

The Importance and Role of Organizational Culture in (Online) Recruiting Processes

DIPLOMARBEIT

zur Erlangung des akademischen Grades

Diplom-Ingenieur

im Rahmen des Studiums

Business Informatics

eingereicht von

Roland Ulbricht, B.Sc.

Matrikelnummer 0525359

an der
Fakultät für Informatik der Technischen Universität Wien

Betreuung: Univ.Prof. Mag.rer.soc.oec. Dr.rer.soc.oec. Sabine Theresia Köszegi

Mitwirkung: Univ.Ass. Mag.rer.nat. Dr.phil. Martina Hartner-Tiefenthaler

Wien, 29.01.2014

(Unterschrift Verfasser)

(Unterschrift Betreuung)

The Importance and Role of Organizational Culture in (Online) Recruiting Processes

MASTER'S THESIS

submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Diplom-Ingenieur

in

Business Informatics

by

Roland Ulbricht, B.Sc.

Registration Number 0525359

to the Faculty of Informatics
at the Vienna University of Technology

Advisor: Univ.Prof. Mag.rer.soc.oec. Dr.rer.soc.oec. Sabine Theresia Köszegi

Assistance: Univ.Ass. Mag.rer.nat. Dr.phil. Martina Hartner-Tiefenthaler

Vienna, 29.01.2014

(Signature of Author)

(Signature of Advisor)

Erklärung zur Verfassung der Arbeit

Roland Ulbricht, B.Sc.
Unterer Wagram 35, 3464 Goldgeben

Hiermit erkläre ich, dass ich diese Arbeit selbständig verfasst habe, dass ich die verwendeten Quellen und Hilfsmittel vollständig angegeben habe und dass ich die Stellen der Arbeit - einschließlich Tabellen, Karten und Abbildungen -, die anderen Werken oder dem Internet im Wortlaut oder dem Sinn nach entnommen sind, auf jeden Fall unter Angabe der Quelle als Entlehnung kenntlich gemacht habe.

(Ort, Datum)

(Unterschrift Verfasser)

Acknowledgements

This thesis would not have been possible without the support of several individuals.

First of all, I want to thank my advisor Univ.Prof. Dr. Sabine Köszegi and Dr. Martina Hartner-Tiefenthaler for making this work possible and for their competent support, patience and time.

Deepest gratitude goes to my parents, Elvira Ulbricht and Ing. Dieter Ulbricht for their support throughout my studies.

I would also like to thank the interview partners who supported the qualitative part of the research and the participants of the online survey.

Finally, special thanks to all people who supported this work through discussions, ideas or emotional support.

Abstract

The aim of this thesis was to find out how culture fit influences recruiting from both the organizational as well as the individual perspective.

Qualitative research of nine different organizations and a quantitative survey of potential applicants were conducted. The most important questions concerned the relevance of fit in decisions of both sides and how communication about these issues worked.

On the employer side, cultural fit was an important selection criterion for most examined organizations, however they were unsure how to communicate their values and how to select fitting individuals. The organizations used online recruiting intensively, however, also indicated that transmitting information about their culture was difficult when done in written form and much easier in person through referrals or campus recruiting.

On the side of individuals, fit was also an important aspect when choosing an employer. Survey participants stated that the most important sources of information about employers are personal contacts and the organizations' websites.

In conclusion the findings indicate that providing richer information for individuals through personnel marketing leads to better self-selection from their side and better fitting applications.

Kurzfassung

Diese Arbeit untersuchte die Rolle von kultureller Passung (“cultural fit”) in der Personalrekrutierung sowohl aus der Organisationsperspektive als auch aus der Perspektive der BewerberInnen.

Es wurde eine qualitative Studie von neun unterschiedlichen Organisationen durchgeführt gefolgt von einer quantitativen Befragung von potenziellen BewerberInnen. Die wichtigsten Fragen dabei waren die Wichtigkeit von “fit” in den Rekrutierungsentscheidungen beider Seiten und wie die Kommunikation über diese Themen erfolgt.

Auf der Organisationsseite war “fit” ein wichtiges Auswahlkriterium für die meisten betrachteten Organisationen. Darüber, wie sie ihre Werte kommunizieren können und wie passende Individuen ausgewählt werden können, waren sich die Organisationen unsicher. Die Organisationen nutzten online recruiting intensiv, gaben jedoch auch an, dass die Kommunikation über Kultur auf schriftlichem Weg schwierig war und auf persönlichem Weg viel einfacher wäre, zum Beispiel durch Empfehlungen oder Campus-Werbung.

“Fit” war auch für Individuen ein wichtiger Aspekt in der Auswahl von Arbeitgebern. Die UmfrageteilnehmerInnen gaben an, dass persönliche Kontakte sowie die Websites von Organisationen die wichtigsten Informationsquellen über Arbeitgeber seien.

Zusammenfassend deuten die Ergebnisse darauf hin, dass die Bereitstellung von reichhaltiger Information auf dem Wege des Personalmarketings zu besserer Selbstselektion der potenziellen BewerberInnen and folglich zu besser passenden Bewerbungen führt.

Contents

List of Tables	xi
1 Introduction	1
2 Theoretical Background	3
2.1 The emergence of organizational culture	3
2.2 Defining “good” person-organization fit	4
2.3 Actions taken by organizations to recruit the best people	7
2.4 Ways information technology can support recruiting processes	10
2.5 Decisions made by individuals about joining organizations	13
2.6 Research gap	15
3 Organizational / recruiter perspective by qualitative research	17
3.1 Research objectives	17
3.2 Data collection	18
3.2.1 Expert interviews	18
3.2.2 Artifact analysis	19
3.2.3 Protection of research subjects	19
3.3 Data analysis	20
3.3.1 Organizations examined	23
3.3.2 Personnel marketing	26
3.3.3 Personnel selection	29
3.3.4 Differences between type, size, structure of organizations	32
4 Individual perspective by quantitative research	33
4.1 Research objectives	33
4.2 Survey procedure	35
4.3 Measures	35
4.4 Data analysis	39
4.4.1 Participants	39
4.4.2 Preferences regarding employers	41
4.4.3 Scenario: decision between values and money	48
4.4.4 Preferences regarding voluntary organizations	53
4.4.5 Sources of information about employers	58

5 Discussion	63
5.1 Limitations and strengths	66
5.2 Implications and recommendations for further research	67
A Survey design	69
B Responses from question J002	77
References	81

