around CSP and relevant to this current study are discussed.

2.2 Historical background to writings on Corporate Social Performance

The construct of CSP has a history, albeit not widely acknowledged, dating back centuries where business demonstrated a variety of concerns for their communities (Carroll, 1999). Conversely, it can also be said that communities demonstrated concern about their investments and whom they were associated with and their attitude towards CSP seeing as this could be perceived as expressive of what they stood for (Kinder &
Domini, 1997). The most notable of these would be the early Quakers of the 17th century where “they could not reconcile investing in slaves……with their belief in equality of humankind” (Kinder & Domini, 1997, p. 12). However, on the whole formal writings on what we now understand as Corporate Social Performance did not emerge until the 1920’s and coincided with the surfacing of a societal disapproval for wholly profit driven ethics (Weinstein, 1968). These texts appear to have remained relatively unchallenged until the early 1950’s, and the beginning of what was considered the modern era, when a more widespread social consciousness began to emerge and business was questioned again on its accountability and its obligation towards society (Bowen, 1953).

While Bowen urged business to take responsibility for the consequences of its actions, his works failed to find momentum until the 1960’s when the literature of scholars such as Keith Davis offered impetus and explored the belief that business actions needed to surpass purely economic and technical interest (Carroll, 1999). It was Davis (1960) who had the foresight to go as far as to suggest that long term non-direct financial return might be the gain with the adoption of, and adherence to, CSP. Furthermore, Davis put forward what has been considered an ‘iron law’ of CSP (Carroll, 1999) when he stated “social responsibilities of businessmen need to commensurate with their social power” (Davis, 1960, p. 71). Carroll (1999) suggests that another major contributor to literature on CSP in the 1960’s is Joseph McGuire who, through his writings proposed that corporations should have a consciousness of politics, education, community welfare, employee satisfaction, and express good ethics and corporate citizenship.

The 1970’s saw an appearance of attempts to ‘define’ and articulate CSP through writings from scholars such as Johnson, Steiner, Sethi, Preston and Post, and Carroll. With this came a push to shift the focus from a solely shareholder and profit driven emphasis, to concern for, and the inclusion of, all stakeholders (Carroll, 1999; Hoffman, 2007; Wood, 1991). It was also in the 1970’s that the term ‘corporate social performance’ emerges. The phrase was initiated by Backman (1975) where he inferred that corporate social responsibility was a facet of corporate social performance that integrated “employment of minority groups, reduction in pollution, greater participation in
programs to improve the community, improved medical care, and improved industrial health and safety” (p. 2).

The 1980’s gave way to research from the academics such as Jones, Drucker, Epstein, and Wartick and Cochran. Theirs was an attempt to measure and operationalise CSP and its emerging themes while at the same time pushing for a comprehensive theory (Carroll, 1999). Jones (1980) placed emphasis on his belief and concept that CSP was a ‘process’ and not an outcome. It can also be said that Jones (1980) continued to strive for CSP to be stakeholder inclusive, while forging the idea that to be successful CSP should be entered into voluntarily. This point was highlighted when he said “corporate social responsibility is the notion that corporations have an obligation to constituent groups in society other than stockholders and beyond that prescribed by law and union contract” (Jones, 1980, p. 59). One interesting contribution, but possibly overlooked at the time as to its full potential and the wider perspective, was by Peter Drucker (1984) where he suggested that profitability and responsibility are compatible and that organisations should look to convert CSP into business opportunity. Given this, Drucker proposed “ the proper ‘social responsibility’ of business is to tame the dragon, that is to turn a social problem into economic opportunity and economic benefit, into productive capacity, into human competence, into well-paid jobs, and into wealth” (1984, p. 62).

The 1990’s served to add more themes and acted as a point of departure towards stakeholder theory and the inclusion in business research of ethics and corporate citizenship (Carroll, 1999). In fact, while for the purposes of this research ‘corporate social performance’ and ‘corporate social responsibility’ have for the main part been deduced as one in the same and used interchangeably, Carroll (1999) suggests that it was at this time that corporate social ‘performance’ was acknowledged as a construct. It was at about this point that Wood (1991) suggested that while the concept of CSP had been around for decades it was ill-defined and under-utilised despite being pervasive in both written and unwritten policy. Further to this, Wood (1991) drew on previous literature and reiterated that CSP had three facets: motivating principles, behavioural processes, and observable outcomes. Wood’s 1991 research set about articulating a sound and rational framework suited towards both business and societal investigation,
and to restate her position, she defined CSP as “a business organisation's configuration of principles of social responsibility, processes of social responsiveness, and policies, programs, and observable outcomes as they relate to the firm's societal relationships” (p. 693). While this definition captures the essence of CSP it was not fully in keeping with the era as the key reason most firms engaged in CSP activity was still profit driven and confined to retaining and growing customers, attracting investment, and staying within legal boundaries (Carroll, 1999; Turban & Greening, 1997).

By the mid 1990’s however, organisations began to consider more seriously that CSP may offer opportunity (Carroll, 1999; Crumpacker & Crumpacker, 2007; Highhouse, Lievens, & Sinar, 2003). While this was a view expressed by Peter Drucker as far back as 1984, this turn of events was bought about in part by the realisation of an imminent shortage of skilled labour and the belief that CSP could assist in resolving this issue (Crumpacker & Crumpacker, 2007; Highhouse et al., 2003). The concept of CSP providing additional benefits was aided by increased recognition and support for multiple stakeholder theory, of which potential employees would be a part (Turban & Greening, 1997). The suggestion that potential employees are organisational stakeholders reinforces the conviction of Freeman (1984) and is cemented by Hunger and Wheelen’s (2003) definition that stakeholders are ‘those groups who can affect or are affected by the achievements of organisational objectives’ (p. 27).

Research on and around the various themes of CSP continued to increase in the late 1990’s and in 1997 Daniel Turban and Daniel Greening decided to focus their investigations of CSP towards its possible association with a firm’s attractiveness to prospective employees. This research looked at, and supported, the suggestion that CSP was positively related to a firm’s reputation and attractiveness as an employer. Consequent research founded on Turban and Greening’s initial 1997 study, both by themselves and others such as Luce et al (2001) and Backhaus, Stone and Heiner (2002) also explored and further supported the proposal that there is a link between espoused organisational CSP and organisational attractiveness.
Given the escalating and varied subject matter pertaining to CSP, and for the purpose of this project, it is at this point in history, that the seminal writings by Turban and Greening (1997), and consequent derived research, will act as a point of departure and foundation throughout the remainder of this chapter, and thesis to some extent.

2.3. Does CSP have a place in the recruitment process?

Literature on and around the employee recruitment process is vast and has increased significantly over the past fifteen years (Reeve & Schultz, 2004). In saying this, it has been noted that until recently this research has largely focused on traditional recruitment methods placing emphasis on how organisations evaluate applicants and not how applicants evaluate organisations (Hannon, 1996; Highhouse & Hoffman, 2001; Rynes & Barber, 1990; Turban, 2001). What's more, it appears that recruitment research and firms have habitually tended to highlight job and organisational factors such as ‘training and development’ and ‘pay and benefits’ as a primary source of attraction, and have in the main been transactional in orientation as opposed to endeavouring a more holistic approach to include attributes such as work-life balance. Given this, it has been offered by Lievens & Highhouse (2003) that potential applicants’ initial attraction to organisations is not solely explained by job and organisational factors. Turban, Forret and Hendrickson (1998) add to this by suggesting that initial impressions play a key role as attractors through image, which in turn has then been said to be associated to job acceptance decisions (Gatewood, Gowan, & Lautenschlager, 1993; Luce et al., 2001; Powell, 1991; Powell & Goulet, 1996).

While it has been recognised that attracting the ‘right’ employees’ is critical to value creation and success (Berthon, Ewing, & Hah, 2005; Sutherland et al., 2002), organisations at times find it difficult to attract a suitable applicant pool and it is proposed that a shift in the recruitment process mindset is needed (Lievens & Highhouse, 2003). This has led organisations and researchers alike to seek alternative methods of employee attraction that surpass classic attributes and advertising methods and that will offer a much needed point of difference (Berthon et al., 2005). Johnson (2002) endorsed this by suggesting that with everyone chasing the same talent pool, the
winners will be those that can differentiate themselves, and Copeland (2000) advocated that through innovative and compelling HR programs firms can establish themselves as a preferred employer. Further to this, literature suggests that jobs and organisations within the same industry can be seen as very similar (Lievens & Highhouse, 2003; K. M. Thomas & Wise, 1999) and therefore adding impetus to the need for an attainment of differentiation and divergence in recruitment methods.

In search of an elusive differentiation, and the desire to be an employer of choice, employer branding/reputation management has come to the forefront (Nel, van Dyk, Haasbroek, Schultz, Sono, Werner, 2004). As previously alluded to, organisational branding has traditionally been perceived as the domain of marketing and a growing number of scholars suggest that modern employee recruitment and marketing principles are closely linked and intertwined (Lievens & Highhouse, 2003; Sutherland et al., 2002). Kotler (1996) and Sutherland et al (2002) suggest that the stronger an organisation’s brand, image and reputation, the more attractive it is as a workplace and top talent will aspire to work there. As the construct of employer branding has expanded in meaning and complexity to encompass an array of levels such as attributes, benefits, values, image, culture, and personality (Kotler, 1996), and given that it is said to be the “sum of a company’s efforts to communicate to existing and prospective staff that it is a desirable place to work” (Lloyd, 2002, p. 64), it has also begun to stand out as a function towards organisational differentiation (Nel et al., 2004; Sutherland et al., 2002).

Further to this, as organisational branding develops in prominence as a recruitment message, from within its ranks CSP has emerged as a discriminate means of articulating this message and that Greening and Turban (2000) propose is ‘coming of age’. Greening and Turban (2000) further suggest that with the growing attention towards CSP a new business paradigm is developing. McWilliams, Siegel and Wright’s (2006) add to this by proposing that CSP can be an integral part of a firm’s differentiation strategy to be engaged as a strategic investment. These suggestions are given extra weight by a study undertaken at the Centre for Corporate Citizenship in Boston where 30% of employers stated that positive CSP helps them recruit employees (Sujansky, 2007). Having said this, and if we are to believe Greening and Turban,
McWilliams et al., and employers, the question must be asked why this tool is not being utilised and exploited more since Backhaus (2004) tells that only 2.4% of text in job advertisements posted on America’s largest internet recruitment site, Monster.Com, contains reference to an organisation’s CSP.

2.4. Research influential to this study

In reviewing CSP a vast amount of research and information came to light, that while interesting and revealing, was to a large extent peripheral to this project. This is to say that numerous scholars have explored differing aspects and themes of CSP in relation to various functions and for diverse purposes to achieve different end results. The core purpose of this study is to discover and explore ‘to what extent, and why, job-seekers find Corporate Social Performance, and its elements, to be attractive in a potential employer’. In doing this the researcher has primarily utilised the 1997 seminal writings of Turban and Greening as a foundation and the derived literature of Greening and Turban (2000), Luce et al (2001), and Backhaus, Stone and Heiner (2002) as a focal point. These writings have been selected as this collection of research was directly related and investigated CSP and its relationship to employer / job-seeker attraction, and it will also aid in the containment of this study. However, before commencing an evaluation of the research considered most influential and pertinent to this study a brief assessment will be offered on other literature and themes of CSP deemed appropriate since to some extent they constitute an interwoven fabric of background research and each other.

2.4.1. The Construct of CSP

Why firms undertake CSP initiatives: Making CSP a strategy

In times when available resources are not at a premium firms may be reluctant to invest in unknown quantities such as CSP activity. However, in times of shortages of skilled labour, positive organisational CSP may afford a point of difference (Rynes & Barber, 1990; Turban & Greening, 1997). Consequently, when considering CSP there is a need for firms to weigh up the possible returns and strategic advantages on offer against the
investment needed (Dentchev, 2004; Heslin, 2008). Furthermore, in taking into account Carroll’s (1979) belief that CSP is established in principles, processes, and observable outcomes, any competitive advantage afforded can be seen as an ‘outcome’ (Albinger & Freeman, 2000; Carroll, 1979).

Du (2009) suggests that a firm’s CSP is a testimonial to its ingrained character and personality that can differentiate it from competitors. The projected competitive advantages of partaking in positive CSP are extensive as it is proposed they may lead to improved stakeholder relationships with the aim to, and result of: enhanced reputation; superior financial performance; increased investment; an increase in, and retention of, customer share; increased organisational performance; increased employee motivation, satisfaction, morale, commitment, trust, and loyalty; and last but not least employee attraction (Albinger & Freeman, 2000; Bhattacharya, Sen, & Korschun, 2008; Brammer, 2007; Brammer & Millington, 2008; Branco & Rodrigues, 2006; Dennis, 2008; Dentchev, 2004; Greening & Turban, 2000; Heslin, 2008; Turban & Greening, 1997; Valentine, 2008; Waddock, 2000, 2001; Waddock, Bodwell, & Graves, 2002). Having said this, Dentchev (2004) proposes that while CSP strategies may be a means to achieving corporate objectives, firms need to be aware there can be both positive and negative outcomes, and that some theories fall short in practical value and lack business rationale. Additionally, Porter and Kramer (2007) in discussing the proposed link between corporate social responsibility and competitive advantage suggest that while most companies feel obligated to give to charity, few have figured out how to do it well.

It can be said that the most probable, and sought after, advantage associated with the implementation of CSP has an underpinning founded on the desire for improved financial performance (Heslin, 2008). Branco and Rodrigues (2006) suggest that there are two contrasting motivational cases for organisational CSP; normative and business. Firstly, ‘normative’ is a motive initiated in the aspiration to do good because it is morally correct. Secondly, a ‘business’ objective is motivated by self interest. Having said this, Branco and Rodrigues (2006) further propose that the CSP and financial performance of firms need not be considered as tradeoffs but instead one can act as a determinant
and consequence of the other. Waddock and Graves (1997) are in agreement with this when proposing that good organisational financial performance affords profitability that can be spent on CSP activities which in turn may aid increased financial performance and further profitability. Furthermore, Branco and Rodrigues (2006) tell of three pillars to this perpetual circle; economic sustainability, environmental sustainability, and social sustainability. Valentine (2008), although not investigating the relationship between CSP and financial performance, did allude to a catalyst styled and circular result of another type when firms act socially responsibly. His research found that socially responsible organisations are viewed as ethical and therefore promote and solicit similar actions from employees. What's more, Valentine (2008) suggests as a course of this process CSP mediates positively between ethical behaviour and job satisfaction.

Part and parcel of an organisation’s financial performance is its ability to attract investment. In 2006, 10% of every dollar invested in America went to organisations with positive CSP ratings, and 64% of firms listed in the Fortune Global 100 published reports of their CSP (Heslin, 2008). Heslin (2008) suggests that doing good is a “means to identify and develop viable, value adding and self sustaining strategic opportunities” (p. 131). Additionally, he proposes that there are five guidelines for successful exploitation of positive CSP; focus initiates, identify and engage relevant stakeholders, manage and work through any ethical dilemmas, develop appropriate measurements, and reinforce through leadership.

Believers in the resourced-based perspective are increasingly supporting the engagement in CSP as an integral part of creating a sustainable competitive advantage (Branco & Rodrigues, 2006; Dennis, 2008). Dennis (2008) proposes that both tangible and intangible resources can be provided through policies and processes that incorporate the CSP elements ‘community relations’, ‘employee relations’, ‘environmental protection’, and ‘diversity management’. Branco and Rodrigues (2006) add to this by suggesting that while CSP may afford firms competitive advantage by offering internal and external benefits through relationship building and generating resources and capabilities (for example; employee motivation, morale, commitment, loyalty, trust, employee attraction, and enhanced organisational reputation), the
disclosure and consequences of CSP activities can both create and ‘deplete’ these resources. Building on the principle that CSP has a place within a resource-based perspective and the creation of sustainable competitive advantage, it is proposed that “collective relationships” (p. 126) built can be maximised by focusing on relational characteristics not transactional given that they are less easily to imitate (Branco & Rodrigues, 2006). However, Branco and Rodrigues (2006) go on to say that the CSP initiatives undertaken by an organisation should be personally important to stakeholders and expressive of shared values seeing as perceptions are linked to personal attitudes.

The studies of Peterson (2004) and Brammer (2007) add to this growing body adhering to a resource-based perspective when investigating the impact of CSP strategies on stakeholder behaviour. Their research suggests that high levels of favourable organisational CSP are positively related to, and have a major impact on, employee organisational commitment and job satisfaction as it was perceived these organisations were committed to doing good. Of particular interest in the research of Peterson (2004), given the changing demographics of today’s workforce (Avery & McKay, 2006), was that not only did employees want to be proud and identify with firms displaying favourable reputations for CSP, but that this was especially strong with females and their supposed desire for community-based CSP initiatives. The writings of Sen (2006) add to this complexity of how best to exploit positive CSP in their proposal that the impact of CSP is less pervasive in the real world and that firms need to generate awareness of activities for it to be beneficial. This is to say that Sen’s (2006) research found that the impact of an organisation’s CSP initiatives was positively related to stakeholder awareness, and once known consequently influenced their attitude towards the firm. This idea of the need to create awareness has been taken up, and supported, by what Greening and Turban (2000) suggest are ‘visionary companies’ like Microsoft, IBM, and General Motors who include their CSP activities in recruitment brochures and the like.

It can be said that when participating in CSP activity as a means of winning the ‘talent war’ firms want to obtain as much value as possible (Bhattacharya et al., 2008). Having said this, Bhattacharya et al (2008) agree with Porter and Kramer (2007) that few firms “have figured out how best to reap the returns” (37). In the article of Bhattacharya et al
(2008), ‘Using Corporate Social Responsibility to Win the War for Talent’, they propose communication and engagement with employees in the decision-making process as being the key. This article suggests that firms should establish what social realities ‘excite’ their employees and make them part of their larger corporate mission. The authors suggest that this can aid a perception that the organisation shares congruent employee values that in turn lends itself to identification with the organisation as a means of fulfilling personal needs. Bhattacharya et al (2008) propose that by ‘humanising’ the organisation the firm will be afforded leverage resulting in talent acquisition, employee retention, and increased productivity and job satisfaction. Of interest in this article was not only that they discussed the benefits of engaging in CSP initiatives but offered core steps to its successful implementation while also telling of barriers to its effectiveness. These steps and barriers are illustrated below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Steps to Effective CSP</th>
<th>Barriers to Effective CSP Initiatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase employee proximity. For example; communicate and create employee awareness of CSP activities</td>
<td>Lack of employee awareness and involvement in CSP initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use an input-outcome approach to make CSP decisions</td>
<td>Limited understanding of employee needs fulfilled by CSP. For example; self enhancement and work-personal life integration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understand and target the fulfillment of employee social needs</td>
<td>Poor understanding of CSP outcomes. For example; employee acquisition returns through CSP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure employee identification with chosen and specific CSP initiatives</td>
<td>Top-down approach to CSP initiatives. For example; CSP initiative development and ownership should come from employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involve employees in co-creating and implementing CSP values</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Following on from, and adding to, the resource-based perspective, it has been suggested that positive CSP not only aids in attracting potential employees but attracts those who are more qualified, and therefore contributing to competitive advantage (Albinger & Freeman, 2000; Greening & Turban, 2000). Albinger and Freeman (2000) while investigating a proposed link between CSP as an attractor to job-seekers with differing job choice opportunities found that a firm’s espoused positive CSP gives off socially responsible signals that in turn provide an identity that is desirable to be associated with. For instance, MBA students said they would work for lower wages at a socially responsible firm they could identify with. In support of this, the research of Dawkins and Lewis (2003) found that 51% of UK employees believe that the social and environmental responsibilities of organisations are very important and they would prefer to be associated with firms exhibiting these traits. Greening and Turban (2000) explored a similar train of thought to Albinger and Freeman (2000), albeit from a more theoretical view, and also concluded that there was a positive relationship between employer attraction of quality job-seekers and an organisation’s espoused CSP.

Greening and Turban (2000) and Albinger and Freeman (2000) were in further support of each other when drawing on social identity and signalling theory and suggesting that this attraction was contributed to by job-seekers’ desires for positive self-concept and their interpretation of an organisation’s espoused CSP as signals indicating the firm’s value system. Having said this, both these sets of scholars additionally proposed that the attractiveness of CSP was higher in those job-seekers more qualified as they perceivably had a greater level of job choice, while those with fewer job choices may have to accept positions at less socially responsible organisations out of necessity.

Matching CSP activities with organisational objectives

Given that purely altruistic motives are rarely justification enough for most firms to participate in socially responsible activities (Peloza & Falkenberg, 2009) the issue previously facing organisations was ‘if’ they would pursue CSP objectives. However, given the mounting evidence in its favour the question now being asked is not ‘if’ but ‘how’ to pursue CSP objectives, and ‘what’ objectives to pursue (Papania, Shapiro, &
Peloza, 2008). It has been suggested that firms deciding to implement CSP initiatives should give primary consideration to organisational objectives, coupled with the expectations of key stakeholders that the organisation is attempting to attract (Brammer, 2006; Sen, 2006; Wood, 1991). This is to say that the effectiveness and supposed advantages of positive CSP may well depend on a focused and targeted implementation and execution. Furthermore, Brammer (2006) and McWilliams, Siegel, and Wright (2006) suggest that to maximise the CSP benefits on offer, not only does there need to be a fit between the form of CSP undertaken (a connection and relevance between the firm’s industry and its CSP activity) but it should be voluntary as opposed to following regulatory dictation, and therefore portraying a sincerity for its participation. It is proposed that differing types of CSP have a varied impact contingent to the industry and sector the organisation operates in (Brammer, 2006). For example, stakeholders pay more attention to espoused ‘environmental’ CSP if the firm is in the transport sector rather than the finance sector. Interestingly, and in contrast to this proposal, Brammer’s (2006) study revealed that of all the CSP dimensions evaluated ‘community involvement’ was an exception in that it found broad appeal amongst stakeholders across all industries and sectors. Also in contrast to Brammer’s suggestion of the need for focused CSP initiatives that are directed at particular stakeholders, Sen (2006) proposes that “using a common instrument across stakeholder groups can result in a shared and coherent mind-set” (p. 164) given that stakeholders are potentially multidimensional, and could possibly therefore be consumers, investors, and current or potential employees.

When deciding an approach to CSP the researcher feels that Wood (1991) offers some sound advice when proposing that firms are not responsible for solving ‘all’ the world’s problems, but are however accountable for helping to resolve problems and social issues related to their operations and interests. Wood (1991) does however extend this and suggests that over and above the CSP obligations and expectations relevant to an organisation’s operations and actions, there is room for what is termed ‘discretionary responsibilities’. Discretionary responsibilities are described as being those which are not demanded, and entail voluntary social involvement (Carroll, 1979).
The suggestion of discretionary CSP activities is one favoured by Peloza and Falkenberg (2009). However, theirs’ is one lending itself to the allocation of resources such as product, expertise and knowledge and by way of joint ventures with NGO’s, while maintaining a connection to the industry and organisational objectives. Peloza and Falkenberg’s (2009) belief is that a collaborative form of CSP activity will simultaneously strengthen multiple stakeholder relationships and gain valuable exposure and awareness. Furthermore, their research suggests that the more exposure generated by an organisation’s CSP initiatives the more advantage to be gained, given that stakeholder awareness of firms’ CSP is generally relatively low. Continuing along the lines of utilising organisational expertise and knowledge as a means of demonstrating social responsibility Peloza, Hudson and Hassay (2009) propose exploiting organisation-backed employee volunteerism. Through volunteerism firms can engage employees as a tool that is said to offer exposure and a connection to stakeholders (Peloza et al., 2009). Having said this, Peloza et al (2009) suggest that this form of social activity needs to fit with organisational core competencies and have employee buy-in to be effective. However, while their research informs that 49% of US firms in 1999 actively integrated volunteer programs into their business plan, up from 19% in 1992, employee participation is low. Nevertheless, Peloza et al (2009) do propose that if the programs are desirable employees feel connected and indentify with them, which in turn affords enhanced morale, lower turnover, and organisational attractiveness.

Measuring CSP

The primary purpose for measuring firms’ CSP is to provide accurate and transparent information of their societal actions and behaviour (Chatterji et al., 2009). This in turn enables interested stakeholders with various motives to make informed and expressive decisions; for example – social investing and consumer value-based purchasing. By applying the term ‘expressive’ Chatterji et al (2009) propose that these stakeholders exercise their transactions as a means of demonstrating their own personal identity through association. Having said this, there has been, and still is, much discussion on and around the measurement of CSP. Literature has called into question various aspects around those that perform the measurement, the accuracy of measurement and
lack of an established definition and framework, the era of measurement and ability to predict, the geographical location of the organisation measured, and the differing needs of interested stakeholders (Carroll, 1999; Chatterji et al., 2009; Graves & Waddock, 2000; Papania et al., 2008; Waddock & Smith, 2000a, 2000b; Wood, 1991). Given the number of influential variables involved in the measurement of CSP it is not surprising that in 1991 Carroll described it as a ‘swirling waters’ (as cited in Sharfman, 1996).

Wood (1991) suggests that CSP is dynamic and “not locked in time” (p. 693), and therefore exacting measurements to attain conclusive results is difficult as they are only a snapshot that is open to the interpretation of the era and the interest, acceptance, and value structure of stakeholders. Wood (1991) further proposes that in scrutinising an organisation’s perceived CSP, observation should be relevant to the firm’s interests, operations and actions, and that difficulty arises in isolating and measuring CSP effects that are not intrinsic to the organisation. Papania et al (2008) add to this by suggesting that “different contextual realities act upon different businesses, especially those within different industries and countries” (p. 4), and that there is a need for fit between the organisation’s activities and satisfying stakeholder expectations. Papania et al (2008) also propose that in analysing organisational CSP the findings are often shown as an aggregate whereas some CSP functions measured may not be applicable to a particular firm and therefore needlessly impact negatively on their perceived behaviour.

To add to the convolution around the measurement of CSP there are various independent agencies offering data and information on organisational standings, and include; Dow Jones Sustainability Index, Fortune Corporate Reputation Industry Report, FTSE4good, and KLD Research and Analytics (KLD). These different indices rate organisations primarily on what each various research agency deems important and relevant, and the data used to compile them is drawn from surveys, media articles, annual reports, firm statements, and third party data (Papania et al., 2008). While there is debate around the form, reason, and interpretation of CSP measurement, which primarily appears to be due to its complexity, it is the rating data of Kinder, Lydenberg and Domini (KLD) that emerges as the most widely accepted (Backhaus et al., 2002;
It is suggested that the KLD indices offers a CSP standard that is potentially the best available (Sharfman, 1996; Waddock, 2000). KLD have been providing independent social performance ratings research about firms for business investor communities and academics since 1991 (Graves & Waddock, 2000). While Chatterji et al (2009) suggest that these ratings are limited in their ability to project an organisation’s future performance they still concur that they are the best currently available, and their research supports the proposal that KLD data is a good and accurate summary of past organisational social performance. The KLD Indices primarily consists of eleven indicators of which five have been singled out as most important in research (Backhaus et al., 2002; Chatterji et al., 2009; Greening & Turban, 2000; Luce et al., 2001; Turban & Greening, 1997). Luce et al (2001) queried the belief of Turban and Greening (1997) that these five CSP elements (employee relations, concern for the environment, product quality, community relations, and treatment of women and minorities) were in fact the most important in terms of job attraction and therefore as part of their study investigated the relative importance of all eleven elements. The results of their research were consistent with that of Turban and Greening (1997) and confirmed that indeed these five elements were those most important to job-seekers in a potential employer.

*It should be noted that these five CSP elements are the five to be utilised in this current project.*

### 2.4.2. CSP research central to motivating this project

As alluded to earlier, the investigations into CSP as an antecedent to employer attraction by Turban and Greening (1997) are a foundation of this research. From their seminal writings others were led to further explore this facet of CSP in an attempt to prove, or disprove, its relationship to job-seeker and organisational attraction, and the influence CSP may, or may not have in the job choice process. Of the research to evolve from that of Turban and Greening (1997) those of most relevance to this project are Greening and Turban’s (2000) own consequent study and that of Luce et al (2001)
and Backhaus et al (2002). Consequently a brief underpinning of these studies and their core findings will now be offered.

**Turban and Greening (1997): Corporate Social Performance and organisational attractiveness to prospective employees.**

This research undertaken by Turban and Greening (1997), by drawing on signalling theory and social identity theory, hypothesised that an organisation’s CSP positively related to their reputation and attractiveness as an employer of choice. This is to say, Turban and Greening (1997) suggest that these two theories explain that job-seekers interpret espoused organisational CSP as indicators of what the firm may be like to work for, and the value system within which they operate. Job-seekers then take this information and evaluate it against their own needs, beliefs and values, to aid in their job decision process.

These authors and other literature tell that social identity theory is related to self-perception and based on one’s unique characteristics that is in turn influenced by and influences membership of groups that include employment (Greenberg & Baron, 2008; Greening & Turban, 2000; McShane & Travaglione, 2003). Signalling theory, when related to recruitment, suggests that many job-seekers have limited knowledge of a firm and its activities, and therefore interpret information they receive as signals of the working conditions and manner the firm conducts itself (Bauer & Aiman-Smith, 1996; Greening & Turban, 2000).

As a measurement of CSP Turban and Greening (1997) used, as allude to earlier, what was, and still is, considered to be the five most recognised and researched standards as derived from the Kinder, Lydenberg, Domini and Co CSP company profile ratings data (Backhaus et al., 2002; Greening & Turban, 2000; Luce et al., 2001; Turban et al., 1998; Turban & Greening, 1997). The five base dimensions of CSP utilised in this research were:

- community relations
- treatment of women and minorities
The results from this study found that firms with high levels of positive CSP have the ability to reap numerous benefits:

- they have more positive reputations
- they are more attractive to job-seekers
- and they will possibly attract a larger applicant pool

Turban and Greening (1997) draw on these results to suggest and add to the growing belief that CSP may offer competitive advantage. It is worthy of reminder that while Turban and Greening (1997) propose that positive CSP will help to attract a large applicant pool, Albinger and Freeman (2000), while in agreement, suggest that this is only true for those job-seekers with a high level of choice. As a secondary investigation in this study the authors conducted additional analysis based on 'unfamiliarity' of the firm. The results of this analysis found that overall familiarity positively correlated with organisational reputation.

**Greening and Turban (2000): Corporate Social Performance as a competitive advantage in attracting a quality workforce.**

Greening and Turban’s (2000) continuation of their initial 1997 research once again drew on signalling theory and social identity theory. In doing so this research had the view to examine the comparative extent to which high and low levels of espoused CSP influenced job-seeker decisions of employment pursuance. These investigations proposed that the CSP of an organisation signaled to prospective employees the probable values, norms and working conditions of the firm.

The authors held two hypotheses for this study. Firstly, “individuals will report stronger job pursuance intention towards firms described with positive versus negative CSP” (p. 261). Secondly, “individual difference will moderate the effects of CSP on job pursuit
intentions” (p. 261). For the purposes of this study ‘individual difference’ referred to set demographics such as the control variables age, gender, and work experience, and the individual’s importance of various CSP dimensions (for example; the value personally placed on the environment by males). Once again the five CSP dimensions ‘community relations’, ‘treatment of women and minorities’, ‘employee relations’, ‘treatment of the environment’, and ‘quality of products and services’ as derived from Kinder, Lydenberg, Domini and Co CSP company profile ratings data were employed.

The results of this study found that overall there was a positive association between high levels of CSP and organisational attractiveness. Additionally, when examining the results in view of the control variables from an interactionist perspective, Greening and Turban (2000) found that there was only one significant difference. This difference was that while organisational attractiveness by gender and a high display of the CSP dimension ‘treatment of women and minorities’ varied marginally, males were significantly less influenced than their female counterparts when low levels of this CSP dimension were displayed. The results of this study suggest that all CSP dimensions may benefit firms in some way and to some extent, however, ‘community relations’ appears to have the least affect. Having said this, the authors suggest that the poor showing by the CSP element ‘community relations’ may be relative to the sample population of the study.

In this article Greening and Turban (2000) proposed that those with a belief system that values CSP, whether it is as individual dimensions or collectively, will be attracted by way of self-concept to socially responsible firms, as they perceive the CSP displayed signals the firm’s own values. Furthermore, the authors suggest that this ties into person-organisation fit theory and called on Kristof’s (1996) review where ‘fit’ conceptualises the “extent to which the organisation meets the individuals needs or preferences” (p. 260). Given this, Greening and Turban (2000) further propose that firms may be able to target a particular audience by communicating selective CSP information.
It is also proposed in this article that an organisation with high levels of positive espoused CSP may not only attract larger applicant pools, but those job-seekers with higher levels of skills. The authors go on to suggest that this in turn lends itself to a greater chance of organisational success in that a talented and quality workforce will be increasingly important in the future and offers a source of competitive advantage. Additionally, while Greening and Turban (2000) admit that espoused positive CSP may have greater value in times of a tight labour supply, their proposition that high quality job-seekers will have more job choices and therefore CSP may offer a point of difference between one firm and another, holds merit.

**Luce, Barber, and Hillman (2001): Good deeds and misdeeds: A mediated model of the effect of Corporate Social Performance on organisational attractiveness.**

The study of Luce, Barber and Hillman (2001) set about to test the previous research by Turban and Greening (1997) whereby the authors proposed that organisational familiarity mediates the relationship between CSP and organisational attractiveness. This is to say that the purpose of this study was to determine the function of familiarity in the relationship between CSP and job-seekers perceptions of organisational attraction, and where ‘familiarity’ has been described as the “degree to which an individual is acquainted with a particular firm” (Luce et al., 2001, p. 400). The authors’ posit that CSP activity, be it positive or negative, contributes most to familiarity when at high levels and least when at low levels. They further propose that a high level of CSP activity in turn lends itself to a more attractive employment image as it creates awareness and acts as a signal of suitability.

