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Abstract

The main purpose of the current study was to investigate the effects of firm size and corporate social responsibility (CSR) on organizational attraction (focusing on the dimensions of general company attractiveness and job pursuit intentions and exploring the third dimension of prestige). Given that most CSR research has focused on large companies, this study examined medium, small, and micro firms in addition to large firms. A total of 255 participants read one of eight hypothetical job ads and then completed the study’s measures. Results showed that CSR did not have a significant main effect on any of the three dimensions of organizational attraction. CSR and firm size also did not have a significant interaction on any dimension of organizational attraction. However, results showed that there was a significant difference in perceived social image, such that the job ads with CSR were rated significantly higher on social image than the jobs ads without CSR. Although the hypotheses were not supported, this research shed light on the relations among CSR, firm size, and organizational attraction. Findings also highlighted the importance of further examining the relations among CSR, social image, and organizational attraction in future research.
Chapter I

Review of the Literature

In recent years, both researchers and practitioners have been paying more attention to the construct of corporate social responsibility (CSR). Research has shown that CSR can enhance a company’s reputation and applicant attraction to a company (Fitjar, 2011). Turban and Greening (1996) also found that CSR was related to several competitive advantages, including applicant decision making. However, the majority of CSR research has focused on large corporations (Perrini, Russo, & Tencati, 2007), and Fitjar (2011) stated that CSR studies should not be generalized to all firm sizes because they do not operate the same way. Hence, there is a need to examine CSR in smaller organizations as well to investigate if firm size might influence perceptions of organizations that engage in CSR.

The main purpose of the current study, therefore, was to investigate the effects of firm size and CSR on organizational attraction. This research shed light on whether CSR and firm size affect organizational attraction, and whether there is an interaction between these two variables. Given that most CSR research has focused on large companies, this study provided valuable information about medium, small, and micro firms. Examining micro firms is especially important because they tend to be under-researched (Perrini et al., 2007). Organizations should also be able to benefit from the findings of this study by tailoring their practices and job advertisements to attract the most qualified applicants. This is necessary because it helps companies better understand how job applicants view
CSR, whether applicants are more likely to be attracted to it or to view it as a marketing ploy, and whether those perceptions might be affected by the size of the firm.

**CSR**

The era of modern social responsibility began around 1953 when Howard R. Bowen published a book called *Social Responsibilities of the Businessman* (Carroll, 1979). This was the first book published solely on this topic (Carroll, 1979). Although there does not seem to be a universally-accepted definition of CSR (Carroll, 1979; Nisim & Benjamin, 2008; Reverte, 2009), several definitions have been offered by different researchers. For example, Elg and Hultman (2011) defined CSR as “the firm’s consideration of, and response to, issues beyond the narrow economic, technical and legal requirements of the firm” (p. 446). Arendt and Brettel (2010) defined CSR as the “management of stakeholder concern for responsible and irresponsible acts related to environmental, ethical, and social phenomena in a way that creates corporate benefit” (p. 1471). Overall, CSR seems to focus primarily on human rights, unfair business practices, organizational governance, environmental protection, social development, and the health and safety of employees (Leonard & McAdam, 2003).

Carroll (1979) and Nisim and Benjamin (2008) explained CSR through four responsibilities a company has. The first obligation is economic responsibility, which focuses on companies maximizing their profits. Legal responsibilities are next, as all company responsibilities and procedures must be legal. Ethical responsibilities are based on community values and norms, and they are moral obligations for the company not required by the law. The final is philanthropic responsibilities (e.g., donations to various organizations), which are not required but instead good deeds made by the company.
Some researchers have argued that the last two responsibilities should only be related to CSR because these are voluntary for companies, and CSR should only involve those voluntary behaviors (Carroll, 1979; Nisim & Benjamin, 2008; Schuler and Cording, 2006).

Within the last decade, CSR has increased in popularity (Mueller, Hattrup, Spiess, & Lin-Hi, 2012). The world’s largest companies increased social responsibility reports between 2005 and 2008 by 60% (Mueller et al., 2012). There has been an increase in annual social responsibility reports made available to the public in the last 20 years; Reverte (2009) attributes this growth to increased public awareness and media coverage on social responsibility. The reports are also used to increase the legitimacy of a company’s CSR program (Reverte, 2009). De Grosbois (2012) found that stakeholders such as customers, investors, and the community, want to learn more about the company behind the brand name, and they want companies to be held more accountable for their actions. Another reason for this increase in CSR popularity could be linked to CSR’s close connection with globalization (Mueller et al., 2012). Mueller et al. (2012) stated that globalization has influenced companies to take on more responsibility, including CSR.

De Grosbois (2012) explained that CSR reporting is currently completely voluntary and the depth of information released is up to the company’s discretion. However, several European countries within the last five years have been moving towards mandatory CSR disclosures. De Grosbois believed this movement is due to pressure from stakeholders wanting to know more about the companies they invest in, buy from, and work for. She stated that although companies are allowed to withhold CSR
reports, media and non-governmental organizations have been publicly writing about companies’ CSR polices. This recent push for CSR disclosures and the possibility of negative publicity may have been enough to pressure companies into increasing their CSR (de Grosbois, 2012).

The main industries that are increasing their companies’ CSR are the hotel-related industries, controversial industries (e.g., tobacco), and Fortune 500 Companies (Cai, Jo, & Pan, 2011; de Grosbois, 2012). The hotel industry has been under increased scrutiny for its harmful effects on the environment (de Grosbois, 2012). Environmental CSR has been increasing in popularity and could be defined as green initiatives beyond the environmental laws and regulations (Reinhardt, Stavins, & Vietor, 2008). A main reason for hotel companies to embrace CSR is that 109 out of 150 of the largest hotel chains report some aspect of CSR (de Grosbois, 2012). Controversial industries such as tobacco, alcohol, gambling, and adult entertainment, have also been improving their CSR (Cai et al., 2011). Cai et al. (2011) believe these industries participate in CSR to help decrease the negative brand image perceptions that many people have of them. Leonard and McAdam (2003) stated that the effect of being low on CSR is apparent in corporate rankings, such as Business Week’s “The Best and Worst Corporate Boards in America.”

Fitjar (2011) believed there are two different reasons why companies incorporate CSR: They want to do well and/or they want to make money. In other words, although some companies participate in CSR because it is ethical and/or helps the community, other companies might engage in it because it could result in economic benefits (Fitjar, 2011). However, regardless of the company’s reason, people have their own perceptions of how “genuine” a company’s intentions are when engaging in CSR, and different
organizational factors could affect those perceptions. One firm demographic that could influence people’s perceptions is firm size.

**Firm Size**

Different classifications have been used to determine firm sizes. For example, using U.S. Census Bureau size classifications, Mittelstaedt, Harben, and Ward (2003) set the following criteria to distinguish among large, medium, small, and micro firms: 500 employees or more for large companies, 100 to 499 employees for medium companies, 20 to 99 employees for small companies, and fewer than 20 employees for micro companies. Perrini et al. (2007) also identified four different classifications of firm size, but they based their criteria on the definition of small- to medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) offered by the European Commission. Specifically, they set the following criteria: 250 employees or more for large companies, between 50 and 249 employees for medium companies, 10 to 49 employees for small companies, and fewer than 10 employees for micro companies. In the current study, the numbers in the job advertisements were set to fit both Mittelstaedt et al.’s and Perrini et al.’s criteria. Specifically, large, medium-sized, small, and micro firms were conceptualized as having 1000, 200, 40, and 8 employees, respectively.

Nisim and Benjamin (2008) interviewed 31 cleaning subcontractors at various companies in Israel varying in firm size to examine the relation between firm size and social responsibility. They found that most companies, regardless of size, displayed some form of ethical responsibility. This means that all firm sizes can and do engage in CSR, which supports the need to examine more than just large firms. That being said, Perrini et al. (2007) found that large companies are more likely to have a formal CSR plan than
SMEs. One reason for that could be that large companies can have a group of employees working strictly on CSR programs, but it would be hard to set aside one or more employees to solely work on CSR efforts in smaller companies (Fitjar, 2011). This does not mean that SMEs are not engaging in CSR; rather, SMEs have different CSR strategies than large firms (Perrini et al., 2007).

Perrini et al. (2007) examined the relation between firm size and CSR strategies and found that micro firms were more likely to have a public ethical code than small- or medium-sized companies. According to Perrini et al., micro firms were more likely to encourage and motivate their employees to volunteer than the small, medium, and large companies (Perrini et al., 2007). Udayasanker (2008) suggested that the relation between firm size and CSR participation is a U-shaped curve, such that micro and large companies are more likely to participate in CSR than SMEs, but this suggestion has not been examined yet.