List of Tables

2.1	Comparison of online job board providers in Austria	12
3.1	Location, industry, ownership, size and structure of the organizations examined in qualitative research	25
3.2	Marketing channels used for recruiting by organizations examined in qualitative research	28
3.3	Selection criteria and selection methods of organizations examined in qualitative research	31
4.1	Survey questions overview	36
4.2	Overview of scenario questions	38
4.3	Survey participant education	39
4.4	Survey participant occupation	40
4.5	Survey participant country of residence	40
4.6	Survey participants about voluntary work	41
4.7	Descriptive statistics of self-rated employability (SRE)	41
4.8	Survey participants' most important employer criterion when choosing an employer	42
4.9	Survey participant employer preferences	43
4.10	PCA pattern matrix of survey participant's employer preferences	44
4.11	PCA Component Correlation Matrix of survey participants' employer preferences	45
4.12	Employer selection preferences component scales	47
4.13	Participants' responses to scenario questions	49
4.14	Participants' responses to scenario questions (grouped)	49
4.15	Scenario answer values	49
4.16	Scenario answers descriptive statistics	50
4.17	Scenario answers descriptives depending on participant's gender	51
4.18	ANOVA of scenario answers depending on participant's gender	52
4.19	Survey participant preferences regarding voluntary work organizations	53
4.20	Paired samples correlations of preferences regarding employment and regarding voluntary organizations	55

4.21	Paired samples test of preferences regarding employment and regarding voluntary organizations	56
4.22	PCA pattern matrix of survey participants' voluntary work organization preferences	57
4.23	PCA component correlation matrix of survey participants' voluntary work organization preferences.	58
4.24	Sources of information about employers rated by survey participants	59
4.25	Scales of information sources	61
4.26	Correlations between preferred sources of information (scales) and preferences regarding employers (components)	62
A.1	Quantitative survey design overview	70
B.1	Grouping of responses to question J002	77

Introduction

This work deals with the role of cultural fit in recruiting. I have for many years been a member of a voluntary non-profit student organization which suffered from a constant lack of members and observed that some people were very enthusiastic about work in certain organizations while other people were completely indifferent about the same topics – different organizations seemed to appeal to different people. The interest to find out more about this was the motivation for this thesis.

Essentially, recruiting is the process of matching individuals to jobs in organizations. Organizations perform personnel marketing which aims to motivate as many people as possible who have the right qualifications to apply for positions, those who apply then go through the organization's selection process and those who are selected are integrated into the organization (Achouri, 2010, p. 12; Holtbrügge, 2007, pp. 95, 113).

During the 20th century the importance of recruiting grew considerably. In 1943 Winston Churchill (Speech at Harvard University, 1943 as cited by The Economist, 2006) said that “the empires of the future will be empires of the mind”. Changes in demographics will further increase the issue of lack of personnel in the future: In the EU the working-age population is projected to fall by 10% in the next 40 years¹. This makes recruitment of well-educated individuals an important topic for all organizations.

Furthermore, methods of recruiting have changed considerably in the last decades. One of the major influences in personnel attraction and selection in recent years has been the introduction of online recruiting methods which are assumed to result in cost savings, time savings, increased numbers of applicants and other benefits (Lang et al., 2011). Hence, this research will put particular emphasis on the analysis of the effects of online recruiting.

Schneider (1987) proposed that different kinds of organizations attract, select and retain different kinds of people based on their culture. Chapman et al. (2005) found that

¹Working-age population defined here as the age range from 15 to 64 years. According to projections by Eurostat (2011), the number of people in the EU aged 15-64 will fall from 336 million in 2010 to less than 300 million in 2050.

perceived person-organization fit (P-O fit) was a good predictor for whether a person would want to pursue a job offer.

P-O fit appears to have positive effects on job satisfaction, organizational commitment, retention rates, and also organizational performance (Kristof-Brown et al., 2005). However, “too much” fit may also produce negative effects – Schneider (1987, p. 446) theorized that organizations that have a high cohesion (a lot of people of the same “type”) would be unable to adapt to change and ultimately would have to fail.

Taylor (2004) said that during the 20th century the concept of work has been synonymous with paid employment, however they argued that this classical conceptualization of work was insufficient and suggested a framework that accommodated a range of different work relations: “paid, unpaid, public, private, formal and informal” (Taylor, 2004, p. 45). This thesis will focus on work in organizations, however the research will include both paid and unpaid work.

49% of individuals who participate in voluntary work say one of their most important motivations was to meet people (Statistics Austria, 2010). This indicates that fit may be even more important in voluntary organizations.

Both P-O fit and online recruiting have received considerable research attention in recent years, however only limited research could be found that evaluated the effects that the introduction of online recruiting methods had on P-O fit. Lang et al. (2011) stated that online job portals allow only very limited organization- and job-specific information to be included in postings. This may indicate that users of these systems find less information about organizations compared to users of other recruiting methods.

The objective of this research was to get a holistic image of the role of cultural fit in personnel attraction and selection, with special emphasis placed on the aspect of online recruiting. Hence, both the organizational and the individual perspectives were considered: First, a number of organizations were examined qualitatively to find out what role cultural fit played in their recruiting methods and attitudes towards the topic of cultural fit. A wide variety of organizations was examined to get a complete impression, including student organizations, a university faculty and companies of various sizes. The aim of the second part of the research was to find out whether the methods used by organizations matched the preferences of potential candidates. In a quantitative survey potential applicants were queried about their preferences regarding organizations and the way they collect information.

Theoretical Background

This section will provide an overview of the topics involved in this thesis. In the beginning an introduction to the topic of organizational culture and person-organization fit will be given. After that, current literature regarding recruiting will be presented followed by a more detailed analysis of electronic recruiting. Finally, literature on individuals' perspectives on the recruitment process will be examined.

2.1 The emergence of organizational culture

Schein (2010, p. 7) proposed that culture was an abstraction, but its effects were powerful and hard to comprehend for the individual. People can often seem to be “bureaucratic”, “political” or “irrational” if the cultural roots of the behavior are not understood (Schein, 2010, p. 7).

Schein (2010, pp. 23-33) described three levels of culture: The most visible manifestations of culture are called artifacts, which are physical or observable manifestations; the level below are espoused beliefs and values – the ideals, goals, values, ideologies and rationalizations of people; the deepest level are the underlying, unconscious assumptions – they determine behavior and thought, but are taken-for-granted and not questioned (Schein, 2010, pp. 23-33).

One major branch of cultural research aims to find dimensions to measure culture empirically. Different scales have been suggested for example by Hofstede (see e.g. Hofstede, 2001) or the “GLOBE” study of 62 societies (see House et al., 2004).

Hofstede (2001, pp. xix-xx) explained culture by arguing that individuals carry “mental programs” containing culture which are developed and reinforced throughout childhood and education. Organizational culture, according to Hofstede (2001, p. 391), is complementary to national culture. It is the study of differences in culture between organizations that are part of the same country. Hofstede's definition of organizational culture is: “the collective programming of the mind that distinguishes the members of one organization from another”.

Brodbeck et al. (2004, pp. 664-665) found that although organizational culture differs among societies and among industries, there are almost no measurable cross-regional industry-sector effects. This means that the industry influences the culture of an organization within a country, but the common assumption that organizational culture is similar for corporations in other countries as long as they are in the same industry does not hold.