Luce et al (2001) in part draw on scholars such as Gatewood et al (1993) and Bazerman (1998) to justifying the impact of familiarity. In viewing these two authors the researcher feels that Bazerman (1998), although looking at familiarity from a product sales perspective, raises the interesting point of ‘perceptual biases’. Bazerman (1998) suggests that perceptual bias is an influential factor as respondents to his study were more likely to associate higher sales volumes to firms with names familiar to them than
to those firms that ‘actually’ had substantially higher sales but whose names were less familiar.

Luce et al (2001) in fitting with related research employed Kinder, Lydenberg, Domini and Co CSP company profile ratings as a source of data. However they were primarily interested in analysis of overall CSP activity and therefore a summation of the values of the previously individually investigated five CSP dimensions was used. In the course of this article Luce et al (2001) call into question Turban and Greening’s 1997 research whereby whilst alluding to familiarity they did not employ it as a variable but instead explored CSP as a ‘net’ rating. This is to say; the positive CSP rating minus negative CSP rating. Having said this Turban and Greening (1997) did conduct post hoc analysis where ‘unfamiliarity’ was investigated based on respondents indicating their inability to judge firm attractiveness due to lack of knowledge about the firm. This analysis found that unfamiliarity of an organisation was negatively associated to employer attractiveness.

The results of the research carried out by Luce et al (2001) found that organisational familiarity and organisational attractiveness as an employer are highly correlated and that a firm’s CSP leads to it being more familiar, which in turn lends itself to employer attractiveness. However, of key importance the findings of this study showed that firm familiarity completely mediates the relationship between CSP and organisational attractiveness. Having said this, the findings of this study also demonstrated that CSP activity is significantly related to both familiarity and organisational attractiveness, and familiarity is significantly related to organisational attractiveness. Luce et al (2001) also conducted post hoc analysis on the five individual dimensions of CSP. This analysis showed that only ‘community relations’ and ‘treatment of women and minorities’ exhibited a significant relationship with both organisational familiarity and organisational attractiveness when tested separately. However, as with CSP as a whole, these two CSP dimensions were completely mediated and only organisational attractiveness and familiarity displayed a significant relationship when all variables were tested together. All in all the findings of Luce et al (2001) tell that as organisational familiarity increases so does organisational attractiveness. Furthermore, based on these results Luce et al
(2001) suggest that Turban and Greening’s (1997) conclusions only tell part of the story, in that while CSP may add to employer attraction this can conceivably be due to its indirect contribution to familiarity and it is the publicity value of CSP, good or bad, that is most relevant.


This study of Backhaus et al (2002) set about building on and adding to existing research on CSP and its proposed association with the job choice process. The authors’ intentions were to investigate job-seekers perceptions of the importance of CSP and explore the effects of individual CSP dimensions on organisational attractiveness.

Backhaus et al (2002) primarily used the research of Turban and Greening (1997) and Greening and Turban (2000) as a point of departure and for comparison during the course of their study.

This study, as with previous research, utilised data form Kinder, Lydenberg, Domini and Co CSP company profile ratings. However, in an attempt to discover whether the five dimensions that have been believed to be most relevant are actually those considered most important, all eleven CSP dimensions were employed in the first stage of investigations. Furthermore, also as with previous research, Backhaus et al (2002) drew on social identity theory and signalling theory as a means of explaining their results.

This research consisted of eight hypotheses. The following table states each of these hypotheses as well as whether or not it was supported.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1  Job-seekers rate CSP as an important organisational attribute when considering prospective employer.</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2  Job-seekers consider the CSP dimensions of environment, community relations, diversity, product issues, and employee relations more important than the other dimensions, which include non-U.S. operations, alcohol, tobacco, gambling, military contracting, and nuclear power.</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cont …
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female job-seekers will rate the dimension of 'diversity' as more important than male job-seekers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority job-seekers will rate the dimension of 'diversity' as more important than nonminority job-seekers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firms’ CSP ratings will influence job-seekers’ assessment of employer attractiveness.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual dimensions of CSP will have differential effects on job-seekers’ assessment of employer attractiveness.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Employee relations’ will be most influential of the five dimensions on assessment of employer attractiveness.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Product issues’ will rank second among the dimensions in its effect on assessments of employer attractiveness.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Due to the number of hypothesis in this study and its complexity the key findings have been summarised below:

- Job-seekers consider CSP to be important at all stages of the job search process, especially when it comes to job acceptance.
- Job-seekers consider CSP to be important in the overall assessment of an organisation.
- Job-seekers believe some CSP dimensions are more important than others. Of the eleven CSP dimensions investigated at the first stage of this study the top five were found to be the same as those that have been said to be most relevant and commonly used in other research: concern for the environment, community relations, diversity, product issues, and employee relations.
- Women and minority groups have a greater interest then men and non minorities when it comes to a firm’s diversity record. The authors suggest that this may be because women and minority groups may perceive a firm’s poor diversity record as a signal that they may encounter barriers within the organisation.
Women and minority groups are more concerned with a firm’s overall CSP record than men.

More easily recognised firms were rated as being a more attractive place to work. The authors suggest that this may be due to familiarity bias as proposed by Gatewood et al (1993), and since participants were in the first instance asked to rate firms with limited knowledge of their CSP record. This proposal is supported as the attractiveness ratings of firms with poor records lowered significantly when respondents were given full data of their overall CSP record. In recognition of this the authors propose that the attractiveness of a firm can be influenced by creating awareness of its CSP.

When CSP dimensions were investigated separately it was found that organisational attraction lowered significantly when a firm’s CSP shifted from a neutral to a poor CSP rating, and this was especially true for the CSP dimensions ‘employee relations’ and ‘concern for the environment’. However, there was no significant shift in firm attraction when an organisation’s CSP record changed from neutral to good. The authors propose that this suggests that so long as a firm does not have a ‘poor’ CSP record it can be considered acceptable seeing as poor CSP has a negative effect on organisational attractiveness to job-seekers while good CSP has a neutral effect. In contrast however, job-seekers show less tolerance for firms displaying a poor ‘employee relations’ record as it was found that a firm poor in this dimension but still high in the others was still perceived as an unattractive place to work. And, if a firm displayed a good employee relations record but was poor in other dimensions they were still perceived as attractive. Having said this, the findings of this study do suggest that poor performance in a ‘single’ CSP dimension may have little effect on attractiveness while poor showings in ‘multiple’ CSP dimensions may have a big effect.

In contrast to previous research this study established that the individual CSP dimensions ‘diversity’ and ‘concern for the environment’ were the two most attractive to job-seekers not ‘employee relations’ and ‘product quality’. Having said this, employee relations had the most combined effect.
Interestingly, the findings of this study also revealed that broad societal CSP issues such as ‘concern for the community’ were of more importance than the likes of ‘product quality’ and ‘employee relations’ that are of direct relationship to employee daily lives.

Having viewed this study by Backhaus et al (2002) it is the researcher’s belief that overall it is in agreement with the findings of Turban and Greening (1997).

In concluding this segment of discussion, of particular interest is that in the studies of Turban and Greening (1997), Green and Turban (2000), Luce et al (2001) and Backhaus et al (2002) a key perceived limitation is the use of undergraduate students as a sample population, due to their possible lack of real job experience. With this in mind, the researcher still perceives this population is nonetheless very relevant as not only are they probably the most socially conscious, demanding, selective and diverse generation to hit the workforce but also the most highly educated (Crumpacker & Crumpacker, 2007). President of NAMIC Kathy Johnson wrote in the media journal CableWORLD, that in order to attract talent companies must mirror the values of a savvy new generation (K. Johnson, 2007). In the same article the National Association of Colleges and Employers (NACE) is quoted as saying that in the USA over the next seven years, 8.4 million Hispanics, 5.9 million African-Americans and 2.7 million Asian-Americans are projected to graduate from college (K. Johnson, 2007), and therefore further highlighting the emergence of a demographically changing workforce.

New Zealand is also witnessing a demographical change in its workforce structure and figures from Statistics NZ show that:

- Between 2004 and 2007 the number of working age females grew by 66,200.
- Immigration increased from -8,987 in 2000 to +12,081 in 2007.
- For the working age population as identified by ethnicity, excluding what could be considered New Zealand’s traditional workforce (European, Polynesian, and Maori) the category of “other” grew by 79,100 males and 80,900 females between 2001 and 2007.

(stats.govt.nz, 2009)
Crumpacker and Crumpacker (2007) further stress the emergence of changing demographics in the workforce by proposing that there may be at least four different generations currently in the workforce that all have different representative values and norms cast by events of their time, and where each generation shares its own world view. Crumpacker and Crumpacker (2007) also suggest that while different generations may share similar values their priorities may vary and “HR should have knowledge of the demographic profile and trends within the external talent pool from which the organisation may recruit” (p. 350).

2.5. Theory influential to this research

There are many theoretical factors that can lay claim to influencing this project. However, at this point the researcher in an attempt at containment has chosen to primarily examine two he believes to be most prevalent and influential. The two theories to be explored are ‘social identity theory’ and ‘signalling theory’. Furthermore, these theories are the same as those identified and investigated by Turban and Greening (1997) and consequent associated research as being most influential and therefore exploring them in this current study will allow for better comparison and evaluation. A third theory however, person-organisation fit, will also be briefly defined.

2.5.1. Social Identity Theory

Defining Social Identity Theory:

Social identity theory is recognised as having roots set in social psychology and behaviour (Ashforth & Mael, 1989) and places emphasis on self-concept and membership affiliation (Greening & Turban, 2000; Turban & Cable, 2003; Turban & Greening, 1997). Social identity theory recognises that self-perception, and the way we perceive others, is based on individual characteristics and priorities such as personality traits and the groups we associate with (Greenberg & Baron, 2008; McShane & Travaglione, 2003). As individuals, the way we perceive and define ourselves is our ‘personal identity’ combined with one’s ‘social identity’ as determined by our
associations (McShane & Travaglione, 2003). In examining social identity, Ashforth and Mael (1989) offer several distinctive points in relation to this theory:

- Social identity is a perception of oneness with a group.
- Social identity stems from categorisation of individuals towards unique group formation.
- Social identity leads to actions congruent with, and in support of, the group and reinforces the antecedents of identification.
- Social identity is a means of identifying ourselves and others.

It is also worthy of note that once others have observed a person’s social identity, such as membership, they too may well form a stereotypical perception and identify them by that association (Ashforth & Mael, 1989; McShane & Travaglione, 2003). This is to say that others will now use this perception as a means to ‘categorise’ that person.

It is perceived by the researcher that social identity theory is pertinent to this study as it will facilitate in giving understanding, interpretation, and rationale of ‘why’ and ‘what’ job-seekers may be attracted to in an organisation. In establishing this it may then be possible to identify what attributes are most advantageous for firms to adopt and promote so as to be perceived as attractive to job-seekers. Additionally, previous seminal writings on organisational CSP and job-seeker attraction have identified social identity theory as being instrumental.

Social Identity Theory as it relates to CSP

It has been suggested that identification by way of employment is one of the most important group affiliations for an individual (Bergami & Bagozzi, 2000), and while the aspects of social identity theory discussed here in part take a general view, on the whole it will be related to firm identification, CSP, and attraction by various associated stakeholders, and job-seekers in particular. This is to say that while social identity theory can be associated with different stakeholders that identify with and are attracted to various groups for various reasons and rewards, an attempt is made to contain group association to organisations and where possible related to the firms CSP and job-
seekers. Given this, the focus of this section will be the self-identification by job-seekers, employees, consumers, or investors to a particular group, cause, product or employer because they may hold an emotional attachment, have shared values and beliefs, have shared goals, or may want the perceived prestige associated therein.

As a way of setting what the researcher believes are encompassing parameters to the understanding of social identity theory, Bergami and Bagozzi’s (2000) proposal of three components to social identity is drawn upon. Firstly, there is a cognitive component where individuals have an awareness of their membership to a group/organisation through self-categorisation. Second, is an emotional component of involvement through which the individual’s self esteem and commitment are enacted. The third component is evaluative, whereby the positive and negative connotations attached to membership in a particular group/organisation are considered. In addition to these three components Bergami and Bagozzi (2000) further propose that there are then two dimensions involved in the emotional component of social identity. Firstly, the positive feelings an individual obtains ‘from’ the group due to membership, and secondly, the feelings of attachment and belongingness orientated ‘towards’ the group.

Amongst the more recognisable research on social identity theory and the organisation is that of Ashford and Mael (1989) where they propose that social identification is a perception of oneness stemming from categorisation. These authors suggest that this identification leads to activities congruent with the identity of the organisation, and that is maintained through stereotypical perceptions. Ashford and Mael (1989) tell that along with a positive view of the organisation, individuals that have formed a self identification towards a firm invest more of their self conception in the “valued persona” (p. 21). This article proposes that organisational identification is the search for meaning, connectedness, and empowerment, and whereby the individual gains fulfillment through comparison and increased self esteem. Additionally, it is said that this comparison and social identification enables the individual to vicariously partake in the success of the organisation as they assume a common identity. Ashford and Mael (1989) suggest that factors such as distinctiveness of organisational values, prestige, awareness, shared goals, and common history influence identification, as individuals align themselves with
firms that are congruent with salient aspects of their lives. Furthermore, Ashford and Mael (1989) propose that in contrast to what the individual receives via social identification, the organisational reward and consequence of this identification is the individual’s loyalty, pride, and commitment toward the firm.

Brammer (2007) in studying the contribution of CSP to organisational commitment established a relationship with social identity theory and offered support to the views of Ashford and Mael. This article proposes that individuals take pride in, and can identify with, organisations that have favourable reputations and that part and parcel of a firm’s reputation is its espoused CSP which in turn is an expression of its values and enduring attributes. The author goes on to say that when these values are positive, individuals identify with the firm and thus form an emotional attachment leading to the desire to be involved with them as part of their self concept. The findings of Brammer (2007) suggest that CSP provides indirect benefits to stakeholders in alignment with the conceptual framework of social identity theory. This is said as Brammer (2007), akin to Ashford and Mael, proposes that individuals identify with and commit to organisations participating in activities congruent with salient aspects of their own identity. Peloza et al (2009) add to this when discussing the use of organisation-backed employee volunteerism as a means of increasing the effectiveness of CSP activities. These authors suggest that as a result of engaging staff, firms solicit an affinity whereby employees identify with the cause that in turn lends itself to organisational commitment and employee attraction.

It has been suggested by Sen (2006) that a firm’s actions reveal its character. It is this ‘character’ that Sen (2006) proposes is the identity of the organisation and that which overlaps with individuals’ self-identification leading to attraction. If we relate the character of a firm to in part be its espoused CSP, and to which individuals perceive a oneness, it is suggested that pro organisational stakeholder behavior may be the firm’s reward (Sen, 2006). Conversely, it is suggested that the reward for the individual when identifying with such organisations comes by way of fulfillment of higher level needs such as self-enhancement (Ashforth & Mael, 1989; Sen, 2006). Bhattacharya et al (2008) in their article on winning the talent war, while suggesting that the primary objective in pursuing CSP activities is to increase identification with the organisation
support the view that personal fulfillment is an outcome. These authors justify this finding by proposing that through the utilisation of CSP activity and creating stakeholder awareness of and involvement in such activity, individuals identify with both the organisation and activity whereby satisfaction of personal needs and self enhancement occurs. Bhattacharya et al (2008) then go on to say that with fulfillment of personal needs comes further organisational identification and therefore indicating a continuous circle. Additionally, this article suggests that through identification with an organisation’s CSP activities comes job satisfaction, pride, well being, and the use of the word ‘we’ that ultimately suggests oneness. Moreover, this research indicates that positive CSP by a firm strengthens stakeholder identification as it reveals its values or “soul” (2008, p. 43).

Feldman, Bearden, and Hardesty (2006) when researching the content of job advertisements found that information in the advertisement may help job seekers to identify with the firm by influencing their attitude towards the organisation. The authors propose that by conveying a positive corporate image in job ads potential applicants will be influenced and attracted to the organisation due to their desire to be identified with an image they perceive will enhance their self image and the esteem in which they are held by others.

Having viewed literature around other relevant stakeholders, the study by Marin and Ruiz’s (2007) on consumer behaviour and its relationship to social identity proposes that the extent to which individuals identify with firms is dependent on the attraction of the organisation’s identity, as it is this identity that facilitates the satisfaction of individual self-definitional needs. The results of this research confirmed a relationship between identity attraction and corporate associations. While the authors propose that the reason firms attempt to connect with consumers is retention and to gain their loyalty that in turn lends itself to organisational profitability, the motivation offered in this article for customers to engage is less clear. Having said this, Marin and Ruiz (2007) tell that firms are social groups with which consumers identify in order to satisfy their need for social identification and whereby the CSP of a firm may be a trigger. The authors go on to support the suggestion that awareness of a firm’s CSP activities influences attitudes
towards them that can culminate in the organisation being rewarded favourably by stakeholder actions and behaviour. Marin and Ruiz also propose that this simultaneously aids to satisfy the stakeholder’s personal needs and enhances the desire to strengthen ties. This in part demonstrates a reciprocal affiliation and increases the “level of overlap between how a member defines him or herself and the organisation” (p. 554) affording a sense of belongingness (Marin & Ruiz, 2007). While the authors propose that stakeholder identification and attraction to a firm by way of its CSP demonstrates a fit and congruence in values forming a bond and platform towards a long term relationship, they also suggest organisations should be aware that there is a need for integrity in what values they display.

Shifting from consumers to another, and equally important stakeholder, investors, Chatterji et al (2009) suggest that socially responsible investors see the actions of the firms they invest in as an extension of their way of life by way of association. The authors propose that expressively motivated investors are concerned by firms’ reputations, and base their social identity on investment associations, as these investment associations can be perceived as an expression of their own personal values and beliefs.

It should be reiterated at this time, that the core research associated with this current study is that of Turban and Greening’s (1997), Greening and Turban (2000), Luce et al (2001) and Backhaus et al (2002). Of these four sets of authors the only one not to explore social identity theory as part of their research was Luce et al (2001). In the investigations of the other three it was found that there is an association between the desire for social identification by job-seekers, CSP, and organisational attractiveness. These authors established that by way of social identity theory an organisation’s positive CSP is positively related to an enhanced reputation and attractiveness as an employer since job-seekers then expect this to lead to a more positive self-concept. These articles propose that a firm’s espoused CSP aids job-seekers to identify with a firm’s perceived values, which in turn assists in determining if it is a desirable place to work. In relating organisational attraction and self-identification to individual CSP elements Backhaus et al (2002) further proposed that job-seekers attempt to select self-
enhancing employment settings so as to derive a more positive sense of self-identity by associating with attributes such as high quality and prestigious products, and firms that are perceived to do good for the community and the world in general.

2.5.2. Signalling Theory

Defining Signalling Theory:

To the researcher, signalling theory is seemingly less frequently investigated and employed as a determining factor in studies related to organisational attraction of job-seekers than other theories such as social identity and person-organisation fit. However its fundamentals are easily understood and recognised. It is said that the basis of signalling theory is to communicate information, albeit incomplete or imperfect, to a receiver with the intention to influence, motivate, and/or manipulate rather than wholly inform (Bird & Smith, 2005; Goldberg & Allen, 2008; Greening & Turban, 2000; Palmer & Pomianek, 2007; Spence, 1973; Turban & Greening, 1997). Palmer and Pomianek (2007) supplement this by proposing that signals are intended to influence, manipulate and promote cooperative social relationships whereby their effectiveness is ultimately measured by the reaction it solicits from the receiver.

Goldenberg (2008) adds to this by proposing that signalling is a subjective process interpreted by way of perception and the impression offered. It has been said that signalling can also be a means of articulating idealist notions such as organisational environmental sustainability practices, that are then received, interpreted and accepted or rejected by receivers dependent on pre-existing preferences (Bird & Smith, 2005). In relation to job-seeker attraction Turban and Greening (1997) somewhat expanded on this view and suggest that organisational signals are sent with the intention to influence perceptions by providing information on a firm’s attributes, and are an expression of their values and norms and are indicative of what it would be like to work there. In essence, it can be said that signalling theory, as related to job-seeker attraction, is the process by which messages are sent with the intention to engage attention, create interest, reduce uncertainties, offer satisfaction of organisational attributes, and
culminate in influencing the job-seeker decision making process (Goldberg & Allen, 2008; Lievens & Highhouse, 2003).

The concept of signalling theory is relative to this study as the researcher perceives it will assist to explain and clarify data collected, and analysis and interpretation of ‘how’ and ‘why’ job-seekers may be attracted to an organisation. This may in turn lend itself to identifying not only the type and form of signal that will afford paramount returns for organisations given it is said that different job-seeking populations are attracted by different things (Albinger & Freeman, 2000; Turban, 2001), but also the best channels by which to signal. Additionally, previous research central to this current study has identified signalling theory as being influential in explaining job-seeker and organisational attraction.

Signalling theory as it relates to CSP

Signalling theory, while having been consistently recognised as influential in many aspects of organisational and personal life and having formed an association with constructs such as marketing, financial investment, cultural rituals, and employee recruitment, retains the same base fundamentals across constructs (Albinger & Freeman, 2000; Backhaus et al., 2002; Bird & Smith, 2005; Biswas, Dutta, & Biswas, 2009; Chapman & Webster, 2006; Goldberg & Allen, 2008; Greening & Turban, 2000; Littler; Palmer & Pomianek, 2007; Rubaii-Barrett, 2007; Saks & McCarthy, 2006; Spence, 1973; Thompson & Bunderson, 2003). It has been said that signalling theory “attempts to explain various forms of communication….. that promote cooperative social relationships among participants” (p. 295) and whereby trust is important (Palmer & Pomianek, 2007).

Given this, the aspects of signalling theory discussed here will, while to some degree capturing a general overview, on the whole be directed to organisational signalling of CSP as indicators and attractors to various associated stakeholders, and job-seekers in particular. Furthermore, it is the researcher’s belief that signals intended for a ‘particular’ target market such as investors or consumers, are transferrable and can just as easily be relevant and shaped toward another; job-seekers for example. This is said as Sen
(2006) proposed that individuals can be multiple stakeholders, and that attraction may be dependent on need and the perceived value and importance of the signal, and consequently job-seekers may also be consumers and place dual value on signals of such things as perceived product quality. Additionally, in the main signalling theory as related to employer attraction, is suggested to act as a cue or indicator of a firm’s attributes and how it can be expected to behave (Albinger & Freeman, 2000; Backhaus et al., 2002; Cable & Turban, 2003; Chapman & Webster, 2006; Fombrun & Shanley, 1990; C. Freeman, 2003; Gatewood et al., 1993; Goldberg & Allen, 2008; Greening & Turban, 2000; M. Johnson, 2002; Littler; Peloza et al., 2009; Reeve & Schultz, 2004; Turban & Greening, 1997; Zagenczyk, 2004).

Bird and Smith (2005) propose that firms can utilise signals as a means to convey and articulate idealist notions of intangible social benefits such as CSP activity, and whereby attraction to such signals and any consequent motivated behaviour by receivers is dependent on pre-existing preference towards the message. Furthermore, the authors suggest that signals are intended to provide benefits for both the sender and receiver. The research of Thompson and Bunderson (2003) on violations of principle within the construct of the psychological/ideological contract and its effects on the employee/employer relationship, add to Bird and Smith’s (2005) concept of signals pertaining to ideals. These authors suggest that firms espousing commitment to ideals are said to be signalling a promise of support. Additionally, they equally propose that firms not upholding their perceived commitment, of community involvement for example, signal a breach of exchange that can be both negotiable and non-negotiable to the employee and whereby the consequence may include distrust, withholding of labour, and even termination of the relationship.

Michael Spence (1973) in his study of job market signalling, while primarily taking the perspective of an employer sending and receiving and interpreting signals, suggests that signals received are founded on uncertainty and imperfect information that is subjectively accessed. He proposes that signals are adjustable and open to manipulation, and therefore can be seen as a point of differentiation and deserving of more consideration, dependent on the importance to the receiver. The author tells that
signals can create an image of organisational attributes and beliefs and that interpretation of these can change given past experience of the receiver, and the perceived value and truth of the message. Zagenczyk (2004) adds to this in suggesting that having shaped impressions and framed perceived organisational attributes founded on signals sent, stakeholders then seek to understand, and will make deductions as to why the firm signals what it does, and evaluate their motives. For example; is the firm’s positive CSP activity founded on altruistic motives? Interestingly, Zagenczyk (2004) proposes that firms caught out with poor CSP reputations and that then begin to signal positive CSP activity, will be viewed negatively by employees as they are perceived to be acting with instrumental motives and lacking sincerity.

Albinger and Freeman (2000) in their study of the attractiveness of CSP in an employer to different job-seeking populations, propose that the advantage posed by CSP is contingent on the degree of job choice available to the job-seeker population. These authors find an amount of agreement with Fombrun and Shanley (1990) and propose that “each stakeholder group judges a firm’s relative merits by interpreting the informational signals available and makes comparisons of the competing reputational signals received when making decisions” (p. 244). These authors suggest that a firm signalling high levels of CSP has the opportunity to improve its reputational standing, given that a firm’s reputation can be influenced by signals sent to stakeholders. While the results of Albinger and Freeman’s (2002) study indicated that organisational CSP is positively related to employer attractiveness for those job-seekers with high levels of job choice, no relationship was found for populations with low levels. Based on this, the authors suggest that firms exhibiting socially responsible signals may be afforded competitive advantage in attracting higher quality candidates. Furthermore, the authors propose that in accordance with signalling theory a firm’s social policy may serve as a signal of working conditions and organisational values and norms, and that given this, stakeholders interpret and compare firms as they search for congruence in values and beliefs contingent on individual differences.

In the study conducted by Rubaii-Barrett (2007) the author proposes that job-seekers are moving away from what have been considered traditional employment recruitment
methods and turning to web-based recruitment. This author’s article researching internet use by job-seekers, website diversity messages, and organisational attractiveness, tells that minority job-seekers such as minor ethnic groups, value the need for organisational fit. Given this, Rubaii-Barrett (2007) suggests websites that exhibit signals of diversity can make a connection with these groups. She proposes that minority job-seekers use websites to look for signals from firms that indicate value congruence. In particular, the author proposes that visual imagery depicted through firms’ websites send strong signals of their values and norms. And, if such imagery demonstrates diversity, it may lend itself to positive organisational attraction from minority job-seeking groups. This view is in support of Avery (2003) where the author proposes a ‘similarities attract’ paradigm, and that signals of racial diversity in firm advertising has a positive effect on minority recruitment.

Rubaii-Barrett (2007) singled out text and visual content of US State Government websites as pertaining to diversity statements as the target of her research and investigations. The results of this study found that in contrast to private sector firms, overall US State Government websites did not exhibit, or emphasise and signal, a commitment to diversity. Rubaii-Barrett (2007) proposes that the messages signalled on firms’ websites may be a job-seekers first means of accessing organisational suitability. This article suggests that given a firm’s website may potentially be the first port of call for job-seekers, organisations have the opportunity to signal, highlight, and push their own unique qualities and aspects of culture so as to make a positive first impression. Having said this, the research of Avery (2003) showed that job-seeker reactions to signals or cues of organisational diversity vary, and is contingent on one’s views and openness to diversity. This is to say the author found that diversity was less salient to whites, and blacks were only attracted to diversity imagery that signalled minorities in supervisory and higher positions.

Goldberg and Allen (2008) add to the research of Rubaii-Barrett (2007) in their study of firm website design and its implications on minority job-seeker attitudes and intention of pursuance. These authors’ suggest that interpretation of signals sent is subjective, based on perception, and as proposed by Albinger and Freeman (2002), is influenced
by individual difference. This article suggests that an organisation’s website communicates signals not only to indicate what a firm would be like to work for, but with the intent of engaging attention, creating interest, reducing uncertainty, affording satisfaction of organisational attributes, and influencing the employment decision process. Goldberg and Allen (2008) suggest that the characteristics of a firm’s website such as ease of site arrangement, signal an overall impression of the organisation, and the manner with which job-seekers interact is as important as the information contained within it. This is said as the authors point to this leading to an assessment of favourability given that positive perceptions serve as positive indicators of organisational attributes. Additionally, and found of interest by the researcher, it is proposed in this article that a firm’s website serves a similar function to traditional ‘in person’ recruiters. The authors of this study suggest a firm’s website is an effective and economical means to indicate CSP messages such as diversity statements, which in turn signal to job-seekers that a firm is committed to a cause. Having said this, contrary to these authors’ initial beliefs, results of this study showed that organisational diversity statements did not impact as widely as anticipated as blacks reacted more strongly than whites, and therefore suggesting that job-seeker reaction may be dependent on group status. However, overall the results demonstrated positive support for firms to signal CSP activity by way of their website as a means of attracting job-seekers.

A study by Fombrun and Shanley (1990) on organisational reputation building, proposes that stakeholders contrast competing signals, or “cues” (p. 234), of a firm’s reputation to access prospects, and whereby the ‘right’ signals will influence their judgments toward such things as investment decisions, product choices, and career decisions, and therefore afford potentially significant competitive advantage to the firm. These authors tell that an organisation’s signals are intended to inform “key characteristics to constituents to maximise their social status” (p. 234) and that in doing so the organisation potentially inhibits other firms attractiveness while crystallising their own. Littler (2006) adds to this by proposing that firms can maximise their signals through timeliness and employing follow-up signals to keep stakeholders informed. Further to this, given that firms have multiple stakeholders each with varied assessment criteria,
and that each audience is attracted to different cues when judging an organisation, Fombrun and Shanley (1990) propose that for greatest return firms should ensure they put forward their principal attributes. These authors also suggest that firms exhibiting a reputation for paying particular attention to organisational aspects such as employee welfare may find themselves in a good bargaining position within the labour market, and whereby they attract a higher calibre of candidates. This study proposes that a firm’s reputation is an outcome of signals communicated to stakeholders and whereby such signals can highlight benefits and advantages and afford differentiation. Further to this, it is suggested that some potential advantages of signalling a favourable reputation are; the ability to charge a premium for products, enhanced access to capital, and attraction of quality staff. Having said this, Fombrun and Shanley (1990) tell that stakeholders make collective judgments that can create both advantages and disadvantages, as false signals can influence behaviour starting a chain of events whereby those uninformed will trade off others opinions and behaviours. Therefore, the authors propose that false signals may have short term advantages while perceived as true, followed by long term payoff when discovered to be untrue. This view of false signals is supported by a conference paper by Craig Littler (2006) and where he proposes that if the gap between interpreted signals and actual reality is significant, then a firm’s reputation is at risk.

Chapman and Webster (2006) in their study of applicant reaction to recruiter influence in the job choice process by way of signalling and expectancy theory, proposed that in the absence of complete information, applicants make use of what is available to make inferences of missing components, and accordingly make judgments as to what they perceive they can expect from the firm as a whole. In doing so, Chapman and Webster (2006) suggest that job-seeker attitudes may change towards the organisation during participation in the recruitment process, whereby interpretation of recruiter signals may result in behavioural consequences such as premature withdrawal, loss of best applicants, non acceptance of a job offer, and possible loss of custom. These authors propose that as job-seekers search for missing information, the recruiter facilitates and acts as an agent representative of the whole organisation, and therefore job-seekers draw on recruiter signals to access the suitability of the firm. Having said this, while the
findings of this study showed that interviewer signals were influential and afforded expectation of what the organisation would be like to work for, pre-interview attraction was the strongest determinant of post-interview organisational attraction.

The research undertaken by Saks and McCarthy (2006) on job-seeker reactions pertaining to the effects of discriminatory interview questions such as age, sexual orientation, and relationship status, suggests that job-seekers interpret such questions as indicative signals of the organisation and the way they could expect to be treated. This research found that such questions had a significant negative effect on perceived organisational attractiveness and job-seeker intentions to pursue and accept a position, and also to recommend the firm. Furthermore, results of this study showed that this was especially true for females, and it appeared that males were more willing to tolerate discriminating questioning.

Biswas et al (2009) in researching the effects of product quality and multiple simultaneous signals found that a signal’s standalone credibility determines its strength in the coexistence of another competing signal, and that the strength of a weaker signal would be increased by the coexistence of a stronger signal. The authors therefore proposed that firms need an ‘optimal mix’ of signals. This research also showed that individual ‘brand’ signals influence perceptions and assessment of the firm as a whole. Moreover, the researchers propose that signals are a diagnostic which stakeholders perceive they can use with some confidence to make inferences about a firm and its products. Sorescu, Shankar, and Kushwaha (2007) also researched signalling in reference to a firm’s products. However, their study investigated new product pre-announcements, and proposed that this 'strategic' form of signalling can be both beneficial and dangerous. The authors, although primarily referring to financial share value, are in agreement with Fombrun and Shanley (1990) when proposing that signals interpreted by stakeholders as being false, or not delivered on, while possibly creating short term positive attention and attraction can also have long lasting negative impacts and consequences when discovered to be inaccurate, and whereby stakeholders perceive the firm as untrustworthy. This is in contrast to where the return on signals
proven to be accurate, reliable, and credible, is said to prolong attention and attraction, and in this instance meant long-lasting increases share value.

Sutherland et al (2002) in their research into organisational branding, becoming an employer of choice, and the attraction of knowledge workers, proposed that talent is critical to an organisation’s value creation. While this research exposed CSP and its elements as a contributor to being an employer of choice by way of diversity, good employee relations, and product quality, one of its research questions was to discover what communication channels knowledge workers use to identify such employers. Ensuing from their analysis the authors propose the following six communication channels as those most used in ascertaining signals that convey desirable employer of choice attributes:

- current employees
- word of mouth
- media
- firsthand experience such as being a customer
- branding
- the internet

Given this, the authors identified cues afforded by ‘current employees’ and ‘word of mouth’ as being most sought and trusted by knowledge worker job-seekers. Conversely, it can be said that ‘current employees’ and ‘word of mouth’ are the best means for firms to signal and communicate their brand message so as to be known as an employer of choice and attract knowledge worker job-seekers. Furthermore, Sutherland et al (2002) propose that the content of such signals encompass organisational values, policies and behaviour and can be interpreted as the “seller’s promise” (p. 14). Cable and Turban (2003) add support to this premise, as their investigations of the value of organisational reputation to recruitment, found that job-seekers used a firm’s reputation as a signal of perceived organisational attributes. Additionally, the research of Sutherland et al (2002) suggests that firms can tailor brand
image signals and messages to particular job-seeker market segments, and that the type of communication channel employed plays a critical role.

