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The current study examined gender differences in organization attraction. Attraction to different organization attributes has been examined in previous studies. However, there is no one theoretical framework of organization attributes, as a result the findings from different studies were not directly comparable. The current study summarized previous studies about organization attraction and developed a four-factor framework of organization attributes based on evolution theories and Barrick, Mount, and Li’s (2013) theory of purposeful work behavior. The current study also found that females were more likely to be attracted to organizations with higher level of work life balance and organizations with supportive social environment using both policy capturing and direct rating. Personality agreeableness mediated the relationship between gender and attraction to social environment. Findings of current study have both theoretical and practical implications. Future study directions were discussed.
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INTRODUCTION

Attracting competitive applicants is an essential part of organizational success. With increasing emphasis on organization diversity, organizations are focusing more on attracting and hiring talented female applicants. Many companies have established family-friendly policies, e.g. flexible work options, phase-back for new moms, dedicated lactation facilities, and on/near-site childcare centers, with the goals of attracting and retaining female employees. More research is needed, however, especially with regard to what attracts female employees to a job or organization. A better understanding of this issue can help organizations determine whether these initiatives are likely to affect job or organization attraction, and whether there are additional avenues to attract females. The current study examines how females and males differ in terms of what makes an organization attractive, to provide insights about how attraction to the organization functions across two different groups. Looking at gender differences in attraction to organizations could also provide a model for organizations to understand how they might increase other kinds of diversity by examining group differences in attraction.

Although gender differences may play a critical role in job and organization attraction, there are limited previous studies about this topic, and little consensus. Some studies found significant gender differences in job attribute preferences (Heckert et al., 2002; Konrad, Ritchie Jr, Lieb, & Corrigall, 2000) while others did not (Carless & Wintle, 2007; Chapman, Uggerslev, Carroll, Piasentin, & Jones, 2005). Moreover, most previous studies were descriptive accounts of gender differences in job/organization attributes (i.e., not based on theoretical frame). As a result, there was no common taxonomy of job/organization attributes across studies and the results of
previous studies cannot be directly compared. Table 1 provides a comparison of taxonomies across studies.

The current study will address limitations of previous studies. An evolutionary and social cultural theory frame will be developed to predict and explain different job/organization attribute preferences for males and females. A taxonomy of organization attributes will be generated based on the theory frame. Also, the current study will be the first to examine personality as a mediator of the relationship between gender and job/organization attraction and to empirically test Barrick and his colleagues’ theory of purposeful work behavior (Barrick, Mount, & Li, 2013).

**Outcomes of Recruiting Procedures**

Recruiting was defined as organizational activities that (1) influence the number and/or types of applicants who apply for a position and/or (2) affect whether a job offer is accepted (Breaugh, 1992). In studies of recruiting, applicant attitudes toward prospective employers are often measured as outcome variables of interest (Chapman et al, 2005).

Measurement of recruiting outcomes has evolved over time. Early stages of recruiting studies measured participants’ attitude by asking their anticipated job satisfaction working in an organization (e.g. Strand, Levine, & Montgomery, 1981). Researchers then turned from measuring general satisfaction projections to measuring recruits’ probable pursuit of specific jobs or attraction to the job (Aiman-Smith, Bauer, & Cable, 2001). For example, items assess participants’ attempts to pursue an interview for a job (Rynes, Schwab, & Heneman, 1983) or the probability with which they would respond to an organization and pursue further contact (Gatewood, Gowan, & Lautenschlager, 1993). One of the most recent meta-analyses about
recruiting reviewed various recruiting outcomes in previous studies and summarized four outcome variables: job pursuit intention, job/organization attraction, acceptance intentions, and job choice (Chapman et al, 2005).

The concept of applicant attraction has been defined broadly in literature. A group of highly correlated and overlapping attitudinal responses of applicants to organizations can be categorized under the term of applicant attraction, including: organization attraction, application intention, or acceptance intention (Swider, Zimmerman, Charlier, & Pierotti, 2015; Uggerslev, Fassina, & Kraichy, 2012). Measurement of organization attraction varies across studies, including asking respondents the probability of responding to an organization and pursuing further contact (Gatewood, Gowan, & Lautenschlager, 1993), assessing participants’ attitudes towards organizations such as attraction to the job (Turban & Dougherty, 1992), or measuring both action and affective attitudes at the same time (Turban & Keon, 1993). Highhouse, Lievens, and Sinar (2003) revealed that organization attraction, intention to pursue, and prestige of organization are highly correlated but distinct constructs. Empirical data supported a mediator model of the three constructs: intention to pursue mediated the influence of organization attraction and organization prestige on organization pursuit behavior (Highhouse et al, 2003).
CHAPTER I. EVOLUTIONARY AND SOCIAL CULTURAL PERSPECTIVES ON GEDNER DIFFERENCES IN ATTRACTION

The long history of evolution has influenced how males and females differ genetically and biologically. In fact, many psychological gender differences can be accurately predicted by evolutionary biologists based on physical differences of sex (Pinker, 2002). Evolutionary psychology also explains why certain gender difference patterns are consistent across different cultures (Buss et al, 1990).

A large body of research on evolutionary psychology has supported that in long-term mating, females more than males prefer mates who display high social status, good earnings or earning potential, and ambition (Buss, 1989; Buss et al, 1990; Buss, Shackelford, Kirkpatrick, & Larsen, 2001; Li, Bailey, Kenrick, & Linsenmeier, 2002). From an evolutionary perspective, this is because females are vulnerable during pregnancy and have typically been heavily involved in rearing children. Hence, females’ reproductive success can benefit from mating with males who are able to reliably invest in both themselves and their children (Bjorklund & Jordan, 2013; Buss, 1999).

Because females prefer males who can provide resources, males compete with each other on dimensions related to the ability to provide resources (Buss, 1989; Geary, 2000). Males compete with each other over intelligence, social status, social dominance, job title, and income. Males prefer long-term mates who are intelligent as well, but a woman’s ambition, job title, and earnings are not usually of high importance when it comes to mating (Li et al, 2002). These arguments lead to the prediction that males will be drawn more so than females to organizations that provide them higher payment and more promotion opportunities.
Moreover, throughout the animal kingdom, paternal investment in children is rare. Among humans however, male invest in children much more substantially than in most species. However, cross-culturally, females still do substantially more parenting than males (Bjorklund & Jordan, 2013; Buss, 1999). Because females are certain of their relatedness to offspring, whereas males are not, and because female's initial investment in creating an offspring is so much greater than that of males, females continue to invest more than males in terms of parenting (Bjorklund & Jordan, 2013; Buss, 1999). Furthermore, due to evolutionary time lags, even in the modern world where females hold full time jobs, many females still spend more time parenting than males. Even many females with Ivy League educations give up the opportunity for a successful full-time career in order to stay at home with their children (Story, 2005). These arguments lead to the prediction that females will be drawn more so than males to jobs or organizations that allow them to have flexible work schedules and provide family-friendly policies.