When an organization is founded, the founders make decisions based on what “makes sense” to them and according to boundaries set by their environment: they set goals based on their values and hire people who they believe share their values, which in turn creates the organization’s culture (Schein, 2010; Schneider et al., 1995, pp. 752-753).

Processes and structures in different organizations are different. They develop out of necessity, but they are ultimately traceable to decision makers and founders of the organization (Schneider, 1987, p. 443). The combination of different people and different environments produces differences in structures (Schneider, 1987, p. 443).

The leaders who were hired by the organization’s founders because of their values will in later stages make hiring decisions and hire people who share their own values, which are similar to those of the founders – this process reproduces culture and leads to increased homogeneity (Schneider et al., 1995, pp. 752-761).

2.2 Defining “good” person-organization fit

Person-organization fit (P-O fit) is one kind of *person-environment fit* (P-E fit) and closely related to *person-group fit* (P-G fit; concerned with fit in work groups; definitions of the group may range from immediate coworkers to subunits of organizations), *person-vocation fit* (P-V fit; similarity with people who perform the same tasks or who completed the same education) and *person-job fit* (P-J fit) (Kristof, 1996). A more recent research area has been *person-supervisor fit* (P-S fit) (Kristof-Brown et al., 2005).

P-O fit can be described as the compatibility between individuals and organizations (Kristof, 1996; Kristof-Brown, 2000). Compatibility is usually seen as either a *supplementary fit* (the individual is similar to the organization; there is a congruence of values or goals; similarity of personality with the organizational climate) or *complementary fit* (the individual possesses characteristics which the organization is missing and/or vice-versa; they are fulfilling one another’s needs) (Kristof, 1996). Kristof (1996) added that the different definitions of P-O fit are not always contradictory but usually closely related different views of similar issues.

According to Kristof-Brown (2000), P-J fit is a similar, yet separate concept to P-O fit – recruiters associate both concepts with knowledge, skills, abilities (KSAs) as well as values of applicants, but Kristof-Brown found that recruiters mention KSA more frequently as indicators for P-J fit than P-O fit, while personality traits or values were mentioned as better indicators of the latter.

The ASA model Schneider (1987) introduced the “Attraction-Selection-Attrition” (ASA) model. It claims that different kinds of organizations attract, select and retain

different kinds of people.

Unlike other theories that attribute organizational culture and behaviors of individuals to those people's environment (e.g. technologies, leadership, the stories, myths and assumptions of an organization), Schneider (1987) argued that differing personalities resulted in certain people's attraction and selection into an organization while others whose personality did not fit were deterred, leading to a cycle whereby similar people would be attracted:

“My thesis suggests that Kurt Lewin may have overstated the case when he hypothesized that behavior is a function of person and environment, that is, $B = f(P, E)$. My thesis is that environments are function of persons behaving in them, that is, $E = f(P, B)$.” (Schneider, 1987, p. 438)

The first step of ASA is *Attraction*. Hollande (1976, 1985, as cited in Schneider, 1987, p. 441) had found that careers are groupable into six types and that people are differently attracted to them. Furthermore, Tom (1971, as cited in Schneider, 1987, p. 441) had made similar findings regarding different environments. People choose their career and join organizations based on these preferences, therefore similar people will select similar places (Schneider, 1987).

Attrition is the reverse side of attraction. Mobley (1982, as cited in Schneider, 1987, p. 442) found that people who do not fit an environment tend to leave. As a result, those who stay are likely to be similar to one another and thereby form a more homogeneous group.

The counterpart of attraction and attrition of individuals is *selection* done by the organization. In addition to personality traits, organizations select by competences, further restricting the kinds of people that can join (Aldrich, 1979 as cited in Schneider, 1987, p. 444).

As organizations evolve, this evolution will be based on the basic personality characteristics of the people in the organization (Schneider et al., 1995, p. 754). Further stabilizing factors are that members of a group will mimic the behaviors they observe and that even decision makers do not critically evaluate institutionalized practices (Dickson et al., 2004, pp. 81-82).

The role of fit in the hiring process As predicted by the ASA model, P-O fit has been shown to be related to individual preferences for organizations as well as organizations' selection decisions (Kristof, 1996). Sekiguchi (2003) found that managers' judgements of applicants' qualifications were strongly correlated with both P-O fit ($r = .60; p < .01$) and P-J fit ($r = .56; p < .01$).

Traditional models focussed primarily on P-J fit, but scholars suggested that P-O fit was a more desired outcome of the hiring process in order to select employees who will stay in the organization for the long-term as well as enhancing future organizational flexibility (Kristof, 1996; Kristof-Brown, 2000). Sekiguchi (2007) on the other hand

proposed that P-O fit was more desirable than P-J fit only for certain situations: long-term relational psychological contracts, for firm-specific human capital¹, and “locals”² (Sekiguchi, 2007). Sekiguchi (2007) assumed that there is a trade-off between P-J and P-O fit.

The consequences of fit P-O fit (both from a needs-supplies perspective as well as from supplementary perspective) has been found to positively influence work attitudes resulting in higher job satisfaction, organizational commitment and lower intentions of quitting (Kristof, 1996; Kristof-Brown et al., 2005).

Kristof-Brown et al. (2005) performed a meta-analysis on fit to find the correlation between overall performance and different types of fit. They found a moderate correlation of performance with P-G fit, but for P-O, P-J and P-S fit the results were inconclusive.

Schneider (1987, pp. 445-446) proposed that, over time, organizations can become ingrown in type and become less adaptable, which is one reason why they can fail as adapting to change without changing the types of people in the organization is very difficult. Schneider et al. (1995, pp. 765-766) said that the consequences of homogeneity may not be exclusively positive or negative. They argued that early in an organization homogeneity may have positive effects because it facilitates coordination, communication and cooperation, but it may lead to inflexibility and inability to adapt later on. In later stages of an organization’s development, heterogeneity in higher hierarchy levels may be important in order to increase flexibility and more quickly adapt to market needs (Schneider et al., 1995, pp. 765-766).

Measuring fit There are several different ways to assess fit. One possibility is to describe persons and organizations using the same dimensions to make them directly comparable (Kristof, 1996). Another option is to assess subjective or perceived fit, which is said to exist if it is perceived to exist, regardless of the actual properties of the research subjects (Kristof, 1996). The problem with the latter method is that is often difficult to judge which dimensions are being considered by the respondents (Kristof, 1996). Ravlin and Ritchie (2006) found that actual fit and perceived fit are independent from one another and have separate and independent positive effects on work attitudes.