As mentioned earlier the core research associated with this current study is that of Turban and Greening’s (1997), Greening and Turban (2000), Luce et al (2001) and Backhaus et al (2002). Of these four articles, and as with social identity theory, the only one not to explore signalling theory as part of their research was that of Luce et al (2001). The research of Turban and Greening (1997) and Greening and Turban (2000) suggest that job-seekers are in general equipped with limited knowledge of potential employers and therefore interpret CSP signals sent by firms as indicators of working conditions and what it would be like to be a member of the organisation. These two authors propose that the espoused CSP of firms are signals suggestive of their values and norms intended to influence job-seekers perceptions of conditions at the firm, and that in turn can influence organisational attraction. Additionally, Turban and Greening (1997) and Greening and Turban (2000) propose that job-seekers draw on a firm’s espoused CSP as signals of suitability or otherwise. The research of Turban and Greening (1997) suggest that signals of superior levels of CSP can positively aid a firm’s reputation. Greening and Turban (2000) propose that a firm’s espoused CSP signal that it is committed to a goal or cause. Furthermore, as particular CSP cues are interpreted they may be valued by different job-seeking populations more than others due to ‘individual difference’. For example; the CSP element ‘treatment of women and minorities’ sends a stronger signal to minority population job-seeking groups than perceivably to white males. The research of Backhaus et al (2002) while in general agreement with Turban and Greening (1997) and Greening and Turban (2000) as to the effects and intentions of signals, makes several subtle additions. For instance, they propose that in order to make rational employment decisions job-seekers exploit firms CSP signals in accessing appropriateness and to draw conclusions on their intentions and forecast future actions. Furthermore, Backhaus et al (2002) suggest that given a firm’s espoused CSP signals their values these values are therefore an integral part of employment image.
Definition of Person-Organisation Fit Theory:

While a number of theories may arise as affording influence during the analysis of this study and signalling theory and social identity theory have been identified as primary, it is perceived that person-organisation fit theory may also be prevalent. Therefore, a brief definition of this theory is offered.

The primary assumption behind the theory of ‘person-organisation fit’ is that individuals are differently attracted to organisations founded on personal needs, interests, preferences, and personality (Judge & Bretz, 1992; Lievens, Decaesteker, Coetsier, & Geirnaert, 2001). This view is supplemented by the proposal that before making job choice decisions individuals make an assessment of the congruence between their personal values and those of an organisation (Backhaus et al., 2002; Cable & Judge, 1994). It has been said that in evaluating such congruence job-seekers take into account an organisation’s policy, practices, image, and CSP (Albinger & Freeman, 2000; Gatewood et al., 1993; Ng & Burke, 2005). However, this is not to say that both the organisation and individual are not making decisions about one another seeing as organisations attract, recruit, and select based on individuals that best fit their needs and expectations (Lievens et al., 2001).

The theory of person-organisation fit is perceived by the researcher as being relevant to this study as a larger construct from which other sub-themes such as social identity theory are developed. This is said as the theory of person-organisation fit undertakes to account for ‘how’ individuals make an assessment of congruence between themselves and an organisation while also offering an explanation of ‘why’ they may make a particular job choice decision (Ng & Burke, 2005).

2.6. Summary

During the course of this literature review firstly the historical background of CSP was explored where the varied influences and underlying principles of CSP along with the scholars that set the foundation for this as a construct were identified. CSP was then reviewed at as to why it should be considered alongside more traditional organisational
recruitment processes and tools. Literature was subsequently questioned under the larger umbrella of organisational branding and image as to whether or not CSP could offer firms a point of difference in attracting quality job-seekers. In reviewing literature as to why firms should, and actually do, partake in CSP it was shown that it may be a means of attaining differentiation, improving stakeholder relationships, and possible competitive advantage. Research then argued from a resource base perspective that CSP may afford further competitive advantage, and that as such stakeholders attained increased satisfaction and afforded organisational commitment.

So as to understand the aforementioned possible advantages of CSP and related activity, research and literature around the implementation of and returns from effective CSP was reviewed along with matching of activities with organisational objectives, given it was suggested there was a need for fit. Literature discussing the various forms and means of measuring CSP were evaluated along with its dynamics.

At this point the central studies of Turban and Greening (1997), Greening and Turban (2000), Luce et al (2001), and Backhaus (2002) were examined and explored as to the effects of espoused organisational CSP in relation to characteristics such as organisational reputation and familiarity, and job-seeker attraction. Leading on from this an assessment of social identity theory and signalling theory was offered seeing as these theories were key explanatory components to the previously mentioned scholars’ research and are anticipated to be influential in this current study. This appraisal for the main part proposed that social identity theory in relation to job-seeker attraction was expressive of a need for congruence in values and beliefs, and a want to increase self-concept, self-belief, self-esteem, and fulfillment. The overall key themes derived from literature reviewed on signals and signalling theory relative to a firm’s CSP, attraction, and job-seekers was that signals consisted of incomplete information that indicated organisational attributes, and shaped and influenced job-seeker impressions as to the norms, and values and suitability of a firm. Furthermore, firms signals informed what it would be like to be a member of an organisation and allowed for assessment of congruence and perceived fit.
Chapter Three

3.0 Research Design

3.1. Overview

This chapter outlines the method of data collection employed while conducting this research and the rationale behind it. Differing research method characteristics are discussed that lead to the choice of one in particular that is perceived as that best suited to answer the research question of “to what extent do job-seekers find Corporate Social Performance, and its elements, to be attractive in a potential employer?” The subject matter discussed in this chapter also covers important factors that influenced the choice of research design undertaken.

To provide context for the choice of research method the two main research paradigms are discussed along with their strengths and weaknesses. Additionally, consideration is then given to an increasingly popular third paradigm that perceivably combines the best of both methods (Connelly, 2009; Jupp, 2006; Saunders, Lewis, & Thornhill, 2007). In choosing an appropriate methodology awareness is given to the suggestion that while the choice of quantitative or qualitative methodology, or a combination of both, is dictated through the research question, the end philosophy chosen may also be reflective of researcher preference and identification (Collis & Hussey, 2003). The methodology used by other studies that investigate the impact of CSP as it pertains to attraction of potential employees and the job search process is also briefly discussed, with particular attention given to the seminal study of Turban and Greening (1997) and subsequent research derived from it. Furthermore, while it could be considered that any of the paradigms discussed are equally suitable for this research, one emerges as ‘most’ appropriate given the need to achieve the explicit goals and objectives of this study.

This chapter also describes and explains the sample selection procedure, questionnaire design, and online survey distribution and collection process employed during this
study. The data collection process is detailed along with analysis techniques utilised. This chapter concludes with an evaluation of any ethical implications of this research.

3.2. Philosophies / Research Paradigms

Before delving into the paradigm and methodology chosen as best suited to this research project, it is appropriate to briefly discuss and define the various choices at hand. However, as a precursor to this discussion we should give understanding to the term ‘research’ and ‘paradigm’.

Research has been described as “a quest for knowledge and understanding” (Greenfield, 2002, p. 3) with systematic and critical investigation that, through demonstrable facts may establish new conclusions, answer questions, and/or resolve problems (Walliman, 2005). It is worthy of note that while these definitions offer descriptions they also suggest that research is dynamic and ongoing. This concept is supported by Leedy and Ormrod (2005) as they propose that “in virtually every subject area, our knowledge is incomplete and problems are waiting to be solved” (p. 1). While it is important to define what research is, it is equally important to recognise that research is not the shifting of facts or just the gathering of information (Leedy & Ormrod, 2005; Walliman, 2005).

The word paradigm can be explained as simply as “a model or example” (Collins paperback English dictionary, 1999, p. 591). However, for the purpose of research this word offers far more complexity. For example, Collis and Hussey (2003) describe a paradigm as “the progress of scientific practice based on peoples’ philosophies and assumptions about the world and the nature of knowledge” (p. 352); Saunders, Lewis and Thornhill (2007) define it as “a way of examining social phenomena from which particular understandings of these phenomena can be gained and explanations attempted” (p. 605); Walliman (2005) states that a paradigm is “the overall effect of the acceptance of a particular general theoretical approach, and the influence this has on the scientist’s view of the world” (p. 436); and finally, Quinton and Smallbone (2006) propose a paradigm is “a pattern or framework that forms our thinking before we begin research” (pp. 5-6). While the definition of a paradigm appears to be wide and varied, a
core prevailing theme is of a set of beliefs and rules that influence and manipulate what and how research should be conducted and interpreted (Jupp, 2006). Having said this, Morgan (1979) (as cited in Collis & Hussey, 2003) suggests that to provide clarity, and aid in choosing an appropriate paradigm, three levels of thought be established; firstly a philosophical level that reflects general world beliefs, secondly a social level that offers structure of how to conduct the research, and thirdly a technical level that firmly identifies methods and techniques to be adopted.

3.2.1 Research Paradigms

There are considered to be two dominant research paradigms, positivistic and phenomenological (Collis & Hussey, 2003). While these two paradigms are seen by purists as unequivocal and distinct it has also been suggested they contain an amount of crossover (Collis & Hussey, 2003; Jupp, 2006). In the following discussion of the aforementioned two paradigms, evaluation is directed toward their fit with the goals and objectives of this research so as provide sound and constructive data and information that can then be interpreted with validity and credibility. Additionally, given the proposal of crossover in the two main paradigms, appraisal of a third mixed method methodology approach is also offered.

**Phenomenological paradigm**

Before discussing the phenomenological paradigm it is fitting to first set an understanding of its meaning. In doing so the writings of scholars such as Saunders, Lewis and Thornhill (2007) are drawn on, where they describe phenomenology as the “research philosophy that sees social phenomena as socially constructed…… concerned with generating meaning and gaining insights” (p. 606). It is further said that the idea of phenomenology is concerned with understanding human behavior from the participant’s position and own reality (Collis & Hussey, 2003), and in basic terms can be associated to the perceptions, perspectives and understanding of a certain situation or event by a person (Leedy & Ormrod, 2005). Phenomenology is also known as interpretivism and qualitative. For the purpose of this research the term ‘qualitative’ will be used.
Qualitative research investigates the ‘real world’ in all its complexities without necessarily having one distinct truth (Leedy & Ormrod, 2005) and is less scientifically objective or concerned with numerical measurement than its opposite complement, quantitative research (Collis & Hussey, 2003; Creswell, 2003). It is subjective in nature, where data is rich and generalisations can be made from one setting to another (Collis & Hussey, 2003). This approach to research is generally associated with a small sample population and lends itself to the interview process where the observer seeks a high level of detail (Alvesson, 2002; Collis & Hussey, 2003; Newman, 2005). Unfortunately qualitative research can be open to researcher bias, as frequently the researcher is the ‘research tool’ and consequently interprets data subjectively through their own eyes (Goulding, 2002). While it is said that qualitative data obtained from the likes of one on one interviews provides direct experiences (Leedy & Ormrod, 2005) it is also alleged that multiple realities may be captured that are less reliable and open to misinterpretation and misunderstanding (Collis & Hussey, 2003). This methodology is more inclined to be used when there is a need for description, interpretation, and evaluation so as to reveal the nature of events and gain new insight about phenomena (Leedy & Ormrod, 2005), and when there is need for understanding of how things happen and are linked (Creswell, 2003).

**Positivistic paradigm**

Literature tends to associate positivism to numeric analysis of large amounts of data that scientifically deal with social facts detached from value and coupled with the proviso and tenet of mathematical proof (Collis & Hussey, 2003; Jupp, 2006; Saunders et al., 2007; Walliman, 2005). Additionally, Leedy and Ormrod (2005) suggest that positivism is commonly used to answer measureable questions with the rationale of explaining, predicting, and controlling. This view is furthered, and supported, by Walliman’s (2005) suggestion of the want for objective causal explanation as opposed to the desire for subjective understanding as prescribed by qualitative research. With this in mind Saunders et al (2007) define positivism as “the epistemological position that advocates working with an observable reality. The emphasis is on highly structured methodology….and the end result can be law-like generalisations” (p. 606) with the
defining factor being that numbers result. Quinton and Smallbone (2006) and Collis and Hussey (2003) propose this approach has a dominance in business research and underpinning for social sciences. Having said this, Jupp (2006) suggests that the positivistic view is beginning to disappear as a natural science methodology due to its disregard for the importance of individual subjectivity.

Positivistic research, also referred to as quantitative (Collis & Hussey, 2003; Creswell, 2003; Jupp, 2006; Leedy & Ormrod, 2005; Quinton & Smallbone, 2006; Saunders et al., 2007), is said to be objectively measurable, detached, devoid of researcher bias, and lending itself to statistical analysis (Leedy & Ormrod, 2005; Saunders et al., 2007). For the purpose of this research, and ease of understanding, the term ‘quantitative’ is used when referring to the positivistic paradigm and methodology. Quantitative research and methodology implies the collection of numeric data in the form of scores, ratings, scales, and durations, in controlled or natural environments using special, or sample populations (Jupp, 2006). Jupp (2006) expands on this by telling that quantitative research allows for valid and meaningful outcomes that are facilitated through statistical analysis detecting relationships and producing facts about real world behaviour that can be both tracked over time and generalised from. Leedy and Ormrod (2005) further add to this in proposing that quantitative research applies deductive reasoning and analysis from which to draw conclusions.

It is said that the key weaknesses of quantitative research is that statistical data may not quite be what it superficially appears, in that it does not account for social meaning and interaction, subjectivity, and individual values and perception (Jupp, 2006; Walliman, 2005). This methodology traditionally affords itself to research questionnaires with the purpose of hypothesis confirmation or disconfirmation (Collis & Hussey, 2003; Leedy & Ormrod, 2005; Saunders et al., 2007).

**Mixed method methodology**

It can be said that mixed method research is an integration of the traditional approaches adopted by quantitative and qualitative research with the goal of drawing on their strengths while minimising their weaknesses whilst addressing a ‘single’ research
question (Connelly, 2009; R. B. Johnson, 2004; Jupp, 2006; Saunders et al., 2007). Saunders (2007) suggests that it is possible to use the characteristics of both the two main research methodology, and defines this mixed method approach as “the use of quantitative and qualitative data collection techniques and analysis procedures either at the same time (parallel) or one after the other (sequential)” (p. 602). Creswell and Plano Clark (as cited in Cohen, 2008) add value to this by saying mixed method methodology “guides the collection, analysis, and mixing of quantitative and qualitative types of data, providing a better understanding of the research problem than any one method alone” (p. 528).

In mixing methods the use of open-ended qualitative and closed-ended quantitative questioning is able (Cohen, 2008; Jupp, 2006) and constitutes a “within-stage mixed-model design” (R. B. Johnson, 2004, p. 20). Johnson (2004) further suggests that mixed method typologies such as mixed-model designs and mixed method designs have numerous combinations and vary depending at which stage the mixing of methods occurs and to what extent it occurs. This is to say, one method may be more dominant than the other.

Collis and Hussey (2003) and Jupp (2006) propose that quantitative and qualitative methodologies are two extremes of the continuum, and a blur can appear in studies that signifies a blend of assumptions where quantitative statistical data is enhanced and value added through qualitative insight and richness that ultimately offers a more complete understanding. However, it is suggested that researchers utilising a mixed method approach should be aware of the difficulty that may arise in combining the findings into meaningful results (Connelly, 2009) and the possibility of purists calling into question its soundness and validity (Jupp, 2006; Parse, 2009). Additionally, Creswell and Plano Clark (2007) forewarn of the need to stay true to the original research question and be mindful of researcher attitude and bias in interpretation so as to allow multiple viewpoints to emerge. Having said this, Saunders (2007), Jupp (2006), and Collis and Hussey (2003), suggest that on a whole qualitative and quantitative research do not function in isolation, and not only do they complement each other but combining the two offers a broader view that has found advocacy within business research.
3.3. Methodology

Previous research

Although previous research around the topic of CSP and its association to employer attractiveness, applicant quality, and organisational competitive advantage is in its infancy and relatively limited, the most influential writings have come from Turban and Greening (1997) which was further expanded on in Greening and Turban (2000). In pursuing this topic Turban and Greening (1997) noted that a key difficulty in researching CSP was the lack of a standard measurement. It is their utilisation of the Kinder, Lyndenberg, Domini and Co (KLD) company profiles that has now set a foundation for subsequent measurement. Of the eleven CSP dimensions rated by KLD, Turban and Greening extracted the five most commonly used in research and applied them as their measure. These five CSP dimensions have since been applied in successive studies by themselves and others, and are considered the most relevant in researching stakeholder views on CSP (Berman, Wicks, Kotha, & Jones, 1999; Waddock & Graves, 1997). In saying this, there is limited empirical evidence apart from that of Backhaus et al (2002) to support this in relation to recruitment, as on a whole research of these five CSP dimensions has concentrated on organisational financial performance (Backhaus et al., 2002).

Emerging from Turban and Greening’s seminal CSP writings is a slow but steady body of research from the likes of Albinger and Freeman (2000), Luce et al (2001), Backhaus et al (2002), and Sen (2006). Both Turban and Greening’s and consequent research has tended to follow a quantitative methodology that was in the main part structured around the investigation of Undergraduate Degree student perceptions of the CSP espoused by organisations. These studies focused on how and why these perceptions came about, their influence on job choice decisions, their interrelationship, and connection to the central theories of social identity, signalling, and to a lesser extent person-organisation fit and individual difference.

This body of research underpinned by a positivistic approach, sought answers to questions through strict numeric analysis that engaged CSP elements both individually
and collectively as dependent variables. They invariably employed surveys as a tool which rated and scaled questions so as to collect data that in turn was applied to statistical analysis. This analysis primarily engaged descriptive statistics to search out correlation and prove, or disprove, hypothesis. In doing this an attempt was made to objectively explain, predict, and deduct causally, and then generalise through the inclusive theory of social identity, signalling, and person-organisation fit.

3.4. Methodology Selection

In choosing an appropriate research methodology for this project, ultimate consideration was given to how best answer the research question of “to what extent do job-seekers find Corporate Social Performance, and its elements, to be attractive in a potential employer?” As alluded to earlier all three methodologies previously discussed could equally be applied to this research and a suitable result obtained, particularly that of a quantitative approach as prior research has adhered to this directive. However, as this research attempts to not only determine what CSP dimensions job-seekers value most but why, it is believed that a mixed methodology approach is best suited. This is to say, that given the understanding of aforementioned paradigms, and the goals and objectives of this project, it is believed that the use of a combined methodology utilising both quantitative and qualitative data would complement and serve this research best. Further to this, it is considered that a mixed methodology survey of open-ended and closed questioning would contribute to validity, add richness, and enhanced value of outcomes (Jupp, 2006).

This decision to use a mixed method research approach where both quantitative and qualitative data collection and analysis techniques are employed at the same time, that is in parallel/concurrent (Jupp, 2006; Saunders et al., 2007), will allow the best of both worlds (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2007; R. B. Johnson, 2004) and is perceived appropriate in this research for two key reasons. Firstly, statistical analysis of ranked and scaled questions on the importance of CSP elements and job factors in a potential employer by job-seekers will identify which are most valued and their relative importance. Secondly, open-ended qualitative questioning will offer insight as to
perceptions and attitudes about why. It is worthy of mention at this time that while this research is mixed method, the status of the two paradigms is not equal and quantitative is dominant. Below is a mixed method design matrix that demonstrates the approach for this research in the lower left quadrant.
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Figure 1: Mixed method design matrix. Source: Johnson (2004)

It is the researcher’s belief that while previous studies adopted a strictly quantitative approach and were statistically sound, they lacked the richness and individual reality that qualitative research and methodology has the ability to provide. It is viewed that the research question presented here contains the complexity of individual perception and therefore would not be given justice by a solely quantitative approach. Additionally, it is believed that this research question sits in the middle of the research paradigm continuum (Collis & Hussey, 2003) where a single reality does not do justice by statistical analysis alone and the subjectivity of individual perception would need better understanding so as to be fully recognised. By using a mixed methodology that constitutes the robustness and reliability of quantitative research coupled with the richness and validity offered in qualitative research it is felt that the result will be a complete framework (Collis & Hussey, 2003; Creswell & Plano Clark, 2007; Neuman,
Also, as a result of a combined approach the weaknesses of one methodology will be offset by the strengths of the other (Collis & Hussey, 2003).

Having considered that previous research utilised a survey instrument in the course of their investigations a survey tool was also selected for this project. And, to enable ease of distribution and follow up, and alleviate participant time restraints, an internet e-survey was selected to administer the questionnaire (Czaja & Blair, 2005). Finally, it should be noted that the use of a survey instrument to jointly collect quantitative and qualitative data is both an efficient and cost effective research method. This is to say that a survey can reach a large sample population quickly, with relative ease of collection, has limited researcher bias, and is comparatively cheap (Czaja & Blair, 2005; Neuman, 2003).

3.5. Data Collection and Analysis

As mentioned earlier, a mixed method process has been adopted for this project in order to gain the richness, rigor, and validity offered by parallel quantitative and qualitative research and will be applied in the form of an e-survey to answer the research question:

“To what extent do job-seekers find Corporate Social Performance, and its elements, to be attractive in a potential employer?”

This research question sought to understand the sample population Undergraduate Business Degree students’ perceptions, perspectives, and preferences regarding espoused organisational CSP dimensions in relation to employer attraction. This project also investigated the following related factors:

- Those CSP dimensions most valued by job-seekers.
- The relative importance of CSP in relation to traditional organisational/job factors.
- If CSP adds appreciably to employer attraction.
- If CSP influences the job decision making process of job-seekers.
- Theoretical associations between CSP and job-seeker employer attraction.
The research design of this project is both descriptive and explanatory. By employing a descriptive approach the researcher considers that a profile of participant responses and perceptions can be constructed that offers rich data and a picture that will aid in exploring any relationships exposed (Saunders et al., 2007). Additionally, quantitative descriptive statistical analysis will allow trends to be identified (Collis & Hussey, 2003; Lind, Marchal, & Mason, 2002) that ultimately lend themselves to a broader approach and situational generalisation of results (Kruger, 2003). It is felt that by integrating an explanatory aspect the researcher exceeds mere description of the results, and allows a continuum that investigates ‘why’ phenomena may occur and therefore offer a more in-depth understanding of any relationships exposed (Collis & Hussey, 2003).

Sample selection

The scope of this project was a voluntary survey that has been conducted on the sample frame population of all Undergraduate Business Degree students at a large New Zealand Institute of Technology. Undergraduate students were selected for this project as previous research linked with CSP and job-seeker attraction towards a potential employer had also utilised a similar sample population. Furthermore, the target population of Undergraduate Business Degree students’ were chosen as it is felt that the Business School has a diverse underpinning that includes a mixture of disciplines, and therefore a broad spectrum of views and opinions can be solicited. The researcher also chose this particular target population as being a former student he had a familiarity and ease of access to them.

The sampling technique for this research is probability sampling and therefore offers the entire population of Undergraduate Business Degree students an equal opportunity to participate. An additional rationale in favour of choosing a probability sampling technique was that it is widely used for surveys and allows statistical estimation and inference of sample population characteristics (Saunders et al., 2007). The key selection and participation criterion for this research was that respondents needed to be current Undergraduate Business Degree students. As of February 22\textsuperscript{nd} 2009 the total population of Undergraduate Business Degree students at the institution chosen for this
study was 617. It was believed an adequate sample size could be solicited from this population to offer reliability to the results drawn as Leedy and Ormond (2005) have suggested that the larger the population the smaller the percentage needed to have a representative sample.

This research has a data collection method that, as mentioned previously, is e-survey based, and was administered by the internet resource *Survey Monkey*. Survey Monkey was chosen for its flexibility and assistance in designing a survey, and facilitation in collection and analysis of data. It should be noted that a questionnaire research method is the most widely administered data-gathering technique used by researchers and allows for standardisation, ease of comparison, and offers added control over the research process (Neuman, 2003). Furthermore, it is believed that this technique provides flexibility fitting with explanatory and descriptive research (Saunders et al., 2007).

**Questionnaire Design**

The development and deployment of this survey aimed to meet the primary objective of gaining insight as to the perceptions and value of CSP as an attractor to an employer of choice by Undergraduate Business Degree students. The questionnaire instrument used in this study was constructed by the researcher solely for the purpose of this project and answering the research question. Having said this, it should be remembered that this project has a foundation of interest supported by the previous investigations around CSP and job-seeker attraction by Turban and Greening (1997) and Greening and Turban (2000) and therefore, while not using their specific questions, the design of this survey took these studies into account. In doing this it is felt that comparison and evaluation with their findings will be facilitated.

The questionnaire for this study was based around selected evaluative questions centring on CSP dimensions and job factors as derive from relevant research. It consisted of three sections totalling 31 questions (see Appendix 1). Electronic access of the questionnaire was made available to participants via the survey tool site [http://www.surveymonkey](http://www.surveymonkey). Of the 31 questions 18 were forced choice, 11 were forced
choice with an open-ended component, and the remaining two were fully open-ended. Effort was applied to minimising complexity of the survey and maintaining a straightforward format that was clear and worded plainly. The standardisation of this questionnaire was an attempt to create a survey that was easily understood, and to encourage accuracy and completion. This was especially important given the ethnic diversity of respondents. The survey was preceded by an introduction to the researcher, and outline of the reason and rationale for the research. Additionally, so that participants were all of similar understanding the cover letter offered an explanation of corporate social performance and concise meaning to its five elements being investigated. At this time anonymity was also assured to all respondents.

Section one of this survey consisted of 11 basic demographic questions designed firstly to capture a picture of those participating, and secondly as a means to check the representativeness of responses against the total survey population. This is to say that questions were asked regarding participant age, gender, and ethnicity. In addition to these central demographics respondents were asked about their current employment status, marital status, and residential history and arrangements. It was anticipated that in gaining an understanding of the demographics of respondents the researcher would also be able to highlight the sample population by subset (gender, age, ethnicity, and employment status) and as to their particular views and standing on CSP. All questions in this section were of a closed and quantitative nature.

Section two of this survey consisted of 13 questions. Of these 13 questions one was open-ended, five were closed, and the remaining seven were closed with an open-ended component. The focus of this section was to investigate and provide data on Undergraduate Business Degree students' views and beliefs as to not only if the espoused CSP of an organisation was important in a potential employer, but which of the predetermined five CSP elements were most desired and why. In this section CSP was represented both as a whole and with the five elements as separate variables. This is to say the data afforded in these questions will offer valuable insight into participants’ perceptions of the CSP elements both individually and collectively, and their influence in
the employment decision process. The questioning technique applied varied throughout this section and included:

- The need to rank CSP elements in order of importance (1 being most important, and 5 being least important).
- The use of the five point Likert scale *very important* through *not important at all*.
- Yes / No / Unsure option answers.
- The need to select, or omit, predetermined answer options.
- Qualitative sub-questions designed to solicit and explore the individual perceptions and views of respondents in their own words.

The third and final section of this survey was comparative in nature and introduced job factors into the equation in conjunction with CSP and its individual elements. This section contained seven questions. Of these seven questions two were open-ended, two were closed, and the remaining three were closed with an open-ended component. The rationale of this section was to compare and contrast CSP against traditional job factors. A further motivation was to establish if CSP as a whole, or as individual elements, when combined with traditional job factors added appreciably as an influence in the job choice decision process. Participants were first required to rank and scale five predetermined job factors in order of importance to them in a potential employer using a five point Likert scale. In addition to this participants were asked why their first choice was important. This was followed by the introduction of the five job factors combined with the five CSP elements creating a total package of 10. From this package participants were requested to rank which seven they perceived most important to them in a potential employer, and why their first two choices were important. It should be noted that initially all 10 of the package were to be ranked, but it was felt that this would be overly confusing to participants. This belief was confirmed during the pilot stage of the questionnaire. Further to this, it is recognised that seven points of issue, or chunks of information, are recommended as the maximum amount that is easily digested during thinking and problem solving (Gleitman, Fridlund, & Reisberg, 2000). Section three concluded by asking participants where overall they believed CSP rated in the
employment decision process, and if they had any further comments, views, and opinions to contribute.

**Pilot study**

Prior to distribution of the survey it was piloted on a group of 10 peers and fellow Postgraduate students’ who had not seen it before. These peers and students were invited to offer feedback as to its readability and flow, grammar, clarity, interpretation, amount of time taken to complete, ease of completion, and general ideas for improvement. Based on the views and critique of these people several adjustments were made. These modifications included such things as: simplifying wording; inclusion of definitions, use of a Likert scale no higher than seven, and a slight reduction in the total number of questions to ensure completion time stayed within 15 minutes. It was felt that in undergoing this external critique process the researcher would minimise issues such as non-response bias due to ambiguity and confusion, and excessive length that could subsequently affect participant response rate and representation, and the reliability of any data collected towards final results (Collis & Hussey, 2003; Czaja & Blair, 2005; Leedy & Ormrod, 2005).

Once corrections had been undertaken and finalised the survey was ready for distribution.

**Questionnaire data collection process**

Before the process of survey distribution was undertaken permission was sought from the institution to use the school class forum Black Board as a mode with which to contact all Undergraduate Business Degree students and invite them to participate in this research. Permission was consequently granted once it was established that all reasonable steps to maintain privacy and anonymity would be taken, and that there would be no ethical boundaries crossed or excessive intrusion caused to students and lecturers. Upon obtaining permission to utilise Black Board, contact was made with a senior lecturer with whom the researcher would liaise and channel all relevant student announcements and contact.
Prior to going live with this survey, and as a means of raising awareness of its advent, the researcher created A2 sized posters (see Appendix 2) which, with the permission of the Student Association, were positioned on student notice boards and in the undergraduate student common room. The 16th of March was chosen to be a suitable commencement date as students would have had sufficient time to settle into the new semester, no exams or assignments were likely to be due, and a premium of student email contact details would be current. Further to this, on the 9th of March 2009 an announcement was sent to all 617 enrolled Undergraduate Business Degree students to inform them of the pending arrival of the survey invitation.

Additionally, and as part of a strategy to increase response rates, contact was made with a total of 12 business school lecturers and permission was sought to attend their Undergraduate Bachelor of Business classes as a way of introduction to students, offering background on the research, and to encourage their participation. It was felt that by applying a personal touch and familiarity, and if students were able to put a face to the researcher, they would be more inclined to be involved and accept its legitimacy (Czaja & Blair, 2005; Leedy & Ormrod, 2005). The commencement of class visits was arranged to coincide with a second student announcement containing a link to the open survey. A total of 22 classes were visited over the two week period 16th March 2009 through 30th March 2009 and students were spoken to for approximately 3-5 minutes (See Appendix 3). During class visits the rationale behind this research was discussed along with the length of time it would take to complete the survey, and students were given a pamphlet-sized version of the poster. Additionally, the need to check their student mail and access the related announcement and consequent survey link was reinforced, and any student questions were answered.

While attending classes several students enquired about the availability of hard copies of the survey as a preference, and due to a lack of access to computers. This situation was evaluated and consequently a paper-based version was offered in addition to the electronic as it could be considered that a combination of both these methods might improve response rate (Kroth et al., 2009). Accordingly a small number of paper copies
were distributed to lecturers and placed in the student common room along with a returning box.

A series of three reminders along with the survey link were given at two week intervals. Prior to sending these reminders contact was made with all relevant lecturers requesting they mention the announcement’s pending arrival during class as a further means of raising awareness and interest. During this time the paper copy return box located in the student common room was cleared regularly, and all correctly completed surveys were entered into Survey Monkey by the researcher.

A fourth and final announcement was intended to be sent to all students on April 27th 2009 along with a survey cutoff date of one week latter being the 4th of May 2009. However, this announcement was postponed by a further week as it clashed with mid-semester break. Consequently the fourth announcement was issued to students on the 4th of May 2009 along with notification that the survey participation cut off and closure of the electronic link to Survey Monkey would occur on the 11th of May 2009. This announcement was preceded once again by the researcher contacting all appropriate lecturers and asking for their assistance by mentioning in class the upcoming announcement and the survey’s pending closure.

While the survey response rate had not been as good as anticipated by the date of the final announcement, it was felt by the researcher that it was time to bring it to a close so as to avoid monotony in contacting, and what might be considered undue perusal of students and lecturers. Additionally, it was believed that those willing to contribute in this voluntary research had done so as it is suggested that 99.25% of survey responses will be returned within 4 weeks (Hamilton, 2003). Given this, the survey component of this research was concluded on the 11th of May 2009 and the return box for paper based responses was cleared and all remaining surveys entered into Survey Monkey, and all further electronic entry access duly cut off.

Of the 617 enrolled Undergraduate Business Degree students called upon to participate, a total of 131 (20.15%) accepted this invitation of which 13 (9.92%) were paper-based. Furthermore, of the 131 completed surveys 46 responses were filtered out
due to incorrect or incomplete filling-out of the questionnaire. This left a total of 85 valid responses and equated to a sample population of 13.78% derived from the total population. It should be noted that whilst this response rate does not appear high, the correctly completed and returned rate of 13.78% is marginally higher than the 13.35% total response rate that Hamilton (2003), in his article for Tercent Inc/Super Survey, suggests as standard.