Social cultural approaches, on the other hand, provide a proximate explanation of gender differences in organization attraction. For example, how do individuals internalize social norms and expectations towards gender and shape their own motivation accordingly? In the context of job/organization attraction, social role theory and social identity theory can explain how people internalize social expectancies about different sexes and reflect those expectancies in organization preferences.

Social role theory was originated to understand gender differences in social behaviors. Social role theory assumes that gender role is the underlying cause of sex-differentiated behaviors. “Gender roles are emergent from the activities carried out by individuals of each sex in their sex-typical occupational and family roles; the characteristics required by these activities become stereotypic of women or men” (Eagly, Wood, & Diekman, 2000, pp.127). For example,
in our society girls observe their mothers or sisters performing nurturing and domestic activities to take care of the family; thus, they learn about female’s role as homemaker in the family from their mothers or sisters. And they are more likely to acquire these nurturing and domestic skills and take the same role as homemaker after they grow up.

Expectancies connected with gender role act as “normative pressures that foster behaviors consistent with sex-typical work roles through expectancy confirmation processes and self-regulatory processes” (Eagly et al, 2000, pp.127). And social pressure generally favors behaviors consistent with gender role and might penalize inconsistent behaviors (Eagly, Karau, & Makhijani, 1995). Under this external pressure, people may internalize cultural expectancies about their sex and “consequently be intrinsically motivated to act in a manner consistent with their gender roles” (Eagly et al, 1995, pp.126).

According to social identity theory (SIT), people have a tendency to classify themselves and others into various social categories, such as organizational membership, gender, and religious affiliation (Ashforth & Mael, 1989). By segmenting, classifying, and ordering the social environment, the social classification procedure benefits individuals in two ways: first, it provides the individual systematic means of defining others; second, it facilitates the individual defining and locating himself/herself in social environment (Ashforth & Mael, 1989; Tajfel & Turner, 2004). SIT proposes that self-concept is constituted of two parts: personal identity and social identity. Social identity indicators, including salient group classifications, are “the perception of oneness with or belongingness to some human aggregate” (Ashforth & Mael, 1989, pp.21). Thus, by identifying membership of a social group, such as gender, as social identity, individuals might internalize social roles and expectations towards that group.
From a cognitive perspective, internalization of gender roles occurs because being categorized as a member of one sex or the other accentuates the similarities within sex categories. Enhanced salience of within-sex similarities results in depersonalization and the perception that one possesses traits thought to distinguish one’s own sex from other. (Konrad, Ritchie Jr, Lieb, & Corrigall, 2000, p. 594)

By internalizing social expectations, people might be motivated by factors congruent with social expectations. More specifically, females might be more likely to be motivated by things that could maximize reproductive ability while males might more likely to be motivated by things that could maximize potential for resource acquisition.

**Gender Differences in Attraction to Job and Organization Characteristics**

When it comes to job and organization preferences, females and males might be attracted by different attributes of a job or organization, because society has different expectations for them. For example, females might be more attracted to organizations that allow flexible schedules because flexible schedules provide them opportunities to better take care of their children, which is a reflection of reproductive ability. In contrast, males might be more attracted to organizations that provide higher payment, higher status, or better opportunities for promotion, which indicates potential for resources.

One study examined the need systems for sex stereotypes across 30 countries. The Adjective Check List was an assessment of the relative strength of fifteen psychological needs on the basis of one’s self-description (Williams & Best, 1990). Williams and Best (1990) found that masculine stereotype is associated with the traits of dominance, autonomy, aggression, exhibition,
achievement, and endurance, while feminine stereotype is associated with affiliation, nurturance, deference, and abasement (Williams & Best, 1990). Consistent with Williams and Best (1990), a meta-analysis about gender differences in job attribute preferences (Konrad et al, 2000) demonstrated that attributes related to affiliation, such as making friends and working with people, and attributes related to nurturance, such as helping others, were more important for females while attributes related to autonomy were more important for males.

Evolutionary and social cultural perspectives suggest that female show preferences for work-life balance (e.g. flexible schedule, family-friendly policies) in order to fulfill reproductive needs for themselves and expectations from others. Konrad et al (2000) pointed out that females traditionally occupy the role of homemaker. This indicates that females would value flexible schedules and family-friendly policies, which provide them opportunities to take care of their family (Lacy, Bokemeier, & Shepard, 1983).

Also, research has found that females are more likely to change their job location to follow their spouse’s job relocation than are male (Bielby & Bielby, 1992; Konrad et al, 2000). Thus, “geographic location may be more important to females because a homemaker must follow the income provider’s (male) location if the family is to stay together” (Konrad et al, 2000, pp.595). Noteworthy is that the work-life balance attributes summarized here based on evolutionary and social cultural frame are consistent with homemaker category summarized by Konrad et al (2000) when they were looking at job attribute preferences linked to dimensions of masculinity and femininity.
Hypothesis 1: Compared to males, females will be attracted by organization attributes which allow work-life balance, such as flexible schedule, family-friendly policies, and amount of overnight travel required.

Evolutionary theory also found that females were more likely to show need for and tendency to provide social support. “In early man hominid development, female emerged as the nurturing sex by providing food through hunting and gathering and by encouraging the development of extended kinship bonding” (Flaherty & Richman, 1989, pp.1222). Tanner and Zihlman (1976) also pointed out that mothers (females) were primary socializers in early man hominid. Therefore, females might give more weight than males to supportive work environment (e.g., making friends) and frequency of work in team or groups. This is consistent with the affiliation category under the feminine dimension by Konrad and colleagues (2000).

Social norms might be generated through the long history of human development; at the same time, individuals learn those social norms of their society at an early age through parental and school education. Barry III, Bacon, and Child (1957) found that girls and boys were exposed to different socialization pressures and learned to behave in ways that were consistent with the definition of gender in their society. More specifically, girls tend to get more nurturance training by taking care of younger siblings while boys tend to get more self-reliance training. Thus, female are hypothesized to value more about opportunities to provide social support, for example opportunity to help others, which is consistent with the nurturance category under the femininity dimension by Konrad and colleagues (2000).
Hypothesis 2: Compared to males, females will be more attracted to organizations with supportive social environment, opportunities working in teams or groups frequently, and emphasizing helping behavior.