Schneider (1987, pp. 446-447) suggested using personality tests to select people of various kinds, however they warn that personality tests should not be considered as fine-grained selection mechanisms. They also emphasized the importance of recruiting activities in order to enlarge the pool of possible candidates (Schneider, 1987, p. 448):

“The ASA framework suggests that the major way organizations can actively determine the pool of candidates from which they will choose their members is through recruitment activities. Thus, if organizations are to

¹i.e. people with knowledge and skills that is only applicable in one organization

²Sekiguchi (2007) referred to Gouldner’s (1957) cosmopolitan-local theory. “Locals” are individuals who have a high loyalty to an organization and perform tasks that are deeply embedded in the organizational context.

make active choices to increase the range of the types of people they select, then it will be primarily through a focus on increasing the pool of candidates that this will happen. Haphazard recruitment and/or faith in the selection process, either self-selection or organizational selection, cannot be expected to yield the non-right types required for long-term viability.” (Schneider, 1987, p. 448)

Several researchers suggest that P-O fit has always been implicitly included in selection processes as part of selection interviews (Sekiguchi, 2003).

2.3 Actions taken by organizations to recruit the best people

Barnard (1938, p. 73) defined organizations as “system[s] of consciously coördinated [*sic*] activities or forces of two or more persons”. This definition is interesting as organizations are not defined as groups of people, machines or rooms but rather as systems of some of the of activities of many individuals which can include investors, creditors, customers and suppliers (Berger and Bernhard-Mehlich, 2002).

Berger and Bernhard-Mehlich (2002) stated that control of organizational leadership over employees was limited which is why organizations are dependent on employees who make decisions in the interest of the organization independently themselves.

These statements illustrate the important role of people within an organization: their actions are what defines the organization itself and they have to make decisions independently, which makes goal and value congruence between organization and employees so important. This congruence can be reached either through selection of people who possess the desired values or by training people to obtain them.

Barber (1998, p. 5) defined recruiting as “those practices and activities carried on by the organization with the primary purpose of identifying and attracting potential employees”. Recruiting consists of three phases: (1) attraction phase (*personnel marketing*); (2) selection phase (*personnel selection*); (3) integration phase (Achouri, 2010, p. 12; Holtbrügge, 2007, pp. 95, 113). Only the first two phases are to be examined in this thesis.

In some literature, the second phase is split into “maintaining applicant status” (during which organizations try to maintain applicants’ interest in the organization and decide which applicants to keep in their applicant pool) and “job choice” (during which applicants decide whether to accept a concrete job offer by the organization) (Barber, 1998).

The transfer of current employees to different positions within an organization is called “placement”, a field that is closely related to recruiting but separate (Achouri, 2010, p. 65). Other authors (e.g. Barber, 1998, p. 3), refer to this process as “internal recruitment” and consider it a sub-field of recruiting. However, this work will address only the attraction and selection of personnel from outside the organization.

Personnel demand planning Before the recruiting process starts, personnel demand needs to be evaluated. It must be decided how many people (quantitative dimension) with which qualifications (qualitative dimension) are needed at what time (temporal dimension) at which place (geographic dimension) (Holtbrügge, 2007, pp. 88-93). Literature contains different methods to estimate personnel demand, especially for routine tasks (for example in an industrial environment) – mental and managerial tasks are harder to estimate which is why analytical planning methods are less useful (Holtbrügge, 2007, p. 94).

Barber (1998, pp. 19-22) said that deciding whom to target was the first step of applicant generation. They mentioned the geographic and skills dimensions as most important, but also asserted that the importance of skills was often overestimated as job requirements could be adapted to individuals (Barber, 1998, pp. 19-22).

Personnel marketing According to Holtbrügge (2007, p. 95), personnel marketing has three functions: (1) information function (informing non-members of an organization about vacancies); (2) action function (aims to motivate an adequate number of individuals to apply); (3) selection function (information about requirements)

Methods used in personnel marketing include: job advertisements in print media, public employment services, campus recruiting (offering lectures, thesis topics, company tours, internships, participation in career fairs), recruitment agencies (headhunters), staff leasing (hiring staff for limited period of time through an agency), and internet recruiting (Holtbrügge, 2007, pp. 97-103). Also word-of-mouth and employee referrals are important marketing methods (Holzer, 1988; Barber, 1998).

Kristof (1996) proposed that recruitment strategies that provide realistic previews to applicants (such as site visits) would increase P-O fit.

Personnel selection Personnel selection uses a wide array of methods such as review of application documents, questionnaires, Critical Incident Technique (CIT), job interviews, open question techniques, stress situation interviews and assessment centers (Achouri, 2010, pp. 27-39; Holtbrügge, 2007, pp. 103-104). Face-to-face interviews are the most used method in the personnel selection phase, used not only to exchange information about the organization and the applicant but frequently also to increase the interest of the other party in further pursuit of the selection process Barber (1998, pp. 52-54).

Traditional literature recommends selecting the candidate who has the highest match with the requirements profile that has been developed in personnel demand planning (Achouri, 2010, p. 27; Holtbrügge, 2007, p. 103). In reality, of course, a lot more aspects than qualification are involved in selection.

Holzer (1988, p. 2) found that applicants who were recommended to the company by current employees have a much higher acceptance rate than other applicants, which indicates that employers regard referrals as the better sources of information than direct applications. However, the high acceptance rate may also be rooted in a high cultural fit as the current employee and the referred applicant are likely to be similar to one

another (Montgomery, 1991, p. 1409). Others have argued that current employees will only recommend well-qualified applicants to protect their own reputation (Montgomery, 1991, p. 1410). Another proposed explanation is that referred individuals may have superior knowledge about the job resulting in a higher perceived match quality while other qualified applicants self-select themselves out of the process prematurely (Montgomery, 1991, pp. 1409-1410).

An obvious problem of referrals is that hiring employees from current employees' social networks may introduce inbreeding biases towards certain groups (e.g. race, religion, sex, age, education) (Montgomery, 1991, p. 1413). For example, Staiger (1990, as cited by Montgomery, 1991, p. 1413) found that 85% of males but only 30% of females received a referral from a male.

Kristof (1996) proposed that demands and abilities would influence organizations' early applicant filtering while P-O fit will be used to make the final decision. Kristof (1996) warned that P-O fit was not always relevant to everyday job performance and therefore it may be questionable or even illegal to use it as a selection method. Their later study, Kristof-Brown et al. (2005), also found ambiguity about the effects of P-O fit on performance.

Recruiting for voluntary work 43,8% of Austrians take part in voluntary work of some kind - 47% of men and 40% of women do it (Statistics Austria, 2010). Informal voluntary work is equally popular as formal voluntary work (in volunteering organizations) - however, men are more active in formal volunteering organizations while women are more active in informal activities (Statistics Austria, 2010). When asked for their motivation to participate in voluntary work, people indicate that they are doing it for fun, as a service to the community and for social connections (Statistics Austria, 2010). Social connections are the third most important item selected by 49.0% of survey participants. This could indicate that fit is even more important in voluntary organizations.