A majority of small companies are involved in CSR activities, but do not call it CSR; this is called “silent CSR” (Perrini et al., 2007). SMEs often have informal CSR programs that have little to no advertisement or PR to highlight the program (Baumann-Pauly, Wickert, Spence, & Scherer, 2013). It is assumed that they do not recognize the potential benefit of advertising (Perrini et al., 2007). Baumann-Pauly et al. (2013) stated that executives at SMEs often find it too expensive to send out the CSR reports, as their return on investment would not be worth the time and money it takes to create the report every year. The employees usually share that information with the stakeholders in informal ways, such as face-to-face communication (Baumann-Pauly et al., 2013). SMEs are however more advanced in applying these programs and getting employees involved
SMEs have an advantage of implementing the ideas quicker than going through multiple people at a large company, and employees are engaged and aware of the CSR programs because CSR is incorporated in the culture of the companies (Baumann-Pauly et al., 2013).

SMEs have not been researched on a large scale (Perrini et al., 2007). The research done on this topic has primarily focused on SMEs that mainly compete with large companies (Fitjar, 2011). If researchers continue to neglect SMEs, they will overlook a vast majority of companies (Nisim & Benjamin, 2008), as SMEs represent 90% of the companies worldwide and have over 50% of employment (Udayasankar, 2008). In Europe, SMEs account for 99.79% of the businesses and up to 69.73% of the employment (Perrini et al., 2007).

Large companies tend to be more socially responsive due to their public exposure (Udayasankar, 2008). Given that large companies are highly publicized, it can be a benefit if they engage in CSR (Nisim & Benjamin, 2008). Otherwise, large companies can be publicly scrutinized for having unethical business practices (Nisim & Benjamin, 2008). Research has shown that large corporations more closely follow company values because of their visibility, which makes it easier for people to find out about any organizational behaviors that conflict with the corporate values (Nisim & Benjamin, 2008). However, stakeholders may expect a large corporation to engage in CSR programs; therefore, that might be less noticeable and not as impressive compared to a small or medium firm engaging in CSR.

SMEs face the opposite problem because these companies are hidden and not as visible as large companies (Nisim & Benjamin, 2008). This means that SMEs that focus
on CSR tend to be less publicized and may not benefit from incorporating CSR (Nisim & Benjamin, 2008). However, because SMEs are more dependent on the community for revenue and company support, showing that they are socially responsible toward the community might be beneficial in that regard (Fitjar, 2011). SMEs could also better advertise their CSR programs as a way to enhance their public image and gain a competitive advantage (Fraj-Andrés, López-Pérez, Melero-Polo, & Vázquez-Carrasco, 2012). However, SMEs that do not focus on CSR will unlikely be exposed for their lack of CSR because they are less visible (Nisim & Benjamin, 2008), probably because they are less likely than large firms to have external pressures from stockholders.

There are mixed results on whether SMEs or large corporations are better equipped to execute CSR programs (Baumann-Pauly et al., 2013). Initiatives have been designed for large corporations that can provide the manpower and financial resources needed to properly implement CSR programs (Baumann-Pauly et al., 2013). It is often assumed that larger companies have a greater social impact than SMEs (Udayasankar, 2008). Larger companies tend to have a bigger effect on the community due to their increased resources and manpower (Reverte, 2009). In addition, larger corporations tend to focus on managing the company’s environmental footprint (Aras, Aybars, & Kutlu, 2009). Along with environmental issues, large companies have also been found to focus on employment issues and local communities (Perrini et al., 2007).

Although large companies usually focus on environmental issues, it is important to consider the impact that SMEs could have on the environment (Perrini et al., 2007). Individually, SMEs might not have a huge impact on the environment, but a collective group of SMEs could play a big part in improving the environment (Perrini et al., 2007).
SMEs also seem to focus on making donations to charities, whether that is with time or money (Udayasankar, 2008). Research has shown that SMEs’ employees volunteer at local community programs more than large companies’ employees (Perrini et al., 2007). Some argue that small companies are at an advantage because they are often local so they can more easily communicate with and contribute to local charities (Nisim & Benjamin, 2008). However, small- and medium-sized companies have less money and fewer resources to contribute to CSR (Udayasankar, 2008). Therefore, SMEs sometimes collaborate with other organizations of similar size to increase resources needed to engage in CSR (Baumann-Pauly et al., 2013).

As previously mentioned, it should not be assumed that being involved in CSR is going to help every company (Perrini et al., 2007), and this could depend on firm size. Fitjar (2011) stated that CSR research focusing on large companies should not be generalized to SMEs, as those are different types of companies. Moreover, SMEs and large corporations differ regarding their implementation of CSR programs (Baumann-Pauly et al., 2013). Nisim and Benjamin (2008) stated that CSR is a difficult topic to generalize because it should be examined on a firm-by-firm basis and industry-by-industry basis. Perrini et al. (2007) somewhat disagree, as they believe there are some aspects of CSR that can be generalized because the basic principles of CSR are the same for both SMEs and large companies: Companies want to minimize their negative environmental effects and increase social justice, regardless of their size. However, Perrini et al. (2007) believe that SMEs’ motivations for integrating CSR are different from large firms’ motivations. Specifically, in SMEs, CSR is put into place because of the owners’ or managers’ personal values and beliefs (Perrini et al., 2007). On the other
hand, the authors stated that large firms are more concerned with enhancing economic benefits (e.g., visibility to the public, economies of scale, avenues to display values to the customers, and competiveness). These different reasons for engaging in CSR could explain why stakeholders may view CSR differently based on firm size.

Therefore, CSR programs may not produce positive results for all companies (Arendt & Brettel, 2010). For example, some believe that CSR is incorporated into companies for economic survival (Nisim & Benjamin, 2008). Specifically, stakeholders may suspect the company is “greenwashing,” or in other words, using the CSR program as a marketing tool to earn money rather than to help society, creating cynicism and suspicion of the company’s motives (Arendt & Brettel, 2010). As previously mentioned, firm size may play a role in determining whether people are cynical about a company’s CSR. For example, large companies may be accused of implementing CSR programs as a façade to what the company is actually doing, whereas SMEs may be perceived as engaging in CSR based on the owner’s attitude to be socially responsible rather than for financial gain (Baumann-Pauly et al., 2013). Baumann-Pauly et al. (2013) mentioned that the large companies do the CSR “talk,” whereas the SMEs do the CSR “walk.” Large companies are more likely to advertise their CSR plans to the public. Therefore, stakeholder cynicism may be directed more towards large corporations than SMEs. If applicants view CSR as a marketing tool, then that might negatively impact their perceptions of organizations.

**Applicant Perceptions**

The current study examined applicant perceptions of organizations, focusing on organizational attraction. Specifically, this study investigated the organizational attraction
dimensions of general company attractiveness and job pursuit intentions and explore the third dimension of prestige (Highhouse, Lievens, & Sinar, 2003). Arendt and Brettel (2010) found that CSR is instrumental in enhancing a company’s image, attractiveness, stakeholder-company identification, and firm performance. They also found that it might positively affect corporate identity. Moreover, CSR has been found to enhance various stakeholder relations (Udayasankar, 2008). For companies to keep their “good citizen” image in the community, research has shown that they must contribute employee time or company money to the community and society (Nisim & Benjamin, 2008). When a company is proactive and consistent in the CSR program, engaging in CSR is more likely to have positive effects on the organization (Fraj-Andrés et al., 2012).

Past research has shown that CSR could impact companies in several ways. For example, CSR was found to be an important factor that could affect a company’s reputation (Arendt & Brettel, 2010). As previously stated, Fitjar (2011) mentioned CSR can enhance a company’s reputation and become more attractive to job applicants. Applicants often consider several organizational attributes when evaluating companies, such as salary, type of work, and possibly the social responsibly of the company (Zhang & Gowan, 2012). A company with CSR might be able to attract better employees for lower salaries (Fitjar, 2011). For example, Cable and Turban (2003) found that people were more willing to work for companies with better reputations for lower salaries. Moreover, Zhang and Gowan (2012) manipulated different aspects of CSR using hypothetical companies and found that companies engaging in higher social responsibility were more attractive to potential future employees. They also found that
applicants with high ethical standards were more attracted to a company with high ethical standards.

However, the effect of CSR on applicant attraction may differ based on firm size (Fitjar, 2011). For example, most SMEs do not promote their CSR, which seems like a lost opportunity for companies to enhance their attractiveness to potential applicants (Perrini et al., 2007). Often times in SMEs, the people hired are internal references like relatives, friends of employees, or acquaintances (Fitjar, 2011), whereas large companies do not seem to rely as often on internal references. Fitjar (2011) stated that SMEs’ reputation will probably be less affected by disadvantages of not engaging in CSR (e.g., boycotts, media scrutiny), and that the advantages might be as great as a large company.