**Data Analysis**

The data from all surveys was either entered directly into Survey Monkey by participants via the electronic link provided, or entered into Survey Monkey by the researcher from paper-based surveys completed by participants. This raw data was then collated by Survey Monkey and downloaded in Excel spreadsheet format. The Excel spreadsheets were structured in a manner where by all data was separated into individual questions as percentages, averages and rating averages, individual response rate and frequency, and total response rate. This allowed for a working document from which graphs, charts, and tables were constructed as a means of displaying basic descriptive statistics and highlighting associations, relationships, trends and patterns, and information of implication. In addition to this, the data collected by Survey Monkey, and subsequent extracted information, was then selectively cross-tabulated to reveal any noteworthy inter-relationships and gain important insights. For example, total male and female responses were cross-tabulated as independent variables against CSP as a dependent variable to establish which gender valued CSP most.

All qualitative answers and comments extracted from the survey were transcribed verbatim and set out in spreadsheet format as individual questions. This content was then coded and analysed for key themes and trends as they directly related to each relative question. In addition to the spreadsheets all responses to all questions were downloaded in PDF format from Survey Monkey for additional scrutiny.
Ethical Implications

This research project adhered to an Institutional Ethics process, and obtained the institution’s Ethical Committee approval. Once ethical approval was received, as mentioned earlier, permission was sought, and subsequently granted, from the Institution to utilise their electronic Black Board forum to solicit participation in this research from Undergraduate Business Degree students, and distribute the survey questionnaire link.

It was felt that there were limited negative ethical intrusions and safety implications for those that participated in this research as:

- There was limited personal contact with potential participants.
- Participation was completely voluntary.
- No personal identifiers were required from participants.
- No specific gender, race, or age group were sought.
- A cover letter accompanied the research invitation offering a brief background to the study and the researcher.
- This cover letter also detailed assurances that the data collected would be stored securely and only used for this research.
- No sensitive information was requested in the questionnaire.

It should be noted that while no participant contact details were asked for, or needed, to be able to partake in this research those participants that requested a summary of findings offered them of their own accord. No consent forms were required from participants in this survey as permission was given upon voluntarily by choosing to complete it. Furthermore, the cover letter of the survey informed respondents that if they had any concerns or questions regarding the nature of this research to contact the researcher or research supervisor directly. No issues arose and no comments were made by any participants.
3.6. Summary

Chapter Three firstly defined and discussed the various philosophies and paradigms on offer to research projects with the rationale of discovering that which is best suited to answering the research question at hand. The methodology of previous research was also evaluated as part of this decision process and eventually led to a mixed quantitative and qualitative methodology being chosen by the researcher as being most appropriate. This in turn led to discussion of the descriptive and explanatory research design undertaken for this project and the grounds to use a survey questionnaire as the research tool.

The questionnaire design chosen for this study is then assessed along with how the survey was piloted and the adjustments made. This chapter then continued by setting out the selection process of this project and justification of keeping with similar and previous studies to use a sample population of Undergraduate Degree students as participants. The data collection and analysis techniques employed in this study were then revealed and evaluated.

A total population of 617 Undergraduate Business Degree students was solicited for this research with an eventual total sample population of 85. Chapter Three concluded by accessing the ethical implications of this project.
Chapter Four

4.0 Findings

4.1. Overview

To recap, the purpose of this study is to investigate both the importance and impact of Corporate Social Performance and its elements on job-seeker attitudes towards organisational attraction, and to then extend this inquiry further to determining 'why' such attraction may, or may not, occur. The research question is: “to what extent do job-seekers find Corporate Social Performance, and its elements, to be attractive in a potential employer?”

As outlined previously, a total population of 617 Undergraduate Business Degree students’ were invited to participate in this research. From this total population a sample of 131 (21.23%) accepted the invitation. A further 46 of the 131 responses were filtered out due to incorrect following of specified instructions or incomplete filling out of the questionnaire. This left a final total of 85 usable responses and equated to a sample population of 13.78%.

It is intended that the data gathered from usable responses will determine if Undergraduate Business Degree students’ find CSP and/or its elements an attractor to an employer of choice. Additionally, this data will expose any trends, associations, and relationships between espoused organisational CSP, job-seekers, and perceivable intention towards job pursuance. Moreover, the findings revealed will determine if CSP forms part of an overall package, or bundle, which may act as an antecedent, and/or point of difference, to a preferred employer in the job choice process, and why. Additionally, these findings will shape a point of departure for in-depth discussion during the following chapter.

This chapter provides analysis of the survey data collated from the 85 usable responses received. This is then interpreted and, as previously mentioned, will lead into and guide
discussion in the following chapter. The results and findings within this chapter are set out in the original survey order of three sections that comprised a total of 31 questions.

- The first section of the survey gathered basic demographic data on respondents.
  - A summary of comparison for typicality of the sample population against the total population of Undergraduate Business Degree students at this institution is offered at the finish of this section.
- Section two introduced CSP and five of its elements that respondents were asked to rank, scale and assess as to their importance in a potential employer, and why.
- The third and final section of the survey offered and accessed five traditional job/organisational factors. These job/organisational factors were in due course applied in conjunction with CSP and its elements which participants were then asked to evaluate as a combined package.

In addition to, and following the analysis of the individual survey questions, an amount of cross-tabulation was conducted on selected questions and demographic variables to add value, depth and further insight. The data resulting from analysis of the individual questions and cross-tabulation is reported descriptively as percentages, rating averages, response rates and frequencies, and displayed in graphs and tables. This chapter concludes with a summary of the findings.

4.2. Questionnaire Responses

4.2.1. Demographic background of research participants

This section of the survey was concerned with participant demographics and asked a set of 11 basic questions that were all of a closed nature and did not require in-depth description. These questions were designed to reveal the background, and develop a picture of the demographic differences, of the participants in this research project. Additionally, this section will assist in establishing whether respondents were representative of the total population and a contrast of any differences revealed is displayed at its end.
Question One

Question One asked participants to state their gender. The results of this are displayed in Figure 2 and reveal the gender ratio in this project to be 63.5% female and 36.5% male. Despite what appears to be a disproportionate representation of female participants, it is representative of this tertiary institution’s Undergraduate Business Degree gender distribution which comprised 65.32% female and 34.68% male as of Semester One 2009.
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Figure 2: Gender ratio

Question Two

In this question respondents were asked to state their age within one of four ranges; 18-25 years, 26-35 years, 36-45 years; and 46+ years. The results to this question are displayed in Table 1 and demonstrate that the highest frequency of respondents’ is between 26-35 years of age. This is representative of the average age in this institution’s Undergraduate Business Degree which sits at 31.1 years of age. In saying this, apart from the 46+ age range, with only 9.4%, there is a comparatively even distribution of respondents across the other age groups.
### AGE OF PARTICIPANTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Range Options</th>
<th>Frequency of Respondents in Age Range</th>
<th>Percent of Respondents in Age Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>28.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-35</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>34.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-45</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>28.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46+</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9.40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Participant age

### ETHNICITY OF PARTICIPANTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity Options</th>
<th>Frequency of Respondents Identifying Per Ethnicity</th>
<th>Percent of Respondents Identifying Per Ethnicity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Zealander</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand Maori</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Ethnicity of participants

Question Three

Question Three sought to establish the various ethnicities of participants in this study. Six options were on offer to choose from, and respondents were asked to select the one which best described them. The results of this question are displayed in Table 2.

As can be seen from Table 2 the largest single ethnic group identified is New Zealander (30.6%). This was followed by Asian, Other, and European, which were all comparable and ranged from 15.3%–17.6%. The lowest participating ethnic groups are Pacific
Islander and New Zealand Maori with 11.8% and 8.2% respectively. This distribution differs somewhat from the institutionally recorded breakdown of the total population for Semester One 2009 and a contrast is offered at the finish of this section of findings.

Question Four

In Question Four, participants were asked about their learning situation at the institution, (for example; were they studying full or part time). Responses to this question are displayed in Table 3 and indicated that 50.6% of participants are studying fulltime and 49.4% are studying part time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEARNING SITUATION OF PARTICIPANTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Answer Options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full time student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part time student</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Learning situation

While Table 3 shows a fairly even split between those studying full and part time, this is not truly reflective of those enrolled in this institution’s Undergraduate Business Degree as the register for Semester One 2009 shows the ratio was 38.25% (236) fulltime enrolments and 61.75% (381) part time.

Question Five

Question Five asked participants to state if they were an ‘international fee paying student’ or not. The results to this are displayed in Table 4 and revealed that 14.1% of those that participated in this study were international fee paying students’. This not a typical representation given that the ratio of international fee paying students’ enrolled in this institution’s Undergraduate Business School for Semester One 2009 was 50.89%.
Table 4: International fee paying participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>85.9%</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note that records and figures for the remaining questions of this demographic section, Questions Six through Eleven, are not available from the subject institution for comparison of typicality between the total population and sample population of this questionnaire.

**Question Six**

Question Six sought to find out how far through their degree participants were. The two options of less than half way and more than half way were offered to choose from. The results to this are displayed in Table 5 and establish that 58.8% of participants had completed more than half of their Undergraduate Business Degree while 41.2% had completed less than half.

Table 5: Amount of degree completed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More than half</td>
<td>58.8%</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than half</td>
<td>41.2%</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question Seven**

Question Seven asked participants about their employment situation. The three options of currently employed, currently seeking employment and not currently seeking...
employment were offered for this question. The results to this are displayed in Figure 3 and show that 63 (74.1%) of respondents are employed, eight (9.4%) are seeking employment, and the remaining 14 (16.5%) are not currently seeking employment. Further to this, participants that stated they were currently employed were also asked if their employment was full time or part time. Replies to this showed that 33 (52.4%) of the 63 respondents that indicated they were currently employed stated their employment was full time. Consequently, this revealed that 38.8% of 'all' participants were engaged in full time employment at the time of this survey.

![Employment Status](image)

**Figure 3: Employment status**

**Question Eight**

Question Eight asked respondents to state their marital status. The three options of single, married, and de-facto were offered. Responses to this question are displayed in Table 6 and reveal that 50.6% of participants are single, 37.6% are married, and 11.8% are in a de-facto relationship.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status of Participants</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Answer Options</strong></td>
<td><strong>Response Percent</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>50.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>37.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De-facto</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: Marital status

**Question Nine**

Question Nine asked participants whether they have any dependent children. The options of yes and no were offered. The results to this question are displayed in Table 7 and reveal that 32.9% of respondents stated they have dependent children and 67.1% stated they have not.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants with Dependent Children</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Answer Options</strong></td>
<td><strong>Response Percent</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>32.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>67.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7: Dependent children

**Question 10**

In Question 10 respondents were presented with four options from which to relate their living arrangements; own your own home, rental accommodation, living with family, or living in student accommodation. Results to this are displayed in Table 8 and reveal that 42.4% of respondents lived in rental accommodation, 34.1% owned their own home, 22.4% lived with family, and 1.2% lived in student accommodation.
Question 11

Question 11, the final question of the demographic section of this questionnaire, sought to find out how long participants had resided in their current area. Participants were offered the four options of *one year or less, 1-3 years, 3-5 years, or 5 years or more* to choose from. Responses to this question are displayed in Table 9 and indicate that 21.2% of participants have lived in their current area for 1 year or less, 29.4% for between 1-3 years, 12.9% for 3-5 years, and 36.5% for 5 years or more. This data shows that the majority of participants in this research have lived in their current area for either five years or more, or between 1-3 years. These figures also show an approximately even split of respondents having lived in their current area for either less than three years (50.6%) and three years or more (49.4%).

Table 8: Living arrangements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant Living Arrangements</th>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rent</td>
<td>42.4%</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Own my own home</td>
<td>34.1%</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Live with family</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Live in student accommodation</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9: Duration resided in current area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length of Time Participants had Resided in their Current Area</th>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 year or less</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1-3 years</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3-5 years</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 years or more</td>
<td>36.5%</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Key features of section one of questionnaire: demographic differences of sample population to total population

Comparison for typicality between the demographic composition of the sample population that partook in this study and that of the total population of Undergraduate Business Degree students at this institution will not be directly evaluated during the discussion of findings, and therefore a brief assessment is offered now. Furthermore, as previously mentioned records and figures for questions six through to eleven are not available from the subject institution for comparison.

When an evaluation of the findings from questions one through five of the demographic section of this questionnaire were profiled against records and figures obtained from the host institution about the total population of Undergraduate Business Degree students studying as of Semester One 2009, several notable differences were identified and are displayed in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMPARISON OF SAMPLE POPULATION TO TOTAL POPULATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Option</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question 3: Ethnic distribution</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealander</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maori</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question 4: Learning situation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question 5: International fee paying students</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This table shows three differences worthy of mention. Firstly, there is a mismatch between the sample population ethnicity distributions to those of the institutionally recorded breakdown of the total population. However, while there is a non-matching representation between those that participated in this survey and those enrolled in the Undergraduate Business Degree program of this institution, apart from New Zealand Maori this distribution is comparatively indicative of the New Zealand working age population projections of the four groups measured by, and according to, the ‘National Ethnic Population Projections: 2006 (base) – 2026 update’. This workforce projection indicates that by 2026 New Zealand’s ethnic distribution will be:

- New Zealander – 63.6% (includes those representatives of; New Zealander, European, and Other).
- Maori – 15.5%.
- Pacific Islander – 9.2%.
- Asian – 17.3%.

(stats.govt.nz, 2010)

Secondly, the ratio of full-time and part-time student participants in this questionnaire is not typical of the of this institution’s enrolment records. Nonetheless, it is perceived that this finding will not distract or hinder the accuracy of this study, but instead their comparatively even ratio may well assist a sound mix of views and opinions are captured. Lastly, the sample population ratio for international fee paying students is disparate to those of the total population at this institution. However, it is perceived that this finding will not unduly affect the accuracy or validity of this study as it is perceived that fee paying alternatives will not alter or reflect on the appreciation of CSP in an employer.

Having identified demographic differences between the sample population of this study and the total population of Undergraduate Business Degree students at this institution, it is still felt that the composition of respondents was of a mix whereby analysis will allow a fair representation of views and opinions from which to draw relevant and valid conclusions and consequently permit generalisation. Given this, the sample population of Undergraduate Business Degree students in this study represented:
• An even spread of various ages.
• A comparatively even mix of full and part time students.
• A comparatively even mix of those having completed more, and those having completed less, than half of their degree.
• A blend of those with and without children.
• A sound mix of ethnic backgrounds.
• A comparatively even mix of single people and those in a relationship.
• A good blend of participants who had resided in their current domicile for varied lengths of time. For example; one in three own their own home and had lived in the same area for three years or more.
• And, a large percentage of participants were in gainful employment. This is to say that 74.1% are currently employed, from which 52.4% were employed fulltime.

A fair and sound mix of demographics is beneficial to the validity of this study so as to ensure the views and opinions offered for analysis by participants tender a credible foundation. This is to say: it may be difficult for a job-seeker to truly know or understand what they value in a prospective employer if he or she has not been engaged in employment, and /or it may not be easy for an individual to have a bond with the community unless he or she has spent time there. Furthermore, the desirability of a sound participant mix was highlighted in previous related research as it was suggested such factors could be a limitation.

4.2.2. Which Corporate Social Performance Elements do Undergraduate Business Degree students value most in a potential employer?

The questions in this section of the survey are intended to investigate participant attitudes towards espoused organisational CSP and its elements as they relate to the job choice process. It consists of thirteen questions that are both closed and open-ended. When answering these questions participants were asked to rank, scale, and justify their answers. The questions in this section apply CSP both as a whole and the five separate elements of:
1. Employee relations  
2. Treatment of women and minorities  
3. Concern for the environment  
4. Product quality  
5. Community relations

**Question 12**

The first question of this section, Question 12, asked participants to ‘rank’ in order of importance in a potential employer the five selected CSP elements: *employee relations*, *treatment of women and minorities*, *concern for the environment*, *product quality*, and *community relations*. This question used forced ranking that required participants to choose one element per order of importance ranking, and where ‘one’ was most important through to ‘five’ being least important. The results from this question are displayed in Table 10 and further demonstrated in Figure 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSP Elements</th>
<th>Ranking Options</th>
<th>Rating Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee relations</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(60%)</td>
<td>(22.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product quality</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(21.2%)</td>
<td>(25.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment of women and minorities</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(9.4%)</td>
<td>(23.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern for the environment</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(7.1%)</td>
<td>(21.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community relations</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2.4%)</td>
<td>(7.1%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10: CSP Element Rankings of Importance
Table 10 shows both the frequency and percentage of responses as selected by participants for each ranking and CSP element category. The most frequently selected CSP element for each ranking and percentage of respondents selecting it in that scale option is shown in bold for emphasis. Given this, the top CSP element selected for each of the one through to five scaled options, and frequency of responses in that ranking is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSP Scale Rankings – Forced Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scale Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10 also shows that the CSP element ‘concern for the environment’ tops both the third and fourth ranking options as most important, and signifies an even appeal across these ranking positions. Given this, and the nature of forced ranking, the rating average displayed in the last column of Table 10 adds a further, and possibly clearer, perspective to the order of importance of these CSP elements. Note that the rating average order of importance has been numbered in brackets, and highlighted for emphasis and ease of interpretation.
Figure 4: CSP Element Rankings of Importance

Figure 4 demonstrates that the CSP element ‘employee relations’ is clearly most important and top choice in scale position one, while the CSP element of ‘community relations’ is clearly top choice, although least important, in scale position five.

Question 12 also included an open-ended component where respondents were asked to provide a brief explanation for their top and most important CSP selection. There were 68 responses to this and the key themes to emerge are displayed in Table 11. Note that the bracketed number at the beginning of each theme indicates how often it was raised by respondents, and that topics referred to less than three times are not listed (apart from those for the element ‘community relations’ where only two respondents selected this as their top choice and therefore their views are included).
### Why CSP Elements are Important to Job-Seekers in a Potential Employer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Importance Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employee relations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9) Makes for a stable &amp; good organisational culture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8) All other elements stem from this</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) Sets expectations &amp; is an indicator of organisational values</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) Suggests employees are listened to, treated fairly, &amp; valued</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) Directly impacts on employees &amp; their wellness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) Impacts on home life</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) Is critical to productivity &amp; efficiency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Sets the terms for a long lasting relationship &amp; tenure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Forms basis of trust, respect, honesty, commitment, loyalty, &amp; openness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Creates; pride in place of work, motivation, morale, &amp; satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Sets the foundation for working towards mutual goals, &amp; a ‘win win’ situation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Directly impacts on employees &amp; their wellness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Impacts on home life</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Is critical to productivity &amp; efficiency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Sets the terms for a long lasting relationship &amp; tenure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Forms basis of trust, respect, honesty, commitment, loyalty, &amp; openness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Creates; pride in place of work, motivation, morale, &amp; satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Sets the foundation for working towards mutual goals, &amp; a ‘win win’ situation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatment of women and minorities</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(3) There is a need to ensure fair &amp; equal representation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) There is a need to ensure equal employment opportunities are adhered to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concern for the environment</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(3) There is a desire to work for employers who care for the environment &amp; NZ’s clean green image</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) It demonstrates organisational vision &amp; concern for generations to come</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Product quality</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(6) It is a driver in creating long term organisational success; poor product quality lends itself to less customers which in turn leads to a slowdown in business and employee cut backs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) There is a need to be proud &amp; believe in what you make &amp; who you work for</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) It offers satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) The product of an organisation relates to its image, to which those who make it are then associated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) It encourages employee ownership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community relations</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(2) Organisations are accountable to the communities in which they operate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11: Why CSP elements are important
Question 13

Question 13 asked participants to ‘rate’ how important the five CSP elements of employee relations, treatment of women and minorities, concern for the environment, product quality, and community relations are in a prospective employer. Unlike the previous question ‘forced ranking’ was not used and a five point Likert sliding scale ranging from very important, important, neutral, not very important, through to not important at all was opted for. While each element could only be entered once, participants were permitted to select as many elements on a single scale as they wished. It should be noted that it is considered that by including two questions of a similar nature (Question 12 & 13) but with different methods of scale and ranking, the prospect to compare results for similarity and validity is afforded. Further to this, it is felt this will not only demonstrate if CSP is seen as a collective and complete package or bundle, namely is one element inextricable and/or holding similar value of another, but also if individual and particular CSP elements are substantially more or less important, or actually important in an employer at all. The results from this question are displayed in Table 12 and Figure 5. Table 12 exhibits the frequency and percentage of participants that selected a particular rating scale for each CSP element along with the most selected scale for each element being highlighted for emphasis.

This table shows that the vast majority of participants felt that the five CSP elements were either ‘important’ or ‘very important’. Conversely, a minority of participants believed that they were ‘not very important’ or ‘not important at all’. The highest ranked CSP element for ‘very important’ is employee relations on 65.9%, followed by product quality at 40%. This is in contrast to community relations that while rating highly in the scale ‘important’ at 44.7%, also rates highest for ‘not important at all’ with a response rate of 8.2%.
In order to provide further clarity, a summary of the five CSP elements ranked in order of importance according to their rating average as displayed in the last column of Table 12 is provided below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSP Rating Average – Non Forced Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Employee Relation – 1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Product Quality – 1.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Concern for the Environment – 2.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Treatment of Women &amp; Minorities – 2.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Community Relations – 2.41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While these rating averages show that employee relations followed by product quality ranked highest and community relations ranks the lowest, overall the difference between highest and lowest ratings is relatively small, and they ‘all’ rate relatively high.
Figure 5 further demonstrates that the majority of participants believe that ‘all’ five CSP elements are either ‘very important’ or ‘important’. However, it should be noted that the CSP element *employee relations* appears considerably more important than any other.

**Figure 5**: How important are the five CSP elements?

As previously mentioned, Question 13 was in part to offer comparison with Question 12 and accordingly the results of both questions are displayed side by side in Table 13. This table indicates that the only change in characteristic between these two questions is the reversal of the CSP elements ‘treatment of women and minorities’ and ‘concern for the environment’ between position three and four. This reinforces that two most important CSP elements are ‘employee relations’ followed by ‘product quality’.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employee Relations – 1.72</td>
<td>Employee Relation – 1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product Quality – 2.81</td>
<td>Product Quality – 1.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment of Women &amp; Minorities – 3.19</td>
<td>Concern for the Environment – 2.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern for the Environment – 3.35</td>
<td>Treatment of Women &amp; Minorities – 2.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Relations – 4.04</td>
<td>Community Relations – 2.41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13: Comparison Q12 & 13; CSP element rating average forced & non forced ranking
Question 14

Question 14 asked participants if there were any other CSP elements they would consider important aside from the five currently being assessed. There were 28 responses to this question, of which some exhibited an overlap to what could be considered sub-themes of the CSP elements already evaluated, and traditional job/organisational factors. The key themes to emerge from these replies are shown in Table 14 below. Note that the bracketed number at the beginning of each theme indicates the number of times it was raised by respondents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Additional CSP Dimensions Considered to be Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(3) The desire for a more holistic &amp; humanitarian approach by organisations – The promotion of work life balance &amp; employment flexibility; advocacy for employee involvement, ideas, &amp; autonomy; support for &amp; promotion of, &amp; contribution towards, employee growth &amp; study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) The desire for organisations to show ethical responsibility through disclosure &amp; transparency about whom they do business with. For example, are they associated with; tobacco, gambling, and alcohol.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) The desire for organisations to promote socially beneficial events with employee involvement &amp; support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) The want for organisations to advocate fair &amp; reasonable treatment of ‘all’ stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) The desire for organisations to ‘openly’ promote and endorse equal employment opportunities &amp; have ‘all’ encompassing diversity programmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) The desire for organisations to take responsibility &amp; be accountable for their actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) The want for disclosure of; ethical standards, board activities, organisational values &amp; culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Training in, &amp; knowledge &amp; awareness of, the impact of the organisation’s products, goods &amp; services provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) The desire for concern for the environment to be both external &amp; internal of the organisation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14: Additional CSP dimensions
In addition to these comments, respondents emphasised the value and importance of equality, a ‘good’ culture and employer/employee relationship, and a belief that CSP is an all-encompassing package.

Question 15

In Question 15 participants of this study were asked how important the ‘overall’ CSP displayed by an organisation is to them. This question used a five point Likert non-forced sliding scale of very important, important, neutral, and not very important, through to not important at all. The results of this question are displayed in Figure 6 and show that a high majority of respondents believe the overall CSP displayed by an organisation is either ‘important’ (45.9%) or ‘very important’ (43.5%). These two options (very important & important) accounted for a total of 89.4% of all responses with the remaining 10.6% falling into the neutral category. Interestingly, not a single participant chose ‘not very important’ or ‘not important at all’.

![Figure 6: Importance of overall CSP displayed by an organisation](image-url)
Question 16

Question 16 asked participants if the absence in an organisation of any of the five CSP elements of *employee relations*, *treatment of women and minorities*, *concern for the environment*, *product quality*, and *community relations* would prevent them from applying for a job there. In answering this question participants were invited to select as many, or as few, elements that applied to them. The results of this question are displayed in both Figure 7 and Table 15 and indicate that the absence of various CSP elements, either individually or collectively, would notably influence respondents’ choice of whether to apply for a position within an organisation. The absence of the CSP element *employee relations* at 71.2%, and accounting for over half (47) of the sample population, appears to hold most weight in respondents job pursuance decisions. The next most influential CSP element is *treatment of women and minorities*, where 54.5% of respondents stated they would not apply for a position at an organisation in its absence. The CSP element that appears to exert the ‘least’ influence is *community relations* at 24.2%, and with a frequency of 16. Having said this, a frequency of 16 suggests that the absence of the least supported CSP element would still influence nearly one in five respondent’s job pursuance decisions. Furthermore, these statistics indicate that the absence of the CSP element *employee relations* is almost three times more likely to influence, and/or deter, job pursuance than the absence of *community relations*. And, the element *concern for the environment* is almost half as likely to hold influence as *employee relations*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSP Elements</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employee relations</td>
<td>71.2%</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment of women and minorities</td>
<td>54.5%</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product quality</td>
<td>48.5%</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern for the environment</td>
<td>39.4%</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community relations</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 15: CSP elements that absence would discourage job applications
Question 16 included an open-ended component where respondents who acknowledged that the absence of any of the five CSP elements would influence their job pursuance decisions were invited to tell 'why'. A total of 53 responses were received and the key themes to emerge are displayed in Table 16. Note that the bracketed number at the beginning of each theme indicates the number of times it was raised by respondents, and only those topics referred to three times or more are listed.

Table 16 shows the main theme to emerge is that 'organisational values and philosophy need to fit with personal values and beliefs'. Also of high importance to respondents is the desire to work for firms that respect the environment, offer a good working relationship, supply goods and services to be proud of, and provide equal opportunities in the work place. Furthermore, additional feedback to this component of Question 16 emphasised that CSP is an 'overall package' and should be an integral part of an organisations values, philosophy, culture, and strategy.
Table 16: Why absence of espoused organisational CSP influence job pursuance decisions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Why Absence of Espoused Organisational CSP Influences Job Pursuance Decisions?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(12)</td>
<td>Organisational values, beliefs &amp; philosophy need to fit with personal values &amp; beliefs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>The desire to work for an organisation that is fair &amp; has a good employer/employee relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>The desire not to be associated with an organisation that produces inferior or perceivably bad products &amp; services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>The desire not to be associated with an organisation that is not concerned about the environment, sustainability, or future generations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>Don’t want to work for an organisation that does not practice equality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>Don’t want to work for an organisation that has a perceivably bad overall reputation – Want to be part of an organisation that cares</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>The desire to work for an organisation you can be proud of, trust, &amp; believe in – There is the need for a sense of pride in what a firm does &amp; makes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>There is a want to work for an organisation that values its employees &amp; and their wellbeing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>There is a want to be associated with an organisation that has a good reputation in the community &amp; contributes to society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>There is a desire to work for an organisation with a socially responsible philosophy &amp; culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>Good employee relations leads to a successful organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>There is a desire for person-organisation fit – Matches with personality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>An organisation’s CSP can reflect &amp; impact personally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>Product quality leads to organisational success</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 17

Question 17 invited participants to select one of five options and was designed to solicit ‘at what stage in the recruitment process they would like to know an organisations’ CSP position’. The options offered were: before I apply for the job; at the selection process;
at orientation; learn on the job; does not matter to me. The results to this question were very clear and are displayed in Table 17 and Figure 8. This table and figure show that 61.2% of participants in this research would like to know an organisations' CSP position before they apply for a job. The next most frequently selected option was at the selection process on 24.7%. It is also worth noting that the remaining three options failed to reach 6%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recruitment Stage</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Before I apply for the job</td>
<td>61.2%</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At the selection process</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learn on the job</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At orientation</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not matter to me</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 17: Stage of recruitment process to know an organisations' CSP position

Figure 8: Stage of recruitment process to know an organisations’ CSP position
Question 17 included an open-ended component where respondents were asked to share their views on ‘why’ they selected a particular recruitment stage option. A total of 58 responses were received for this, and the key themes to emerge are displayed in Table 18. Note that the bracketed number at the beginning of each theme indicates the number of times each topic was raised.

Table 18 highlights several core themes of importance to respondents. Firstly, there was a desire to have background information about an organisation and what they are perceivably like to work for with which to make informed decisions. Secondly, there was a desire to ensure that the organisation matched with personal value systems, beliefs, and goals and aspirations. Third, participants suggested that this would help ensure that neither party wasted the others time, energy, and ultimately money.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Why Participants want to know an Organisation’s CSP Position</th>
<th>at a Particular Stage of the Recruitment Process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Before applying for a job</td>
<td>▪ (22) To gain an insight of what the organisation might be like to work for, &amp; therefore make better informed decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ (16) To ensure that organisational goals, values, &amp; beliefs, are a match with personal goals, values &amp; beliefs, &amp; aspirations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ (11) So as not to waste each other’s time, money &amp; energy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ (7) So as to be able to decide on person-organisational fit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ (5) To gain an understanding of the culture of the organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ (3) An organisations CSP would be a defining influence if given the choice between two otherwise equal jobs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At the selection process</td>
<td>▪ (5) So as to be able to ask questions directly &amp; have any concerns addressed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At orientation</td>
<td>▪ (2) This stage of the recruitment process is the organisation’s opportunity to market themselves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learn on the job</td>
<td>▪ (3) So as to observe first hand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not matter</td>
<td>▪ No comments were received for this option</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 18: Why participants want to know an organisation’s CSP at a particular stage of the recruitment process?
Question 18

Question 18 asked respondents if they would explore an organisation’s CSP before applying for a position. The three options of yes, no, and maybe were offered to choose from. In answer to this 46 (54.1%) of the 85 respondents said yes, nine (10.6%) said no, and 30 (35.3%) were undecided. These results are displayed in Figure 9.

Respondents who answered yes to this question were further asked ‘where’ they would look to explore an organisation’s CSP. Two key themes emerged from replies to this; firstly, investigate the company’s website, and second, approach existing employees and/or friends. Several respondents also indicated they would utilise an internet search engine such as Google to see if there was additional information such as news and journal articles and blogs about the organisation. Additionally, it was suggested to investigate company mission statements, or even contact the NZ Company’s office.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Would you explore an organisation's CSP before applying for a job there?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Yes (54.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>No (10.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Maybe (35.3%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 9: Would participants explore organisations CSP before applying for a job
Question 19

Question 19 asked respondents where they thought they should be able to learn about an organisation’s CSP. The five options *job advertisement, company website, company’s policy manual, does not matter to me*, and *I don’t know* were offered to choose from. In answering this question respondents could select as many, or as few, options that were applicable to them. The results of Question 19 are displayed in Figure 10, and clearly indicate that most (87.1%) respondents feel it should be possible to learn of a company’s CSP from their website. Figure 10 also shows that over half (52.9%) of all respondents believe the CSP of a firm should be made known via its policy manual, while one in three suggest it should be included as part of the job advertisement. In addition, and of particular interest, the results to this question show that only 3.5% of respondents’ deem it ‘does not matter’.

![Figure 10: Where do you think you should be able to learn of an organisations CSP?](image)

In addition to the set options offered respondents were then invited to suggest any other places they felt an organisation’s CSP should be able to be found. In reply to this respondents overwhelmingly reiterating ‘a firm’s website’. Having said this, general advertising, industry and sector groups, by approaching the firm’s Human Resources Department, and independent third party CSP monitors were also suggested. It is also worth noting that in response to this segment of Question 19 several participants voiced
their reservation to believe all that an organisation wrote about themselves and that word of mouth or independent reviews may be more accurate and truthful.

**Question 20**

Question 20 of this survey required a ‘yes’ or ‘no’ response as to whether respondents believe it is important for an organisation to state their CSP in any of the five predetermined areas of; *job description, at orientation, in the job advertisement, on their website, and/or in general advertising*. The results from this question are displayed in Figure 11 and reinforce the majority view that an organisation should state their CSP on its website (82 – yes: 3 – no). The next most popular ‘yes’ selection was *at orientation* (77 yes: 8 no), and the least popular selection was *general advertising* (43 yes: 42 no). Viewed as a whole, these results suggest that more than half of all respondents feel that it is important for an organisation to state their CSP in ‘all’ five of these places.

![Figure 11: Importance for organisations to state their CSP](image)

In addition to the five predetermined options offered, respondents were invited to suggest any others they felt appropriate for an organisation to state their CSP position. In answer to this it was suggested organisations’ state their CSP position in annual reports, at the interview process, and in their mission statement. It should be noted that
amongst replies to this, several respondents stated that they believed it was up to the organisation if they wanted to state their CSP or not.

**Question 21**

Question 21 asked respondents if they thought an organisation’s CSP provided an idea of what they would be like to work for. The three options offered to chose from were; yes, no, or unsure. The results from this question are displayed in Figure 12 and show that most respondents (74.1%) believe that an organisation’s CSP ‘does’ indicate what they would be like to work for. These findings also show 7.1% believing that it was not indicative, while 18.8% were unsure.