Dyer and Jost (2007, pp. 5-6) suggested planning ahead for recruiting new volunteers, but roles should be adaptable to each person's needs and interests, which will make the organization more attractive to prospective volunteers. They argued that a lack of planning causes many problems such as lack of defined work for new volunteers, unhappy existing staff because they have not been consulted, complaints from clients due to lack of organization and also volunteers leaving after a short time.

Planning voluntary work within an organization should include planning of goals, budget, roles, policies, the setting up of insurance and expenses and the preparation of existing volunteers for the arrival of newcomers (Dyer and Jost, 2007, p. 6). Recruitment goals, budget, methods and strategies need to be clarified. Selection and training processes need to be set up as with normal employees (Dyer and Jost, 2007, p. 6).

Saving money is not the only reason to bring volunteers into an existing organization, they can also help to establish links to the community as well as bringing in new ideas and enthusiasm and can complement skills that existing staff possess (Dyer and Jost, 2007, p. 11). Clients of an organization often appreciate the support of people who do not expect money in return (Dyer and Jost, 2007, p. 11).

To make an organization attractive to volunteers, Dyer and Jost (2007, Ch. 6) suggested demonstrating that the organization is well organized and shows appreciation for volunteers by paying expenses (e.g. travel, meals, phone calls, postage or even child care). They said that it was important that volunteers feel a sense of ownership which will in turn make them take care of the organization and keep things clean and ready. They also said that training was an important part of volunteering and one of the primary reasons for many people to join. This claim is supported by Statistics Austria (2010): 43% of survey participants reported that gaining knowledge was an important motivation for their voluntary work.

2.4 Ways information technology can support recruiting processes

Online recruiting is also sometimes referred to as “web-based recruiting”, “internet recruiting”, “e-recruiting” or “e-cruiting” (Wolfswinkel et al., 2010). Its scope ranges from attracting and identifying potentially talented individuals to selecting and retaining candidates (Lang et al., 2011).

Online personnel marketing methods include promotion of vacancies on online job portals or on the organization’s website, the latter also gives an opportunity to provide a more detailed description of the organization, online games and web assessments are other possible methods of online recruiting (Holtbrügge, 2007, pp. 100-102).

Parry and Tyson (2008, as cited in Wolfswinkel et al., 2010, p. 7) suggested that online recruiting is more than a change of the communication medium and may require changes in the recruiting process as a whole.

According to Lee (2005), 94 of the “Fortune 100” companies have corporate career websites, the remaining six use third-party job boards. In addition those companies that have their own corporate career web sites usually supplement with third-party job boards (Lee, 2005). 83 of the 100 companies allow submission of CVs through online forms or résumé builders, many do not accept applications via fax or paper mail anymore (Lee, 2005).

Lee (2007) proposed the following categorization for online recruiting methods: general-purpose job boards, niche job boards (serving particular professions, industries, education, location, etc.), e-recruiting application service providers (providing specialized software, processes, education and training), hybrid recruiting service providers (providers with experience in advertising or recruiting services that offer also recruiting, but not exclusively, e.g. newspapers), e-recruiting consortiums (associations of several employers advertising their openings together) and corporate career web sites.

Lang et al. (2011) found that organizations have very high expectations of online recruiting that drive its increased usage. Lang et al. (2011) and Suvankulov et al. (2012) found that the consequences of the introduction of online recruiting include reduced costs for personnel recruiting by 90% or even more, an increased number of suitable applicants but also unsuitable applicants requiring the organization to implement filtering methods as well as time savings for organizations and applicants. Lang et al. (2011) also found

that organizations that used e-recruiting had an improved corporate image, but on the other hand applicants perceived a loss of individuality. Chapman and Webster (2003, as cited in Lang et al., 2011) found that IT-based personnel selection was perceived by applicants as being less fair than other methods.

Challenges of online recruiting include the exclusion of potential applicants who do not use the technology (internet access penetration differs among groups of different age, income and professional group) and security of applicants' data (Lang et al., 2011; Suvankulov et al., 2012). Lang et al. (2011) also found that the decision which online job portal to use is difficult for organizations. They also mention that the implementation of a new online recruiting tool requires the organization to invest a lot of effort and money (Lang et al., 2011). It has been observed that online recruiting leads to more applications from unqualified applicants which requires more effort for selection (Lang et al., 2011). If e-assessment is used, there is a risk that the applicant could be substituted by a third person to achieve better results (Lang et al., 2011). Lang et al. (2011) also found that the possibility to provide organization- and job-specific information is limited on online job portals. The last argument is especially relevant for this research as a lack of organization- and job-specific information makes it harder for candidates to determine their P-O fit.

Smith (2004, as cited in Wolfswinkel et al., 2010, p.7) suggested trying to eliminate the human element in data collection and personnel selection. This argument is supported in the light of Elgin and Clapham's (2004, as cited in Wolfswinkel et al., 2010, p. 9) finding that recruiters get different impressions about a person from electronic versus paper based CVs.

Lee (2007, p. 83) suggested modeling the online recruiting process as eleven steps: (1) identification of hiring needs; (2) submission of job requisition; (3) approval of job requisition; (4) job posting on the internet; (5) online job search by job seekers; (6) submission of applications; (7) searching the applicant database; (8) evaluation of resume/application; (9) interviewing by managers; (10) pre-employment screening; (11) job offer and contract.

Online recruiting providers in Austria Table 2.1 provides a comparison of offers and prices of several online job boards in Austria. The platforms reviewed here are the ones that were mentioned by organizations in qualitative research. Prices for publishing job offers vary from free to EUR 27.50 (Monster (a)) per day. Platforms also offer access to their applicant pools for prices up to EUR 20.00 per individual contact (WillHaben: Prices).

In reference to the categorization of online recruiting methods proposed by Lee (2007), Karriere.at, Monster, Willhaben, Jobnavi, Jobwohnen, UniJobs and StepStone can be considered as general-purpose job boards while DiePresse.com and Kleinezeitung are hybrid recruiting service providers. IAESTE can be considered a hybrid recruiting service provider as it offers several different recruiting services, but it also a niche provider focussing on engineering and natural sciences.