In summary, the purpose of the current study was to investigate the effects of firm size and CSR on potential applicants’ organizational attraction. Specifically, the focus was on general company attractiveness and job pursuit intentions, but prestige was investigated in a more exploratory manner. The results of this study will help companies better understand how job applicants view CSR and how those perceptions might be affected by the size of the firm.
Chapter II

Rationale and Hypotheses

Although CSR has gained popularity over the last decade, given that this topic is still fairly new, more research is needed. CSR refers to “the firm’s consideration of, and response to, issues beyond the narrow economics, technical, and legal requirements of the firm” (Elg & Hultman, 2011, p. 446). CSR was found to be instrumental in a company’s image, attractiveness, stakeholder-company identification, and firm performance (Arendt & Brettel, 2010). Therefore, it is expected that the presence of CSR should have a positive effect on organizational attraction. Specifically, the following hypotheses were developed:

*Hypothesis 1a:* CSR will have a significant main effect on general company attractiveness.

*Hypothesis 1b:* CSR will have a significant main effect on job pursuit intentions.

Although most companies incorporate some form of ethical responsibility, CSR research has primarily focused on large multinational corporations (Nisim & Benjamin, 2008). Udayasanker (2008) suggested that the relation between firm size and CSR participation is a U-shaped curve, such that micro and large companies are more likely to participate in CSR than small- and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs), but this proposition has not been examined yet. Mittelstaedt et al. (2003) used U.S. Census Bureau firm size classifications to set the following firm size criteria: 500 employees or more for large
companies, 100 to 499 employees for medium companies, 20 to 99 employees for small companies, and fewer than 20 employees for micro companies. Perrini et al. (2007) also identified firm size classifications, basing their criteria on the definition of SMEs offered by the European Commission: 250 employees or more for large companies, between 50 and 249 employees for medium companies, 10 to 49 employees for small companies, and fewer than 10 employees for micro companies. Nisim and Benjamin (2008) stated that small firms should not be viewed the same as large firms, suggesting that the research findings found for large corporations should not be generalized to smaller companies.

Arendt and Brettel (2010) showed that a company with a CSR program enhanced the company’s reputation, which in turn increased the attractiveness of the company. CSR has also been shown to strengthen the ties and commitment of employees to their companies (Nisim & Benjamin, 2008). However, some research has also suggested that some stakeholders may have CSR cynicism, which is when people believe a company engages in CSR as a marketing ploy or to increase sales (Arendt & Brettel, 2010). Large companies can be accused of implementing CSR programs as a façade to what the company is actually doing, whereas SMEs may be perceived as engaging in CSR based on the owner’s attitude to be socially responsible rather than for financial gain (Baumann-Pauly et al., 2013). Hence, both positive and negative perceptions may result when companies engage in CSR, and firm size may play a role in influencing those perceptions. Specifically, given that large and micro companies are expected to participate in CSR activities, engaging in CSR might be less impressive and should be less likely to enhance organizational attraction than when SMEs engage in CSR. Overall, companies that do not participate in CSR are expected to have lower organizational
attraction than companies that do engage in CSR. However, as previously discussed, it is expected that large companies without CSR will receive the lowest organizational attraction ratings because large companies should have more money and resources to help society. On the other hand, SMEs and micro firms without CSR should be less affected and should have similar organizational attraction ratings because SMEs are less expected to engage in CSR and because both micro firms and SMEs are expected to have less money and fewer resources to help society. In other words, it is expected that there would be a significant interaction between CSR and firm size, qualifying the main effect of CSR (see Figure 1). Specifically, the following hypotheses were developed:

*Hypothesis 2a:* CSR and firm size will have a significant interaction on general company attractiveness ratings, such that in the presence of CSR, ratings will be highest when small firms are engaging in CSR, followed by medium firms, then micro firms, and finally large firms, whereas in the absence of CSR, ratings will not differ among small, medium, and micro firms, and those ratings will be higher than the large firm ratings.

*Hypothesis 2b:* CSR and firm size will have a significant interaction on job pursuit intentions, such that in the presence of CSR, ratings will be highest when small firms are engaging in CSR, followed by medium firms, then micro firms, and finally large firms, whereas in the absence of CSR, ratings will not differ among small, medium, and micro firms, and those ratings will be higher than the large firm ratings.

Given that the prestige factor will be investigated in a more exploratory manner, no hypotheses were developed for this organizational attraction dimension.
Figure 1. Hypothesized interaction between corporate social responsibility and firm size on organizational attraction. CSR = corporate social responsibility.
Chapter III

Method

Participants

Participants were recruited from Amazon’s Mechanical Turk (MTurk), which is an online marketplace where people are compensated for completing human intelligence tasks (HITs). Participants had to be at least 18 years old, live in the United States, have a HIT approval rate of at least 95%, and have a minimum of 50 HITs completed to be eligible to participate. Participants who completed all the required items and passed the quality and manipulation checks were paid $.25 for participating. Eleven participants were accidentally compensated due to a researcher error, but their data were not used in the analyses.

A total of 476 participants participated in this study, but 215 participants were deleted because they either failed at least one manipulation check or previously participated in this study. Five other participants were deleted because they failed at least one quality check. An additional person was discarded for providing an invalid MTurk ID number, resulting in a final sample size of 255 participants. The study used a 2 (CSR: CSR vs. No CSR) x 4 (Firm Size: Micro vs. Small vs. Medium vs. Large) between-subjects factorial design, resulting in eight groups. The first 237 participants were randomly assigned to one of the eight conditions. Due to unequal sample sizes in the different groups, the last 18 participants were assigned to one of three of the conditions.
with the smallest samples sizes: Large without CSR, Medium without CSR, and Micro without CSR.

Sample size for the following demographic information ranged from 230 to 254. Therefore, the information reported here is based on valid responses, excluding missing data. About 60.1% of the participants were male, 38.7% were female, and 1.2% preferred not to respond. About 78.3% were Caucasian, 6.7% were Hispanic or Latino, 5.9% were Black or African American, and 5.9% were Asian; 2% chose “Other,” and the remaining 1.2% were American Indian, Alaska Native, or preferred not to respond. The level of education varied, such that 35.8% had a bachelor’s degree, 29.1% had some college, but no degree, 10.2% had an associate’s degree, 10.6% had a high school diploma or equivalent, 10.6% had a master’s degree, 2.8% had a doctoral degree, and 0.8% reported that their level of education as below high school. About 94.4% had been previously employed. At the time of data collection, 44.5% were employed full-time, 30.3% were unemployed, and 25.2% were employed part-time. Moreover, about 31.6% were searching for a job when the data were collected. The mean age of participants was 33.28 years (SD = 11.41 years). Based on 234 usable work experience responses (unless the response was “0” or “not applicable,” only responses that clearly indicated if the answer was provided in “months” or “years” were included), the average work experience was 12.70 years (SD = 10.80 years).

Materials and Measures

Job advertisements. This study used a 2 (CSR: CSR vs. no CSR) x 4 (Firm Size: Micro vs. Small vs. Medium vs. Large) between-subjects factorial design. Eight job ads were used to represent the different conditions. A short description of a fictional entry-
level job was adapted based on the job ad developed by Diab, Dalal, and Hurley (2013), who created their ad similar to job ads used in previous research (e.g., Avery, 2003; Highhouse, Stierwalt, Bachiochi, Elder, & Fisher, 1999). The two independent variables were the only things that differed among the eight ads. The different numbers chosen for the large, medium, small, and micro firms were based on firm size criteria used in prior research (Mittelstaedt et al., 2003; Perrini et al., 2007). Specifically, large, medium-sized, small, and micro firms were conceptualized as having 1000, 200, 40, and 8 employees, respectively. Please refer to Appendix A for the job ads.

Organizational attraction. The organizational attraction scale developed by Highhouse et al. (2003) was used to measure organizational attraction. This scale measures three facets of organizational attraction: general company attractiveness (assessing applicants’ attitudes towards a company as a possible place for employment), job pursuit intentions (assessing intentions to actively seek employment at a company), and prestige (assessing the social consensus of the company, such as reputation, popularity, and status). Although this study focused on the first two factors, the prestige factor was included for exploratory purposes. This measure consists of 15 items, 5 items for each subscale. Participants were asked to respond using a 5-point response format ranging from 1 = Strongly Disagree to 5 = Strongly Agree. A sample company attractiveness item is “A job at this company is very appealing to me.” A sample job pursuit intentions item is “I would accept a job offer from this company.” A sample prestige item is “Employees are probably proud to say they work for this company.” Each set of 5 items were summed and averaged to find one score for each subscale. One company attractiveness item was reverse-scored prior to summing and averaging the
items. Highhouse et al. found the subscales to be internally consistent, with coefficient alphas of .88 for general attractiveness, .82 for job pursuit intentions, and .83 for prestige, respectively. Walker, Feild, Giles, and Bernerth (2008) also found that these subscales were internally consistent, with coefficient alphas of .79 for general attractiveness, .74 for intentions to pursue, and .76 for prestige, respectively. In the present study, coefficient alphas were .92 for general attractiveness, .84 for job pursuit intentions, and .87 for prestige. The source for this measure is shown in Appendix B.