Males will be expected to show preference for jobs and organization attributes that will fulfill expectations for resource acquisition potential. Buss (1989) has pointed out that resources typically translate into earning capacity that signals the possession or likely acquisition of resources among humans. Characteristics of individuals connected with increased earning capacity included ambition and industriousness (Buss, 1989). Earning directly links to signal of acquisition of resources. Power and status are also indicators of resources acquisition potential in our society. Browne (1998) has pointed out that high status and wealth are key attributes that females look for in mate selection and these preferences continue today. Promotion opportunities always represent potential higher earning or status, thus it can be viewed as attributes related to resource acquisition potential. The resource acquisition potential in the current article is a combination of the income provider, dominance, and achievement categories under the masculinity dimension by Konrad and colleagues (2000).

Given the reproductive advantage of high-status males in human evolution, males are more likely to strive for status in hierarchies and engage in “the kind of risk-taking behavior that is often necessary to reach the top of hierarchies and acquire resources” (Browne, 1998, pp.430). In other words, males are hypothesized to be more interested in challenges on the job compared to females. In summary, males are likely to be attracted to jobs and organizations that offer them opportunities for resource acquisition.
Hypothesis 3: Males will be more attracted by the following attributes than will females: salary, opportunities for promotion, power and status, and challenge.
CHAPTER II. THE ROLE OF PERSONALITY

Gender differences might also influence preferences for job/organization attributes through personality. Personality is defined as “an individual’s characteristic patterns of thought, emotion, and behavior, together with the psychological mechanisms-hidden or not-behind those patterns” (Funder, 2001, pp.198).

Previous studies have found gender differences in personality (Table 2). Females were found to be higher in emotional stability, agreeableness, and conscientiousness under broad big-five personality factors (Costa Jr, Terracciano, & McCrae, 2001; Schmitt, Realo, Voracek, & Allik, 2008). Previous studies also looked at narrow personality facets: females showed higher levels of anxiety, trust, tender-mindedness, openness to feelings, warmth, gregariousness, and order, while male showed higher levels of openness to ideas, activity, and assertiveness (Costa et al., 2001; Feingold, 1994).

Three models could be used to explain gender differences in personality: biological, sociocultural, and biosocial models (Feingold, 1994). The biological model claims that gender differences in personality are rooted in the biological differences between males and females, such as gonadal hormones (Zuckerman, 1991) and chromosomes (Nolen-Hoeksema, 1987).

The sociocultural model posits that social and cultural factors cause gender differences in personality. The first example of the sociocultural approach is gender role theory. Eagly (1987) pointed out that gender roles were the causes for gender differences in social behavior. Social expectations towards gender roles will shape individual’s behaviors and influence personality. Another sociocultural explanation of gender differences in personality is expectancy theory and self-fulfilling prophecy. Holders of gender stereotypes treat others in ways that result in others
conforming to the stereotypes (Feingold, 1994). A third sociocultural explanation of gender differences in personality is the artifact model. The artifact model posits gender differences on personality scales rather than underlying constructs (Feingold, 1990). Males and females, influenced by sociocultural factors (i.e.: gender stereotypes), hold different values about the importance of possessing various traits. These values then bias their self-reported personality scales, which is not an accurate reflection of underlying personality constructs.

The third approach, the biosocial model is a combination of the aforementioned biology and sociocultural models, claiming that gender differences in personality are a product of both biology and sociocultural factors.

**Personality and Attraction to Job and Organization Characteristics**

People with different personalities tend to be attracted by different job characteristics. Barrick et al. (2013) proposed a theory of purposeful work behavior. This theory “integrates higher-order implicit goals with principles derived from the Five-Factor Model (FFM) of personality and the expanded job characteristics model to explain how traits and job characteristics jointly and interactively influence work outcomes” (Barrick, Mount, & Li, 2013, pp.132). This theory proposes that personality initiates purposeful goal strivings. The motivational forces associated with job characteristics jointly influence individual striving for purposefulness and experienced meaningfulness. In turn, experienced meaningfulness triggers task-specific motivation processes that influence the attainment of work outcomes.

Barrick and colleagues (2013) theorized that high agreeableness and emotional stability are each positively related to the pursuit of communion goals (communion-striving motivation) and employees high in agreeableness and emotional stability will have a preference for and self-
select into jobs with higher levels of social support and affiliation. Agreeableness was found to be positively correlated with kind, cooperative, and generous (Goldberg, 1992). Emotionally stable individuals are “pleasant to be around, interact well with others, and thereby maintain positive relations with other” (Barrick et al, 2013, pp. 141) because they are usually calm, relaxed, less depressed, and more confident (Barrick & Mount, 1991). Thus, agreeableness and emotional stability are two personality traits that are associated with degree of affiliation in a job; therefore, these two personality traits are predicted to mediate the relationship between sex and attraction of affiliation in job.

**Hypothesis 4a: Agreeableness will mediate the relationship between sex and social-relevant attributes (social environment at work) of the organization.**

**Hypothesis 4b: Emotional stability will mediate the relationship between sex and social-relevant attributes (social environment at work) of the organization.**

Extraversion was shown to be positively related to desire for power and dominance within a status hierarchy, which is status-striving motivation according to the theory of purposeful work behavior (Barrick, Stewart, & Piotrowski, 2002; Mount, Barrick, Scullen, & Rounds, 2005). Lucas, Diener, Grob, Suh, and Shao (2000) demonstrated that reward sensitivity was the essence of extraversion. Most people, even introverts, experience greater pleasant affect when they are with others than when they are alone. And emotional bonds with other people are associated with positive implications for health, adjustment, and wellbeing for both extraverts and introverts (Pavot, Diener, & Fujita, 1990). The apparent sociability of extraverts could then be explained by the greater striving for rewards offered by many social situations. Of those job characteristics, power and status are two that are associated with striving for status (Barrick, Mount, & Judge, 2000).
As a result, degree of extraversion is likely to influence the relationship between sex and status-related job characters.