The platforms Kununu.com and Whatchado.net provide different services than the

Platform	Popularity	Job board offer	Applicant database offer
Karriere.at	1,800,000 page views and 700,000 unique visitors per month (ÖWA)	starting at EUR 490 for 60 days	53,000 applicants in database, 75% have high-school diplomas, access costs EUR 590 for two months with the possibility to contact 100 candidates.
Monster	Claims to be largest private job wall in Austria at 444,000 visitors per month	starting at EUR 385 for 14 days, discounts for larger quantities or durations; jobs are also posted on four partner sites	27,000 applicants, access costs EUR 380 for one month with the possibility to contact 50 applicants
Willhaben, JobNavi, DiePresse.com, Kleinezeitung	not mentioned	starting at EUR 280 for 30 days, job offers for lower qualification levels and certain industries start at EUR 90	Contacting one person from the applicant pool costs EUR 20 – quantity discounts available
JobWohnen, UniJobs	3,300,000 page views, 400,000 unique visitors per month, on average more than 1,000 views per job offer	starting at EUR 110 for 3 weeks	N/A
StepStone	not mentioned	starting at EUR 490 for 30 days	looking at 500 CVs and contacting 100 persons: EUR 199
IAESTE Job Wall	not mentioned	free, but only certain professions are allowed	N/A

Table 2.1: Comparison of online job board providers in Austria; Sources: Karriere.at, ÖWA, IAESTE: Job wall, JobWohnen, StepStone, WillHaben: Prices, WillHaben: Special offers, Monster (a), Monster (b)

classical job board / applicant database providers. Kununu.com is a social employer rating website operated by Xing (Kununu: Prices). Employees, applicants and apprentices can rate employers, post comments and list benefits (Kununu: Example page; Kununu: Prices). There are two “seals of quality” available: “Open Company” is awarded to companies that invite their employees to Kununu and post additional information about themselves; “Top Company” is a company that received positive ratings by employees (Kununu: Top Company). Prices for listing of a company start at EUR 395 per month (Kununu: Prices). Whatchado.net is a web site containing videos of employees talking about their job, answering the same questions in every video (Whatchado). A total of 104 recorded hours of people from various professions and levels of expertise are available as of October 2013 (Whatchado).

2.5 Decisions made by individuals about joining organizations

Why individuals work in organizations In Section 2.3 organizations were defined as coordinated activities of individuals. Individuals must always receive inducements or incentives in exchange for their contributions: “The net satisfactions which induce a man to contribute his efforts to an organization result from the positive advantages as against the disadvantages which are entailed” (Barnard, 1938, pp. 139-140). Barnard (1938, pp. 140-149) listed many different examples of inducements including from material inducements such as money, satisfying of personal ideals and feelings of personal comfort. Therefore, the vitality of the organization is dependent on its ability to create this balance of burdens and incentives for its contributors (Berger and Bernhard-Mehlich, 2002).

Herzberg (1987) found that there were two kinds of inducements: motivational factors and hygiene factors. They stated that hygiene factors needed to be satisfied in order for individuals to not be demotivated from work while motivational factors made employees perform better (Herzberg, 1987). Hygiene factors include satisfactory organizational policy, supervision, work conditions, relationships and salary while achievements, recognition and responsibility are examples for motivators (Herzberg, 1987).

Sekiguchi (2007) said that employment can also be seen as a psychological contract between the employer and the employee. The contract can either be limited to the exchange of work for inducements or a long-term commitment (Sekiguchi, 2007).

Methods used by individuals to identify potential jobs Holzer (1988) analyzed long-term survey data and found that among unemployed youth in the USA, friends/relatives were the most used channel for job search, the most efficient one and the one that led to the highest acceptance rate. Various studies for different fields have reported that 24 to 74% of jobs are found through friends/relatives (Montgomery, 1991, p. 1409). The importance of social networks in job searches is documented as early as the 1960s (Weber and Mahringer, 2008). A more recent study of Caliendo et al. (2011) showed that unemployed individuals in Germany with a larger social network relied more heavily on informal information sources and had higher reservation wages. Weber and Mahringer (2008, p. 164) found that in Austria, friends are used as a method for job search by 60% of job searchers and 46% of jobs are found through this channel.³

Direct application, also known as unsolicited application or random application, refers to an application sent to an employer without referencing an advertisement (Weber and Mahringer, 2008). This method generates many job offers which however have a low acceptance rate for job seekers (Weber and Mahringer, 2008). In the study of Holzer (1988), direct applications were the second most used job search method which combined with friends/family accounted for 67% of all job offers and 74% of all accepted offers.

³Possible reasons for the high success rate of personal referrals were discussed in Section 2.3.

Advertisements in newspapers and other media are another method of job searching for many individuals, but the rejection rate (by the prospective employer) is high (Holzer, 1988; Weber and Mahringer, 2008).

Most developed nations operate state employment agencies which are not only trying to match unemployed individuals with jobs but also support unemployed through free services and education (Weber and Mahringer, 2008, p. 154). Weber and Mahringer (2008, p. 154) said that: “A common empirical finding is that job offers through the public employment office are characterized by low wages and high rejection rates from the side of the unemployed (Holzer 1988; Osberg 1993; Blau and Robins 1990).”

Internet job search (IJS) is also a popular method to look for jobs. There are several studies that report a positive impact of internet search on job search outcome while other studies report no impact (Suvankulov et al., 2012). Suvankulov et al. (2012) reported that both in Germany and in South Korea in the period 2003-2007 internet job search had a positive effect on reemployment probability as well as reducing duration of unemployment.

Other common methods of job search include private recruiting agencies, advertisements in schools and universities and direct contacts initiated by employers who are seeking personnel (Weber and Mahringer, 2008, p. 162).

How individuals decide which job to accept The organizational image (i.e. loose and unstructured feelings towards an organization) influences early in the process whether individuals feel attracted to an organization (Barber, 1998, pp. 32-36). Individuals feel attracted to organizations whose image is similar to their self-image (Barber, 1998, pp. 32-36).

Schein (2010, pp. 177-178) said that potential applicants try to decipher culture from the outside in order to make a decision whether to join an organization. They said that applicants can do this through visits, artifacts, asking insiders, identifying appealing values, looking for inconsistencies and finally comparing this to the actually observed behavior (Schein, 2010).

Chapman et al. (2005) analyzed literature on predictors for recruiting outcomes. They found four recruiting outcome variables: (a) *Job pursuit intentions* – a person’s desire to submit an application, attend a site visit, etc.; (b) *Job-organization attraction* – a person’s overall evaluation of job attractiveness; (c) *Acceptance intentions* – a person’s perceived likelihood to accept a job offer; (d) *Job choice* – the actual choice a job-seeker has made. The analyzed predictors included an array of job and organizational characteristics, recruiter characteristics, perceptions of the recruitment process, perceived fit, perceived alternatives, and hiring expectancies.

Some variables are potential deal breakers for job pursuit intentions (pay level, benefits offered, advancement opportunities) while other variables are compensatory (low attraction in one variable compensates for high attraction in another) (Barber, 1998, p. 48; Chapman et al., 2005, pp. 933-935).

Perceived fit was found by Chapman et al. (2005) to be one of the best predictors for recruiting outcomes: P-O fit predicted job pursuit intentions ($\rho = .62$; 95% CI: .55–

68) and job-organization attraction ($\rho = .46$; 95% CI: .37–.56), and P-J fit predicted acceptance intentions ($\rho = .45$; 95% CI: .34–.55).