**Manipulation and quality checks.** There were two manipulation checks in this study (please see Appendix C). Participants were asked if the company in the job advertisement had a CSR program and what the firm size of the company was. These checks were incorporated to ensure that the participants carefully reviewed the job ad. Participants were also asked to respond to two quality checks to ensure that they were paying attention to the questions being asked. Participants were asked to either select “Agree” or “Disagree.” Participants who did not pass the manipulation or quality checks were not compensated for participating, with the exception of the 11 participants who were accidentally compensated due to a researcher error (please see Participants section).

**Social image items.** As an additional way to assess if the CSR manipulation was effective, items measuring corporate social image were also included. In other words, if the CSR manipulation worked, participants who received the job ad that stated the company had a CSR program should rate the company higher on CSR image than participants who received the “no CSR” condition. The three-item social image subscale developed by Diab and Highhouse (2014) was used in this study (please see Appendix D.
for the source). Coefficient alpha for this subscale was .85. However, responses to these items were not used to determine whether participants should get compensated.

**Procedure**

Approval for this study was sought from Xavier University’s Institutional Review Board (IRB; please see Appendix E for the IRB approval letter). Participants were recruited using a posting on MTurk, where the link to the online survey was provided on the MTurk interface (see Appendix F for the MTurk interface). Data were collected using SurveyGizmo. Once participants clicked on the survey link, they were first given the informed consent form to read (see Appendix G). If participants agreed to the terms of the study, they proceeded to the study by clicking “Next.” Then, they received one of the eight hypothetical job advertisements about a fictitious company and asked to complete the measures of the study, the quality and manipulation checks, and the demographics form (please see Appendix H for a list of all the demographic items). When participants submitted their responses, they were given a debriefing form to read (see Appendix I).
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Results

Means, standard deviations, and intercorrelations of the study measures are shown in Table 1. Prior to running the main analyses, an independent-samples $t$-test was conducted on the social image subscale to examine if there was a perceived difference between the job advertisements with CSR compared to those without CSR. Results showed that there was a significant difference in perceived social image, $t(253) = 4.50, p < .001$, such that the job ads with CSR were significantly higher on perceived social image ($M = 3.74, SD = 0.59$) than the jobs ads without CSR ($M = 3.39, SD = 0.64$). These results suggest that the CSR manipulation was effective.

Prior to testing the study hypotheses, the correlation between the primary dependent variables (i.e., company attractiveness and intentions to pursue) was examined, and it was $r(255) = .85, p < .001$. Given the high correlation between the dependent variables (DVs), two separate analyses of variance (ANOVAs) were conducted. Specifically, a separate $2 \times 4$ between-subjects factorial ANOVA was conducted on each DV. The main effect of CSR on each DV was examined to test Hypotheses 1a and 1b, whereas the interaction between firm size and CSR on each DV was examined to test Hypotheses 2a and 2b. Please see Table 2 for the ANOVA results for each DV and Table 3 for the means and standard deviations for all conditions, separated by DV.
Table 1

*MMeans, Standard Deviations, and Intercorrelations of Study Measures*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 General Company Attractiveness</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Job Pursuit Intentions</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Prestige</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Social Image</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. All correlations are statistically significant, p < .001.*
Table 2

Effects of Corporate Social Responsibility and Firm Size on General Company Attractiveness, Job Pursuit Intentions, and Prestige

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>(\eta_p^2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Company Attractiveness</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>.770</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSR</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>.620</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size * CSR</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>.472</td>
<td>.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>135.31</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job Pursuit Intentions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>.646</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSR</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>.672</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size * CSR</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>.477</td>
<td>.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>104.763</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prestige</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>.573</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSR</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>.088</td>
<td>.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size * CSR</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>.861</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>90.38</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. CSR = corporate social responsibility. CSR: CSR vs. no CSR. Firm Size: Micro vs. Small vs. Medium vs. Large.*
Table 3

Means, Standard Deviations, and Sample Sizes for General Company Attractiveness, Job Pursuit Intentions, and Prestige by Condition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Company Attractiveness</th>
<th>CSR</th>
<th>With CSR</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Without CSR</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Firm Size</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Pursuit Intentions</th>
<th>CSR</th>
<th>With CSR</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Without CSR</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Firm Size</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prestige</th>
<th>CSR</th>
<th>With CSR</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Without CSR</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Firm Size</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Results showed that CSR did not have a significant main effect on general company attractiveness ratings, $F(1, 254) = 0.25, p = .620$, suggesting that companies that engaged in CSR ($M = 3.82, SD = 0.76$) did not result in significantly higher perceptions of general company attractiveness compared to companies without CSR ($M = 3.86, SD = 0.71$). Therefore, Hypothesis 1a was not supported. Moreover, CSR and firm size did not have a significant interaction on company attractiveness ratings, $F(3, 254) = 0.84, p = .472$. Hence, Hypothesis 2a was also not supported. CSR also did not have a significant main effect on ratings of job pursuit intentions, $F(1, 254) = 0.18, p = .672$, suggesting that companies that engaged in CSR ($M = 3.76, SD = 0.67$) did not result in significantly higher ratings of job pursuit intentions than companies without CSR ($M = 3.78, SD = 0.62$). Therefore, Hypothesis 1b was not supported. In addition, CSR and firm size did not have a significant interaction on pursuit ratings, $F(3, 254) = 0.83, p = .477$. Hence, Hypothesis 2b was also not supported. A separate 2 x 4 between-subjects factorial ANOVA was also conducted to explore the effects of firm size and CSR on prestige, but no significant results were found (the ANOVA results and the descriptive statistics for prestige are also shown in Tables 2 and 3, respectively). Given that the last 18 participants were not randomly assigned to one of the eight conditions, the main analyses were re-run on a data set that excluded those participants ($N = 237$), and the same pattern of results was obtained.
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Discussion

The purpose of the study was to investigate the effects of firm size and CSR on organizational attraction. It was hypothesized that engaging in CSR would increase perceptions of general company attractiveness as well as job pursuit intentions. It was also hypothesized that CSR and firm size would have a significant interaction on ratings of general company attractiveness ratings and job pursuit intentions, such that in the presence of CSR, ratings would be highest when small firms are engaging in CSR, followed by medium firms, then micro firms, and finally large firms, whereas in the absence of CSR, ratings would not differ among small, medium, and micro firms, and those ratings would be higher than the large firm ratings. However, results showed that the hypotheses were not supported. Moreover, the effects of CSR and firm size on prestige were explored, but similar to general company attractiveness and job pursuit intentions, no significant effects on prestige were found.

These findings were surprising, given that previous research has found that CSR is instrumental in enhancing a company’s image, attractiveness, stakeholder-company identification, and firm performance (e.g., Brettel, 2010; Turban & Greening, 1996). One factor that may have affected these results is that the manipulation of CSR or firm size may have not been effective. However, manipulation checks that ensured participants were able to recognize to which condition they were assigned were administered, and only participants who passed the checks were included in the main analyses. Moreover,
as expected, there was a significant effect of CSR on perceived social image in the expected direction, providing further evidence that the manipulation of CSR was effective. Therefore, it seems that the manipulation of the independent variables was effective. However, it should be noted that the social image means between the CSR ($M = 3.74$, $SD = 0.59$) and non-CSR ($M = 3.39$, $SD = 0.64$) conditions were both above neutral, suggesting that although social image was significantly higher when the company had a CSR program, both were still above average.