*Hypothesis 5: Extraversion will mediate the relationship between sex and job attributes representing high potential for resources.*

Autonomy-striving motivation, the third motivation Barrick and colleagues (2013) proposed, is defined as “a desire to have control over what to do, when to do it, and how to do it” and “incorporates growth goals because a person who learns and grows is more likely to develop the capacity to affect or control the environment” (Barrick et al, 2013, pp. 144). Barrick also proposed that people high in openness to experience tend to have an intense desire for autonomy because “they are imaginative, cultured, curious, original, broad minded, intelligent, and artistically sensitive” (Barrick et al, 2013, pp. 144). Work autonomy is one of the work design characteristics relevant to autonomy-striving motivation (Barrick et al, 2013). Given that males were found to be slightly higher in openness to ideas than females (Feingold, 1994), a prediction of the relationship between gender and work autonomy based on theory of purposeful work behavior is that,

*Hypothesis 6: Compared to females, males will be attracted by positions with high work autonomy, namely freedom to make decisions, independence at work, and low level of direct oversight by supervisor.*

*Hypothesis 7: Openness to experience will mediate the relationship between sex and job/organization attributes representing autonomy.*
CHAPTER III. METHOD AND MEASUREMENTS

Method and Procedures

Participants in the current study were adults recruited from Amazon Mechanical Turk (MTurk). MTurk participants were used in this survey because this population was more likely to have family compared to student sample and the current study was examining family-relevant attributes (i.e., family-friendly policies).

There are two methods of measuring attribute preferences: direct estimate and policy capturing. In direct estimate, participants will be asked how important each attributes is for them when looking for a job. In policy capturing, stimuli with different levels of attributes are created. Participants read stimuli and rate how attractive each stimuli organization is for them (Slaughter, Richard, & Martin, 2006). Both methods were used in current study.

Participants first read an introduction about an example and example questions (see Appendix A). Then they saw a group of profiles for 16 fictitious companies. An example profile is in Appendix B. In the profile, four factors of a company were manipulated, including factors related to work-life balance, social environment at work, potential for resource, and work autonomy. A list of the four categories was in Appendix C. Participants were asked to rate their attraction to those fictitious companies. The order of the 16 fictitious companies was randomized. Next participants were asked to directly rate the importance of each attribute under the four factors (see Appendix D). For example, under the work-life balance category, they would rate the importance of family-friendly policies and flexible work scheduling. The 13 direct rating items were also randomized. Participants answered questions measuring personality after rating organization attraction. And demographic information was collected at the end of the survey.
Measurement

*Personality.* Personality was measured with the 20-item International Personality Item Pool (Mini-IPIP; Donnellan, Oswald, Baird, & Lucas, 2006). The Mini-IPIP is a 20-item scale, with four items measuring each of the five-factor model traits. Respondents answer on a five-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). Example items are “Am the life of the party” for extraversion, “Sympathize with others’ feelings” for agreeableness, “Get chores done right away” for conscientiousness, “Have frequent mood swings” for emotional stability, and “Have vivid imagination” for openness to experience.

*Motivation orientation.* Striving for communion (11 items), status (11 items), and achievement (9 items) were measured using Motivational Orientation Inventory (Barrick et al., 2002). Respondents indicated their degree of agreement with each item on a 5-point scale (from 1=strongly agree, to 3=neither agree nor disagree, to 5=strongly disagree). Example items are “I frequently think about getting my work done” for achievement striving, “I frequently think about ways to advance and obtain better pay or working conditions” for status striving, “I frequently thinking about ways to better cooperate with coworkers and supervisors” for communion striving. Striving for autonomy was measured by autonomy subscale of Manifest Needs Questionnaire (MNQ; Steers & Braunstein, 1976). In the original scale, participants responded to 5 items on a seven-point Likert scale with always, almost always, usually, sometimes, seldom, almost never, never. In current study, this subscale was adjusted in order to be consistent with the other three motivation measurements. An example item is “In my work assignments, I try to be my own boss”.

*Importance of organization attributes.* Importance of job/organization attributes was measured using items adapted from the measure developed by Slaughter et al (2006).
Participants indicated their agreement (1=extremely unimportant, 7=extremely important) with statements about whether the listed attributes are important for them in a job. In total, 13 attributes will be included in this measure (Flexible schedule, family-friendly policies, work autonomy, location, make friends, work with people, helping others, earning, promotion, power and status, challenge, task identity, and feedback from the job or coworkers).

Organization attraction. Organization attraction was measured using adapted Highhouse and colleagues’ (2003) subscale of organization attraction. The adapted measurement decreased item number to three in order to reduce participant fatigue. Respondents answered on a 5-point scale with response options ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). An example item is “This company is attractive to me as a place for employment”.

Gender orientation. Gender orientation was measured using the short form of Bem Sex-Role Inventory (BSRI; Bem, 1981). The short form BSRI contains 30 personality characteristics. Participants indicate how well the masculine, feminine, and neutral personality characteristics describe themselves by rating on a 7-point scale. Example characteristics are “Defend my own beliefs”, “Affectionate”, and “Conscientious” for masculine, feminine, and neutral respectively. In addition, one item directly measuring gender orientation was asked.

Demographic information. Participants will be asked questions about their sex, age, education, and work experience (part-time or full-time).
CHAPTER IV. RESULTS

536 participants responded to the survey. 79 of them did not pass screening questions. Screen questions are to make sure that participants are currently employed and age range is 18 to 45. In addition, 21 cases were deleted for not passing attention check questions, leaving a sample size of 436. 48.9% of the participants were females and 51.1% were males. A majority of the participants identifies themselves as Caucasian (72.7%), 9.9% African American, 6.9% Hispanic, 7.3% Asian, 1.1% Native American, and 2.1% chose other. The age range of participants is 18-44 years old, with a mean age of 31.57 and standard deviation of 5.85.

Factor Analysis for Organizational Attribute Taxonomy

The current study summarized previous studies in organization attraction and developed a four-factor organization attributes framework, including work-life balance, social environment, potential for resources, and autonomy. Because this taxonomy of organization attributes has not been used before, factor analyses were run to examine this four-factor category of organization attributes. The sample was randomly split into two parts. First, an exploratory factor analysis (EFA) was run for direct rating scale on half of the sample. Result of EFA showed that all items load on correspondent factors except for “competitive work environment”. Therefore, this item was removed from following analyses. Next, a confirmatory factor analysis was run on the second half of data in order to examine whether measurement model fit the data well – in other words, whether the items measured the correspondent latent trait. The CFA model included direct rating for organization attributes, personality, and gender. The model appeared to be an acceptable fit to the data, \( \chi^2 (48) = 113.47, p < .001; \) RMSEA = .08, 95% CI = (.06, .10); CFI = .93. In current study, an alpha level of .05 was used for all statistical tests. Factor loadings for latent
variables in the CFA model were all significant. Therefore, the four-factor attraction model was justified. The samples for EFA and CFA were combined for the following analyses.