Also needs-supplies fit between personality traits has been shown to predict job-organization attraction – e.g. characteristics such as the need for achievement, materialism or self-efficacy – have been used to predict preferences for organizations with certain reward or pay systems (Kristof, 1996).

2.6 Research gap

Recruiting is a process of reducing information asymmetry: In the beginning, neither the organization nor the individual know about one another. The process then connects the two and they make decisions whether to engage in a deeper relationship or not.

Research has shown that fit, among other things, influences job pursuit intentions, organizational attraction on potential employees, job choice Chapman et al. (2005), work attitudes (Kristof, 1996; Kristof-Brown, 2000), manager’s judgement of applicants (Sekiguchi, 2003) and even organizational performance (Kristof-Brown et al., 2005).

However, no research was found on whether fit is equally important for all individuals and organization or whether there are differences. The only hints regarding this topic are the theoretical proposition of Schneider et al. (1995) that fit may be more important in the early stages of an organization and the statistical finding by Statistics Austria (2010) that social connections are very important in voluntary work.

Another open question, in my opinion, is how fit is determined by organizations or individuals during the recruiting process and what the effects of different personnel marketing and selection methods on perceived fit are. On the one hand, it was suggested that recommendations by friends (Montgomery, 1991) or site visits (Kristof, 1996) may result in higher fit than other recruiting methods. On the other hand, Lang et al. (2011) said that online job boards gave only little possibility to provide detailed information about organizations.

As the effects of fit are so extensive, it is relevant to find out whether the importance of fit varies among different groups and whether the method of communication influences the possibility to determine fit.

Organizational / recruiter perspective by qualitative research

In order to find out which personnel recruiting methods are used in organizations and recruiters' opinions about the role of fit, I decided to conduct qualitative research that included interviews and a review of the organization's marketing material, all of which was then subjected to content analysis.

It seemed important to explore a very wide variety of organizations in order to be able to observe different approaches to the topic used by different organizations. The initial target was to examine four to eight organizations, about half of them for-profit companies and the other half a mixture of research institutions, student organizations or other volunteering organizations.

3.1 Research objectives

Personnel marketing is used by organizations to inform potential applicants about vacancies, motivate them to apply but at the same time inform them about the requirements to deter unqualified applicants (Holtbrügge, 2007, p. 95). The first question is concerned with the role of cultural fit within this process:

Question 1. *Which personnel marketing methods are used by organizations to communicate their values and attract fitting individuals? How are online personnel marketing methods used to perform these tasks? Are there differences between type, size, structure of organizations?*

Chapman et al. (2005) found that P-O fit was strongly correlated with job pursuit intentions. Therefore the way organizations communicate their values in marketing is of crucial importance for the perceived organizational attractiveness.

The second part of the question puts emphasis on the use of online personnel marketing. Lang et al. (2011) found that online job boards are not ideal in providing detailed information about the organization or the job offered. This may indicate that the use of online recruiting may lead to applicants with poorer P-O fit who are in turn less frequently selected by organizations¹. On the other hand, Kristof (1996) proposed that recruitment strategies that provide realistic previews to applicants (such as site visits) would increase P-O fit.

The last part of the question deals with differences between different organizations. This includes possible differences between voluntary work and paid employment. Schneider et al. (1995, pp. 765-766) proposed that fit was more important in the early stages of an organization and may have negative effects in later stages.

The second research question deals with the personnel selection done by organizations:

Question 2. *What is the perceived importance of fit in personnel selection, and what are the methods used by organizations to assess fit? Are there differences between type, size, structure of organizations?*

As mentioned in Section 2.2, there are several methods to evaluate fit ranging from subjective perceptions to cultural dimensions analysis and personality tests. The relation of fit with personnel selection has been shown empirically before (e.g. Kristof, 1996; Sekiguchi, 2003), however it is unclear whether fit is used deliberately or whether recruiting processes are unknowingly biased.

If organizations use fit deliberately as a criterion, it needs to be found out why they do it and what their expectations are.

On the other hand, there may also be organizations that aim to reduce homogeneity through personality tests as Schneider (1987) suggested.

An additional goal of this qualitative research was to generate list items of employer benefits and personnel marketing channels which were later used in quantitative research.

3.2 Data collection

3.2.1 Expert interviews

The primary source of information in the qualitative part of the research were expert interviews with people responsible for human resources in each examined organization. Interview partners were asked about their perception of the organization's culture as well as details about their recruiting methods and success.

¹The relation of P-O fit with personnel selection decisions is analyzed in e.g. Kristof (1996); Sekiguchi (2003)

I tried to roughly follow the guide offered by Yin (2009, pp. 106-109) for focussed interviews. A list of questions was created before the interviews, but it was considered rather as a guide than as a static structure. This allowed deeper inquiry into details of topics that appeared to be of relevance. The interviews were recorded, transcribed and afterwards analyzed.

3.2.2 Artifact analysis

Artifacts were the second source of information used. Artifacts used in this study were personnel marketing material of the respective organization, especially the websites, online recruiting tools, and brochures. I anticipated in this way discovering more about the culture, entry criteria and the organization's self-image.

Lueger (2000, pp. 140-145) defined artifact analysis as the study of tools and everyday objects but also of involuntary traces of activities. Artifact analysis can be used in parallel to other field research methods (Lueger, 2000, pp. 140-145).

3.2.3 Protection of research subjects

Since my research involved the collection of data from individuals and organizations, their protection was a topic that had to be considered, especially since my search involved asking people questions about their employer and possibly information about applicants would be revealed.

The Vienna University of Technology's Code of Conduct unfortunately did not state any rules regarding the privacy of research subjects (VUT, 2007), therefore I performed a search of further frameworks that could be applicable to my research.

The ethics guidelines for psychological research of the University of Vienna stated that information about the background of the research has to be provided to research subjects, data collected in research has to be anonymized, all communication and data that could lead to identification should be separated from research data (Ethikkommission Psychologie, 2011, Sec. III. b,c).

Schein (2010, pp. 186-188) warned that an organization can be made vulnerable by revealing its culture to outsiders but on the other hand argued that naming organizations in research would allow others to verify and replicate findings. Therefore they said that deciding whether to anonymize the names of organizations was a difficult issue to consider (Schein, 2010, pp. 186-188).

As a result of these findings, it was decided that neither the identity of interview partners nor organizations would be published in the thesis and characteristics that could lead to easy identification were not mentioned. It is unfortunate that this level of secrecy had to be chosen, but since interview partners were HR experts of each organization and most organizations only have a very small number of these positions, a revelation of an organization name could have easily led to identification of the interview partners whose identities I wanted to protect.

3.3 Data analysis

Content analysis (in social sciences) refers to the analysis of recorded material that originates from communication (Mayring, 2010, pp. 11-13). I used the framework provided by Mayring (2010) as a reference. According to Mayring (2010, p. 13), content analysis is supposed to be a systematic, rule-driven, theory-driven analysis of fixed communication with the aim to draw conclusions from particular aspects of communication. Free interpretations are not accepted in content analysis as it aims to follow a ruleset that will allow other researchers to verify and reproduce the conclusions (Mayring, 2010, pp. 12-13).