![Figure 12: Does an organisation’s CSP indicate what they would be like to work for?](image)

**Question 22**

In Question 22 respondents were asked if ‘negative’ publicity of an organisation’s CSP would influence their decision to apply for a position there. The three options offered to chose from were; yes, no, or maybe. The results from this question are displayed in Figure 13 and suggest that more than half of all respondents (54.1%) believe that
negative publicity of an organisation’s CSP would influence their decision to apply for a job there. Conversely, 7.1% believed that it would not influence them, while 38.8% were unsure.

![Bar chart showing response distribution.](chart)

Figure 13: Would negative CSP publicity of a firm influence application decisions?

**Question 23**

Question 23 of this survey was designed to expand on question 22, and asked respondents if ‘positive’ publicity of an organisation’s CSP would influence their decision to apply for a position there. The three options offered to choose from were; *yes, no, or maybe*. The results from this question are displayed in Figure 14. This figure indicates that most respondents (65.9%) believe that positive publicity of an organisation’s CSP would influence their decision to apply for a job there while 32.9% were unsure, and 1.2% believed that it would not influence them.
Given that while the results of Question 22 and 23 are informative in their own right, it is felt that a comparison of the two would add value and understanding of which is ‘most’ influential, positive publicity or negative. Therefore the results of both these questions are displayed side by side in Figure 15.

Figure 14: Would positive CSP publicity of a firm influence application decisions?

Figure 15: Influence of negative versus positive CSP publicity
Figure 15 suggests that overall, positive publicity of an organisation’s CSP is ‘more’ likely than negative publicity to influence applications for a position within an organisation. However, more respondents are ‘unsure’ if negative CSP publicity versus positive CSP publicity would influence their decision to apply. And, more respondents felt that negative publicity would ‘not’ influence their decision to apply as opposed to those who believed that positive CSP publicity would not influence them. Having said this, both positive and negative CSP publicity of an organisation appear to appreciably influence the job choice process in more than 50% of all participants one way or the other, therefore suggesting that CSP is highly influential whatever its form.

Question 24

Question 24 asked respondents if they thought the CSP displayed by an organisation represented part of its commitment towards them. The three options offered to chose from were; yes, no, or unsure. The results from this question are displayed in Figure 16 and reveal that most respondents (64.7%) believe that an organisation’s CSP ‘is’ representative of their commitment to them, while 29.4% indicated they were unsure. However, more telling is that only 5.9% believed that an organisation’s CSP ‘is not’ representative of their commitment to them.

Figure 16: Does the CSP of an organisation represent a commitment?
Further to this question, respondents who answered yes were also asked ‘why’ they felt that an organisation’s CSP might signify their commitment towards them. The key themes to emerge in reply to this are displayed in Table 19. Note that the bracketed number at the beginning of each theme indicates the number of times it was raised, and only those topics referred to four times or more are listed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Why Espoused Organisational CSP Forms Commitment Towards Employees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>▪ (15) They are reflective of how employees could expect be treated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ (9) They set an expectation of how the firm will act &amp; behave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ (7) They are an expression of the organisation’s credibility &amp; integrity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ (7) They offer reassurance that the organisation’s values and beliefs are a fit with one’s own</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ (6) They offer assurance of the way the organisation conducts business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ (5) They are an expression the organisation’s overarching principles and the way they do things</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ (5) They create an image of what employees can expect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ (4) They act as, &amp; form part of, the employee/employer arrangement &amp; are a foundation for their relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ (4) Good CSP demonstrated by an organisation shows that they are not purely profit driven but also concerned with both societal and personal well being</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ (4) They are a way of gaining reciprocal commitment and motivation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 19: Why would espoused organisational CSP form part of a firm’s commitment towards employees?

In addition to the themes displayed in Table 19 regarding CSP and its relationship with organisational commitment towards its employees, several respondents suggested that words and action are two different things, and there is a need to be aware of spin.

4.2.3. **Comparative importance of Job/Organisational Factors and Corporate Social Performance Elements**

The final section of this survey consisted of seven questions that are both closed and open-ended and whereby participants were asked to rank, scale, and justify their answers. Firstly questions were asked regarding the importance of five predetermined job/organisational factors. Next, the questioning was of a comparative nature and included the previously evaluated five CSP elements. This section of the survey...
concluded by enquiring about respondents position and views of the importance of an organisation’s reputation, where CSP rated in the overall employment decision process, and solicited any final comments.

The five job/organisational factors that were evaluated and compared are:

1. Challenging and rewarding work
2. Training and development
3. Pay, compensation, and benefits
4. Career development
5. Job security

**Question 25**

Question 25 required the five job factors *challenging work, training and development, pay compensation and benefits, career advancement, and job security* to be ranked from 1-5 in order of importance in a potential employer (1 being most important and 5 being least important). This question used forced ranking and participants could choose only one factor per order of importance. The results of Question 25 are displayed in Table 20 then discussed and further demonstrated in Figure 16. Note that each job factor’s most frequently selected ranking is shown in bold for emphasis.
### Job Factor Rankings of Importance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Factors</th>
<th>Ranking Options</th>
<th>Rating Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay, compensation, and benefits</td>
<td>20 (23.5%)</td>
<td>30 (35.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenging and rewarding work</td>
<td>32 (37.6%)</td>
<td>9 (10.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training and development</td>
<td>12 (14.1%)</td>
<td>21 (24.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Advancement</td>
<td>9 (10.6%)</td>
<td>17 (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job security</td>
<td>12 (14.1%)</td>
<td>8 (9.4%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 20: Job factor rankings of importance

Table 20 exhibits both the frequency and percentage of responses as selected by participants for each ranking and job factor category along with its overall rating average being displayed in the last column. When this table is analysed using frequency the job factor *challenging and rewarding work* is of most importance and top selection in scale ranking one at 32. *Pay, compensation, and benefits* is top selection in scale ranking two with a frequency of 30, and *career advancement* top in ranking three with 24. Table 20 also shows the job factor *training and development* as having an identical frequency in scale ranking two, three, and four but is only ranked as the top selection in option four. Consequently, the rating average, as displayed in the last column, may provide a clearer picture as to the order of importance of these factors. In viewing these rating averages while it appears that no one job factor is definitively more important, the order of importance changes whereby *pay, compensation, and benefits* is most important, *challenging and rewarding work* second, and *training and development* third. Interestingly the only job factor to remain constant under both forms of analysis is *job security*. Given these changes in ranking the table below comparatively demonstrates...
the order of importance of these job factors based on both frequency and rating average.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Job Factor – Frequency</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Job Factor – Rating Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Challenging and rewarding work – 32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Pay, compensation, and benefits – 2.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Pay, compensation, and benefits – 30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Challenging and rewarding work – 2.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Career advancement – 24</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Training and development – 2.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Training and development – 21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Career advancement – 3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Job security – 35</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Job security – 3.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 17: Job factor rankings and rating averages

Figure 17 while using the same statistics as Table 20 adds a more visual, and different, perspective. This figure demonstrates that the job factor *challenging and rewarding work* is clearly top choice in ranking option one and therefore considered the ‘most’ important job factor in a potential employer, while *pay, compensation, and benefits* is
clearly top choice of ranking option two. It should be noted that the variance between challenging and rewarding work, and pay, compensation and benefits can plausibly be explained by the nature of forced ranking. This is to say that pay, compensation, and benefits is ranked highest when based on rating average while challenging and rewarding work is ranked highest when based on frequency. Figure 17 also shows that job security while clearly top selection of scale ranking five is least important of all job factors. Furthermore, this figure noticeably demonstrates that the job factor training and development by being prominent and evenly spread between choice two, three, and four holds broad appeal and is of considerable importance. When interpreting Figure 17 it should be remembered that in contrast to the job factor scale bars, the shorter the rating average bar the more high-ranking it is.

This question also contained an open-ended component where respondents were invited to explain their first choice. A total 52 replies were received in answer to this and the key themes to emerge for each of the five job factors are displayed in Table 21. Note that the bracketed number at the beginning of each theme indicates the number of times it was raised and that only those topics mentioned two times or more are listed. Also, over and above these themes, several respondents proposed that all of these job factors are important and that each has the ability to flow, and contribute, to another.
### Why Job Factors are Important

| **Challenging and rewarding work** | 14. Provides motivation  
|                                  | 12. Avoids frustration, discontent, & early termination  
|                                  | 10. Offers a sense of achievement & satisfaction  
|                                  | 3. Employees need to feel good about what they do  
|                                  | 3. Helps employees feel part of the organisation  
|                                  | 3. Offers an opportunity for self-actualisation  
| **Training and development**     | 5. Promotes self-actualisation  
|                                  | 5. Encourages employee involvement, & increases performance & contribution towards the organisation  
|                                  | 5. Adds value to employees & the organisation  
|                                  | 4. Provides a flow on effect. For example; training leads to career advancement, & higher pay, & increased satisfaction  
|                                  | 3. Provides an opportunity to gain transferrable knowledge & skills  
| **Pay, compensation, and benefits** | 4. Shows employees they are valued  
|                                  | 4. Provides employees with the means to live the lifestyle they want, & assists in the ability to plan for the future  
|                                  | 4. Enables fulfillment of commitments and obligations  
|                                  | 2. Employees desire to paid what they believe they are worth  
|                                  | 2. Is a motivating factor  
| **Career advancement**           | 3. Employees have a desire to excel & succeed  
|                                  | 2. It provides a stepping stone that flows on to other job factors. For example; career advancement leads to challenging work, & higher pay, & job security  
|                                  | 2. It provides recognition & shows you are valued  
| **Job security**                 | 4. Employees have the need for stability  
|                                  | 3. There is currently a recession  
|                                  | 3. There is the need to fulfil commitments & plan for the future  

Table 21: Why are job factor important?
Question 26

Question 26 asked participants to rate the importance of the five job factors *challenging work*, *training and development*, *pay compensation and benefits*, *career advancement*, and *job security* in a potential employer. Unlike the previous question, forced ranking was not used and a five point Likert sliding scale of *very important*, *important*, *neutral*, and *not very important*, through to *not important at all*, was opted for instead.

Participants were permitted to select as many factors on a single scale as they wished but could only enter each factor once. It should be noted that it is considered that by including two questions of a similar nature (Question 25 & 26), but with different methods of scale and ranking, the prospect to compare results for similarity and validity is afforded. Further to this, and similar to Question 13, it is felt this will not only demonstrate if job factors are seen as a complete package or bundle, namely is one job factor inextricable and/or holding similar value of another, but also if individual and particular job factors are actually important to job-seekers at all. The results of this question are displayed in Table 22 and further demonstrated in Figure 18.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Factors</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Not Very Important</th>
<th>Not At All Important</th>
<th>Rating Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pay, compensation, &amp; benefits</td>
<td>44 (51.8%)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenging &amp; rewarding work</td>
<td>48 (56.5%)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training and development</td>
<td>40 (47.1%)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career advancement</td>
<td>35 (41.2%)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job security</td>
<td>31 (36.5%)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 22: How important are job factors?
Table 22 exhibits the frequency and percentage of participants that selected a particular rating scale for each job factor along with the overall rating average for each factor displayed in the last column. Note that the most frequently selected scale for each job factor is in bold for emphasis.

This table shows that most respondents believe all job factors except for job security are ‘very important’. In viewing the scale position and frequency of each job factor it can be seen that challenging and rewarding work is considered most important with 56.5% of respondents saying it is ‘very important’ to them. This is followed by pay, compensation, and benefits at 51.8%, training and development 47.1%, career advancement 41.2%, and the least important of all job factors job security at 36.5%. Of interest is that over 77% of job factor selections fall under ‘very important’ or ‘important’, and the only job factor to show consequence in the lower half of the continuum, ‘not very important’ and ‘not important at all’, is job security at 11.8% in the scale of ‘not important at all’.

Additionally, the rating averages in the last column of Table 22 reveal little variance between highest to lowest and further emphasise that a relatively similar value is placed on all job factors. However, when looking at these averages it can seen that the order of importance of these job factors changes slightly so that the positions of challenging and rewarding work, and pay, compensation, and benefits is reversed. Given this change, and the application of two methods of analysis, they are displayed together below for comparison.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Factor Order of Importance: Percentage</th>
<th>Job Factor Order of Importance: Rating Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Challenging and rewarding work – 56.5%</td>
<td>1. Pay, compensation, and benefits – 1.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Pay, compensation, and benefits – 51.8%</td>
<td>2. Challenging work – 1.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Training and development – 47.1%</td>
<td>3. Training and development – 1.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 18 shows a simplified graphic and holistic interpretation of the data in Table 22. This figure demonstrates that most respondents perceive all these job factors are at the very least ‘important’, and that *job security*, while overall still important, is rated least important of the job factors measured. Worthy of note is that a number of respondents indicated that *job security* and *career advancement* are ‘not important at all’.

![Figure 18: How important are job factors?](image)

As mentioned earlier, Question 26 was also intended to offer comparison with Question 25. In order to do this the findings of both questions are displayed together in Table 23. When viewing this table it can be seen that the results are the same for both questions based on rating average, and the only change in characteristic when based on percentage is that *career advancement* and *training and development* have interchanged between positions three and four. In considering both rating average and percentage, it can said that overall the two most important job factors are *challenging and rewarding work* and *pay, compensation, and benefits*. 
### Table 23: Comparison of Q25 & Q26; Job factor order of importance percentage and rating average

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 25: Job Factor – Forced Ranking: Percentage</th>
<th>Question 26: Job Factor – Non Forced Ranking: Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Challenging and rewarding work – 37.6%</td>
<td>1. Challenging and rewarding work – 56.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Pay, compensation, and benefits – 35.3%</td>
<td>2. Pay, compensation, and benefits – 51.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Career advancement – 28.2%</td>
<td>3. Training and development – 47.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Training and development – 24.7%</td>
<td>4. Career advancement – 41.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Job security – 41.2%</td>
<td>5. Job security – 36.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 25: Job Factor – Forced Ranking: Rating Average</th>
<th>Question 26: Job Factor – Non Forced Ranking: Rating Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Pay, compensation, and benefits – 2.52</td>
<td>1. Pay, compensation, and benefits – 1.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Challenging and rewarding work – 2.67</td>
<td>2. Challenging and rewarding work – 1.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Training and development – 2.95</td>
<td>3. Training and development – 1.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 27

Question 27 asked respondents if there were any job factors other than the predetermined five that they would consider important. There were 29 replies to this and it appeared that there was some uncertainty in what could be considered distinct and additional job factors. However, the key themes to emerge are displayed in Table 24. Note that the number of times each theme was raised is bracketed, and only those topics mentioned two times or more are listed.
Additional Job Factors of Importance

- (5) The want for a professional, creative, motivating team & work environment
- (5) The desire for a positive & non political work environment
- (4) The desire for a positive organisational culture & value fit
- (4) The want for acknowledgement, performance reviews, goal setting, & mentoring
- (3) The want for flexible work hours & location, & work life balance
- (2) The desire for a participative decision making processes, open communication, & autonomy

Table 24: Additional job factors of importance

Question 28

Question 28 combined both the five predetermined CSP elements and five predetermined job factors, and was designed to allow contrast and evaluation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMBINED PREDETERMINED JOB FACTORS AND CSP ELEMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job Factors</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay, compensation, and benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenging and rewarding work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training and development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career advancement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job security</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It should be noted that the combined package of job factors and CSP elements were randomly ordered on the questionnaire and not titled/labelled job factor or CSP element, in an attempt to avoid bias.

From these integrated 10 factors and elements respondents were asked to choose and rank only the seven that are most important to them in a potential employer. This
question used a forced ranking Likert scale where one equals most important and seven, least important. Only one scale of importance could be allocated to each or any of the factors or elements. The results of this are displayed in Table 25, and illustrate the frequency of participants that selected a particular ranking for each job factor and CSP element and its equating percentage. Note that the most frequently selected ranking for each factor and element is in bold for emphasis, and that the second to last column shows the rating average while the last column shows the total frequency of respondents that selected that element or factor in their top seven out of ten.

Additionally, while respondents are requested to only indicate their top seven from the ten options offered, all ten alternatives are presented in the data seeing as they all had representation within the seven scaled rankings.

Table 25 reveals that in scale ranking one the highest frequency of respondents (21) selected the job factor *pay, compensation, and benefits* as their top selection. This was closely followed by *challenging and rewarding work* with a frequency of 20. Having said this, it should be noted that *challenging and rewarding work* has a marginally higher percentage of respondents that selected this factor in their top seven and as being top selection in scale ranking one. The CSP element *employee relations*, while third selection in scale ranking one and with a frequency of 11, was top selection in scale ranking two on 20. Of importance in this data is not only 'which' CSP elements and job factors were selected in the top seven, but 'what' the order of importance was. It is believed that the last two columns of Table 25, *total frequency* and *rating average*, present a clearer image of this and have therefore been ranked comparatively in Table 26.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Rating Average</th>
<th>Total Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pay, compensation, and benefits</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenging and rewarding work</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee relations</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training and development</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career advancement</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job security</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product quality</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment of women &amp; minorities</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern for the environment</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community relations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5.89</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 25: Combined Job factor and CSP element rankings of importance
In Table 26 it can be seen that both total frequency and rating average contain the same CSP elements and job factors in their respective top seven. However, only pay, compensation and benefits, and career advancement, hold the same ranking in both. Also of implication in this table is that the only CSP elements to appear in the top seven are employee relations and product quality.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMPARISON OF TOTAL FREQUENCY AND RATING AVERAGE ORDER OF IMPORTANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rating Average Order of Top Seven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Pay, compensation, and benefits – 2.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Challenging and rewarding work – 3.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Employee relations – 3.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Treatment of women and minorities – 4.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 26: Comparison of total frequency and rating average order of importance of job factors and CSP elements

Question 28 also contained an open-ended component where respondents were asked ‘why’ their first two selections were important to them in a potential employer. The key themes to emerge for each factor and element from the 50 replies received are displayed in Table 27. Please note that the number of comments received pertaining to each theme raised is bracketed.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Themes of why the Top Two Selections from Combined Job Factors and CSP Elements are Important in a Potential Employer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Challenging and rewarding work</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(13) Provides satisfaction, enjoyment, &amp; a sense of achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) Is a motivating factor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Offers sense of productivity, efficiency, &amp; effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Provides a feeling of contribution &amp; involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Offers opportunity to be innovative &amp; improve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Product quality</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Provides a feeling of pride</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pay, compensation, and benefits</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9) Enables fulfilment of commitments and obligations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Financial compensation is an expression of recognition &amp; being valued</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Is a motivating factor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Enables a customary lifestyle &amp; standard of living</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) There is a want to save for the future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Treatment of women and minorities</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Equality is a right</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Has a direct affect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Representative of organisational values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job security</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8) Offers stability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) There is currently a recession</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employee relations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) This is the foundation for a ‘long term’ employer/employee relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) This is reflective of the values of the organisation, &amp; how they will treat their employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) This has a direct affect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) A good employer/employee relationship is motivating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) This is an expression of how much an employer values their employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Career advancement</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) This sets the foundation for the future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) This is a reward &amp; recognition for efforts contributed to the organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Concern for the environment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) There is a need for fit between organisational &amp; personal values &amp; beliefs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cont ...
From the themes displayed in Table 27 the primary points to surface were that while pay, compensation and benefits are a form of recognition and necessary to fulfil personal commitments, and job security provides stability, it is attributes such as challenging and rewarding work and good employee relations that offer satisfaction and a sense of achievement, are motivational, reflect the way employees can expect to be treated, and ultimately provide the foundation for a long term relationship.

**Question 29**

Question 29 asked participants if they would prefer to work for an organisation that has a good reputation of CSP. Participants were given the three options *yes*, *no*, and *does not matter to me* to choose from. The results from this question are displayed in Figure 19 and show that 83.5% said yes, 16.5% said it did not matter to them, and not one respondent said that they would not prefer to work for an organisation that has a reputation for good CSP.
This question had an additional and possibly more telling component, where respondents who answered ‘yes’ were asked why. The core themes to emerge from the 33 replies received are displayed in Table 28. Please note that the number of comments received pertaining to each theme raised is bracketed, and only those topics mentioned twice or more are listed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Why Respondents want to Work for an Organisation with a Good Reputation For CSP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(10) Would be proud &amp; inspired to work for &amp; be associated with the organisation, &amp; contribute to their success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) The CSP of an organisation reflects on those who work there &amp; their personal image</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) It shows the organisation cares about people &amp; society, &amp; have strong corporate values &amp; are a role model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) It would reflect on how employees are viewed by their peers &amp; in the market place through association with the organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) It would show organisational commitment, credibility, integrity &amp; vision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) It would most likely be representative of the culture of the organisation and how employees would be treated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) It is a conscience &amp; ethical issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) It would offer competitive advantage leading to organisational success</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 28: Why respondents would like to work for an organisation with a good reputation for CSP
The principal points to surface from the themes raised in Table 28 are that a reputation for good CSP is inspirational, and generates pride and a desire for association as it reflects on one's own image. A further comment made in replies to this question was that CSP is only a small part of an organisation, and does not mean they are completely bad.

**Question 30**

Question 30 asked participants where CSP rated in their overall employment decision process, and offered the five options *very important, important, neutral, not very important*, and *not important at all* to select from. The results of this question are displayed in Figure 20. This figure clearly conveys that CSP is an ‘important’, if not ‘very important’, consideration in the overall employment decision process as 85% of all respondents fall into these two categories. Also of meaning is that only three respondents believe that CSP is ‘not very important’ in the overall employment decision process, and not one respondent felt it was not important at all.

![Figure 20: Where does CSP rate in the overall employment decision process?](chart.png)
Question 31

In Question 31, the final question of this survey, respondents were asked if they had any further comments concerning CSP and what it meant for them in the job choice process. While the majority of respondents had no further views to add, the key themes to emerge from those that did are displayed in Table 29 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant Final Comments about CSP and its Association to the Job Choice Process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>▪ Employment branding is important &amp; includes an organisations’ reputation and values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Unfortunately as we are in a recession job security is ever more important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Honesty, integrity &amp; values are important &amp; it is important that these are a personal match</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ CSP has an important role to play in an organisation &amp; is reflective of their vision &amp; goals, &amp; reflects their achievements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 29: Final comments by participants

4.3. Cross-tabulation

Having viewed all survey questions as specific and individual, it is important to acknowledge the many variables that can influence their outcomes. Therefore, the next step in analysis of the data collected in this research is to identify the impact of these influences through cross-tabulation. This necessitates recognising any inter-dependent relational implications of identities such as demographics against CSP and its elements. While the combinations of influential and relational variables are numerous, the researcher has selected gender, age, and ethnicity, as of most interest and perceivable relevance. Furthermore, these demographics appear as controlled variables in previous research on organisational attraction and may therefore allow for comparison (Backhaus et al., 2002; Cable & Graham, 2000; Cable & Judge, 1994; Greening & Turban, 2000; Sutherland et al., 2002). Questions 12, 15, 16, 18, and 30 have been selected to be cross-tabulated against these demographics, and were chosen as the researcher believes they provide a fundamental overview of the survey. A table summary of the cross-tabulation conducted is offered at the conclusion of their analysis.
Question 12

Question 12 asked participants to rank in order of importance the five selected CSP elements *employee relations, treatment of women and minorities, concern for the environment, product quality,* and *community relations.* A forced ranking was employed that allowed only one element per order of importance ranking, and where one is most important through to five being least important.

**Gender cross-tabulation**

When Question 12 was cross-tabulated between genders and rating averages compared, the only CSP element to exhibit any variation of implication was *treatment of women and minorities* and where the female average was 2.87 and male 3.74. This suggests that females value this element considerably more than their gender counterparts. The full results of this cross-tabulation are displayed in Figure 21.

![Gender 1.5 rankings of Corporate Social Performance elements according to how important they are in a potential employer.](image)

Figure 21: Gender rankings of CSP order of importance in a potential employer
Age cross-tabulation

Upon cross-tabulating the five CSP elements against the four age groups 18-25, 26-35, 36-45, and 46+ it was found that ‘all’ groups rated employee relations as the ‘most’ important element. However, the age range 36-45 rated this element highest amongst all groups with an average of 1.46, and those 18-25 years of age rated it least at 1.96. Additionally, the CSP element treatment of women and minorities was rated somewhat less important to the age range 46+ than any other group and with an average of 3.63, while those 36-45 years of age rated it most important of all groups at 2.96. It is also worth noting that the age range 18-25 years rated the element concern for the environment more highly than any other with a rating average of 3.00, while those 36-45 years rated it least with a rating average of 3.5. The full results of this cross-tabulation are displayed in Figure 22.

![Figure 22: Age range rankings of CSP order of importance in a potential employer](image)
Ethnicity cross-tabulation

When the five CSP elements were cross-tabulated against the ethnic categories New Zealander, New Zealand Maori, European, Pacific Islander, and Asian, the results exhibited several points of consequence. Firstly, while all ethnic groups valued the CSP element employee relations most out of all elements, those in the European category placed least importance on it with an average of 2.15, and ‘New Zealand Maori’ valued it most with a rating average of 1.29. Secondly, the Pacific Island grouping placed least importance on the CSP element product quality out of all groups with an average of 3.7, while ‘European’ valued it most with an average of 1.92. Third, the Pacific Island ethnic category valued the CSP element community relations markedly more than any other group. Also of interest in this cross-tabulation is that the ‘New Zealand’ ethnic category placed more value on the element treatment of women and minorities than any other with an average of 2.8, while those in ‘European’ placed least and with a rating average of 3.6. The full results of this cross-tabulation are displayed in Figure 23.

Figure 23: Ethnicity rankings of CSP order of importance in a potential employer
Question 15

Question 15 asked participants how important the ‘overall’ CSP displayed by an organisation was to them. This question employed a five point Likert sliding scale of very important, important, neutral, and not very important, through to not important at all.

Gender cross-tabulation

The results of this cross-tabulation are displayed in Figure 24. In viewing these results it was found that females rate the overall CSP displayed by an organisation considerably more as very important, with 51.9% selecting this option compared to their male counterparts on 29%. However, it can also be said that the vast majority of both male (87.1%) and female (90.8%) believed that the overall CSP displayed by an organisation was either important or very important, and there is no noteworthy difference when these two response options are combined.

Age cross-tabulation

The cross-tabulation of this question against the four age groups 18-25, 26-35, 36-45, and 46+ is displayed in Table 30. This table while revealing no major differences did
show that the majority of all age groups believed that the overall CSP displayed by an organisation was either *important* or *very important*. This is emphasised by the low rating averages displayed on the last row of Table 30. So as to provide better clarity of this cross-tabulation these results are further displayed in Figure 25 as a percentage per age range. This figure, while confirming that the majority of respondents find the overall CSP displayed by an organisation to be either *important* or *very important*, demonstrates that those in the 36-45 age range value it most out of all groups and is in support of this age range having the lowest rating average as displayed in Table 30.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGE: IMPORTANCE OF OVERALL CSP DISPLAYED BY AN ORGANISATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Answer Options</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not very important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not important at all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rating average</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 30: Age range: Importance of overall CSP displayed by an organisation

Figure 25: Age range: Importance of overall CSP displayed by an organisation
Ethnicity cross-tabulation

The cross-tabulation of Question 15 against the five ethnic categories New Zealander, New Zealand Maori, European, Pacific Islander, and Asian, exhibited two considerable differences. Firstly, 80% of those in the Pacific Island category stated that the overall CSP displayed by an organisation was very important with the remaining 20% stating that it was important. This is in contrast to the next closest ethnic categories ‘New Zealander’ and ‘Asian’ with 46% stating that it was very important. Further to this, all categories, apart from ‘Pacific Island’, held between 10-20% neutral views. Secondly, ‘European’ is the only group where the majority view was that the overall CSP displayed by an organisation was important in contrast to very important. Having said this, the majority of all ethnicities believe the overall CSP displayed by an organisation is either important or very important, and no one indicated it was not very important or not important at all. These results are displayed in Figure 26.

Figure 26: Ethnicity: Importance of overall CSP displayed by an organisation
Question 16

Question 16 asked participants if the absence of any of the five selected CSP elements *employee relations*, *treatment of women and minorities*, *concern for the environment*, *product quality*, and *community relations* would stop them from applying for a position at an organisation.

**Gender**

The cross-tabulation of the five CSP elements against genders is displayed in Figure 27 and revealed two noteworthy differences. Firstly, 68.3% of females versus 32% of males would not apply for a position at an organisation where the CSP element *treatment of women and minorities* was absent. Secondly, 80% of males in contrast to 65.9% of females would not apply for a position at an organisation where the CSP element *employee relations* was absent.

![Figure 27: Gender: Would the absence of CSP elements deter from applying for a job?](image)

**Age cross-tabulation**

When Question 16 was cross-tabulated against the four age ranges 18-25, 26-35, 36-45, and 46+, several points of importance emerged. Firstly, 81% of 26-35 year olds and
80% of 36-45 year olds said they would not apply for a position at an organisation in the absence of the CSP element *employee relations*. This is in contrast to 60% for those in the 46+ age range and 55% for those 18-25 years of age. However, these statistics suggest that at least 50% of ‘all’ age groups would not apply for a position in the absence of this CSP element. Secondly, 80% of the age range 46+ would not apply for a position at an organisation that lacked the CSP element *concern for the environment*, with the next closest age range being 18-25 years on 45%. It is also worth noting that those aged 26-35 years are the least influenced by this element at 28.6%. Third, of all age groups those 36-45 years would be most influenced by absence of the CSP element *treatment of women and minorities* at 60%, while those aged 46+ years are least influenced with 40% saying they would not apply for a position at an organisation in the absence of this element. Lastly, the age range 26-35 years, as with the CSP element *concern for the environment*, would be least influenced of all age groups by the absence of the CSP element *community relations* at 14.3%, this is in contrast to 40% of the 46+ years age range suggesting they would not apply for a position at an organisation in the absence of this element. The results of this cross-tabulation are displayed in Figure 28.

![Figure 28: Age range: Would the absence of CSP elements deter from applying for a job?](image-url)
Ethnicity cross-tabulation

Question 16 was then cross-tabulated against the five ethnicities: New Zealander, New Zealand Maori, European, Pacific Islander, and Asian. The results of this cross-tabulation are displayed in Figure 29 and reveal that ‘New Zealand Maori’ spearhead all elements, except employee relations, in saying their absence would prevent them from applying for a position. Of particular interest when viewing the results of this cross-tabulation is that the CSP element community relations, while being the least influential of all elements, was not selected by anyone from the European category. This was in contrast to 100% of ‘New Zealand Maori’ saying that the absence of the CSP element treatment of women and minorities would influence their decision to apply for a position. Also of meaning, was that ‘New Zealand Maori’ polled highest for the CSP element product quality on 80%, and ‘Pacific Island’ next at 71.4%, with the remaining three ethnic categories ranging between 35% and 42%. Additionally, Figure 29 demonstrates that across all ethnic categories measured here the CSP element employee relations is the most influential of them all.

Figure 29: Ethnicity: Would the absence of CSP elements deter from applying for a job?
Question 18

Question 18 asked respondents if they would explore an organisation’s CSP before applying for a position there. For this question the options of yes, no, and maybe were offered.

Gender cross-tabulation

The results of Question 18 when cross-tabulated against male and female gender are displayed in Figure 23 and reveal that 59.3% of females would explore an organisation’s CSP before applying for a position compared to 45.2% of males. This figure also shows that while a relatively even number of males and females would ‘not’ explore an organisation’s CSP before applying for a position males are markedly more undecided than females.

Figure 30: Gender: Exploration of an organisation’s CSP before applying
Age cross-tabulation

When the four age ranges 18-25, 26-35, 36-45, and 46+ were cross-tabulated against this question it was found that those aged between 36-45 years were 21% more likely than any other group to explore an organisations CSP before applying for a position there. Conversely, and while somewhat consequently, this same age range, 36-45 years, was then 29% lower than any other in the maybe option, they were however most likely of all age ranges ‘not’ to explore an organisation’s CSP before applying for a position there. The results of this cross-tabulation are displayed in Figure 31.

![Figure 31: Age range: Exploration of an organisation’s CSP before applying](image)

Ethnicity cross-tabulation

Question 18 was then cross-tabulated against the five ethnic groups New Zealander, New Zealand Maori, Pacific Islander, European, and Asian. This cross-tabulation showed that the two ethnic categories most likely to explore an organisation’s CSP before applying for a position there were ‘Pacific Islander’ at 70% and ‘New Zealander’ on 61.5%, and was in stark contrast to ‘European’ on 38.5%. Having said this, European easily topped the option of maybe with 53.8%. Also of interest was that ‘no
one’ from ‘Pacific Island’ stated they would not explore a firm’s CSP before applying for a position. Full results of this cross-tabulation are displayed in Figure 32.

![Ethnicity: Exploration of an organisation’s CSP before applying](image)

Figure 32: Ethnicity: Exploration of an organisation’s CSP before applying

**Question 30**

For this, the last question to be cross-tabulated, a Likert five point scale with the options *not important at all, not very important, neutral, important,* and *very important* was used, and respondents were asked to state where they rated CSP in the job choice process.

**Gender cross-tabulation**

The results of cross-tabulating Question 30 against male and female gender are demonstrated in Figure 33. This cross-tabulation shows that females rate CSP as being a *very important* aspect in the job choice process 17.6% more than their male counterparts. This is not to say that males don’t consider CSP a central ingredient during the job choice process, given that when the values of the two options *very important* and *important* are combined males rate CSP marginally more than females. Having said this, these results show that on the whole over 83% of both males and
females view CSP at the very least an important factor in the employment decision process.