**Policy Capturing**

Using MPlus 7, multilevel modeling and multilevel mediation modeling were specified to test the research hypotheses. Because each participant rated his/her attraction to 16 different stimulus organizations with different attributes, the attraction ratings were nested for each individual. In multilevel modeling, the shared variance within each individual was accounted for. First, a multilevel model was run to test Hypothesis 1 though Hypothesis 4. In the multilevel model, individuals' ratings of organization attraction were regressed on organization attributes, namely work family balance, social environment, potential for resources, and autonomy, at Level 1. Then the effects of gender on Level 1 slopes were examined at Level 2. The results showed that there was significant gender differences on attraction to work family balance ($\beta =-.80, p<.001$). Hypothesis 1, which proposed that females were more likely to be attracted by organization attributes allowing work-life balance compare to males, was supported. The results also showed that there was significant gender differences on attraction to potential for resources ($\beta =.77, p=.002$). This is consistent with Hypothesis 3, which proposed that males were more attracted by organization attributes representing high potential for resources. However there were no significant gender differences on attraction to social environment ($\beta =-.29, p=.05$) or autonomy ($\beta =.10, p=.59$); thus, Hypothesis 2 and Hypothesis 6 were not supported. Worth noting was that the gender effect on social environment was approaching significant.

Next, the mediation effect of personality on attraction to organizations was tested using multilevel mediation modeling. Results of multilevel mediation modeling indicated that agreeableness significantly predicted the slope regressing organization attraction on social
environment ($\beta=.04$, $p=.01$, 95%CI=.01-.07). In other words, people with different level of agreeableness weighted supportive social environment differently in terms of affecting organization attraction. Moreover, there was a significant gender difference on agreeableness ($\beta=-1.62$, $p<.001$, 95%CI=-2.23--1.01). The direct pathway from gender to attraction to social environment was not statistically significant ($\beta=-.41$, $p=.82$, 95%CI=-.86-.05). MacKinnon and his colleagues (2002) found that the joint significance of the two indirect effects in mediation was the best balance of Type I error and power. The joint significance of indirect pathways demonstrated that agreeableness fully mediated the relationship between gender and attraction to social environment. Hypothesis 4a was supported. The multilevel mediation model also indicated that extraversion significantly correlated with attraction to potential for resources ($\beta=.04$, $p=.007$, 95%CI=.02-.08). However, the pathway connecting emotional stability and attraction to social environment ($\beta=.03$, $p=.129$, 95%CI=-.01-.06) was not significant. Therefore, emotional stability did not mediate the relationship between sex and attraction to supportive social environment. Hypothesis 4b was not supported. Also, the pathway connecting extraversion and gender ($\beta=-.22$, $p=.52$, 95%CI=-.88-.44) were not significant. In other words, extraversion did not mediate the relationship between sex and attraction to potential for resources. Hypothesis 5 was not supported. Finally, the openness to experience and attraction to autonomy ($\beta=-.02$, $p=.368$, 95%CI=-.06-.02), and gender and openness to experience ($\beta=.03$, $p=.891$, 95%CI=-.43-.50) were not significant. Openness to experience did not mediate the relationship between sex and attraction to autonomy. Thus, Hypotheses 7 was not supported.

**Direct Rating**

Table 3 presents the means, standard deviations, and correlations among the studied variables. Gender was significantly correlated with agreeableness ($r=-.26$, $p<.001$),
conscientiousness ($r = -0.13, p = 0.007$), and emotional stability ($r = -0.11, p = 0.025$). Also, correlation table showed that agreeableness and attraction to social environment was significantly correlated ($r = 0.27, p < 0.001$), extraversion and attraction to potential for resources was significantly correlated ($r = 0.25, p < 0.001$), and openness to experience and attraction to autonomy was significantly correlated ($r = 0.18, p < 0.001$).

To test Hypothesis 1 through Hypothesis 4, a one-way ANOVA was run with gender as a predictor and four direct ratings (work family balance, social environment, potential for resources, and autonomy) as criteria. The results indicated that there were gender differences on attraction for family work balance ($F(1, 434) = 21.76, p < 0.001$) and social environment ($F(1, 434) = 7.78, p = 0.005$). This indicated that compared to males, females were more likely to be attracted to organizations with work-life balance ($M_{male} = 14.01, SD_{male} = 3.72; M_{female} = 15.63, SD_{female} = 3.55$) and organizations with supportive social environment ($M_{male} = 12.50, SD_{male} = 3.77; M_{female} = 13.45, SD_{female} = 3.27$). Thus, Hypothesis 1 and Hypothesis 2 were supported. There was not a significant gender difference in attraction to potential for resources ($F(1, 434) = 2.89, p = 0.089$) or autonomy ($F(1, 434) = 0.66, p = 0.807$), Hypothesis 3 and Hypothesis 6 were not supported.

Mediation models were examined to study whether personality would mediate the relationship between gender and attraction to different organization attributes. Using MPlus 7, a full mediation model and a partial mediation model were run to test mediation hypotheses. First a partial mediation model was tested ($\chi^2 (12) = 39.32, p < 0.001; RMSEA = 0.07, 95\% CI = (0.05, 0.10); CFI = 0.92$). Bootstrap was conducted in examining full mediation model given that the significance test (i.e. $p$ values) can be unstable in mediation models. The results of mediation model indicated that significant pathways were attraction to social environment on agreeableness ($\beta = 0.22, p < 0.001, 95\% CI = 0.11-0.32$) and agreeableness on gender ($\beta = -1.76, p < 0.001, 95\% CI = -$
2.37- -1.12), attraction to potential for resources on extraversion ($\beta = .19, p<.001, 95\% CI=.12-.26$), attraction to autonomy on openness to experience ($\beta = .19, p=.001, 95\% CI=.08-.30$), and emotional stability on gender ($\beta = -.78, p=.024, 95\% CI= -1.46- -.11$). The joint significance of indirect effects indicated that agreeableness fully mediated the relationship between gender and attraction to social environment. In addition to joint significance, a full mediation model was also examined given that direct effects of gender on attraction to social environment, potential for resources, and autonomy were not significant. The full mediation model did not fit the model significantly worse compared to the partial mediation model ($\chi^2(15)=46.01, p<.001; \text{RMSEA}=.07, \text{CI}=(.05,.10); \text{CFI}=.91$). This also provided support that agreeableness fully mediated the relationship between gender and attraction to social environment, which supports Hypothesis 4a. Also, the direct rating results demonstrated there are significant correlations between personality and attraction to different organization attributes. More specifically, extraversion significantly correlated with respondents’ attraction to potential for resources, which was consistent with policy capturing results. And openness to experience significantly correlated with respondents’ attraction to work autonomy. Moreover, emotional stability was significantly correlated with gender. However, there was no significant correlation between emotional stability and attraction to social environment ($\beta =-.03, p=.438, 95\% CI=-.12-.07$). Hypothesis 4b was not supported. Emotional stability did not mediate the relationship between sex and attraction to supportive social environment. The pathway connecting gender and extraversion ($\beta =-.06, p=.881, 95\% CI=-.86-.69$) was not significant, in other words, extraversion did not mediate the relationship between sex and attraction to potential for resources. Hypothesis 5 was not supported. Finally, the pathway connecting gender and openness to experience ($\beta =-.05,$
Hypothesis 7, which proposed that openness to experience mediated the relationship between sex and attraction to autonomy, was not supported.