Another factor that may have contributed to these non-significant findings is CSR cynicism. Arendt and Brettel (2010) stated that CSR programs may not produce positive results for all companies. For example, some may believe that companies engage in CSR for economic survival (Nisim & Benjamin, 2008). Specifically, stakeholders may suspect the company is “greenwashing,” or in other words, using the CSR program as a marketing tool to earn money rather than to help society, creating cynicism and suspicion of the company’s motives (Arendt & Brettel, 2010). As previously mentioned, it was argued that firm size may play a role in determining whether people are cynical about a company’s CSR. For example, large companies may be accused of implementing CSR programs as a façade to what the company is actually doing, whereas SMEs may be perceived as engaging in CSR based on the owner’s attitude to be socially responsible rather than for financial gain (Baumann-Pauly et al., 2013). Baumann-Pauly et al. (2013) mentioned that the large companies do the CSR “talk,” whereas the SMEs do the CSR “walk.” However, the results of this study showed that firm size did not play a role, as it did not have a significant interaction with CSR on any of the organizational attraction dimensions. Moreover, the means in all the conditions were above 3.50 for company
attractiveness, job pursuit intentions, and prestige. These findings suggest that cynicism probably did not play a role in affecting the results. An exploratory analysis examining the effects of CSR and firm size on social image was also conducted, but results showed that there was no significant interaction between CSR and firm size on social image, providing further evidence that firm size did not play a role in influencing people’s company perceptions.

As previously mentioned, it does not seem that participants were skeptical about the intentions of the company in the job ad. Yoon, Gurhan-Canli, and Schwarz (2006) found that when the company was perceived as sincere in its CSR motives, company image was enhanced, whereas when the company was perceived as insincere, that hurt the company’s image. They also stated that when suspicion regarding the sincerity of the company’s motives is at an intermediate level, it should neither help nor hurt the company’s image. This may have been problematic in this study for two reasons. First, the company used was fictitious. In other words, the participants had no background information about the intentions of the company’s CSR program. Second, the description of the company’s CSR program consisted of one general sentence about CSR that was contained in the hypothetical job ad (i.e., Barker & Duncan Inc. has an in-depth Corporate Social Responsibility program where the company and employees are concerned with environmental, ethical, and social acts). Using a generic statement may have been insufficient for participants to be able to determine whether the company was sincere. Therefore, although other factors in the job ad were held constant (e.g., offering competitive salaries, providing a comprehensive benefits package), they may have been given more weight than CSR, which may have reduced the overall effect of CSR. In other
words, it seems the company portrayed in the job ads was attractive with or without CSR. Therefore, although CSR may be an important characteristic, it may not be perceived as more important than the other positive company attributes mentioned in the job ad. This may explain why all the condition means were above 3.50. Moreover, all the standard deviations were less than one, suggesting that there might have been a ceiling effect. In other words, regardless of the condition, participants seemed to find the company attractive.

It is also possible that CSR does affect organizational attraction, but it may have an indirect effect on organizational attraction (Diab et al., 2013). The relationship between the two variables could be distal, rather than proximal (Shrout & Bolger, 2002). In other words, corporate social image could possibly mediate the relation between CSR and organizational attraction. Diab et al. (2013) also found that CSR did not have a significant effect on organizational attraction, but they found that it had a significant effect on social image, suggesting that the effect of CSR on organizational attraction may be indirect. However, no tests for mediation were conducted in this study because one of the requirements was not fulfilled (i.e., CSR did not have a significant effect on organizational attraction). Moreover, the relation between CSR and organizational attraction might be more complex, with the possibility of having more than one mediating variable.

**Theoretical and Practical Implications**

This study contributed to the literature by being the first to examine the interaction between firm size and CSR on organizational attraction. Moreover, the majority of CSR research has focused on large firms (e.g., Perrini et al., 2007); however;
this study investigated medium, small, and micro companies, in addition to large firms. Examining micro firms was especially important because micro firms tend to be under-researched (Perrini et al., 2007). As previously argued, firm size was expected to play a role in determining whether people were cynical about a company’s CSR. For example, large companies may be accused of implementing CSR programs as a façade to what the company is actually doing, whereas small and medium-sized firms may be perceived as engaging in CSR based on the owner’s attitude to be socially responsible rather than for financial gain (Baumann-Pauly et al., 2013). If applicants view CSR as a marketing tool, then that might negatively impact their perceptions of organizations. However, the current results suggest that firm size may not be an important factor to consider when examining the effect of CSR on organizational attraction.

Results also showed that CSR did not have a significant effect on organizational attraction. However, as previously mentioned, this may have been due to the fact that only a short sentence was provided to the applicants about the CSR program in this study. Moreover, although there was no significant effect of CSR on organizational attraction, there was a significantly higher difference in the perceived social image for the job ads with CSR compared to the job ads without CSR. As previously discussed, CSR may have an indirect effect on organizational attraction, as suggested by other researchers (Diab et al., 2013). Moreover, as previously stated, it seems that the company portrayed in the job ads was attractive with or without CSR, as several positive attributes were listed (e.g., increase in sales, decrease in turnover). This information could have made the company attractive with or without CSR. Therefore, although CSR may be an important
characteristic, it may not be perceived as more important than the other positive company attributes mentioned in the job ad.

Although CSR did not significantly affect organizational attraction, it did have a significant effect on social image, implying that CSR is still important and that companies should not ignore it, as social image has been linked to corporate impressions and general evaluations of corporations (Diab & Highhouse, 2014). The current findings also suggest that companies should provide specific details, testimonials, and figures about their CSR programs to their applicants or on their website to ignite stronger positive responses to their CSR initiatives. As previously mentioned, CSR may have had no effect on organizational attraction in this study because only a short sentence was provided in the job ads about the CSR program. Moreover, it seems that the company portrayed in the job ads was attractive with or without CSR, as several positive attributes were listed. Therefore, by providing a more thorough description of their CSR programs, companies may make their CSR programs more salient and potentially more important.

Limitations and Future Research Suggestions

This study has a few limitations that should be mentioned. First, this study used a between-subjects design (i.e., each participant saw only one job advertisement instead of seeing all the job ads). This could be a limitation because when people apply to jobs, they typically evaluate several job ads and companies at the same time. Therefore, this may have affected the generalizability of the results. However, because participants receive all conditions in a within-subjects design, they are more likely to determine the purpose of the study. Therefore, using a between-subjects design reduced those demand
characteristics, which enhanced the internal validity of the findings. Nevertheless, future research should use within-subjects designs to examine if any of the findings change.

Another limitation was that participants read a fictitious job advertisement about a hypothetical company, which could have affected the external validity of the findings because in reality, people typically have some general background knowledge about companies to which they apply. However, using a hypothetical company should have enhanced the internal validity of the findings, as it allowed for controlling all factors except for the variables of interest (i.e., firm size and CSR). Moreover, using hypothetical companies helped to control for any preexisting biases that participants may have had about real companies. Nevertheless, future research should examine the effects of CSR and firm size using real companies.

An additional limitation related to using hypothetical companies is that real companies often promote their CSR programs in more detail, providing applicants with an opportunity to learn more about the CSR programs rather than only learning about them through job ads. Applicants are typically able to explore a company’s website to learn more about the activities in which the employees participate, the impact the company has on the community, and/or the amount of money the company donates to charities. Often, company websites seem to incorporate testimonials from workers or the individuals who have been helped, which may trigger a stronger emotional response from applicants. For this study, only one sentence was incorporated in the hypothetical job ad. Therefore, future research should examine if incorporating a longer and more detailed description of a company’s CSR program in a job ad could enhance perceptions of organizational attraction. It might also be interesting to examine if mentioning specific
charities to which companies donate or listing specific examples of CSR activities in a job ad might also enhance the effect of CSR. Researchers could also examine if having participants go to different company websites instead of just viewing job ads might also increase the effect of CSR. Although CSR did have a significant effect on social image in the current study, a more detailed description of the company’s CSR program may result in CSR having a direct effect on organizational attraction.

Another limitation is that participants may have had different motivations for taking this study. Specifically, those participants seeking employment might have been more motivated when responding to the items because they were looking for a job at the time of data collection. In this study, only 31.6% of participants were actively searching for jobs, which might have affected how much they were able to relate to the hypothetical situation of applying to a job. Future research should try to recruit participants who are actively searching for jobs (e.g., at a job fair).

The final limitation is that participants were recruited using MTurk. Because participants were given a small stipend to participate, they might have rushed through the study to complete it quicker in an effort to try to complete as many tasks or surveys as possible. However, the manipulation and quality checks helped ensure that participants were paying attention when they read the job ad and when they completed the different items, and only data from those who passed all the checks were retained. Moreover, compared to university-based samples, researchers have found that MTurk samples tend to be better suited for employee-focused research (Barger, Behrend, Sharek, & Sinar, 2011). Another limitation related to using MTurk is that because MTurk is a service provided by Amazon, which is a large corporation, this might have been problematic.
because this study examined firm size. In other words, using Amazon’s MTurk may have been a potential biasing factor if participants identified with Amazon. However, given that firm size did not have a significant main effect on organizational attraction, this does not seem to have been an issue. Nevertheless, although organizational attachment to Amazon’s MTurk was not a focus of this study and thus was not measured, future research could further examine this issue.