![Figure 33: Gender: Where overall does CSP rate in the employment decision process?](image)

**Age cross-tabulation**

Next, cross-tabulation of this question was carried out against the four age ranges 18-25, 26-35, 36-45, and 46+. The results from this are demonstrated in Table 31 and Figure 34. These results show that while at least 75% of all groups rate CSP highly and at the very least ‘important’ in the job choice process, the age range 36-45 years rated CSP 20.8% more than any other as being *very important*. It is also worth noting that those participants in the age range 18-26 years were the most neutral of all groups. Additionally, the only two groups to show any indication that CSP is not a very important factor during the employment decision process were those aged 18-26 years and 26-35 years.
Table 31: Age range: Where overall does CSP rate in the employment decision process?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>18-25</th>
<th>26-35</th>
<th>36-45</th>
<th>46+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very important</td>
<td>25.%</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td>45.8%</td>
<td>25.%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important</td>
<td>50.%</td>
<td>62.1%</td>
<td>45.8%</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not very important</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not important at all</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 34: Age range: Where overall does CSP rate in the employment decision process?

**Ethnicity cross-tabulation**

Lastly, Question 30 was cross-tabulated against the five ethnic categories New Zealander, New Zealand Maori, Pacific Islander, European, and Asian. The results from this cross-tabulation are displayed in Table 32 and Figure 35. These findings demonstrate that all ethnic groups for the most part rate CSP as an *important*, if not *very important*, aspect in the job choice process. This is to say that at least 76% of all
groups state that CSP is at the very least an important consideration during the employment decision process. However, it is worth noting that from the categories ‘New Zealander’ and ‘European’ 7.7% state that CSP is not very important during the employment decision process, and ‘no one’ from any category says it is not important at all. Figure 35 also shows that ‘European’ selected the answer option very important markedly less than any other ethnicity; however this is noticeably offset by the high number that selected the option of important. Additionally, 100% of those in the ‘Pacific Island’ category selected the answer options of either important or very important.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>New Zealander</th>
<th>New Zealand Maori</th>
<th>European</th>
<th>Pacific Islander</th>
<th>Asian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very important</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>69.2%</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>46.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not very important</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not important at all</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 32: Ethnicity: Where overall does CSP rate in the employment decision process?

Figure 35: Ethnicity: Where overall does CSP rate in the employment decision process?
Having conducted cross-tabulation between the set demographics of gender, age, and ethnicity against the survey questions 12, 15, 16, 18 and 30 a number of important associations and relationships came to light. These have been summarised and displayed in Table 33.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Age Range</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Are more deterred by absence of ‘employee relations’ than females</td>
<td>Value treatment of women and minorities notably more than males</td>
<td>Value ‘concern for the environment’ more than any other age range</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Are more undecided than females to explore a firms CSP before applying</td>
<td>Consider the overall CSP of an organisation more as ‘very important’ than males</td>
<td>Are less deterred by absence of ‘employee relations’ than any other age range</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Are more deterred by absence of the CSP element ‘treatment of women &amp; minorities’ than males</td>
<td>And least likely of all age ranges to explore a firm’s CSP before applying</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Are more likely than males to explore a firms CSP before applying</td>
<td>Are the most neutral as to the importance of CSP during the job choice process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>More females say CSP is ‘very important’ during the job choice process than males</td>
<td>Consider the overall CSP of an organisation less important than any other age range</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cont …
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Range</th>
<th>Cross-Tabulation Summary of Questions 12, 15, 16, 18, and 30 Against Gender, Age Range, And Ethnicity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 36-45     | • Value the CSP elements ‘employee relations’ & ‘treatment of women & minorities’ **more** than any other age range  
• Value the CSP element ‘concern for the environment’ & ‘community relations’ **less** than any other age range  
• Rate the overall CSP of an organisation **more** highly than any other age range  
• Are **more** deterred by absence of ‘employee relations’, ‘treatment of women & minorities’ & ‘product quality’ than any other age range  
• Are **more** likely to explore a firm’s CSP before applying for a position of all ages  
• Rate the importance of CSP during the job choice process **more** than any other age range |
| 46+       | • Value the CSP element ‘product quality’ & ‘community relations’ **more** than any other age range  
• Value the CSP element ‘treatment of women & minorities’ **less** than any other age range  
• Are **more** deterred by absence of ‘community relations’ & ‘concern for the environment’ than any other age range  
• Are **less** deterred by absence of ‘treatment of women & minorities’, & ‘product quality’ than any other age range |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Cross-Tabulation Summary of Questions 12, 15, 16, 18, and 30 Against Gender, Age Range, And Ethnicity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| New Zealander | • Are **less** deterred by absence of ‘product quality’ than any other ethnicity, & a close 2nd in ‘concern for the environment’  
• Value the CSP element ‘treatment of women & minorities’ **more** than any other ethnicity |
| New Zealand Maori | • Value the CSP element ‘employee relations’ **more** than any other ethnic group  
• Are **more** deterred by absence of the CSP elements ‘treatment of women & minorities’, ‘product quality’, ‘concern for the environment’, & ‘community relations’ than any other ethnic group  
• Rate the importance of CSP during the job choice process **more** than any other ethnic group |
| European | • Value the CSP element ‘product quality’ **more** than any other ethnic group  
• Value the CSP element ‘employee relations’, & ‘treatment of women & minorities’ **less** than any other ethnic group  
• Are **less** deterred by absence of ‘community relations’, & ‘employee relations’ than any other ethnic group  
• Are **less** likely to explore a firm’s CSP before applying for a position than any other ethnic group |

Cont …
## Cross-Tabulation Summary of Questions 12, 15, 16, 18, and 30 Against Gender, Age Range, And Ethnicity

| Pacific Islander | • Value the CSP element ‘community relations’ **more** than any other ethnic group  
|                 | • Value the CSP element ‘product quality’ **less** than any other ethnic group  
|                 | • The overall CSP of an organisation is **more** important to this ethnic group than to any other  
|                 | • Are **less** deterred by absence of ‘treatment of women & minorities’ & ‘concern for the environment’ than any other ethnicity  
|                 | • Are **more** deterred by absence of ‘employee relations’ than any other ethnicity  
|                 | • Are **more** likely to explore a firm’s CSP before applying than any other ethnic group |

### Comments

- The CSP element ‘employee relations’ is 1st choice & ‘product quality’ 2nd across all demographics in order of importance
- **100%** of ‘New Zealand Maori’ would be deterred from applying for a position where the CSP element ‘treatment of women & minorities’ was absent
- **100%** of ‘European’ would **not** be deterred from applying for a position where the CSP element ‘community relations’ was absent
- The CSP element ‘community relations’ continually poled **lowest** across all demographics overall
- **100%** of the Pacific Island ethnic group rate the importance of CSP in the job choice process as either ‘very important’ or ‘important’
- **No one** of the Pacific Island ethnic group would **not** explore an organisation’s CSP before applying for a position

Table 33: Cross-tabulation summary

### 4.4. Summary

This chapter presented an analysis of the raw data collected via the survey questionnaire constructed for this study. The analysis of this data for the main part followed the same three section format as the survey and totalled 31 questions, and was further supplemented by cross-tabulation of selected demographics and questions.

The first section, presented data obtained from question one through eleven of the questionnaire. This information established that while some of the basic demographics of the sample population of participants in this research were not fully typical of the total
population, they were perceived as sound and a good mix of age, gender, ethnicity, full and part time students, of those with and without dependent children, and were mostly engaged in some form of employment.

Section two solicited information, views and opinions, and data for analysis from participants as to which CSP elements they valued most in a potential employer and why. It was determined here that the CSP element of *employee relations* is the most important element of all as it afforded motivation, respect, satisfaction, pride, was a foundation for trust and loyalty, and elicited employee ownership and a sense of being valued. It was also asserted that the espoused CSP of an organisation was an important aspect in the job choice decision process, and its absence would cause some participants not apply for positions. In addition, it was revealed that positive CSP publicity of an organisation held more influence on the decision to apply for a position than negative. It was also found that most respondents would like to know of an organisation’s CSP activity and standing before they apply for a position there since it may be an indication of working conditions and perceived expectation of treatment, and given they did not want to waste their own, or the organisation’s, time. Furthermore, it was established that an organisation’s website is where most respondents thought, and felt, they should be able to investigate this. Respondents informed that they perceived an organisation’s CSP signalled the culture and values of the organisation, and whether there was mutual compatibility. In completion to this section it was revealed that the majority of participants believed that an organisation’s CSP represented a commitment to them that set an expectation, portrayed an image, and was an expression of credibility and the values held by the organisation.

Section three saw the introduction of traditional job factors for contrast and comparison with CSP, and whereby participants were required select, rank and choose those most important to them in a potential employer as well as to share their opinions and views on why. When job factors were considered alone, data exposed that *challenging and rewarding work* along with *pay, compensation, and benefits* were most important to respondents as they allowed a standard of living, sense of achievement and being valued, solicited employee motivation, involvement and commitment, and facilitated
extended tenure. Once CSP and job factors combined, it was revealed that pay, compensation, and benefits was considered most important of all, followed by challenging and rewarding work, and employee relations polling third. Respondents believed that these job factors and CSP element acted as foundations of, and motivators toward, a preferred employer in the job choice process. This section concluded by revealing that CSP was an important aspect in the overall employment decision process, and most participants would prefer to be employed by an organisation that displayed positive CSP that they could be proud of, and inspired by.

Lastly, these findings were supplemented by cross-tabulation of data from selected questions and participant demographics. This revealed several noteworthy points. Firstly, males rate the CSP element treatment of women and minorities less favourably than females. Next, although the CSP element community relations is the least valued element of all, Pacific Islanders value it more than any other ethnic group. Cross-tabulation also revealed that those in the 46+ age range are less likely to apply for a position at an organisation where the CSP element concern for the environment is absent than any other age group, and New Zealand Maori are the most likely ethnic group not to apply for a position in the absence of ‘any’ CSP element except employee relations. Analysis also suggested that females and those aged 36-45, are more likely than any other demographic group to explore an organisation’s CSP before applying for a position there, and those between the ages of 36-45 years consider CSP more important in the job choice process than any other age group. Lastly, a summary of all cross-tabulation findings is tabled offering demographic comparison and breakdown on standings in light of CSP.

The findings of this chapter are discussed and investigated in more depth in the following chapter.
Chapter Five

5.0 Discussion

5.1. Overview

To recap, the purpose of this study is to investigate both the importance and impact of Corporate Social Performance and its elements on job-seeker attitudes towards organisational attraction, and to then extend this inquiry further to determining ‘why’ such attraction may, or may not, occur. The research question is: “to what extent do job-seekers find Corporate Social Performance, and its elements, to be attractive in a potential employer?”

This chapter considers the results of the survey questionnaire in light of current literature on the issue, and analyses the findings in order to answer the above research question. During this evaluative component, discussion will be also linked to relevant theories that the author believes are the most pertinent.

As part of this course and in answering the research question of this study, not only ‘if’ and ‘which’ CSP elements job-seekers desire most in a potential employer will be examined but also ‘to what extent they are desired and why’. Additionally, the importance of CSP will be evaluated as a complete concept and the individual elements within this concept scrutinized. These elements will also be contrasted for importance and impact against the more traditional recruitment offerings/package of organisational job factors. Lastly, selected participant demographics are discussed and explored as variables so as to identify and reveal differences in the importance and perceived value of CSP in a potential employer.
5.2. **Is a firm’s overall CSP an important part of the employment decision process?**

Determining how important the overall CSP displayed by an organisation actually is to job-seekers during their employment decision process is central to this study.

With this in mind, 89.4% of respondents indicated that the overall espoused CSP of a firm was either ‘very important’ or ‘important’ to them. This finding supports that of Turban and Greening (1997) and Backhaus et al (2002). Given the clarity of this result the proposal by Turban and Greening (1997) that firms displaying high levels of CSP are perceived as more attractive than those displaying low levels of CSP and therefore can expect to receive ‘larger’ applicant pools, may hold merit. Additionally, while Waddock, Bodwell, and Graves (2002) propose that we can best understand the function of CSP when elements are examined individually, these findings suggest that collectively CSP also has the potential to send a powerful signal, and that job-seekers may identify by way of self-concept and the perception that the firm holds a similar general value and belief system to their own (Ashforth & Mael, 1989; McShane & Travaglione, 2003). Furthermore, given that it is said that job-seekers operate with limited knowledge of an organisation at early stages of the recruitment process (Bird & Smith, 2005; Goldberg & Allen, 2008; Lievens & Highhouse, 2003; Spence, 1973; Turban & Greening, 1997) the overall CSP of an organisation may be more instrumental at the initial attraction stage.

Seeing as respondents expressed such a strong opinion towards the importance of the overall CSP displayed by an organisation it is important to ask whether this was particular to any specific demographic, and therefore cross-tabulation undertaken is drawn on. Results of this cross-tabulation analysis showed two important points of interest.

Firstly, 51.9% of females compared to 29% of their male counterparts placed strong emphasis on the overall espoused CSP of an organisation. This is to say they rated it as ‘very important’. This finding is in agreement with Peterson (2004) and Backhaus et al (2002) and signifies a stronger desire by females than males to identify with firms

Secondly, while it should be noted that the ethnic category ‘Pacific Island’ were of minor representation in this study, 80% of this group stated that the overall CSP displayed by an organisation was very important to them. This was 19% more than the next closest ethnicity ‘European’ at 61%. Furthermore, when this ethnic category is observed against other analysis it suggests that those of Pacific Island ethnicity may hold strong social beliefs. This is said as they:

- Place the most value on the overall importance of CSP during the employment decision process of all ethnic groups.
- Value the CSP elements ‘community relations’ and ‘concern for the environment’ more than any other ethnic group.
- Had the highest percentage of all ethnic categories in saying they would explore a firm’s CSP before applying for a position there.

Drawing on Hofstede’s writings on cultural differences, an explanation for this may be found in the concept of collectivism (Elkin, Jackson, & Inkson, 2004; Robbins, Millett, Cacoppe, & Waters-Marsh, 2001; Wood et al., 2004). Further to this it has been said that “indigenous Pacific communities are communities in which sharing and a close relationship to communally-owned land are very important values or norms that pervade social and economic life” (Duncan, 2008, p. 1).

However, these finding afford some complexity as this same ethnic group ranked lowest in suggesting they would not apply for a position at a firm where ‘community relations’ and ‘concern for the environment’ was absent. Under further scrutiny three additional points of interest were found:

- This group rated the job factor ‘job security’ considerably more highly than any other ethnic group (15% more than the next nearest group, European).
- This group rated the job factor ‘pay, compensation and benefits’ marginally more than any other ethnic group (4.3% more than the next nearest group, Asian).
This group rated the job factor ‘challenging and rewarding work’ marginally less than Asian (6.2% less), and at least 25.2% less than the remaining three ethnic categories.

It is difficult to ascertain a definite rationale for this especially given they are of minor representation, however it may in part be due to a strong motivation for fulfillment of lower order needs such as food, shelter, and security as prescribed by Abraham Maslow (Robbins et al., 2001; Wood et al., 2004). Taking this concept further Jelavic and Ogilvie (2009) suggest that different cultures may vary ‘their’ levels of hierarchy of needs due to subjectivity of base values and societal norms, and where some societies may place the importance of self-sacrifice ahead of other needs such as self-actualisation. Additionally, it has been suggested Pacific Island people in New Zealand, and Auckland in particular, have not only been economically, socially, and politically marginalised but tend to occupy lower paid jobs (Cave, Ryan, & Panakera, 2007). Therefore it can be suggested that fulfillment of lower order needs by maintaining a job and earning an income may have been ‘culturally institutionalised’ and become paramount factors, and a firm’s CSP, while appealing, is secondary.

5.3. Which CSP elements are most important to job-seekers in a potential employer?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSP ELEMENT RANKINGS OF IMPORTANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scale Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Central to this study was determining which aspects within the larger construct of CSP job-seekers value most in a potential employer. While participants’ opinions suggest
that given a choice, all five CSP elements measured in this study were important and were seen somewhat as an encompassing package, as previously mentioned Waddock and Graves (1997) suggest that CSP can be best understood as a function when examined element by element. Furthermore, in understanding job-seekers perceived importance of individual elements employers may be able to better match their CSP activities to those that appeal to their target audience.

In evaluating the five options offered, participants identified the element ‘employee relations’ as by far the most appealing in a potential employer, and whereby 60% of all participants ranked employee relations as their first choice, and of highest priority. The importance of this element was emphasised by the relative scoring of the next highest ranked element, product quality, being a full 38.8% lower and with 21.2% of participants considering it of highest priority.

While the high showing of the element ‘employee relations’ is not surprising, the low standing of ‘concern for the environment’ is somewhat puzzling given the heightened reference of this as a societal issue, and supposed broad appeal and peer influence (Aiman-Smith, Bauer, & Cable, 2001; Backhaus et al., 2002; Bauer & Aiman-Smith, 1996; Judge & Bretz, 1992). Furthermore, the element ‘treatment of women and minorities’ might also have been expected to rate more highly in the order of importance in a potential employer, given that equal employment opportunity and diversity in the workplace seemingly receive ample attention, and literature regularly champions it as a pivotal point of difference in job-seeker attraction (Backhaus et al., 2002; Cable & Graham, 2000; Dennis, 2008; Greening & Turban, 2000; Jayne, 2005; Ng & Burke, 2005). Having said this, Greening and Turban (2000) suggest that while males may be more likely than females to accept a position at a firm where this element appears deficient, both genders are just as likely to accept when it is present. This suggests that direct personal impact on the individual and/or job-seeker population, is relative to the element’s importance, and therefore male participants in this study may also not rate the element ‘treatment of women and minorities’ as highly as other job-seeking groups, subject to their belonging to a perceived minority group.
Given the prominence of the CSP element ‘employee relations’, and to a lesser extent ‘product quality’, the following section explores the possible rationale behind these two ‘most important’ CSP elements in more detail.

**Employee relations**

The selection of the CSP element ‘employee relations’ as most appealing when assessing organisational attractiveness accords with the findings of Greening and Turban (2000) and Backhaus et al (2002). However, the findings of Backhaus et al (2002) partially qualify this by proposing that while ‘employee relations’ plays a large part in raising the attractiveness of firms with poor performance in other elements, when pairs of elements are interacting with each other, the elements ‘treatment of women and minorities’ and ‘concern for the environment’ hold most influence. Having said this, these two elements were ranked fourth and fifth in this current study and held a lowly ranking for the most part throughout, suggesting that elements perceived as more removed and having less direct impact on daily work life are less salient to job-seekers. Conversely, it can therefore be said the reason that the CSP element ‘employee relations’ is so highly valued in a potential employer is due to its direct and daily impact on employees. This view supports the findings of Backhaus et al (2002) and Jones (1991) where they refer to factors that have direct personal impact as being perceived to have greater importance by way of ‘issue intensity’.

When participant opinions were sought as to why the element ‘employee relations’ was important in a potential employer it was found that there was a belief that this was the foundation that made for a stable and superior organisational culture from which other CSP elements stemmed and flowed. Additionally, it was said that positive espoused organisational ‘employee relations’ set an expectation of what the firm would be like to work for as this was an indication, or signal, of their core organisational values. Spence (1973) explains this by proposing that a firm’s espoused attributes, such as ‘employee relations’, act as signals to create an image defining the organisation’s beliefs, which job-seekers then use to access suitability (Goldberg & Allen, 2008). Zagenczky (2004) adds to this using attribution theory and whereby he proposes that as stakeholders
attempt to interpret a firm’s signals, they are trying to understand its actions and evaluate the reasons behind them. In doing this, job-seekers can decide if the firm’s motives are altruistic or somewhat symbolic.

While these proposals suggest that participants in this study interpret a firm’s positive ‘employee relations’ as a signal and perceived expectation, the research of Peloza, Hudson, and Hassay (2009) suggests that such signals imply that the organisation is committed to the cause, and Bird (2005) proposes this can then motivate behaviour. However, this only partially explains the core ‘why’ behind ‘employee relations’ as an appreciably more important factor than the other elements. Given this, Albinger and Freeman (2000) offer additional rationale by proposing that different job-seeking populations interpret and value various aspects of CSP differently. Therefore, it can be proposed that the element ‘employee relations’ is universally salient, has broad appeal, and generally perceived by all job-seeking populations as important, whereas the relative importance of the remaining elements can be perceived as being dependent on the individual’s personal values and beliefs.

**Product quality**

The second ranking of the CSP element ‘product quality’ was also in accordance with the findings of Greening and Turban (2000) and Backhaus et al (2002). The perceived importance of this element may reflect the need for self-identification and the desire to align and be associated with firms that offer such things as perceived prestige (Ashforth & Mael, 1989; Backhaus et al., 2002). A further explanation as to the importance of ‘product quality’ was offered by respondents, where they proposed a desire to work for, and be associated with, an organisation they could be proud of and believe in. These opinions can be explained by social identity theory whereby the desire for positive self-concept lends itself to influencing the choice of one’s group membership (Greenberg & Baron, 2008; McShane & Travaglione, 2003). Adding to this Chatterji, Levine, and Toffel (2009) propose this as seeking a perceived extension of one’s self, while others suggest that it is the desire for, and a means towards, satisfaction, self-definition, self-enhancement, perceived happiness, fulfillment of emotional needs, and a need for
attachment and self-categorisation (Ashforth & Mael, 1989; Backhaus et al., 2002; Bergami & Bagozzi, 2000; Bhattacharya et al., 2008; Brammer, 2007; Feldman et al., 2006; Greening & Turban, 2000; Marin & Ruiz, 2007; Sen, 2006; Turban & Greening, 1997).

Also of interest in respondent comments on why ‘product quality’ is important, was their belief that this would provide for the long-term success of the organisation. Although this can also be explained by the desire to identify with a firm that may be perceived as thriving and therefore affording recognition, self-definition and self-enhancement, Sen (2006) suggests that job-seekers are driven by the bigger umbrella as prescribed by Maslow’s motivational theory of hierarchy of needs, and are thereby motivated by the want to satisfy both ‘higher’ and ‘lower’ order needs. This theory has relevance in this instance, as the long term success of a firm may also offer the potential for job security, and therefore satisfy lower order needs, while at the same time affording employee fulfillment and increased self-concept, as related to higher order needs, and through association with a potentially well-regarded organisation.

It is also worthy of mention that while social identity theory provides a rationale for why job-seekers believe ‘product quality’ is of importance in a potential employer, this theory also suggests that in reaping rewards such as pride, prestige, self-concept, satisfaction, attachment and fulfillment, the organisation identified with also gains by way of employee commitment, loyalty, involvement, engagement, and contribution to success (Ashforth & Mael, 1989; Bergami & Bagozzi, 2000; Bhattacharya et al., 2008; Brammer, 2007; Marin & Ruiz, 2007; Sen, 2006). And, as proposed by Bhattacharya et al (2008) with identification comes “we” (p. 43) and therefore alluding to engagement and a oneness with the organisation.

5.3.1. Do different job-seeking populations consider the importance of CSP elements differently?

In an effort to gain a more in-depth understanding of the order of importance of individual CSP elements, this discussion also draws on several points of interest revealed during the cross-tabulation that was undertaken against set demographics.
Gender differences

Firstly, and in agreement with Greening and Turban (2000), Thomas and Wise (1999), Freeman (2003), and Backhaus et al (2002), cross-tabulation found that the element ‘treatment of women and minorities’ was more important to females than males, and exhibited a rating average of 2.87 and 3.74 respectively. It can be said that this may be due to individual difference and a desire for fit (Greening & Turban, 2000) that offers congruence of personal values (Amos & Weathington, 2008). Avery and McKay (2006) add to this in that they propose females place different values on certain organisational characteristics, namely diversity, than males when evaluating potential employers. Therefore this finding suggests that a firm’s success in recruiting diverse personnel, and taking advantage of an increasing female workforce component (Avery & McKay, 2006; Magee, 2001), may be contingent on effectively conveying messages such as its diversity program, particularly as it is recognised these can send a powerful signal (R. R. Thomas, Russell, & Schumacher, 2001).

Secondly, and somewhat surprising, the results of cross-tabulation exhibited no real difference between male and female for the element ‘community relations’. This is in contrast to the suggestion by Peterson (2004) that women are more likely to appreciate organisations that display this tendency. Furthermore, ‘community relations’ was rated as ‘least important’ of all elements by both males and females. This finding is in contrast to that of Brammer (2006), who when studying the need for fit between organisational CSP activities and stakeholder environment, argued that community involvement appealed to all stakeholders and was not industry or organisation specific. While the reasons for this low ranking by ‘community relations’ is not completely clear, it may be in part be environmental, and whereby this element perceivably has limited direct impact on daily work life, and/or specific to this study due to the forced nature of this question.

Ethnic differences

When CSP order of importance was viewed by ethnicity there was little variance, suggesting that the ethnicities measured here, hold similar views overall on which CSP elements they value most in an employer. This finding is somewhat surprising, given the
potential for individual and cultural differences to figure, and the ability for such differences to shape one’s views, convictions, values and beliefs, and influence perception and behaviour (Elkin et al., 2004).

**Age Differences**

When CSP order of importance was cross-tabulated by age range it was found that those 36-45 years valued both ‘employee relations’ (rating average – 1.46; next closest – 1.72) and ‘treatment of women and minorities’ (rating average – 2.96; next closest – 3.21) more than any other. This suggests to the researcher that those in what may be considered the middle, and possibly peak, of their working life hold strong views towards equality, fairness, and organisational justice. It is also conceivable that the views of this age range may have been influenced by work life experience, and having witnessed significant changes in employment arrangements such as downsizing, outsourcing, and restructuring of employment contract agreements (De Cieri & Kramer, 2007; Elkin et al., 2004). What's more, if we are to examine this from a generational perspective it can be said that those between 36-45 years are a combination of ‘Generation X’ and ‘Generation Y’ who are said to hold strong values and have a need for the recognition of individual difference (DeMarco, 2008; McDonald, 2006; Woodruffe, 2009). From a New Zealand viewpoint this age demographic is one that has grown up with, and seen a push for equality in the workplace, and that at one point saw women simultaneously hold the top constitutional and public leadership roles of Prime Minister, Chief Justice, Leader of the Opposition, and head of the country’s largest company Telecom, and whereby this collective dominance by women in high positions of power was seen as unique internationally (Magee, 2001). Having said this, Magee (2001) still proposes power distance in New Zealand as an obstacle requiring further endeavour towards such things as gender pay parity.

Interestingly, and in contrast to those aged 35-46 years, those aged 18-25 years placed least importance on the CSP element ‘employee relations’ of all age ranges. This suggests to the researcher that time and experience in the workforce may well facilitate job-seeker perceptions on the value and desirability of a quality employer/employee
relationship. This opinion is further cemented by this age range exhibiting the view of ‘undecided’ more than any other group when asked if a firm’s espoused CSP forms a commitment by the organisation towards them. Given this, these findings may plausibly be explained by this group’s possible restricted interaction with multiple employers and limited employment history, and therefore lack of rigid expectations. However, this does not lend itself to the suggestion that firms desiring a younger and possibly less experienced and demanding workforce should ignore the potential advantages offered by a ‘good employee relations record’. This is said as it has been suggested that high achievers are confronted with more employment opportunities and therefore in a position to be able to display preference (Trank, Rynes, & Bretz, 2002), and as found by Albinger and Freeman (2000) CSP is positively related to organisational attractiveness for job-seekers with high levels of job choice.

Also of interest in these findings was that those aged 18-25 years rate the CSP element ‘concern for the environment,’ albeit marginally, more highly than any other. This is not surprising given their possible impressionability and the heightened media attention and popularisation of issues such as global warming, and the proposal of Crumpacker and Crumpacker (2007) that one’s representative views and values are set by dominant events of their time.

**Demographic standout**

In discussing the attractiveness of CSP in a potential employer and its impact on the differing job-seeker demographics, those in the age rage 35-46 years appear to be influenced by a firm’s CSP more recurrently than other groups. This is said as their responses indicated they were the most likely age range to value and be influenced by a firm’s espoused CSP in the following areas:

- The overall CSP of a firm was ‘very important’ to them more than any other age range.
- They would investigate a firm’s CSP before applying for a position there more than any other age range.
They valued the CSP elements ‘employee relations’ and ‘treatment of women and minorities’ more than any other age range.

They were more likely than any other age range to ‘not’ apply for a position at an organisation where the CSP elements ‘product quality’ and ‘treatment of women and minorities’ were absent.

And, they rated CSP more highly in the job choice process than any other age range.

It is also worth noting that this age range was a very close second to those 25-35 years, in indicating they would not apply for a position at an organisation where the CSP element ‘employee relations’ was absent (81.6% for those 26-35 years, and 80% for those 36-45 years). Also, owing to this age group’s (36-45 years) strong showing additional analysis was undertaken to investigate their stance against the other age groups and whether or not they believed a firm’s espoused CSP represented a commitment to them. This analysis found that 80% perceived that a firm’s espoused CSP represented a commitment to them and was 17.9% higher than the next closest age range 26-35 years on 62.1%.

This age group’s strong level of showing may in part be explained firstly, and as previously alluded to, by generational views, and secondly through identity theory. It has been proposed that those falling into a Generation-X continuum are stereotypically self-reliant, arrogant, disloyal, having short attention spans, are selfish and in need of instant gratification (Tulgan, 1997) and therefore perceivably exhibiting a somewhat ‘I know what I want’ attitude. Adding to this rationale Jimenez (2009) proposes that each generation has distinct values, attitudes, and behaviors towards workplace expectations which, as previously mentioned, are set by dominant events of their time (Crumpacker & Crumpacker, 2007).

Therefore, and as suggested by DeMarco (2008), those belonging to generation X (age range 36-45 years) have witnessed the emergence of and call for equality and social, environmental, and economic accountability of organisations and “are disgusted with the mismanagement of top corporate officials, hierarchical politics, corporate ladders,
and the lack of job satisfaction and job fulfilment” (p. 10). Additionally, it has also been proposed that this generation value diversity, like strong work relationships, and have a need for alignment of personal and organisational values (DeMarco, 2008; Dwan, 2004; Jimenez, 2009; McDonald, 2006). Furthermore, it is plausible this age group has an expectation founded by substantial work experience and dealings with organisations, and is therefore in a position to acknowledge preference coupled with the ability to more credibly identify the type of organisation they would like to align and associate themselves with based on signals received.

Having explained possible generational traits influential to this age range and that could contribute to their standing towards CSP, a further conceivable rationale may be the want and desire to identify with organisations that demonstrate organisational justice and hold similar views as their own so as to fulfil personal goals and needs. This is said as it is suggested that by way of social identity persons seek to align, and self-categorise with an employer that will add to their self-definition, self-enhancement, and self-image, while facilitating increased self-esteem and a sense of pride (Ashforth & Mael, 1989; Bergami & Bagozzi, 2000; Bhattacharya et al., 2008; Brammer, 2006, 2007; Sen, 2006).

In summary, the results of this study point to job-seekers aged between 36-45 years looking for a strong and ethical employer that shares similar values and beliefs to their own and where there is an overlap with one’s own identity (Bhattacharya et al., 2008; Brammer, 2006, 2007; Sen, 2006). In considering the question of the way in which different job-seeking demographics regard the importance CSP elements differently, and recognising the social and behavioural complexities within the above discussion, it is clear that the association between various job-seeker demographics and CSP attraction is an area that warrants further research.

5.4. **Is the absence of CSP elements likely to have an effect on job-seekers?**

It is just as fundamental for firms to know if the absence of particular aspects of CSP would influence job-seekers decision to self-select out as it is to know which would
entice them in. When participants in this research were asked if the absence of any of
the five CSP elements evaluated in this study would stop them from applying for a
position at a firm the answer was a resounding yes, and two elements were identified as
having more influence than the others.

Having said this, and foremost, 71.2% of participants said they would not apply for
position at a firm where the element ‘employee relations’ was absent. The next most
influential element was ‘treatment of women and minorities’, and where 54.5% of
respondents said its absence would deter them from applying at an organisation. This
finding may not be surprising in itself given the high regard ‘employee relations’ was
held when the five elements were ranked in order of importance and the gender ratio
and ethnic diversity of this study, however, it is felt that there could be additional
contributing dynamics. For instance, the investigations by Dennis (2008) into job-
seekers’ perceptions of firms with a reputation of positive ‘employee relations’, pointed
out that a key theme to emerge was that of interpreting it as a signal that afforded an
expectancy of being treated fairly, and that the organisation regards facets such as
employee involvement as important. Dennis (2008) goes on to say that effective
management of diversity, such as treatment of women and minorities, will develop into a
key component of Human Resource Management. Taking account of the proposal by
Dennis (2008) and the results of this study, the importance for firms to exhibit positive
employee relations and treatment of women and minorities if they want to attract a
diverse workforce is highlighted. An example of the successful implementation and
effectiveness of exhibiting these elements is shown by Pak’n Save Supermarket Mount
Albert, Auckland New Zealand, where the stakeholder base was so diverse that the
company established not only a Muslim prayer room for staff, but also an advisory panel
of new immigrants when considering ethnic food stocks (Jayne, 2005). The flow-on
effect of these initiatives for this organisation was that at the time of their receiving an
EEO Trust Award in 2005, staff vacancies were 10% of that of comparable
supermarkets.

In linking these two CSP elements, ‘employee relations’ and ‘treatment of women and
minorities’, Dennis (2008) has added weight to comments made by participants in this
study that one element flows into and impacts on the other. Furthermore, it can be said that firms lacking in these aspects of CSP are signalling to job-seekers ‘employee conditions’ may be less than favourable and that diversity in the workplace is not appreciated. And given it is said that job-seekers perceive and interpret signals communicated by firms as an expectation and they can motivate behaviour (Bird & Smith, 2005; Goldberg & Allen, 2008; Greening & Turban, 2000; Lievens & Highhouse, 2003; Palmer & Pomianek, 2007; Turban & Greening, 1997), those holding strong views on these may self-select out. Conversely, it could also be said that firms participating in these CSP activities but not creating awareness could be missing out on potentially good employees. By suggesting the absence of such CSP activity would ‘prevent’ or ‘deter’ employment pursuance, respondents were sending a strong message and proposing that job-seekers are primarily willing to identify with employers that demonstrate congruence. This was further emphasised in their comments where a key theme to emerge was the want for matching values and beliefs. A theoretical base for these findings and respondent views will be discussed in more depth later in this section.