**Exploratory Analysis with Gender Orientation**

For gender orientation, three categories were deleted because of less than 5 people in these categories, resulting a sample size of 431 (N=1, 3, and 1, for female to male transgender, gender nonconforming, and not sure, respectively).

For policy capturing, results of multilevel model suggested that gender orientation was significantly correlated with attraction to family work balance ($\beta=-.34, p=.001, 95\%CI=-.55- -.13$) and potential for resources ($\beta=.31, p=.001, 95\%CI=.07-.55$). In other words, feminine people were more attracted to organization with high levels of work-life balance compare to masculine people, and masculine people were more attracted to organizations with high potential for resources compare to feminine people. Multilevel mediation model suggested that agreeableness mediated the relationship between gender orientation and attraction to social environment ($\beta_{Agreeableness-SE}=.04, p=.008, 95\%CI=.01-.08; \beta_{GO-Agreeableness}=-.68, p<.001, 95\%CI=-1.03- -.33$).

For direct rating, results using gender orientation as predictor were consistent with those using gender as predictor. The ANOVA results showed that there were gender orientation significantly correlated with attraction to family work balance ($F(1, 429)=24.68, p<.001$) and social environment ($F(1, 429)=7.95, p=.005$). In other words, feminine people were more attracted to organization with high levels of work-life balance ($M_{mas}=13.98, SD_{mas}=3.70; M_{fem}=15.70, SD_{fem}=3.46$) and organizations with supportive social environment ($M_{mas}=12.48, SD_{mas}=3.79; M_{fem}=13.44, SD_{fem}=3.27$) compare to masculine people. However gender orientation was not correlated with attraction to potential for resources ($F(1, 429)=2.31, p=.129$).
or autonomy ($F(1, 429) = .00, p = .951$). Mediation model of gender orientation suggested that agreeableness mediated the relationship between gender orientation and attraction to social environment ($\beta_{Agreeableness-SE} = .23, p < .001$, 95%CI=.12-.33; $\beta_{GO-Agreeableness} = -.76, p < .001$, 95%CI=-1.13-.40).
CHAPTER V. DISCUSSION

The primary goals of this study were to examine gender differences on organization attraction to different organization attributes and the mediating role of personality. Organization attributes were classified into four different categories based on evolutionary theory, social role theory, and social identity theory. Those categories were work family balance, social environment, potential for resources, and work autonomy. The study showed that when direct rating was used, females were more attracted to work family balance and social environment than were males. Agreeableness mediated the relationship between gender and attraction to social environment. When the policy-capturing method was used, females were more attracted to organizations providing work family balance than were males, and males were more attracted to organization providing potential for resources than were females. The policy capturing method also demonstrated that agreeableness mediated the relationship between sex and attraction to social environment. More specifically, compared to males, females were more agreeable, and more agreeable people were more likely to be attracted by organizations with supportive social environment.

Moreover, results of this study supported Barrick et al.’s (2013) theory of purposeful work behavior by demonstrating the correlations between personalities and organization attraction to different attributes. Barrick et al.’s (2013) theory of purposeful work behavior proposed that people with different personality tend to have different motivational strivings. And with these different strivings, people tend to be attracted by different organization attributes. The current study demonstrated that agreeableness was correlated with attraction to supportive social environment, extraversion was correlated with attraction to potential for resources, and openness to experience was correlated with attraction to autonomy.
Theoretical Implications

Previous studies examined attraction to various organization attributes, including affirmative action policy (Thomas et al, 1999), location (Konrad et al, 2000; Thomas et al, 1999), work interdependence (Barrick et al, 2013), and so forth. But most of these previous studies were descriptive. The current study developed four categories of organization attributes based on theoretical frame and summarizing all previously studied organization attributes. Both EFA and CFA results suggested that the four-factor model fit the data well and all items loaded on their correspondent factors. This four-factor attribute model provided a theoretical summary of organization attributes studied in previous studies and future studies can use this model as a framework and extend this model.

The results of the current study replicated and extended previous research findings. Policy capturing results of the current study showed that males are more attracted by organizations with high potential for resources, which is consistent with previous findings that males are more attracted by high earning, promotion opportunities, and power/influence/authority (Konrad et al, 2000). Meanwhile, direct rating results indicated that females are more attracted to organizations with friendly social environment. Findings were also consistent with Konrad and her colleagues’ meta-analysis (2000) demonstrating that females prefer more opportunities to make friends, to work with people and to help others. Moreover, the current study extended previous research by demonstrating that females are more attracted by organizations with high levels of work family balance with both policy capturing and direct rating. The current study indicated that males and females did not show difference in attraction to work autonomy. One potential reason for this was that the effect size for gender difference was
not large enough to show statistically significant difference because both male and female rated autonomy as an attractive attribute when applying for a job.

This study provides empirical support for Barrick et al’s (2013) theory of purposeful work behavior. Correlation showed that people with high agreeableness are more likely to be attracted by organizations with friendly social environment, people with high extraversion are more likely to be attracted by organizations with high potential for resources, and people with high openness to experience are more likely to be attracted by organizations with high level of autonomy. However the mediation hypotheses in current study were not supported except for agreeableness mediating the relationship between gender and attraction to social environment. One potential explanation for this is that gender is a distal predictor for personality and there are other proximal factors affecting personality, which makes the effect of gender on personality less influential.