Future research could also examine if there are individual differences that might be important to consider when examining the effect of CSR on applicant attraction. For example, some people may not value CSR. For those people, the presence of CSR will probably not affect their perceptions of organizational attraction. Another avenue for future research is including other outcomes, such as corporate impressions and general evaluations of corporations (Diab & Highhouse, 2014), in addition to social image and organizational attraction, to gain a better understanding of what outcomes CSR may directly and indirectly affect (Diab et al., 2013). Finally, as previously mentioned, it seems that the company portrayed in this study was attractive with or without CSR, as several positive attributes were listed in the job ads. Although those attributes were held constant, they may have decreased the overall effect of CSR. Therefore, it might be interesting to hold negative company attributes constant instead and examine if CSR would play a more important role in influencing people’s evaluations of a company. Although using a job ad would not be feasible in such a study, as companies would not mention negative attributes in their job ads, researchers could use a more general recruitment context by giving participants information about companies without using job ads.
Conclusions

The purpose of this study was to investigate the effects of firm size and CSR on organizational attraction. Although the hypotheses were not supported, this research shed light on the relations among CSR, firm size, and organizational attraction. Moreover, there was a significantly higher perceived social image for the job ad with CSR compared to the job ad without CSR. Future research should further examine the relations among CSR, social image, and organizational attraction.
Chapter VI

Summary

In recent years, both researchers and practitioners have been paying more attention to the construct of corporate social responsibility (CSR). Research has shown that CSR can enhance a company’s reputation and applicant attraction to a company (Fitjar, 2011). The main purpose of the current study was to investigate the effects of firm size and CSR on organizational attraction.

CSR

There does not seem to be a universally-accepted definition of CSR (Carroll, 1979; Nisim & Benjamin, 2008; Reverte, 2009), as several definitions have been offered by different researchers. For example, Elg and Hultman (2011) defined CSR as “the firm’s consideration of, and response to, issues beyond the narrow economic, technical and legal requirements of the firm” (p. 446). Arendt and Brettel (2010) defined CSR as the “management of stakeholder concern for responsible and irresponsible acts related to environmental, ethical, and social phenomena in a way that creates corporate benefit” (p. 1471). Overall, CSR seems to focus primarily on human rights, unfair business practices, organizational governance, environmental protection, social development, and the health and safety of employees (Leonard & McAdam, 2003).

Within the last decade, CSR has increased in popularity (Mueller, Hattrup, Spiess, & Lin-Hi, 2012). There has been an increase in annual social responsibility reports made
available to the public in the last 20 years. De Grosbois (2012) found that stakeholders want to learn more about the company behind the brand name, and they want companies to be held more accountable for their actions. De Grosbois explained that CSR reporting is currently voluntary and the depth of information released is up to the company’s discretion. However, several European countries within the last five years have been moving towards mandatory CSR disclosures. De Grosbois stated that although companies are allowed to withhold CSR reports, media and non-governmental organizations have been publicly writing about companies’ CSR polices.

Fitjar (2011) believed there are two different reasons why companies incorporate CSR: Some companies participate in CSR because it is ethical and/or helps the community, other companies might engage in it because it could result in economic benefits. However, regardless of the company’s reason, people have their own perceptions of how “genuine” a company’s intentions are when engaging in CSR, and different organizational factors could affect those perceptions. One firm demographic that could influence people’s perceptions is firm size.

**Firm Size**

Different classifications have been used to determine firm sizes. For example, using U.S. Census Bureau size classifications, Mittelstaedt, Harben, and Ward (2003) set the following firm size criteria: 500 employees or more for large companies, 100 to 499 employees for medium companies, 20 to 99 employees for small companies, and fewer than 20 employees for micro companies. Nisim and Benjamin (2008) found that most companies, regardless of size, displayed some form of ethical responsibility. This means that all firm sizes can and do engage in CSR, which supports the need to examine more
than just large firms. That being said, Perrini et al. (2007) found that large companies are more likely to have a formal CSR plan than small- to medium-sized enterprises (SMEs). This does not mean that SMEs are not engaging in CSR; rather, SMEs have different CSR strategies than large firms (Perrini et al., 2007).

Perrini et al. (2007) examined the relation between firm size and CSR strategies. They found that micro firms were more likely to have a public ethical code than small- or medium-sized companies. Udayasankar (2008) suggested that the relation between firm size and CSR participation is a U-shaped curve, such that micro and large companies are more likely to participate in CSR than SMEs, but this suggestion has not been examined yet.

A majority of small companies are involved in CSR activities, but do not call it CSR; this is called “silent CSR” (Perrini et al., 2007). SMEs often have informal CSR programs that have little to no advertisement (Baumann-Pauly, Wickert, Spence, & Scherer, 2013). It is assumed that they do not recognize the potential benefit of advertising (Perrini et al., 2007). SMEs are however more advanced in applying these programs and getting employees involved (Baumann-Pauly et al., 2013). SMEs employees are engaged in the CSR programs because CSR is incorporated in the culture of the companies (Baumann-Pauly et al., 2013).

SMEs have not been researched on a large scale (Perrini et al., 2007). The research done on this topic has primarily focused on SMEs that mainly compete with large companies (Fitjar, 2011). If researchers continue to neglect SMEs, they will overlook a vast majority of companies (Nisim & Benjamin, 2008), as SMEs represent 90% of the companies worldwide (Udayasankar, 2008).
Large companies tend to be more socially responsive due to their public exposure (Udayasankar, 2008). Given that large companies are highly publicized, it can be a benefit if they engage in CSR (Nisim & Benjamin, 2008). Otherwise, large companies can be publicly scrutinized for having unethical business practices (Nisim & Benjamin, 2008). Stakeholders may expect a large corporation to engage in CSR programs; therefore, that might be less noticeable and not as impressive compared to a small or medium firm engaging in CSR.

SMEs face the opposite problem because these companies are hidden and not as visible as large companies (Nisim & Benjamin, 2008). This means that SMEs that focus on CSR tend to be less publicized and may not benefit from incorporating CSR (Nisim & Benjamin, 2008). However, SMEs that do not focus on CSR will unlikely be exposed for their lack of CSR because they are less visible (Nisim & Benjamin, 2008), probably because they are less likely than large firms to have external pressures from stockholders.

There are mixed results on whether SMEs or large corporations are better equipped to execute CSR programs (Baumann-Pauly et al., 2013). Initiatives have been designed for large corporations that can provide the manpower and financial resources needed to properly implement CSR programs (Baumann-Pauly et al., 2013). It is often assumed that larger companies have a greater social impact than SMEs (Udayasankar, 2008). Larger companies tend to have a bigger effect on the community due to their increased resources and manpower (Reverte, 2009). Individually, SMEs might not have a huge impact on the environment, but a collective group of SMEs could play a big part in improving the environment (Perrini et al., 2007). Research has shown that SMEs’ employees volunteer at local community programs more than large companies’
employees (Perrini et al., 2007). Some argue that small companies are at an advantage because they are often local so they can more easily communicate with and contribute to local charities (Nisim & Benjamin, 2008).

It should not be assumed that being involved in CSR is going to help every company (Perrini et al., 2007), and this could depend on firm size. Perrini et al. (2007) believe that SMEs’ motivations for integrating CSR are different from large firms’ motivations. Specifically, in SMEs, CSR is put into place because of the owners’ or managers’ personal values and beliefs (Perrini et al., 2007). On the other hand, the authors stated that large firms are more concerned with enhancing economic benefits. These different reasons for engaging in CSR could explain why stakeholders may view CSR differently based on firm size.

**Applicant Perceptions**

The current study examined applicant perceptions of organizations, focusing on organizational attraction. Specifically, this study focused on general company attractiveness and job pursuit intentions and explored prestige (Highhouse, Lievens, & Sinar, 2003). Arendt and Brettel (2010) found that CSR was instrumental in enhancing a company’s image, attractiveness, stakeholder-company identification, and firm performance. When a company is proactive and consistent in the CSR program, engaging in CSR is more likely to have positive effects on the organization (Fraj-Andrés et al., 2012). As previously stated, Fitjar (2011) mentioned CSR can enhance a company’s reputation and applicant attraction. Cable and Turban (2003) also found that people were more willing to work for companies with better reputations for lower salaries. Therefore, the following hypotheses were developed:
Hypothesis 1a: CSR will have a significant main effect on general company attractiveness.

Hypothesis 1b: CSR will have a significant main effect on job pursuit intentions.