**CSP element absence: Gender differences**

In an attempt to offer more insight into the impact of the absence of CSP elements, cross-tabulation against demographics was also conducted. This found that 68.3% of females indicated they would not apply for a job at a firm where the ‘treatment of women and minorities’ was perceived as unfavourable compared with 32% of their male counterparts. This finding is fitting with, as mentioned earlier, females ranking the importance of this element considerably more than males. Additionally, these findings are consistent with other attitudes displayed by females towards CSP in comparison to their male counterparts. That is to say females held stronger views than males when considering the importance of an organisation’s overall CSP and during the employment decision process. Further to this, they valued three out of five individual elements more than males, and were more likely to explore a firm’s CSP before applying for a position. These findings are in agreement with the likes of Greening and Turban (2000), Avery and Mckay (2006), Backhaus et al (2002), and Thomas and Wise (1999), and where
individual difference is offered as an explanation. However, this construct is complex and multi-dimensional and whereby a stereotypical proposal of individual difference may be further assisted in this instance by the insertion of person-organisation fit theory (Peterson, 2004). This is said seeing that females appear to indicate a more favourable assessment of employers that demonstrate congruence with personal needs, beliefs and values that offer equality, diversity, and equal opportunity within the workplace. Additionally, the study of Cheryl Freeman (2003), on recruiting for diversity, found that while males and females assign differing levels of importance to different organisational attributes, and that females exhibited greater preference towards perceived ‘feminine’ attributes (For example; friendly culture, diverse mix of colleagues, and caring employer), participants did not suggest that they wanted to work for an organisation with explicit gender attributes, and, in contrast to these findings and those of Ng and Burke (2005), only a small number said it was a key factor in their employment decision process. Freeman (2003) proposes this was due to a “generation of women bought up to believe that they are not only equal but that the world would treat them as such” (p. 73). Elkin et al (2004) add to this in suggesting there are distinct ‘masculine’ and ‘feminine’ social values and that white New Zealanders are above average on ‘masculinity’.

CSP element absence: Age differences

When cross-tabulation using the demographic of age was investigated, it was of particular interest to find that 80% of those 46+ years proposed they would not apply for a position where the CSP element ‘concern for the environment’ was absent, and this was almost twice that of the next closest group, 18-25 years at 45%. Furthermore, this age range, 46+ years, were also 10.5% higher than the next closest age group to propose the absence of the element ‘community relations’ at an organisation would deter them from applying, an element that otherwise holds little influence across any demographic in both this study and that of Greening and Turban (2000). While it should be recognised those 46+ years only constitute 9.4% of the sample population of this study, it is suggested they represent a much higher and increasingly vital proportion in the workforce (De Cieri & Kramer, 2007; Elkin et al., 2004). This age group’s high
regard for these two CSP elements may in part be because, as proposed by Sheahan (2006), they are looking towards a quality of work life, and whereby the ability to satisfy personal needs through their organisational experience is important (Fombrun, 1982), and therefore indicating the possibility of daily work related issues being less salient than those of a broader social and societal nature. Given that, as suggested by Elkin et al (2004), those over forty years of age will continue in the workforce for an extended period of time compared to their predecessors, and that they perceivably have considerable knowledge and experience and stability, firms wishing to recruit this job-seeker population may want to consider highlighting CSP activity efforts in these areas.

**CSP element absence: Ethnic Differences**

When viewing the cross-tabulation of CSP element absence and its impact on applying for a position against ethnicity, the category ‘Maori’, although a small proportion of the total sample population (8.2%), registered 100% as saying they would not apply for a position where the element ‘treatment of women and minorities’ was absent. Another notable finding was that no one (0%) of the group ‘European’ indicated that the absence in an organisation of the element ‘community relations’ would influence their decision to apply for a position there. These findings further emphasise that organisations looking to recruit and take advantage of the suggested benefits of a diverse workforce, and/or or target particular job-seeking populations, may want to pay particular attention to the types and form of CSP activities they display and undertake.

Therefore, if we consider that women and minority groups perceive signals differently than non minorities and men (Turban, 2001), and men may not particularly seek out firms strong in the area of treatment of women and minorities although firms delivering on this does not detract them from applying (Greening & Turban, 2000), this suggests that firms strong in this area could significantly benefit by not only larger but more diverse applicant pools. The reason why ‘no one’ from the European ethnic category said the absence of the CSP element ‘community relations’, the least influential of all CSP elements, would influence their decision to apply at a firm is unclear. However, as
suggested by Elkin et al (2004), this may be in part be due to cultural individualistic societal norms and values stereotypical of those from English speaking countries.

5.4.1. Why does the absence of CSP elements influence job-seekers?

As part of the intention of this study was to understand job-seeker motives, participants were asked for their opinions as to ‘why’ the absence of particular CSP elements would influence their decision not to apply for a position at a firm. The views offered to this were quite clear and the key theme to emerge was the need for ‘fit’ between personal values and beliefs and those of the organisation. This suggests three interlinked things. Firstly, the need for person-organisation fit; secondly, the desire to identify with firms that share similar views as the prospective employee’s own; thirdly, the endeavour to find an instrument to achieve personal needs and wants.

Other themes to emerge were:

- The desire for fair and equal treatment.
  - It is worth noting that while this theme indicates an association to ‘organisational justice’, this theory will not be directly assessed in the course of this discussion.
- To be associated with organisations that produce quality products and services.
- To be associated with organisations that had a good reputation.
- To work for an organisation you can be proud of, and trust and believe in.
- To be associated with organisations that are committed to environmental sustainability.
  - It is worth noting that while the desirability for firms displaying environmental concern came through somewhat strongly in comments, this is in contrast to other findings where it was ranked four out of five for importance against other CSP elements, and nine out of ten when evaluated with both CSP elements and job factors.

Drawing on person-organisation fit theory it has been said that “when given a choice a person activated by a particular need or set of needs may be expected to seek out the environments that offer fulfilment of these needs, and avoid environments that stifle
such fulfilment” (Murray, 1938, as cited in Ng & Burke, 2005, p. 1197). Literature suggests that individuals make an assessment of fit between personal values and the values of the organisation that in turn influences job choice decisions (Albinger & Freeman, 2000; Gatewood et al., 1993; Judge & Bretz, 1992; Ng & Burke, 2005; Turban & Greening, 1997). Additionally, Judge and Cable (1997) propose that values are intrinsic and enduring perspectives of what is right and wrong, and Elkin et al (2004) suggest that values are clear and stable beliefs that can provide career anchors, and depending on their conviction can influence perception, motivation, and behaviour. Given this, and the results discussed previously and participant comments, it can then be said that job-seeker and organisational value congruence is not only an important attractor to job-seekers but can be influential in motivation towards job pursuance.

The opinions offered by participants in this study tie in with Victor Vroom’s (1966) discussion on expectancy theory, and where he poses the concept that job-seekers’ in evaluating the attractiveness of an employer consider the instrumentality of the organisation in achieving personal goals. This is to say that job-seekers in wanting to associate and identify with firms that produce superior goods and services, practice environmental sustainability, and afford pride and trust and belief in, are in quest of an instrument to satisfy personal goals and needs such as fulfilment, self-enhancement, and increased self-concept. Furthermore, participant opinions somewhat find agreement with Fombrun and Shanley (1990), who while proposing that a firm’s espoused CSP are signals and symbolic of the firm’s values and norms, also tell that job-seekers are reluctant to associate and identify with firms that do not exhibit attributes such as prestigious or reputable products or services.

Social identity theory posits the desire for self-categorisation and membership as an enabler towards satisfaction of personal needs such as pride, self-definition, self-concept, happiness, enhanced self-image, increased self-esteem, well being, and personal satisfaction, and whereby such membership may be seen as an extension of one’s self and an assumed common identity (Ashforth & Mael, 1989; Bergami & Bagozzi, 2000; Brammer, 2007; Marin & Ruiz, 2007; Turban & Greening, 1997). This understanding of social identity theory appears apt to this study as themes derived from
respondent opinions articulate that job-seekers covet to identify with firms in order to fulfil both emotional and social needs. It is perceived that in seeking to achieve this, both intrinsic and extrinsic rewards are sought. This is said as; while self image, self-concept and self esteem are related to the view one has of one’s self, they can also affect, and be affected by, the view others hold of individuals. Subsequently, this suggests that by wanting to connect with what is subjectively perceived as a desirable employer because of their espoused CSP attributes and seeming congruent values, job-seekers not only have a need for self approval but that of their peers and society. It is also felt that in attainment of these wants through identification, job-seekers will also afford attachment, whereby an affinity and oneness with the firm may occur lending itself to further fulfillment. Ng and Burke (2005) add to this notion in proposing that an individual’s internal needs and organisational attributes, such as CSP, are key drivers in the job choice process. Furthermore, respondent views exhibit a desire to define one’s self by association of shared goals, which also fits with the concept of social identity theory.

Organisations that fulfil the needs of job-seekers as described above can expect to be rewarded also, as literature suggests that individuals who identify with groups exhibit greater involvement, commitment, attachment, engagement, and loyalty (Ashforth & Mael, 1989; Bergami & Bagozzi, 2000; Brammer, 2007; Marin & Ruiz, 2007; Turban & Greening, 1997).

5.4.2. Why is ‘concern for the environment’ and ‘community relations’ least important?

Throughout this study the CSP elements ‘community relations’ and ‘concern for the environment’ have consistently held modest favour. The researcher believes a briefs rationale should be offered that may in turn leave the door open for possible future research. Especially seeing as it is felt this finding is somewhat surprising given the media hype, and heated debate and attention given to environmental concerns. Adding to this quandary, and in stark contrast to this current study where ‘concern for the environment’ was ranked nine out of ten for importance in a potential employer, Aiman-
Smith et al (1999) when investigating organisational attraction and job pursuance found when it came to ‘attraction’ a firm’s ecological standings were of most importance, followed by employment relationships, and then remuneration. Conversely, this order was reversed when viewed by actual job pursuance. However, other research such as that of Bauer and Aiman-Smith (1996) who propose that positive environmental activity positively influences firm attraction, and Judge and Bretz (1992) where job-seeker perceptions are also said to be influenced by a firm’s environmental policies lend support to the supposed importance of this CSP element. Having said this, it is unclear if this initial attraction converts to actual job pursuance and acceptance, and the study of Bauer and Aiman-Smith (1996) did not measure job-seeker attraction to concern for the environment against any equivalent organisational attribute.

While firms displaying affirmative environmental policies may be attractive to job-seekers in isolation and there may be social benefit, the voice of attraction is possibly a catch cry of the time viewed with public scrutiny, prudence and peer pressure that fades when job-seekers are faced with individual choice and the reality of multiple influencing factors whereby those attributes that are perceivably of more direct impact and fulfil priority needs may take precedence.

5.5. Do job-seekers actually want to know a firm’s CSP?: When, and where do they go to find it?

Questions 17-20 of this study were linked in that participants were quizzed as to:

- What stage in the recruitment process they would like to know a firm’s CSP?
- If they would explore an organisation’s CSP before applying for a position there?
- Where would they look to find out about it?
- And whether it is important for an organisation to state its CSP therein?

These questions are of meaning and consequence as it is suggested that firms are not only in need of a point of difference so as to attract quality job-seekers and win the talent war (Holland et al., 2007), but also in need of knowledge of how best to effectively
Responses to these questions were very clear in that:

- 61.2% of participants would like to know of a firm’s CSP before applying for a position, and this was 36.5% higher than any of the other four options offered.
- 87.1% of participants expected to be able to find this information on the firm’s website, and 95% of them further indicated that it was important that it is there.
- Over 50% of all respondents indicate that a firm’s CSP should be declared in job advertisements and general advertising.
- 54% of participants indicated they would explore a firm’s CSP before applying, and that in addition to the firm’s website they would gain this knowledge by asking friends and current employees.

While these findings suggest that firm’s wanting to maximise the implications of CSP as a possible point of difference should have current employees onside and involved, state their CSP position and activity in job advertisements, general advertising and foremost through their website, of interest was that an additional 35.3% of respondents were undecided if they would explore a firm’s CSP before applying. It is proposed by the researcher that these ‘undecided’ may be swayed toward a firm that is proactive in signalling their CSP and does not leave it to chance that job-seekers will source information for themselves given that, as proposed by Bhattacharya et al (2008) and Sen (2006), awareness of organisational CSP activities is central to gaining best returns. This proposal is afforded additional impetus since 83% of participants indicate that they would prefer to work for an organisation that has a good CSP record and 84.7% suggest that CSP is at the very least an ‘important’ aspect in the employment decision process.

The impact of a firm’s website on job-seekers

In taking the previously mentioned findings on board, it is important to acknowledge the research of scholars such as Holland et al (2007) and Rubaii-Barret (2007) who
propose the recognition of firm’s websites as a pertinent avenue to express organisational values and recruit new employees, and that job-seekers increasingly use blogs and independent websites to find out about organisations. Goldberg and Allen (2008) in their study on the impact of firm websites on employee recruitment, propose that websites have three intentions; to engage interest and attention, to reduce uncertainty by satisfying job and organisational attribute enquiry, and to influence the job-seeker pursuance decision process. Their findings show that messages purveyed by a firm’s website can serve as a positive indicator of organisational attributes by engaging positive job-seeker attitudes and favorable perceptions, and consequently signal its overall suitability based on subjective interpretation and individual needs. These writings are fitting with the fact that participants in this study overwhelmingly believe firms should state their CSP position on their website. What’s more, they are of the opinion that this would then offer an insight into what the organisation might be like to work for, and therefore allow for identification with the firm and evaluation as to a fit and congruence of goals, values, and beliefs, from which to make informed decisions.

Goldberg and Allen (2008) suggest that in attracting potential employees a firm’s website acts as a ‘recruiter’ not just a tool, therefore heightening the importance of getting it right. Having said this, Arpan (2005) when discussing the psychological process of CSP on job-seekers, argues that while individuals are more responsive to firms that display similar values, online declarations create summary impressions leading to interest needing more foundation so as to make memory judgments and final decisions. This was highlighted in comments made by participants and their expressive reservation at believing everything that an organisation had to say about itself and would therefore utilise internet search engines such as Google to source additional information from news articles, blogs, and the like.

By inferring that firms may be less than honest, or prone to puffery, exaggeration, or playing down of situations, reinforces, as proposed by Sorescu, Shankar, and Kushwaha (2007), the need to be able to deliver on promises, especially as it has been said that such statements may be perceived as a commitment by the organisation (Goldberg & Allen, 2008). Interestingly, this suggestion by Goldberg and Allen (2008) of
‘commitment’ is supported by the fact that 64.7% of participants in this study perceive a firm’s espoused CSP as part of the employment commitment by the organisation. Furthermore, the concerns by participants that an organisation’s words and actions may be different are reflected in the writings of Waddock and Smith (2000a) where they propose that some firms display large gaps between their stated values and their daily practices. Sorescu et al (2007) add to this by suggesting that the repercussions for ‘false’ signals can be magnified if proven. Drawing on the writings of Fombrun and Shanley (1990) the researcher proposes that firms participating in making false signals of positive CSP activity may gain increased job-seeker attraction initially, however this may be a short lived pay-off as the truth is learnt and positive attraction turns to long term notoriety. With this in mind, the importance of job advertisement content is given added impetus as it was suggested by Feldman, Bearden and Hardesty (2006) that they offer signals conveying information that can act as a public relations tool and differentiate one firm from another. Given this, and the results of this current study, the question must be asked again why only 2.4% of text in job advertisements found in America’s largest internet recruitment site Monster.Com is dedicated to CSP (Backhaus, 2004).

The findings of this study confirm the worth in the mode of initiatives undertaken by organisations such as IBM and Microsoft in relation to CSP promotional activity (Greening & Turban, 2000). Moreover, this reinforces that firms can and should employ job advertisements, promotional material, and their own company website as instruments to showcase themselves and signal the attributes of the organisation that can then be interpreted by job-seekers to evaluate suitability. This is to say firms may be able to effectively exploit CSP initiatives and attract job-seekers that express a desire to identify and align themselves with an employer of a similar ilk by positioning themselves via their website and general advertising.

This view is in support of literature, and reiterates respondent views where it is proposed that firms displaying their CSP position enable job-seekers to gain an insight into what a firm might be like to work for, and therefore make informed decisions based on the perceived fit between personal and organisational values, beliefs, and goals,
without needlessly wasting time, money, and energy. The explicit mention by participants of not wanting to waste ‘time, money and energy’ suggests that job-seekers are just as enthusiastic as employers in not wanting to expend resources unnecessarily.

These findings once again suggest an association with social identity and signalling theory, as they imply that job-seekers would endeavour to seek out employer indicators and interpret and evaluate them for a perceived fit and congruence with personal needs, values and beliefs. Further to this, it can then be said that job-seekers are shaping impressions of the organisation (Zagenczyk, 2004) in an attempt at self-categorisation and connect, and to find those firms with common goals and that offer fulfillment, enhanced self-definition, and a sense of belonging.

Demographic differences and exploration of CSP

In reference to exploring a firm’s CSP before applying for a position, this study showed that females are 14.1% more likely than males, those aged between 36-45 years are 21% more likely than any other age range, and of the ethnic groups measured those aligning to European and Asian ethnicity were by far the least likely to explore. This result by ‘European’ also fits with them placing least importance of all ethnicities on the overall CSP displayed by a firm and its importance in the employment decision making process. However, this same group ranked highest in telling that a firm’s CSP forms part of its commitment to them. This suggests to the researcher that while European job-seekers may not be overly concerned with establishing the overall CSP of a firm, or exploring a firm’s CSP before applying for a position there, and nor do they necessarily rate CSP as highly as other ethnic groups in their initial employment process, however if a firm has signaled a position on CSP, then they are answerable to it. This is to say that this ethnic group appears to take an organisation’s espoused CSP at face value and as being true and therefore needing adherence.

5.6. What does a firm’s CSP mean to job-seekers?

Although already briefly touched on, it is important to this study to investigate the justification of ‘if’ and ‘why’ an organisation’s CSP may offer an insight into what they
would be like to work for, and then to extend this scrutiny to exploring the rationale behind the perception that a firm's espoused CSP may be perceived as a commitment towards job-seekers.

When this was put to participants the results were conclusive whereby not only did 74.1% indicate that a firm's espoused CSP signified what they would be like to work for, but 64.7% said that this would in turn afford a commitment toward them. These results suggest two important things. Firstly, the espoused CSP of a firm serves as a signal that job-seekers interpret and then use to form an expectation of organisational attributes such as culture, values, norms, beliefs, and philosophies. Secondly, in taking these expectations to be true, job-seekers perceive the firm and those within it to be committed to their upholding.

Organisational signalling to job-seekers

The view by participants in this study that a firm's CSP is an indication of what they would be like to work for is consistent with the findings of both Turban and Greening (1997) and Greening and Turban (2000), and other literature (Goldberg & Allen, 2008; Lievens & Highhouse, 2003; Rynes & Bretz Jr, 1991; Saks & McCarthy, 2006). Furthermore, there is a general consensus that job-seekers generate perceptions of potential employers based on incomplete information sent (signaled), received, and interpreted and assessed subjectively as to its relevance (Bird & Smith, 2005; Greening & Turban, 2000; Turban & Greening, 1997).

It is said that firms can use signals as a means of expressing idealist social notions (Bird & Smith, 2005) that job-seekers then interpret as an indication of organisational characteristics. Job-seekers who find such notions to be attractive, and congruent with their own needs, will be attracted to said firms and then use this 'incomplete' information as an indicator of how the organisation can be expected to behave. For example, if a firm's espoused CSP activities include supporting the charitable organisation Plunket (an organisation that provides support services for the wellbeing of children under five), it could be perceived that this is a signal that the organisation places importance on family values, and whereby they may for instance act empathetically towards
employees wishing to take time off to care for their sick children, or as with the television broadcaster TVNZ, provide an in-house daycare facility. What’s more, as was shown in a study on ‘work-family balance’ by Bourhis and Mekkaoui (2010) activities such as employer supported child care are considered attractive. Given this, it could then be suggested that CSP activity such as this and that can perceivably be intended to signal a targeted audience such as those with young families or mothers wishing to re-join the workforce, are both symbolic and instrumental as they communicate a message that in turn could stimulate interest and/or behaviour. A recognisable example of a New Zealand firm to seemingly exploit its CSP activity to good advantage is Fisher and Paykel New Zealand. The CSP activity undertaken by this firm includes:

- Promoting themselves as environmentally conscious. For example: they recycle 25,000 used appliances annually; and in 2008-2009 reduced their co2 emissions by 32,000kg.
- Active involvement in the community. For example: sponsor of New Zealand women’s domestic and international netball; and is the main sponsor for young scientist of the year.
- Exhibiting a value for good employee relations. For example: participate in employee profit share and share ownership.
(Fisher&Paykel, 2010).

The researcher believes this firm effectively employs its CSP activity as its core accepted business in New Zealand is that of producing innovate home appliances such as washing machines. Given this, by sponsoring women’s netball they are targeting support from those traditionally perceived as their customer base and indicating they hold family values, while in sponsoring ‘young scientist of the year’ they are potentially attracting innovative and quality driven job-seekers and promoting themselves as an employer of choice. Additionally, it is perceivable that Fisher and Paykel are soliciting ‘nationalistic pride’ by sponsoring both domestic and international netball competitions. Furthermore, Fisher and Paykel create added awareness of their activities through promotional material, their website and in stated values.
In considering the example of Fisher and Paykel and respondent opinions related to the rationale behind the interpretation of espoused CSP, it is felt that the writings of Goldberg and Allen (2008) and Lievens and Highhouse (2003) afford an amount of clarity where they propose that signals sent by firms are intended to engage attention, create interest, reduce uncertainty about a firm, offer approval of its attributes, and influence behaviour. Sutherland, Torricelli, and Karg (2002) add to this when suggesting that organisational branding, the larger construct under which CSP can be said to fall, constitutes signals of expectation that in turn equate to a “sellers promise” (p. 14). Ultimately however, the effectiveness of any CSP signals sent can be perceivably be measured by the reaction, or behaviour, it solicits (Palmer & Pomianek, 2007). Hence firms displaying a positive CSP record would hope and anticipate these efforts transferred into a positive image creating attention and action amongst job-seekers and that culminates in larger and higher quality applicant pools.

**CPS signals fashion expectation of commitment**

The investigation of the concept that CSP forms part of a firm’s commitment to employees was not a primary goal of this study. However the author feels this finding is of considerable interest in its own right, and it will therefore be briefly discussed. By stating the belief that a firm’s espoused CSP forms commitment, participants in this study are solidifying the image generated by signals received from the firm, or as Arpen (2005) proposed, they are converting summary impressions to memory judgments. It is felt that in order for this to happen job-seekers have given espoused CSP indicators further scrutiny for assessment of congruence with their own personal values, goals and needs, and organisational suitability. Therefore it is proposed that this deduction of commitment can in part be explained as an enactment of a belief constituting the beginning stages of a psychological, or more aptly, ideology-infused, contract with the organisation. For the purpose of this discussion the use of the term ‘psychological contract’ will equally refer to the notion of an ‘ideology infused contract’ although it should be acknowledged that there are distinct differences. The decision to infer both forms of contract as one in the same was made as the area of study pertaining to ideological contracts is relatively recent and available research is limited, and it has
been said ideological contracts “resemble aspects of both relational and transactional contracts” (p. 576) as determined by a psychological contract (Thompson & Bunderson, 2003).

The suggestion of the influence and presence of a psychological contract in this study has been introduced as it is said to be an informal contract implied by both written and unwritten policy that defines behavioural expectations (Robbins et al., 2001; Stone, 2002; Thompson & Bunderson, 2003; Wood et al., 2004). It is suggested that this form of agreement incorporates trust and can integrate personal goals, and act as a motivator in forming relationships (Nel et al., 2004). When discussing psychological contracts in terms of an expected exchange, Wood et al (2004) suggest that “when the individual is being recruited by the organisation this exchange is an anticipated one” (p. 27) whereby inducements are offered to satisfy an individual's needs and are set within the larger construct of social exchange theory where material and non material contributions may play a role (O'Donohue & Nelson, 2007). Greenberg and Barron (2008) tell that during activities of social exchange, influences and inducements such as a ‘promise’ of benefit are made to a targeted person or audience. However, it should be noted that both psychological contracts and exchange theory are founded on reciprocity. The organisational rewards of such undertakings and exchanges are highlighted in the writings of Peloza et al (2009) where firms who’s CSP activity included supporting employee volunteerism was said to signal to stakeholders that the firm was actively committed to a worthy cause and whereby reciprocation of commitment by employees towards the organisation and acknowledgement as an employer of choice followed.

Comments fielded by participants support this understanding and the perceived undertaking of a psychological contract as they tell that a firm’s espoused CSP creates an image and sets an expectation of how a potential employee would then be treated and what they could expect, as it was seemingly an expression of the firm’s integrity and offered assurance there was a fit of values and beliefs. Furthermore, additional comments by participants proposed that a firm’s CSP shaped an integral part of the employer-employee arrangement that in turn set an expectation and foundation for their
relationship, and attainment of reciprocal commitment. This reiteration of ‘commitment’ and ‘expectation’ cements the researcher’s attention once again on the belief that job-seekers may perceive signals relating to an organisation’s espoused CSP as part of their psychological contract. It should be noted however, that amongst the views offered by respondents on CSP affording commitment once again it was remarked that there was need to be aware of spin.

This suggests an element of doubt and lack of trust in corporate intentions, possibly brought about by experience and/or headlines of past corporate misgivings and behaviours such as the international infamous 1984 Union Carbide disaster in India, and the 1989 Exxon Valdes oil spill in Alaska. Whatever the reason for reservation these views emphasise the need for firms to live up to the signals they project. This view is given impetus as it has been proposed by Robinson and Rousseau (1994) that violations occurring of perceived breach of obligation and promise and formed by way of psychological contract can generate distrust, dissatisfaction, and even dissolution of the relationship. While the scholars Robinson and Rousseau (1994) were referring to the post employment environment, the researcher suggests that it is just as conceivable for such resentment to occur prior to employment. For example, a job-seeker who is also a multiple stakeholder, such as a consumer, intends to peruse employment with a firm on premise of their espoused and perceived commitment to a congruent value such as ‘product quality’ discovers this is not the case and this CSP element was in fact absent, and to use the words of participants, ‘it was spin’. As a result, it is conceivable this violation leads to the job-seeker not only self-selecting out but also ceasing to be a consumer of the firm’s products or services. This notion is reinforced by Thompson and Bunderson (2003) in their research of ideological currency and violation of principle, whereby they propose breach of espoused CSP as an expansion on scope and criteria beyond personal mistreatment that “may result from organisational statements and actions that threaten the espoused cause, even when they have no bearing on how the employee is treated personally” (p. 576). It is also worth noting that these authors draw an association between violation of ideology and social identity theory in that violation of values and beliefs threaten an individual’s self-concept.
While the concept of a *psychological contract* has drawn increased attention for a number of years it has typically been discussed as ‘transactional and relational’ and orientated towards job factors such as remuneration, training and development, and advancement (O'Donohue & Nelson, 2007). However, recently the idea of an ‘ideology currency’ has been added to this (O'Donohue & Nelson, 2007; Thompson & Bunderson, 2003) (see Appendix 4). Thompson and Bunderson’s (2003) definition of *ideology-infused contracts* as “credible commitments to pursue a valued cause or principle (not limited to self interest) that are implicitly exchanged at the nexus of the individual-organisation relationship” (p. 574) assists to explain the belief by participants in this study that a firm’s espoused CSP elements are a commitment to them as job-seekers.

Firms may attempt to evoke the concept of an ideology-infused contract by exploiting their espoused CSP elements as a means to connect. This is said as it has been proposed that firms adopting a particular cause are trying to attract job-seekers by signalling these are the values held by the organisation and consequently appeal to the altruistic nature of people seeking this form of fulfillment (Thompson & Bunderson, 2003).

It is felt that the concept of ideology-infused contract being linked to pre employment and organisational attraction is an area that warrants further research.

### 5.7. The CSP publicity debate: Which impacts more, positive or negative?

Participants in this study were asked if positive and negative publicity of a firm’s CSP would influence their decision to apply for a position. This line of questioning was an attempt to extend the research of Greening and Turban (2000) and Luce et al (2001) which offer mixed views of the rationale and outcomes of positive espoused CSP. Greening and Turban (2000) are in support of other scholars when they found that the positive espoused CSP of an organisation was positively related to firm attraction (Bauer & Aiman-Smith, 1996; Belt & Paolillo, 1982; Gatewood et al., 1993). On the other hand Luce et al (2001) posited and found that this attraction was due to familiarity, and proposed therefore both negative and positive organisational CSP exposure was positively related to firm attraction by way of familiarity. Findings of this current study
offer insights into aspects of this debate that are conclusive in one way but inconclusive in another as 54.1% of participants indicated that they would be influenced by negative publicity, and 65.9% indicated they would be influenced by positive publicity.

The orientation of this question was not set towards investigating the impact of firm familiarity but rather the determination of whether ‘positive’ or ‘negative’ publicity of a firm’s CSP was more influential on job-seekers and their intentions towards employment pursuance and self selection. These results, albeit possibly not conclusive, indicate positive publicity of a firm’s CSP as more influential than negative on job-seeker intention to pursue a position and is in support of the findings of Greening and Turban (2000). This result was somewhat unexpected as other literature has proposed that negative news of a firm has a disproportionate impact compared to positive (Folkes & Kamins, 1999; Kamins, Folkes, & Perner, 1997; Mizerski, 1982; Reuber & Fischer, 2010). This disparity may in part be because this study was not scenario-based, such as that of Sen (2006), and whereby participants could form an imagery stimulus. Therefore, Luce et al (2001) may be correct when suggesting that awareness generated towards a firm by way of its CSP and the overall size of the activity, positive or negative, creates a familiarity with the firm that may serve as a signal which job-seekers then interpret and use to decide on suitability as an employer dependent on individual needs. This was in part recognised both in the comments of participants where it was suggested that one bad act does not condemn a whole organisation completely, and in the high percentage of participants that selected the ‘unsure’ option. What’s more, it has also been said that stakeholders can be relatively forgiving when ‘flawed’ firms are seen to acknowledge their misgivings and take corrective measures (Reuber & Fischer, 2010). However, the results of this current study do show conclusively that be it positive or negative publicity of a firm’s CSP, the attention will have an impact on organisational attractiveness and job-seeker intentions. Having said this, the finding of 83.5% of respondents indicating that they would prefer to work for an organisation that had a positive reputation for CSP lends itself to positive publicity being more influential. Additionally, it has been noted that an organisation’s image relates to its reputation, and that a strong reputation is appealing and arises as a reaction to a firm’s activities.
reflective of their identity and has influence on how this identity is perceived and interpreted (Wiedmann & Buxel, 2005).

From a theoretical standpoint it is felt that these results may exhibit an association to both social identity and signalling theory. This is said for three reasons, and the belief that whatever the CSP publicity direction, positive or negative, it will have an influence on job-seekers. Firstly, it is perceived that job-seekers will subjectively access and use the publicity of a firm’s CSP as signals and determinants for their future actions and behaviour such as self-selection, based on personal goals, needs, and, as proposed by Bird and Smith (2005), pre-existing preferences. Secondly, job-seekers will assess CSP publicity around firms and determine if there is a fit with self image, values, beliefs, and opportunity for pride, attachment, and the like. Thirdly, it is perceived that job-seekers will draw on such publicity as a determinant for self-categorisation, self-enhancement, and whether or not they can share a common identity. Furthermore, it has also been said that job-seeker intention to peruse positions at firms is derived from perception of social appropriateness of organisational behaviour (Highhouse et al., 2003).

5.8. Do CSP elements have a place alongside traditional recruitment factors?

An important component to the purpose of this research is to consider the relative importance of CSP in contrast to traditional job factors as it translates to organisational attraction and the job choice process of job-seekers. Therefore, the third section of the questionnaire attached to this study added five pre determined traditional job factors to the equation.

These job factors were ranked and evaluated by participants separately at first, and then in conjunction with the five CSP elements. In doing this the order of importance for job factors independent of CSP elements could first be established, and since respondents had been asked why the rated one job factor over another there was an opportunity to gain insight into the motive behind this ordering. Next, by offering both job factors and CSP elements in conjunction, the opportunity arose to establish not only
their order of combined importance as inclusive package/bundle, but if and where CSP would fit amid what have been considered customary and traditional organisational recruitment aspects. Furthermore, this advanced cross-referencing endeavours to reveal whether CSP is actually important to job-seekers.

**Which traditional job factors are most important?**

Replies from respondents in this study resulted in establishing that the order of importance of the five job factors offered was:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Factor Order of Importance and Rating Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Pay, compensation, and benefits – 2.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Challenging and rewarding work – 2.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Training and development – 2.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Career advancement – 3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Job security – 3.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is worth noting that when these job factors were viewed by frequency as opposed to rating average, ‘challenging and rewarding work’ was considered as most important and ‘pay, compensation, and benefits’ second. However, this rating average ranking order is consistent with previous research (Aiman-Smith et al., 2001; Bauer & Aiman-Smith, 1996; K. M. Thomas & Wise, 1999) and primarily suggests the presence of motivational and related theory.

There are numerous views on motivation and Robbins et al (2001) propose that it as "the processes that account for an individual’s intensity, direction and persistence of effort towards attaining a goal" (p. 772). Others to offer rationale to motivation and its lasting effects include the likes of scholars such as Frederick Hertzberg who suggests that motivation is intrinsic and founded on internal desires to achieve a goal (Nel et al., 2004), whereby such goals can be considered the satisfier, or motivator, associated with the motivation (Wood et al., 2004). On the other hand Abraham Maslow, as alluded
to earlier, proposes that individuals are motivated by five sets of hierarchical need (physiological, safety, social, esteem, and self actualisation) that are actioned in order, and from what he perceived as low order needs through to high order needs (Greenberg & Baron, 2008).