Another interesting finding of the current study was that the results of policy capturing and direct rating were not consistent. Gender differences were found in family work balance and social environment when using direct rating; whereas using policy capturing, gender differences were found in family work balance and potential for resources. Previous research has found inconsistent results in direct rating and policy capturing as well. Slaughter et al. (2006) compare policy capturing and direct rating (including attribute ratings, points allotted, and direct rankings) in predicting job preferences, and found results that were inconsistent. The authors pointed out that policy capturing out-performed direct ratings when a noncompensatory decision strategy was assumed while direct ratings out-performed policy capturing when a compensatory decision strategy was assumed. Another potential explanation of the inconsistent results is social desirability. It has been shown that attraction to organization attributes can be biased by social
desirability (Brookhouse, Guion, & Doherty, 1986). When asked to rank importance of 10 attributes that make a job good or bad, respondents placed pay as the most important attribute for others while pay was ranked as the 5th and 7th most important attribute for themselves for males and females correspondently. Direct ratings have been criticized as subject to social desirability (Rynes, 1989). In current study, participants who treat potential for resources as essential might have inhibited themselves from providing high rating for this attribute in direct rating whereas the rating would not change much for others. And males are more likely to give more to weight to potential for resources according to theory and finding from policy capturing. Therefore the difference between these two groups (i.e. male and female) might be reduced and lead to a non-significant result.

Finally, the current study highlights how evolutionary theories could guide understanding of workplace behaviors, especially organization attraction. Evolutionary theory, in addition to social cultural theories, is known as a tool to explain human behaviors from a different yet insightful perspective. Given the fact that working behavior is a kind of human behavior, evolutionary theories could be beneficial to the understanding of certain workplace behaviors. For example, evolutionary psychology predicted that in general females invest more in parenting compare to males (Bjorklund & Jordan, 2013; Buss, 1999). Thus, the current study predicted and found support for the idea that, in the workplace, females should be more attracted to organizations providing life work balance, such as flexible schedule and family-friendly policies. The current study is the first the author is aware of to apply evolutionary theory to better understand organization attraction.
Practical Implication

Based on the findings of current study, company might be able to strategically recruit from different groups by emphasizing different organizational attributes in recruiting. To avoid adverse impact in selection, companies, especially those dominated by males, can add information attractive to female applicants in job advertisement, e.g. family-friendly policies and supportive work environment. Also, because job autonomy is attractive for both male and female employees, organizations could emphasize the degree of autonomy employees have in their job advertisement to attract more competitive applicants.

Moreover, the findings of current study shed light on the attributes companies could build if they want to increase diversity by recruiting female employees to better attract and retain female employees. For example, organizations could provide different options for male and female employees in job redesign in make their current job more attractive for them.

Limitation and Future Directions

Though the current study supplemented previous research, there are limitations and future work could be done to better understand gender differences in organization attraction. The largest limitation of current study is that the study is using fictitious company profiles to study organization attraction. The fictitious company profiles are helpful in terms of manipulating organization attribute to create fully crossed design and presenting different attributes in a straightforward way. However, the mechanism of applicants to rate fictitious companies might be different from that of a real company. Future studies could code organization attributes for real companies and see whether there is a gender difference in attraction to these attributes. Additionally, future studies could look at how applicants perceive organizations attributes and how these perceptions influence organization attraction. With a better understanding of
organization attributes perceptions and group difference in attraction to different attributes, companies will be able to attract competitive applicant from different groups.

A second limitation of the current study is that the data were cross-sectional. Even though both theory and common sense suggested that biological gender might influence personality and then organization attraction, and not the other way around, longitudinal data are needed to demonstrate casual relationship or whether the relationship between personality and organization attraction are reciprocal. Future studies could collect two waves of data to examine this relationship.

Third, the current study developed a four-factor model to categorize organizational attributes based on previous studies of organization attraction and provided empirical support for this model. However, there are many other organizational attributes that were not included in this model. Therefore, future studies could look at other attributes and extend this model to better facilitate organization attract competitive applicants. Also, future studies could use this framework to examine how these organizational attributes would affect other stages of job application, e.g. intention to pursuit and intention to accept a job offer. Also, future studies could take a closer look at one particular organization attribute category and examine what specific policies are driving the attraction effect.. For example, there are many different kind of family-friendly policies a company could provide for their employees. Of these different policy options, did one in particular play a more important role in organization attraction?
CHAPTER VI. CONCLUSION

Males and females can be attracted by different organization attributes in job search. A better understanding of gender differences in organization attraction could help organization attract competitive applicants as well as fulfill employees’ needs. The current study is the first study to combine evolutionary and social-cultural theory as a framework to explain gender differences in organization attraction. The current study examined gender differences in organization attraction using both direct rating and policy capturing methods. The current study also examined the mediating role of personality in the relationship between gender and attraction to different organization attributes. The results indicated that females prefer organizations with a high level of family work balance and organizations with supportive social environments under both methods. Agreeableness was demonstrated to mediate the relationship between sex and attraction to supportive social environments. This study contributes to the organization attraction literature by developing a theoretical four-factor organization attribution model and applying evolutionary theories in organization attraction. The results also provide practical information for organizations interested in better understanding gender differences in organization attraction.
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APPENDIX A. INTRODUCTION

Introduction
Imagine you were looking for a job right now. In this study, you will be presented with 16 job descriptions. All jobs are specialist jobs in your area of interest. After seeing each job description, you will be asked to provide and evaluate that job.

For example, the following table describes a job.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenging work</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Friendly coworkers</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive boss</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commute</td>
<td>Short</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

You can see that this job has challenging work, unfriendly coworkers and an unsupported boss, and the commute is short.

After looking at the tables describing the job, you will be asked to respond to the following items about and the job and the company.

1. This company is attractive to me as a place for employment.
2. I am interested in learning more about this company.
3. A job at this company is very appealing to me.
APPENDIX B. EXAMPLE COMPANY PROFILE

Below is a profile of a company. Several characteristics of the company are described.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flexible Schedule: You define where and at what time you work (e.g. remote work, shifting start and end times)</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family-Friendly Policies (e.g., on/near-site childcare center, paid maternity/paternity leave, health/stress management programs)</td>
<td>Many</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of Overnight Travel Required</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of Work Environment</td>
<td>Competitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of Work in Teams or Groups</td>
<td>Rare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance of Helping Others</td>
<td>Not important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starting Salary</td>
<td>Lower than industry average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for Promotion /Advancement</td>
<td>Few</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status: Opportunities for Influence/Prominence</td>
<td>Few</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree of freedom to Make Decisions About How to do the Work</td>
<td>High level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree of Independence at Work</td>
<td>High level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree of Direct Oversight by Supervisor</td>
<td>Minimal oversight</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Imagining you were looking for a job right now. How would you evaluate the company you just saw?
APPENDIX C. ORGANIZATION ATTRIBUTES IN POLICY CAPTURING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work-Life Balance</th>
<th>High Level of Attribute</th>
<th>Low Level of Attribute</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flexible Schedule: You define where and at what time you work (e.g. remote work, shifting start and end times)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family-Friendly Policies (e.g., on/near-site childcare center, paid maternity/paternity leave, health/stress management programs)</td>
<td>Many</td>
<td>Few</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of Overnight Travel Required</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Social Environment at Work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature of Work Environment</th>
<th>Supportive</th>
<th>Competitive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of Work in Teams or Groups</td>
<td>Frequent</td>
<td>Rare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance of Helping Others</td>
<td>Important</td>
<td>Not Important</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Potential for Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Starting Salary</th>
<th>Higher than Industry Average</th>
<th>Lower than Industry Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for Promotion /Advancement</td>
<td>Many</td>
<td>Few</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status: Opportunities for influence/prominence</td>
<td>Many</td>
<td>Few</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Autonomy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree of Freedom to Make Decisions About How to Do the Work</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Degree of Independence at Work</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree of Direct Oversight by Supervisor</td>
<td>Minimal Oversight</td>
<td>A Great Deal of Oversight</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D. DIRECT RATING

Please rate how important each of the following attributes is for you when you looking for a job (with 1 representing Extremely unimportant and 7 representing Extremely important).