However, the effect of CSR on applicant attraction may differ based on firm size (Fitjar, 2011). Large companies can be accused of implementing CSR programs as a façade to what the company is actually doing, whereas SMEs may be perceived as engaging in CSR based on the owner’s attitude to be socially responsible rather than for financial gain (Baumann-Pauly et al., 2013). Given that large and micro companies are expected to participate in CSR activities, engaging in CSR might be less impressive and should be less likely to enhance organizational attraction than when SMEs engage in CSR. On the other hand, SMEs and micro firms without CSR should be less affected and should have similar organizational attraction ratings because SMEs are less expected to engage in CSR and because both micro firms and SMEs are expected to have less money and fewer resources to help society. In other words, it was expected that there would be a significant interaction between CSR and firm size (see Figure 1), and the following hypotheses were developed:

Hypothesis 2a: CSR and firm size will have a significant interaction on general company attractiveness ratings, such that in the presence of CSR, ratings will be highest when small firms are engaging in CSR, followed by medium firms, then micro firms, and finally large firms, whereas in the absence of CSR, ratings will not differ among small, medium, and micro firms, and those ratings will be higher than the large firm ratings.
Hypothesis 2b: CSR and firm size will have a significant interaction on job pursuit intentions, such that in the presence of CSR, ratings will be highest when small firms are engaging in CSR, followed by medium firms, then micro firms, and finally large firms, whereas in the absence of CSR, ratings will not differ among small, medium, and micro firms, and those ratings will be higher than the large firm ratings.

Method

Participants

Participants were recruited from Amazon’s Mechanical Turk (MTurk), which is an online marketplace where people are compensated for completing human intelligence tasks (HITs). Participants had to be at least 18 years old, live in the United States, have a HIT approval rate of at least 95%, and have a minimum of 50 HITs completed to be eligible to participate. Participants who completed all the required items and passed the quality and manipulation checks were paid $.25 for participating. Eleven participants were accidentally compensated due to a researcher error, but their data were not used in the analyses. The final sample size was 255 participants. About 60.1% of the participants were male, 38.7% were female, and 1.2% preferred not to respond. Approximately 78.3% were Caucasian, and the mean age was 33.28 years (SD = 11.41 years). About 31.6% were searching for a job when the data were collected.

Materials and Measures

Job advertisements. This study used a 2 (CSR: CSR vs. no CSR) x 4 (Firm Size: Micro vs. Small vs. Medium vs. Large) between-subjects factorial design. Eight job ads were used to represent the conditions (see Appendix A). The ad was adapted from the job
ad developed by Diab, Dalal, and Hurley (2013), who created their ad similar to job ads used in previous research (e.g., Avery, 2003; Highhouse, Stierwalt, Bachiochi, Elder, & Fisher, 1999). The different numbers chosen for the large, medium, small, and micro firms were based on firm size criteria used in prior research (Mittelstaedt et al., 2003; Perrini et al., 2007).

**Organizational attraction.** The organizational attraction scale developed by Highhouse et al. (2003) was used to measure organizational attraction (see Appendix B). This measure consists of 15 items, 5 items for each subscale. Participants responded using a 5-point *Strongly Disagree* to *Strongly Agree* response format. Coefficient alphas were .92 for general attractiveness, .84 for job pursuit intentions, and .87 for prestige.

**Manipulation and quality checks.** Participants were also asked to respond to two manipulation checks (see Appendix C) and two quality checks.

**Social image items.** Items measuring corporate social image were also included. The three-item social image subscale developed by Diab and Highhouse (2014) was used (see Appendix D). Coefficient alpha for this subscale was .85.

**Procedure**

Approval for this study was sought from Xavier University’s Institutional Review Board (IRB; see Appendix E). Participants were recruited using a posting on MTurk (see Appendix F). Once participants clicked on the survey link, they were given the informed consent form (see Appendix G). If participants agreed to participate, they received one of the eight hypothetical job advertisements and asked to complete the main measures, the quality and manipulation checks, and the demographics form (see Appendix H). When
participants submitted their responses, they were given a debriefing form (see Appendix I).

Results

Means, standard deviations, and intercorrelations of the study measures are shown in Table 1. An independent-samples t-test was conducted on the social image subscale to examine if there was a perceived difference between the job advertisements with CSR compared to those without CSR. Results showed that there was a significant difference in perceived social image, $t(253) = 4.50, p < .001$, such that the job ads with CSR were significantly higher ($M = 3.74, SD = 0.59$) than the jobs ads without CSR ($M = 3.39, SD = 0.64$). These results suggest that the manipulation of the CSR was effective.

The correlation between company attractiveness and intentions to pursue was examined, and it was $r(255) = .85, p < .001$. Given the high correlation between them, two analyses of variance (ANOVAs) were conducted. Please see Table 2 for the ANOVA results and Table 3 for the means and standard deviations for all conditions.

Results showed that CSR did not have a significant main effect on general company attractiveness, $F(1, 254) = 0.25, p = .620$, suggesting that companies that engaged in CSR ($M = 3.82, SD = 0.76$) did not result in significantly higher perceptions of company attractiveness compared to companies without CSR ($M = 3.86, SD = 0.71$). Moreover, CSR and firm size did not have a significant interaction on company attractiveness ratings, $F(3, 254) = 0.84, p = .472$. Hence, Hypotheses 1a and 2a were not supported. CSR also did not have a significant main effect on job pursuit intentions, $F(1, 254) = 0.18, p = .672$, suggesting that companies that engaged in CSR ($M = 3.76, SD = 0.67$) did not result in significantly higher ratings of job pursuit intentions than
companies without CSR ($M = 3.78$, $SD = 0.62$). CSR and firm size also did not have a significant interaction on pursuit ratings, $F(3, 254) = 0.83$, $p = .477$. Therefore, \textit{Hypotheses 1b} and \textit{2b} were also not supported. A separate 2 x 4 between-subjects factorial ANOVA was conducted to explore the effects of firm size and CSR on prestige, but no significant results were found (see Tables 2 and 3).

\textbf{Discussion}

The purpose of the study was to investigate the effects of firm size and CSR on organizational attraction. Results showed that firm size and CSR did not have a significant effect on organizational attraction. These findings were surprising, given that previous research has found that CSR is instrumental in enhancing a company’s image and attractiveness (e.g., Brettel, 2010; Turban & Greening, 1996). One factor that may have affected these results is that the manipulation of CSR or firm size may have not been effective. However, only participants who passed the manipulation checks were included in the main analyses. Moreover, there was a significant effect of CSR on perceived social image, providing further evidence that the CSR manipulation was effective.

Another factor that may have contributed to these non-significant findings is CSR cynicism. Arendt and Brettel (2010) stated that CSR programs may not produce positive results for all companies. It was argued that firm size may play a role in determining whether people are cynical about a company’s CSR. Baumann-Pauly et al. (2013) mentioned that the large companies do the CSR “talk,” whereas the SMEs do the CSR “walk.” However, the results of this study showed that firm size did not play a role, as it did not have a significant interaction with CSR on organizational attraction.
It also does not seem that participants were skeptical about the intentions of the company in the job ad. Yoon, Gurhan-Canli, and Schwarz (2006) found that when the company was perceived as sincere in its CSR motives, company image was enhanced, whereas when the company was perceived as insincere, that hurt the company’s image. They also stated that when suspicion regarding the sincerity of the company’s motives is at an intermediate level, it should neither help nor hurt the company’s image. This may have been problematic in this study because the company used was fictitious (i.e., participants had no background information about the company’s CSR program) and because the description of the CSR program consisted of one general sentence, which may have been insufficient for participants to determine whether the company was sincere. Therefore, this may have reduced the overall effect of CSR.

It is also possible that CSR does affect organizational attraction, but that it has an indirect effect on organizational attraction, as suggested by Diab et al. (2013). The relationship between the two variables could be distal, rather than proximal (Shrout & Bolger, 2002). In other words, corporate social image could possibly mediate the relation between CSR and organizational attraction.

**Theoretical and Practical Implications**

This study contributed to the literature by being the first to examine the interaction between firm size and CSR on organizational attraction. Moreover, the majority of CSR research has focused on large firms (e.g., Perrini et al., 2007), but this study investigated medium, small, and micro companies, in addition to large firms. However, results suggested that firm size may not be an important factor to consider when examining the effect of CSR on organizational attraction.
Results also showed that CSR did not have a significant effect on organizational attraction. However, as previously mentioned, this may have been due to the fact that only a short sentence about the CSR program was provided. Therefore, companies should provide more information about their CSR programs on their websites. Moreover, although there was no significant effect of CSR on organizational attraction, there was a significant effect on social image. Hence, companies should not ignore CSR, as it did affect social image, which has been linked to corporate impressions and general evaluations of companies (Diab & Highhouse, 2014).