Drawing on literature and comments made by respondents of this study it is perceived that as an employee, getting paid what you think you are worth is important, and can accordingly be linked to the satisfaction of ‘lower order needs’ such as food and shelter (Robbins et al., 2001; Wood et al., 2004). Conversely, challenging and rewarding work may afford intrinsic motivation that in turn lends itself to personal satisfaction, a sense of achievement, and possibly self-actualisation, and can consequently also be linked to fulfillment of needs, albeit this time those of a ‘higher order’ (Robbins et al., 2001; Wood, 1991). Having said this, the ranking of ‘job security’ as the fifth, and least, most important job factor appears out of sequence. This finding may be a combination of workplace environmental factors such as several successive years of experiencing a tight labour market, a workforce generation where organisational loyalty is less prominent and job-hopping is more accepted than before (Dwan, 2004; Holland et al., 2007; Tulgan, 1997), and an effect of the significant labour relations restructuring that occurred in New Zealand between 1980 and 2000 (Elkin et al., 2004), as well as a study design factor created by the forced ranking nature of the question.

Having said this, comments from respondents suggested that one job factor may influence and be influenced by another. For instance, ‘training and development’ may lead to ‘challenging and rewarding work’ and ‘career advancement’, which may in turn lend itself to additional ‘pay, compensation, and benefits’ and ‘job security’. In considering that job factors have habitually been the defining organisational aspect and measure from which job-seekers have chosen one firm over another, of particular interest when viewing the statistical results of job factor order of importance was how little variance there was between rating averages overall. This was further highlighted as participant views proposed that given a choice all job factor options offered were important. This suggests that job-seekers value these core job factors relatively equally, and therefore given the proposal by Lievens and Highhouse (2003) and Thomas and
Wise (1999) that jobs and organisations within the same industry can be seen to be very similar, further emphasis is added to the need for organisational differentiation so as to attain increased job-seeker attention and reach ‘preferred employer’ status. The question is then posed; can CSP and its elements fill this void and need for organisational differentiation by offering a point of difference?

CSP and traditional job factors: Is there room for both?

As previously mentioned, following an independent evaluation of traditional job factors they were offered in conjunction with the five CSP elements formerly assessed. Drawing on this collective package, respondents' were thus asked to rank their top seven preferences in order of importance in a potential employer. The results of this found the order of importance to be:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Order of Importance: Combined CSP Elements and Job Factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Pay, compensation, and benefits – 2.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Challenging and rewarding work – 3.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Employee relations – 3.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Training and development – 3.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Career advancement – 4.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Job security – 4.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Product quality – 4.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Treatment of women and minorities – 4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Concern for the environment – 5.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Community relations – 5.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen, while participants were asked to rank their top seven the researcher has decided to display all ten so as to allow contrast and discussion, and given that all factors and elements were represented in respondent selections to some extent. This result demonstrates that the job factors ‘pay, compensation and benefits' and
‘challenging and rewarding work’ were first and second most important respectively, and the CSP element ‘employee relations’ was third. The only other CSP element to rank in the top seven was ‘product quality’ at position number seven. While it can be said that the top two rankings of what job-seekers value most in a potential employer out of the combined list are in agreement with the top two rankings when job factors were evaluated independently, and as recognised by previous research (Aiman-Smith et al., 2001; Bauer & Aiman-Smith, 1996; K. M. Thomas & Wise, 1999), it can also be said that the two CSP elements that ranked within this top seven are also those which were ranked first and second most valued in a potential employer when the CSP elements were evaluated independently, and is consistent with the findings of Greening and Turban (2000).

Whilst this finding demonstrates that traditional job factors dominate what job-seekers value most in a potential employer, it also suggests that all things being equal between organisations and jobs, CSP elements can add value to the overall package, and a possible point of difference. Furthermore, it is felt that the words of Harry Emerson Fosdick are appropriate: “Men will work hard for money; they will work harder for other men. But men will work hardest of all when they are dedicated to a cause” (as cited in Thompson & Bunderson, 2003, p. 571).

Previous research has separately identified in job-seekers the importance of job factors like pay as a recurring theme (Aiman-Smith et al., 2001; K. M. Thomas & Wise, 1999) and a preference for socially responsible employers (Backhaus et al., 2002; Carroll, 1999; Coldwell, Billsberry, van Meurs, & Marsh, 2008; Dennis, 2008; Greening & Turban, 2000; Turban & Greening, 1997). However, it has been difficult finding any substantial research which has investigated both job factors and alternative organisational attributes such as CSP elements simultaneously while also identifying and distinguishing between the two and using consistent variables, which would allow a comprehensive contrast to the findings of this study. Consequently, this is definitely an area that could benefit from further research.
Nonetheless, these results demonstrate that organisational attributes that elicit social attitude and are more removed from the direct impact of the work environment (For example: personal values towards concern for the environment and community) hold less weight than traditional job factors and those CSP aspects linked to direct consequence and having a direct relationship to daily work life. On the other hand, this order of importance appears to demonstrate a seeming lack of fear of unemployment and a comfort in pursuing fulfillment of other needs. This is said as ‘job security’ ranked as 6th and ‘challenging and rewarding work’ ranked 2nd, and can be said is a view stereotypical of generation Y, who have endured a prolonged period of low unemployment and high prosperity (Woodruffe, 2009).

Another possible, and maybe more fitting, rationale for this order of importance can be found in the writings of Elkin et al (2004) where they propose that while salary remuneration is important, ‘New Zealanders’ are less concerned about job security and more concerned about balance and intrinsic satisfaction. Furthermore, even though remuneration is shown to be of very high importance, firms should not take this as being a deal maker, since as proposed by Woodruffe (2009) “few flock to an otherwise bad employer just because it pays well” (p. 33), and given this is one of the easiest inducement others can match, retention may then become the issue not attraction. Additionally, Maslow proposes that money operates as a means to accomplish other needs (Nel et al., 2004), a view alluded to in participants’ comments when they tell that remuneration is a means to maintain their lifestyle and fulfil commitments. Further to this, a study conducted by Cable and Turban (2003) found that job-seekers will accept lower wages to work for firms with good reputations, to which CSP is a component (Belt & Paolillo, 1982). And, while job-seekers may be initially attracted by the offer of high salaries, Aiman-Smith et al (2001) propose that this attraction does not equate to acceptance.

When participants in this study were quizzed on why their top two selections were of importance amongst the more recurring views offered were that: they have a direct effect; they provided motivation, satisfaction, fulfillment, and a sense of pride; there is a need to fulfil commitments; there was a need to look towards employability not just
employment; there is a desire to work for organisations that support and recognise personal growth, development, and achievement; there is a need for fit with personal values; and they set a foundation for stability and a long-term relationship and mutual success. These attitudes suggest the desire by job-seekers to identify and have a sense of belongingness with firms that have an alignment with personal beliefs and values, and that will enable them to attain and satisfy particular and specific needs. However, these views also suggest that job-seekers do not see this as a one way street and organisations are set to gain engagement, contribution to organisational success, and commitment. Based on this, merit is found in the argument of NG and Burke (2005) that job-seekers are as much concerned about picking the right organisation as the right job.

It should also be noted that comments made by participants proposed that both job factors and CSP elements were of importance and the line that distinguished the two was at times blurred. This adds emphasis to the subjectivity involved in deciding what factor or element is more important, and that such choices may be based on the strength and value of one need over another at the time.

5.9. What part does CSP play in the overall employment decision process of job-seekers?

As stated at the outset, an essential component of this study was to discover if espoused organisational CSP really is important and relevant to job-seekers during the ‘overall employment decision process’. As has been outlined, when this question was put to participants the response was a resounding yes, with 84.7% saying it was ‘very important’ or ‘important’ and only 3.5% of respondents said that CSP was ‘not very important’ during the employment decision process and no one declared it was ‘not important at all’.

This result indicates that even though traditional job factors are in general perceived to be more important to job-seekers than CSP elements, if an individual has to choose between two otherwise equal positions a firm’s espoused CSP may be the defining dynamic. Having said this, and while it can be said that high achievers have more job choice, and therefore are able to be more discerning in what they seek in an employer,
these results suggest that the desirability of CSP as a consideration in the employment decision process is not restricted to just the ‘cream of the crop.’

Additionally, these findings offer support the proposal by Turban and Greening (1997) that firms displaying positive CSP can expect larger applicant pools from which to select. Also, these results reveal that job-seekers desire to work for organisations that address perceived organisational obligations and societal concerns to a point it could appear as an expectation.

In an attempt to explore this further a supplementary and separate cross-tabulation was ran against participant employment situations, where it was found that those currently seeking employment rated CSP highest of all groups, while those currently employed were the only category to hold a neutral view or suggest that it was not important. This may suggest three things of those currently seeking employment in relation to CSP: firstly, these job-seekers may be holding out for employment that is congruent with their goals, needs, beliefs and values; secondly, being in the job market does not mean one has to compromise one’s values; and third, some job-seekers may have unrealistic expectations of employers.

When viewing these results from a theoretical perspective social identity theory offers an explanation aligning job-seekers as searching for self-definition and displaying a need for self concept. Furthermore, Greening and Turban (2000) suggest that job-seekers are attracted to firms with similar belief systems as their own. Sen (2006) adds to this by proposing that a firm’s CSP activity exposes its character which stakeholders then identify with due to overlap of their own self-identity and self-definition. Given this, it can then be said that job-seekers will seek congruence and extension of their personal values and beliefs (Chatterji et al., 2009) and attempt to self-categorise, attach and assume a common identity with firms signalling such similarity (Bergami & Bagozzi, 2000) in an attempt to fulfil personal needs (Bhattacharya et al., 2008; Marin & Ruiz, 2007) while at the same time contributing to the success of the firm (Ashforth & Mael, 1989).
On the whole the findings of this study illustrate that the CSP of a firm does play a part, albeit less than traditional job factors, in the employment decision process of job-seekers. Furthermore, these results are given extra merit as they are in accord with those of Question 15 of the survey where it was revealed that 89.4% of all participants believe that the overall CSP displayed by a firm is either 'very important' or 'important' to them. It is felt that this is further emphasis of the desire of to identify with firms that are perceived as holding congruent beliefs and values, and the need for self-enhancement and self-definition. Additionally, this offers additional credibility to the proposed importance for firms to communicate and create awareness of their CSP position and activity (Cable & Turban, 2003).
Chapter Six

6.0 Conclusion

6.1. Can espoused organisational CSP be seen as an antecedent to employer attraction?

In this the final segment of this study, a summary of findings is provided along with an interpretation and synopsis as to where the researcher perceives CSP stands overall as an attractor to organisations for job-seekers, and how and why it may impact on their job choice process, and the rationale behind its influence on job-seekers towards potential employers. This chapter will conclude key aspects revealed by this study, and their relevance and implication for corporate employers in a competitive employment environment. Furthermore, any perceived limitations of this particular study will be pointed out, as well as recommendations for further research involving CSP as it pertains to organisational attraction and job-seekers. And lastly, a closing statement will be offered.

The importance and impact of CSP to Job-seekers

This research finds that CSP is an important consideration to job-seekers in their attraction to an organisation. Further to this, the findings of this study are in general consistent with those of Turban and Greening (1997), Greening and Turban (2000), and Backhaus (2002) and whereby job-seekers show a positive attraction to organisations displaying positive forms of CSP, and both signalling theory and social identity theory have an active part.

This study has shown that job-seekers perceive CSP elements as an indication and signal of a firm’s values, norms and beliefs and that this signal creates an expectation. This expectation can be seen as threefold as: firstly, it can characterise a deduction by job-seekers of how one might be treated within the organisation; secondly, a firm’s espoused CSP may be perceived as reflective of their core values, and that the
organisation was committed to a cause; and thirdly, how the firm might therefore conduct themselves in upholding such values.

The findings of this study revealed that CSP signals sent by firms are interpreted by job-seekers and shape impressions that are utilised to identify congruent values, beliefs and perceived shared common goals which may in turn provide inspiration towards the desire for association. When social identity theory is applied to the results of this study and participant views there is an indication that through a firm’s CSP activity job-seekers may endeavour to engage and extend their self-definition, acquire satisfaction and fulfillment of needs, attain pride, and increase self-esteem and self-concept.

Of the CSP elements measured in this study positive employment relations appears to be universally preferred and desired by all job-seeking populations, while the importance of the other CSP elements may differ to different job-seeking populations relative to ‘individual difference’ and needs, beliefs, goals, and values. Further to this, while Waddock et al (2002) propose that we can best understand CSP as a function when elements are viewed independently, it can equally be argued that CSP elements viewed collectively and as a whole may generate initial interest and summary impression, that job-seekers can then subjectively separate out and refine according to the individual value and importance placed on separate elements through personal wants, needs, and beliefs.

The findings of this study indicate that those CSP elements that have direct and daily impact are most salient to job-seekers, for example; ‘employee relations’ and ‘treatment of women and minorities’ as opposed to ‘concern for the environment’ and ‘community relations’. Conversely, those with less direct daily work life impact are seemingly less salient. Additionally, it can also be said that of all the job-seeking populations measured here, those between 36-45 years and of female gender, value and are most influenced by the CSP and related activity of an organisation.
6.2. Implications of CSP for organisations

While it is accepted that firms undertake CSP activity for various reasons, this study has recognised possible implications for an organisation pertaining to its effects and effectiveness to attracting job-seekers. It may be argued that in times of an oversupply of job-seekers the perceived supplementary value of positive espoused CSP so as to attract potential employees may be less intrinsically beneficial. However, in times of a limited labour supply, and as suggested by Greening and Turban (2000) and Fombrun and Shanley (1990) to possibly attract high caliber candidates, firms may need a point of difference. This study has exposed the potential for CSP to afford differentiation of one firm from another. The findings of this study suggest that organisations that espouse perceivably superior CSP through attributes such as employee-employer relations and diversity principles may potentially be rewarded by increased job-seeker attraction and become an employer of choice. Further to this, there is then the prospect of additional rewards such as increased employee organisational commitment, lower turnover, and improved levels of employee morale and motivation. Therefore, it is proposed that CSP and its elements have the potential to successfully act as an additional recruitment tool that firms can utilise to attract suitable talent.

This study revealed that for the most part job-seekers believe it is important that firms state their CSP during the outset of the recruitment process so as to allow the opportunity to access suitability, fit, and congruence of values and beliefs. In addition and somewhat conversely, the findings of this study also suggest that organisations may be able to profile and target specific job-seeking populations fitting their culture and needs through awareness of which aspects of CSP appeal to them most, and then displaying and communicating appropriate and selective information. For example, participants in this study aged 36-45 years indicated that firms displaying a positive CSP record and reputation in the CSP elements ‘treatment of women and minorities’ and ‘product quality’ was highly valued and their absence may deter this job-seeking population from applying for a position. Furthermore, this suggests that there is potential for firms to enhance particular job-seeker population attraction by applying marketing
principle processes such as; segmentation of the market, selection of the desired market target, and the development of a value to offer the target market (Kotler, 1996).

While this study revealed that traditional job factors are on the whole considered more important than CSP to job-seekers, there were two CSP elements that stood out more than the others and as previously mentioned, therefore suggesting a general appeal to all populations. These were ‘employee relations’ and ‘product quality’. Given this, the researcher proposes that firms wanting to partake in CSP activity but with limited resources to expend may attain most benefit by dedicating efforts towards this. Having said this, the CSP element ‘treatment of women and minorities’ was also prominent in this study by way of individual difference and as an area of particular importance and value to specific job-seeking populations. This further emphasised the potential for firms to apply and accentuate a targeted approach to job-seeker attraction.

Results and opinions from this study suggest that firms can effectively and efficiently exploit their CSP activities by positioning and signalling via their website and general advertising, as this is where job-seekers would foremost explore, and expect to discover information of this nature. Firms should take note however, that views offered by respondents suggest that job-seekers are wary of ‘spin’ and that they perceive espoused CSP not only as indicative of what the firm would be like to work for, and reflective of their norms, values, and beliefs, but as a commitment by the organisation and those within it, which is perceived as genuine in motive and needing to be upheld. Furthermore, seeing as participant comments suggest job-seekers would seek advice from current employees as to an organisation’s CSP, indication is given that firms may well benefit through increased employee awareness, engagement and participation in CSP activity, and therefore conceivably making employees an agent.

While activity such as CSP may be perceived as additional and unwanted costs the findings of this study equally argue that the benefits afforded may outweigh such costs. This is said as respondent comments and applied theory suggest job-seekers attracted to firms as a result of identification through congruent values, beliefs, and goals, will
reciprocate the firm with loyalty, commitment, long tenure, pride in the organisation, and support and contribution to their success.

As an aside, for those looking for further support of this view on the importance and value of positive CSP, an article by Graves and Waddock (2000) titled “Beyond built to last…Stakeholder relations in built-to-last companies” is recommended. This article proposes that so called “built to last” (p. 393) companies have attained outstanding long term success with multiple stakeholders in contrast to other comparable firms through attaining and maintaining higher levels in all the elements of CSP measured in this study and adhering to their core ideologies. These authors akin these firms’ to ‘visionary companies’, having solicited and engaged CSP activity as a catalyst to all round success and competitive advantage (Graves & Waddock, 2000).

Given the findings and participant views and opinions of this study the researcher believes that with time, CSP activity will form a continuum with what are currently considered traditional recruitment characteristics, such as job factors, and develop into not only an accepted and expected component of the employment package, but also, as proposed by Bertels and Peloza (2008), become ‘normalised’. Therefore, it is suggested that firms that are proactive in regard to CSP will be in a position to set the benchmark and reap maximum rewards.

6.3. Limitations

During the course of this project several limitations were revealed. The main limitation of this research is the subjective nature of the importance of CSP and its interpretation, as individual difference may dictate ones perception and therefore hinder generalization and the assumption of actual job-seeker behaviour. Also, this study may have benefited from further in-depth statistical analysis, and while this research incorporated the richness afforded by qualitative questioning the researcher believes that English may have been a second language for a number of participants, who therefore possibly encountered difficulties in fully articulating their views and opinions. Further to this, it is felt that some participants had difficulty clearly distinguishing between job factors and the elements of CSP, and consequently several views and opinions appeared to show
an amount of crossover. A further limitation of this study was that solicitation of student participation proved difficult, and therefore the sample size that contributed while acceptable, was relatively small and possibly restricting the ability to fully generalise. It should also be noted that the complexity and multiple influences pertaining to CSP as an attractor to job-seekers made not only containment but full exploration of this project difficult. Lastly, the volatility and changing global economic situation may have distorted participant views to the importance of CSP elements and enacted a more conservative standing.

6.4. Further research

During the course of this project several areas were revealed that the researcher believes could warrant further investigation.

- Firstly, due to the subjective nature towards the view and impact of CSP and its elements by and on differing demographics, it is believed that further investigation is needed so as to better understand the influence of individual difference.
- Secondly, while a perceived link between CSP, expectation, commitment, and the ideology-infused contract was discussed it is felt this warrants further investigation; firstly to confirm if such a link exists, and secondly to recognise the implications of violation of such a contract.
- Thirdly, the poor showing of what could be called a high profile CSP element, 'concern for the environment', raised the researchers attention and he feels that additional investigation is needed to understand its low ranking of importance.
- Lastly, it is felt that given the lack of distinction and blurring of lines between CSP elements and job factors in respondent views, future research should investigate these various elements and factors in contrast and comparison to establish their closeness, and perceivably as a single package and part of a possible continuum.
6.5. Closing statement

This study has shown that job-seekers ‘do’ value CSP, and in particular the element ‘employee relations’. It has been revealed that job-seekers will explore espoused organisational CSP and related activity to access suitability and self select based on fit and personal values and beliefs. This research has also exposed a firm’s CSP as having the potential to differentiate it and create a point of difference in attracting job-seekers. Additionally however, this study does indicate that in order to maximise returns on resources invested in CSP firms need to create awareness, effectively communicate their activity, and make the information readily available. Having said this, firms need to ensure they can deliver on perceived promises of commitment to a cause as signified by their CSP activity seeing as while job-seekers may interpret and conceive such activity to signal the firm’s values and norms and what they may be like to work for they are still somewhat skeptical.

This research has demonstrated that firms may be able to target particular job-seeking populations by being selective regarding which aspects of CSP they focus on. Conversely, this study has also established that there are CSP elements that have universal job-seeker appeal. The findings of this study suggest that organisational CSP activity has the potential to offer competitive advantage as a foundation recruitment tool in attracting larger applicant pools from which firms can select, and engagement in such activity may lend itself to becoming an employer of choice. In conclusion, CSP has proven in this study to be worthy of inclusion as part of the package, or bundle, of organisational attributes offered by firms to attract job-seekers and influence their job choice process. Therefore, it is encouraged that firms embrace CSP and begin a journey towards being a ‘visionary company’ whereby their reputation is seen as “not just an organisation, they are institutions in the richest sense of that word” (Graves & Waddock, 2000, p. 393) and it can be said:

“they have woven themselves into the fabric of society”

(Collins and Porras as cited in Graves & Waddock, 2000, p. 393)


Appendix One

Survey Questionnaire

Corporate Social Performance

1. Thank you for accepting to participate in this survey on Corporate Social P...

My name is Maurice O’Rourke; I am currently enrolled in the Master of Business programme in the Unitec New Zealand Business School. As part of this course I am undertaking a research project to establish:

“To what extent Undergraduate Business Degree students find Corporate Social Performance to be attractive in a potential employer?”

This survey will ask about your views and opinions on what Corporate Social Performance elements you value most in a prospective employer. Corporate Social Performance will also be compared against traditional job factors in an employer of choice, and if these factors would influence your job selection and acceptance.

This survey will take approximately 15 minutes and I hope that you will find participation an enjoyable experience. I would also like to extend my appreciation for your time and effort.

Privacy and confidentiality:
• Participation in this research is voluntary.
• All data and information collected will be kept confidential and none of the information gathered will contain any personal identifiers.
• The only persons who will know what has been said will be the researcher and his supervisor.
• All data and information collected from the survey will be stored securely on a password protected computer at Unitec for a period of 5 years and then destroyed.

If you have any concerns or require further information regarding this research project please contact:
• Maurice O’Rourke, the researcher, at maurice_orourke@hotmail.com
• Or my supervisor
• Assoc. Prof. Simon Peet: (09) 815 4321 extn: 8650. Email: speel@unitect.ac.nz

UREC REGISTRATION NUMBER: 2008.911
Article 1. This study has been approved by the Unitec Research Ethics Committee from 18th December 2008 to 18th December 2009. If you have any complaints about the ethical conduct of this research please contact the UREC Secretary (ph: 09 815-4321 ext 7248).
Corporate Social Performance

2. Should your next employer offer you more than mere money?

What will attract you to your next employer?

When we work full time we spend at least ¼ of our day working for and standing alongside someone else’s beliefs, attitudes, ideals, and philosophies. Will these core values be the same as yours? Would the actions of a potential employer influence your decision to work for them?

This survey invites you to think about and have your say on what Corporate Social Performance elements are important to you in an employer and if they are more or less important than traditional job factors.

For the purpose of this survey Corporate Social Performance has been divided into 5 elements. These 5 elements and their related meanings are:

1. EMPLOYEE RELATIONS: relationship with unions; employee sense of ownership and employee participation in management decision making process.

2. TREATMENT OF WOMEN AND MINORITIES: employment and promotion policies and practices; diversity programs; women and minorities in senior management positions.

3. CONCERN FOR THE ENVIRONMENT: maintenance of property, plant, and equipment; environmental practices; use of toxic chemicals in production; product packaging.

4. PRODUCT QUALITY: product reputation; service reputation; product safety record; innovation; reputable marketing and production practices.

5. COMMUNITY RELATIONS: involvement in local community; support of local community projects; donations to charity; encouragement and support for employee charity and volunteer participation; corporate citizenship.
Corporate Social Performance

3. Demographics

This section asks general demographic questions. Please answer all questions as accurately as possible.

1. What is your gender?
   - [ ] Male
   - [ ] Female

2. What age group do you currently fall into?
   - [ ] 18-25
   - [ ] 26-35
   - [ ] 36-45
   - [ ] 46+

3. Which of the following would best describe your ethnicity?
   - [ ] New Zealander
   - [ ] New Zealand Maori
   - [ ] European
   - [ ] Pacific Islander
   - [ ] Asian
   - [ ] Other

4. Which of the following best describes your learning situation at Unitec?
   - [ ] Full time student
   - [ ] Part time student

5. Are you an international student?
   - [ ] Yes
   - [ ] No

6. At what stage are you in your degree?
   - [ ] More than half way
   - [ ] Less than half way

7. What is your current employment status?
   - [ ] Currently employed
   - [ ] Currently seeking employment
   - [ ] Not currently employed

   If you are currently employed is your employment full time or part time?
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8. What is your current marital status?
   ○ Single
   ○ Married
   ○ De-facto

9. Do you have any dependent children?
   ○ Yes
   ○ No

10. Which of the following best describes your living arrangements?
    ○ Own my own home
    ○ Rent
    ○ Live with family
    ○ Live in student accommodation

11. How long have you lived in your current area?
    ○ 1 year or less
    ○ 1-3 years
    ○ 3-5 years
    ○ 5 years or more
Corporate Social Performance

4. What Corporate Social Performance Elements appeal to you most in a potential...

This section of the survey asks about your attitude towards Corporate Social Performance elements that a potential employer might display.

12. Please rank from 1 to 5 the following Corporate Social Performance elements according to how important they are to YOU in a potential employer. Only 1 number can be allocated to each element.

(1 being most important and 5 being least important)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employee relations</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Treatment of women and minorities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern for the environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community relations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Why is your first choice important to you?

13. How important to YOU are the Corporate Social Performance elements listed below?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employee Relations</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Not very important</th>
<th>Not at all important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Treatment of women and minorities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern for the environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community relations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. Are there any other Corporate Social Performance elements not listed here that you would consider important to you?
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15. How important to you is the OVERALL Corporate Social Performance displayed by an organisation?

Please indicate which of these most applies to you:

- Very important
- Important
- Neutral
- Not very important
- Not at all important

16. Would the absence of ANY of the Corporate Social Performance elements listed below stop you from applying for a job?
(tick as many, or few, as apply to you)

- Employee relations
- Treatment of women and minorities
- Concern for the environment
- Product quality
- Community relations

If you answered yes to any of the above, why?

17. At what stage of the recruitment process would YOU like to know an organisation’s Corporate Social Performance position?

- Before I apply for the job
- At the selection process
- At orientation
- Learn on the job
- Does not matter to me

Briefly explain why:
18. Would YOU explore an organisation’s Corporate Social Performance before applying for a job there?

- Yes
- No
- Maybe

If yes, where would you look?

19. Where do you think you should be able to learn about an organisation’s Corporate Social Performance?
(tick as many, or few, as apply to you)

- Job advertisement
- Company’s web site
- Company’s policy manual
- Does not matter to me
- Don’t know

Other (please specify)

20. Do YOU think it is important for an organisation to state their Corporate Social Performance in any of the following places?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job advertisement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web site</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General advertising</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21. Do YOU think that an organisation’s Corporate Social Performance gives you an idea of what it would be like to work there?

- Yes
- No
- Unsure
22. Would negative publicity of an organisation’s Corporate Social Performance influence YOUR decision to apply for a position there?
- Yes
- No
- Maybe

23. Would positive publicity of an organisation’s Corporate Social Performance influence YOUR decision to apply for a position there?
- Yes
- No
- Maybe

24. Do you think the Corporate Social Performance displayed by an organisation represents part of its commitment towards YOU?
- Yes
- No
- Unsure
- Unsure

Why?
5. Comparative importance of Job Factors and Corporate Social Performance elements

This final section of the survey asks you to compare the importance of 5 Job/Organisational factors to the 5 Corporate Social Performance elements.

The 5 Job/Organisational Factors to be compared are:
1. CHALLENGING AND REWARDING WORK
2. TRAINING AND DEVELOPMENT
3. PAY, COMPENSATION, AND BENEFITS
4. CARER ADVANCEMENT
5. JOB SECURITY

The 5 Corporate Social Performance elements to be compared are:
1. EMPLOYEE RELATIONS
2. TREATMENT OF WOMEN AND MINORITIES
3. CONCERN FOR THE ENVIRONMENT
4. PRODUCT QUALITY
5. COMMUNITY RELATIONS

Please answer all questions as accurately as you can.
**Corporate Social Performance**

25. Please rank from 1 to 5 the following job factors according to how important they are to YOU in a potential employer. Only 1 number can be allocated to each factor.

(1 being most important and 5 being least important)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Factor</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Challenging and rewarding work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training and development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay, compensation, and benefits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career advancement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job security</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Why is your first choice important to you?

---

26. How important to YOU are the Job factors listed below?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Factor</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Not very important</th>
<th>Not Important at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Challenging work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay and benefits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career advancement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job security</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

27. Are there any other job/organisational factors not listed here that you would consider important to you?

---
28. From the list of 10 factors and elements below please choose and rank only the 7 that are the most important to YOU. Only 1 number can be allocated to each factor.

(1 being most important and 7 being least important)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training and development</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern for the environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay and benefits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community relations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career advancement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job security</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenging work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment of women and minorities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee relations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Why are your first 2 choices important to you?

---

29. How important to an organisation's image do YOU think Corporate Social Performance is?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Not very important</th>
<th>Not Important at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please indicate which of these most accurately applies to you

30. Would You prefer to work for an organisation with a good image?

- Yes
- No
- Does Not matter to me

Why?
31. Would YOU prefer to work for an organisation that has a good reputation for Corporate Social Performance?
   - Yes
   - No
   - Does not matter to me
   Why?

32. Overall where do YOU rate Corporate Social Performance in your employment decision process?
   Please indicate which of these most accurately applies to you.

33. If you have any further comments you would like to add about Corporate Social Performance and what it means to you in the job choice process please share your views and opinions here.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corporate Social Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. Would you like to receive a copy of the survey results?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you would like to receive a summary copy of the results from this survey please send an email titled "Survey Results" to maurice.orourke@hotmail.com.
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Flyer and Poster Survey Invite

Special Invite

What’s your vision?

Source: Alberto Ruggieri. Images.com

What do “you” want from your next employer?

When we work full time we spend at least ⅓ of our day working for and standing alongside someone else’s beliefs, values and philosophies! Will these beliefs, values and philosophies be the same as yours?

My name is Maurice O’Rourke and I am a Master of Business student at ……. As part of my Thesis I am conducting a voluntary survey investigating

“To what extent do Undergraduate Business Degree students find Corporate Social Performance to be attractive in a potential employer?”

I would like to invite all ……. Undergraduate Business Degree Students to participate in my research and have your say on what aspects, if any, of Corporate Social Performance you value most in an employer.

So, if you are an Undergraduate Business Degree Student at ……. and would like to participate in this voluntary and anonymous survey please watch for the announcement coming to you on Black Board and follow the link below to complete the survey, or email me directly at: mauriceo@slingshot.co.nz

Your support in this research is very much appreciated
Appendix Three

Class Visitation Blurb

Survey: The role of Corporate Social Responsibility in the job choice process of Undergraduate Business degree students

Research question that is the foundation of this research:
“To what extent do undergraduate business degree students find Corporate Social Performance factors to be attractive in a potential employer?”

Business question:
“Can good Corporate Social Performance offer organisation’s a point of difference as a preferred employer?”
(Will adding CSP to the organisational branding mix and recruitment process add a point of difference)

Key aims:
To establish how CSP dimensions of influence undergraduate business degree students in the job choice.
• employee relations
• treatment of women and minorities
• concern for the environment
• product quality
• community relations

Compared against traditional job factors
• Training and development
• Job security
• Challenging work
• Pay and benefits
• Career advancement

Survey will take approximately 15 minutes
• Will be asked to rank and scale CSP and job factors in order of importance to you
• Will be asked for your opinions
## An Expanded Framework for Understanding Psychological Contracts: A Comparison of Currencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Economic Currency</th>
<th>Socioemotional Currency</th>
<th>Ideological Currency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Content of the exchange</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization’s obligations</td>
<td>Provide continued employment, safe working environment, fair compensation</td>
<td>Provide training, career development, promotion opportunities, long-term job security</td>
<td>Demonstrate credible commitment to a valued social cause</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual’s obligations</td>
<td>Fulfill formally specified role requirements</td>
<td>Fulfill generalized role obligations; organizational commitment and involvement; organizational citizenship behavior</td>
<td>Participate in the organization’s mission/cause; organizational and societal citizenship behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salient beneficiary</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Self and organizational community</td>
<td>Society, some segment thereof, or an intangible principle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affiliation logic</td>
<td>“The organization gives me a fair day’s pay for a fair day’s work.”</td>
<td>“The organization nurtures my professional development and sense of community.”</td>
<td>“The organization shares my passion, cause, and/or mission.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model of human nature</td>
<td>Egoistic, instrumental</td>
<td>Collectivistic, socialized</td>
<td>Principled, involved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Terms of the contract</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definition of breach</td>
<td>Black and white</td>
<td>Gray (negotiable)</td>
<td>Grey (negotiable), but also entails black and white (non-negotiable) ’moral hot buttons’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response to violation</td>
<td>Exit</td>
<td>Withdraw commitment; revert to economic exchange</td>
<td>Principled organizational dissent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theoretical cousins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelman’s (1998) influence</td>
<td>Compliance</td>
<td>Identification</td>
<td>Internalization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>types</td>
<td>Job</td>
<td>Career</td>
<td>Calling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrezieniowski, McCaulay, Rosin, &amp; Schwartz’s (1997) orientation toward work</td>
<td>Transactional</td>
<td>Social exchange</td>
<td>Corental</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Thompson and Bunderson (2003)