1. Flexible Schedule (You define where and at what time you work).
2. Family-Friendly Policies (Organization offers on/near-site childcare center, paid maternity/paternity leave, health/stress management programs).
3. Low amount of Overnight Travel Required.
4. Supportive work environment.
5. Salary that is higher than industry average.
6. Frequent team/group work.
7. Work environment emphasize helping behavior.
8. Opportunity for promotion/advancement.
10. Competitive work environment.
11. Freedom to make decisions about how to do the work.
12. Independence at work.
13. Minimal direct oversight by supervisor.
APPENDIX E. HUMAN SUBJECTS REVIEW BOARD APPROVAL

Informed Consent Form

INTRODUCTION
People may be attracted to different jobs. This study examines the individual differences in job attraction. The study is led by Hanyi Min from Department of Psychology at BGSU. You are recruited as a participant via Amazon’s Mechanical Turk Service (www.mturk.com).

PURPOSE
The purpose of the study is to examine the attractiveness of jobs that have different characteristics. The goal is to explore the individual differences in job preferences among people in a job seeking process.

BENEFITS
In return for your participation, you will be paid $2.00 through the Amazon’s Mechanical Turk account. Your participation will benefit the research community by increasing understanding of person-job interactions and will benefit employers by helping them identify more effective recruitment strategies.

PROCEDURE
You must be at least 18 years old to participate. If you agree to participate, you will first read an example telling you what you will do in this study. Then, you will read a description of a job and be asked to rate how attractive the described job is to you. You will rate 16 job descriptions in total. People typically take approximately 25 minutes to complete the session. Once you finish the survey, you will be given a code to confirm your participation on Amazon’s Mechanical Turk.

VOLUNTARY NATURE
Your participation in our study is completely voluntary. If at any point during the experiment, you do not wish to continue, you are free to leave without any penalty. Deciding to participate or not will not affect your standing or relationship with Bowling Green State University.

ANONYMITY
All of your responses will be anonymous. Only the researchers for this study will have access to your responses. However, please be aware that (a) no form of communication (e.g. email, telephone, or regular mail) is 100% secure, (b) employers or others may be able to track the information you type into a computer, (c) do not leave survey open if using a public computer or a computer others may have access to, (d) it is best to clear the browser cache and page history (see your browser instructions) after you complete the study.

RISKS
The risk of participation is no greater than that experienced in everyday life. This means that you won't be taking any risks by choosing to participate in this study.

CONTACTS
You should direct any questions or concerns about your rights as a research participant to the Chair of the Human Subjects Review Board (Phone: 419-372-7716, Email: hsrb@bgsu.edu). If you have questions about the study, you may contact Hanyi Min, 419-372-4410, mhanyi@bgsu.edu, or Dr. Margaret Brooks, 419-372-9389, mbrooks@bgsu.edu

Please go to the next page ONLY if you consent to the procedures described above. In other words, if you complete the session by going to the following pages, that means you consent to the procedures described above.
### Table 1 Organization Attributes in Previous Studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>H1: Work-Life Balance</strong></td>
<td>Flexible schedule</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Family-friendly policies</td>
<td></td>
<td>Affirmative action policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H2: Social Environment at Work</strong></td>
<td>Make friends</td>
<td>Social support</td>
<td>Make friends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Work with people</td>
<td>Interdependence</td>
<td>Work with people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Helping others</td>
<td>Help others</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H3: Potential for Resources</strong></td>
<td>Earning</td>
<td>Earning</td>
<td>Salary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>Promotions</td>
<td>Opportunity for rapid advancement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Power and status</td>
<td>Power and influence</td>
<td>Power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Challenging work</td>
<td>Challenge</td>
<td>Challenging and interesting work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H6: Autonomy</strong></td>
<td>Work autonomy</td>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>Freedom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2 Gender Differences in Personality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personality</th>
<th>Research reported male higher than female</th>
<th>Research reported female higher than male</th>
<th>Motivational Striving</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Emotional stability</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Emotional stability, low emotional stability)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Striving for communion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agreeableness</strong></td>
<td>Costa et al., 2001; Schmitt et al., 2008;</td>
<td></td>
<td>Striving for communion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>Feingold, 1994</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tender-mindedness</td>
<td></td>
<td>Feingold, 1994</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Openness</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Striving for autonomy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness to feelings</td>
<td></td>
<td>Costa et al., 2001;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness to ideas</td>
<td></td>
<td>Costa et al., 2001;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Extraversion</strong></td>
<td>Schmitt et al., 2008;</td>
<td></td>
<td>Striving for status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warmth</td>
<td>Costa et al., 2001; Feingold, 1994</td>
<td></td>
<td>Striving for autonomy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conscientiousness</strong></td>
<td>Schmitt et al., 2008;</td>
<td></td>
<td>Striving for achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order</td>
<td>Feingold, 1994</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3 Mean, Standard Deviation, and Correlation Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Gender</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Extraversion</td>
<td>11.29</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Agreeableness</td>
<td>14.93</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>-.26**</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Conscientiousness</td>
<td>15.51</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>-.13**</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Emotional stability</td>
<td>9.36</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>-.11*</td>
<td>-.31**</td>
<td>-.13**</td>
<td>-.38**</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Openness to experience</td>
<td>13.88</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.12**</td>
<td>-.24**</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Work Life Balance</td>
<td>14.80</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>-.22**</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>.12*</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Social Environment</td>
<td>12.96</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>-.13**</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.19**</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Potential for</td>
<td>16.18</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.16**</td>
<td>-.16**</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Autonomy</td>
<td>16.24</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>-.13**</td>
<td>.11*</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td>.14**</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1=female, 2=male.