**Limitations and Future Research Suggestions**

This study has a few limitations. The first limitation is that it used a between-subjects design, which could be problematic because people typically evaluate several job ads and companies at the same time when applying to jobs. Therefore, this may have affected the generalizability of the results. However, using a between-subjects design reduced any demand characteristics, enhancing the internal validity of the findings. Nevertheless, future research should use within-subjects designs to examine if any of the findings change.

Another limitation is that participants read a fictitious job advertisement about a hypothetical company, which could have affected the external validity of the findings. In reality, people have some background knowledge about companies to which they apply. However, using a hypothetical company should have enhanced the internal validity of the findings. Moreover, using hypothetical companies helped to control for any preexisting biases that participants may have had about real companies. Nevertheless, future research should examine the effects of CSR and firm size using real companies.
An additional limitation related to using hypothetical companies is that real companies often promote their CSR programs in more detail. For this study, only one sentence was incorporated in the job ad. Therefore, future research should examine if incorporating a more detailed description of a company’s CSR program could enhance organizational attraction.

A final limitation is that participants were recruited using MTurk. Because participants were given a small stipend to participate, they may have rushed through the study in an effort to try to complete as many tasks as possible. However, the manipulation and quality checks helped ensure that participants were paying attention when they participated. Moreover, compared to university-based samples, researchers have found that MTurk samples tend to be better suited for employee-focused research (Barger, Behrend, Sharek, & Sinar, 2011).

Future research should examine if there are individual differences that might be important to consider when examining the effect of CSR on organizational attraction. For example, some people may not value CSR. Another avenue for future research is including other outcomes, such as corporate impressions (Diab & Highhouse, 2014), to gain a better understanding of what outcomes CSR may affect (Diab et al., 2013).

**Conclusions**

The purpose of this study was to investigate the effects of firm size and CSR on organizational attraction. Although the hypotheses were not supported, this research shed light on the relations among CSR, firm size, and organizational attraction. Moreover, findings highlighted the importance of examining the relations among CSR, social image, and organizational attraction in future research.
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Imagine you are currently searching for a job and that you plan on applying to jobs in the near future (1-2 months from now). Imagine you came across the following job ad about a hypothetical company, Barker & Duncan Inc.

Please carefully read the following job ad and respond to items relating to your perceptions of the job being advertised and the company, Barker & Duncan Inc.

Entry-Level Associate

Entry-level associates are needed to contribute to a corporation with holdings in a variety of areas including entertainment and marketing. All majors, areas of expertise, and levels of relevant experience welcome!

*aBarker & Duncan Inc. is a [large, medium-sized, small, micro] firm that currently has [1,000, 200, 40, 8] employees. In the past five years, we have increased our sales by 150%. Our turnover has decreased by 20% in the past 5 years.*

We offer competitive salaries based on education level and past experience. Employees are also given a comprehensive benefits package and paid time off.

*bBarker & Duncan Inc. has an in-depth Corporate Social Responsibility program where the company and employees are concerned with environmental, ethical, and social acts.*

Barker & Duncan Inc. is an Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) and Affirmative Action (AA) employer.

For more information and to apply to this position online, please visit our website at www.bdinc.net

*a This sentence signifies the portion of the job ad that was changed based on the firm size manipulation. The italicized portions signify the different levels of firm size.*

*b This sentence signifies the portion of the job ad that had information about CSR in the “CSR” condition. This sentence was removed in the “no CSR” condition.*
Appendix B

Organizational Attraction Measure

This measure is not reproduced for copyright reasons, but below is the reference for this measure:

Appendix C

Manipulation Check

1. Which of the following firm sizes was Barker & Duncan Inc.?
   - Large firm (1,000 employees)
   - Medium firm (200 employees)
   - Small firm (40 employees)
   - Micro firm (8 employees)

2. Did Barker & Duncan Inc. engage in a corporate social responsibility program?
   - Barker & Duncan Inc. engaged in a corporate social responsibility program.
   - Barker & Duncan Inc. did not engage in a corporate social responsibility program.
Appendix D

Social Image Items

These items are not reproduced for copyright reasons, but below is the reference for these items:

Appendix E

IRB Approval Letter

April 23, 2014

Ashley Brown
Xavier University

Re: Protocol #13-087, The Effects of Firm Size and Corporate Social Responsibility on Organizational Attraction

Dear Ms. Brown:

The IRB has reviewed the materials regarding your study, referenced above, and has determined that it meets the criteria for the Exempt from Review category under Federal Regulation 45CFR46. Your protocol is approved as exempt research, and therefore requires no further oversight by the IRB.

If you wish to modify your study, including the addition of data collection sites, it will be necessary to obtain IRB approval prior to implementing the modification. If any adverse events occur, please notify the IRB immediately.

Please contact our office if you have any questions. We wish you success with your project!

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Morell E. Mullins, Jr., Ph.D.
Chair, Institutional Review Board
Xavier University
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Appendix F

MTurk Interface

Please note that you will have to enter your unique ID TWICE, once HERE and once at the END of the study in order to be compensated, if eligible.

1. Please enter your unique identifier located on the MTurk Dashboard. You must enter your MTurk ID HERE:

[Box for ID number]

Also, please SAVE your unique identifier because you will be required to enter it once again AT THE END OF THE STUDY.

2. Please click the following link in order to access the survey. After you complete the survey, click the “Submit” button below.

[Survey Link]

[SUBMIT]
Appendix G

Informed Consent Form

You are being asked to participate in a research project conducted by Ashley Brown at Xavier University. The purpose of this study is to investigate perceptions of jobs and organizations.

In this study, you will read a short job ad, and you will be asked to answer questions based on your perceptions of that job ad as well as demographic items. The total time to complete this task will be approximately 15 minutes, but you will be given 1 hour to complete the entire survey.

There are no known risks associated with this study. Participation in this study is entirely voluntary. You are free to withdraw from the study at any time without penalty. Refusal to participate in this study will have no effect on any future services you may be entitled to from Xavier University. You will be paid $.25 for participating in this study. However, please note that if you do not complete all required items or if you do not pass the quality AND manipulation checks, you will not be eligible for compensation. You have to be at least 18 years old to participate in this study.

Although you will be required to enter your MTurk unique worker ID at the end of the survey to receive compensation if eligible, the researchers will not be able to access any identifying information you provided to Amazon or MTurk. Moreover, the researchers will not release any of your survey responses to Amazon or MTurk, and only the researchers conducting this study will have access to your responses. Therefore, your responses will remain anonymous. Finally, no analyses of any kind will be conducted prior to the removal of all MTurk ID numbers from the data set.

If you have any questions at any time during the study, you may contact the principal investigator, Ashley Brown at browna36@xavier.edu or the faculty advisor, Dr. Dalia Diab at diabd@xavier.edu. Questions about your rights as a research subject should be directed to Xavier University’s Institutional Review Board at 513-745-2870.

By clicking “Next,” you agree to the following statement: I have been given information about this research study and its risks and benefits and have had the opportunity to ask questions and to have my questions answered to my satisfaction. I freely give my consent to participate in this research project.
Appendix H

Demographic Items

Age ______

Gender
• Male
• Female
• Prefer not to respond

Race/Ethnicity
• White or Caucasian
• Black or African American
• American Indian or Alaska Native
• Asian
• Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
• Hispanic or Latino
• Other ______
• Prefer not to respond

Level of Education
• Below High School
• High School Diploma or equivalent
• Some college, no degree
• Associate’s Degree
• Bachelor’s Degree (e.g., BA)
• Master’s Degree (e.g., MBA)
• Doctoral Degree (e.g., PhD)

Have you ever been previously employed?
• Yes
• No

Are you currently employed?
• Yes, part-time
• Yes, full-time
• No

Are you currently searching for a job?
• Yes
• No
Overall work experience; please state if your answer is in months or years by writing either the word “months” or “years” after the number you provide: ________________

Please type your unique worker ID to receive payment: ________________
Appendix I

Debriefing Form

Thank you for participating in our research project. The purpose of this study is to investigate the effects of firm size (micro vs. small vs. medium vs. large) and corporate social responsibility (CSR; presence of CSR vs. absence of CSR) on organizational attraction. You were randomly assigned to one of eight job ads, representing the eight conditions. The company and job ad used in this study are fictitious. Please do not discuss the specifics of our study with anyone or distribute this form to any potential participants, as data collection is ongoing. If you have any questions or concerns, or if you would like to inquire about the results of this study, please contact the principal investigator, Ashley Brown at browna36@xavier.edu, or the faculty advisor, Dr. Dalia Diab at diabd@xavier.edu.