The material analyzed were the transcripts of the expert interviews as well as text of organization websites and printed marketing material that was obtained during the interviews. The goal of the content analysis was to find information regarding a set of topics.

An initial category tree was created deductively based on literature. After a first analysis of the content, the category tree was inductively improved. The final category tree which was used for the final analysis can be found below.

The units of analysis were phrases, sentences, groups of sentences or pieces of dialogue which were assigned to categories (meaning that neither single words nor whole interviews were assigned to categories). Finally, for each organization and each category the unveiled content was paraphrased and summarized.

Category tree

- A. Topic: Organizational structure
 - A.1 Formal structure: hierarchy, responsibilities, norms
“We have the one area called ‘Products and Agency’, that is agency work (...) and our own product development (...) and there is one ‘owner’ in each area.”²
 - A.2 Informal structure: responsibilities, deviations from formal structure, lack of norms
“(...) the employees say: ‘if I have a problem, I go directly to the boss’ ”³
 - A.3 Environment: industry, competition, labor market
“My personal impression is that [the situation on the labor market] gets more and more difficult.”⁴

²Original quote of representative of MAC: “Wir haben den Bereich Products und Agency, also Agenturarbeiten (...) und unsere Produktentwicklung (...) da gibt’s jeweils einen Owner. . .”

³Original quote of representative of MB: “(...) die Mitarbeiter sagen: ‘wenn ich ein Problem hab, geh ich direkt zum Chef’ ”

⁴Original quote of representative of Uni: “Mein persönlicher Eindruck ist, dass [die Situation am Arbeitsmarkt] immer schwieriger wird.”

[About the labor market:] “Critical. (...) For our demand we have too few members.”⁵

- B. Topic: Organizational culture
 - B.1 Definition of culture: The recruiter’s own definition
“Corporate culture is, so to say, the way of dealing with one another.”⁶
“Well, essentially the working climate. The values of the company. Yes, something in that direction.”⁷
 - B.2 Description of organization’s culture: “we care about...”, “it is important to us...”
“The consulting business is unbelievably fast. When there is a competition everyone works through three nights and then it is finished. It is very stressful.”⁸
 - B.3 Competition: Differences in culture to other entities
“We are all in the same industry, that means that we all have the same pressure from the outside, which means that we all have to deal with the falling market prices.”⁹
- C. Topic: Personnel Marketing/Attraction
 - C.1 Online job boards: Monster.at, Karriere.at, JobWohnen.at, forums, social media, etc.
“We want [to be on] LinkedIn, XING, Kununu; I have an upcoming meeting with Whatchado.”¹⁰
 - C.2 Organization website / recruiting tool
“Yes, there is the possibility to apply through an online application form.”¹¹
 - C.3 Campus recruiting: Career fairs, excursions, high potential days
“We are present at a lot of career fairs, especially at high schools(...).”¹²

⁵Original quote of representative of SO2-2: “Kritisch. (...) Also nach unserem Bedarf haben wir zu wenige Mitglieder.”

⁶Original quote of representative of EC: “Unternehmenskultur ist sozusagen, die Form des Umganges untereinander.”

⁷Original quote of representative of Uni: “Naja im Wesentlichen das Arbeitsklima. Die Werte des Unternehmens. Ja, in die Richtung.”

⁸Original quote of representative of FBC: “Das Consulting Business ist unglaublich schnell. Das heißt, da ist eine Ausschreibung und da arbeiten alle drei Nächte durch und dann ist die Ausschreibung gegeben. Es ist unglaublich stressig.”

⁹Original quote of representative of IG: “Wir sind alle in der gleichen Branche tätig, das heißt, den Druck von Aussen haben wir alle, das heißt, den Preisverfall müssen wir alle irgendwie bewältigen.”

¹⁰Original quote of representative of IG: “Wir wollen bei LinkedIn, XING, Kununu [vertreten sein]; jetzt hab ich demnächst ein Meeting mit Whatchado.”

¹¹Original quote of representative of EC: “Es gibt eine Möglichkeit eben, sich über so ein Bewerbungsformular zu bewerben, ja.”

¹²Original quote of representative of IG: “Wir sind sehr viel vertreten auf Messen. Da vor allem auf HTL-Messen(...).”

- C.4 Other personnel marketing methods: Friends/family, personal contacts, newspapers, headhunters
“Our employees are our biggest agents and our biggest advocates.”¹³
- C.5 Communication of culture
“Not in the job announcements. During the interviews, if it makes sense, we try to give a realistic picture.”¹⁴
“Yes. We write, for example, that the drinks at the workplace are free, that we have a super-cool atmosphere in a co-working-space, totally free time management.”¹⁵
- C.6 Marketing messages / benefits mentioned in marketing / factors that are attracting people: company doctor, international environment, etc.
“[We offer] the most interesting projects, the best competitions and highest chances of winning them.”¹⁶
- D. Topic: Selection methods
 - D.1 Selection criteria not involving fit: Skills, talent, experience
“[Candidates] ideally possess a certain level of experience, but our trend rather is to take someone who has less experience who can still be formed according to our needs.”¹⁷
“At the moment, we take everyone.”¹⁸
 - D.2 Selection criteria involving P-E fit: P-O fit, P-J fit, sympathy, getting along, fit
“For example, we had someone, who was incredibly good, who had years of experience in Android programming, (...), but) did just not fit into the team.”¹⁹
 - D.3 Selection methods: Tests in recruiting, recruiting interviews, assessment center, informal settings
“It is in principle a multi step interview. Usually the first interview is done by

¹³Original quote of representative of IG: “Mitarbeiter sind im Grund unsere größten Agenten und unsere größten Fürsprecher.”

¹⁴Original quote of representative of SO2-1: “Also in den Ausschreibungen nicht. In den Bewerbungsgesprächen, wo es sich halt anbietet, wobei wir meistens versuchen ein relativ realistisches Bild zu geben.”

¹⁵Original quote of representative of MAC: “Ja. Wir schreiben zum Beispiel rein, dass die, dass die, dass alle Getränke, die während dem Arbeiten konsumiert werden gratis sind, dass er eine super-coole Atmosphäre hat in einem Co-Working-Space, total freie Zeiteinteilung.”

¹⁶Original quote of representative of FBC: “[Wir bieten] die interessantesten Projekte, also die besten Ausschreibungen und Gewinnchancen auf die Ausschreibung vom Projekt.”

¹⁷Original quote of representative of MB: “[Kandidaten haben] idealerweise eine gewisse Berufspraxis, wobei unser Trend ist eher, wir nehmen eher jemanden der weniger Erfahrung hat und formen den und passen den an unsere Wünsche an.”

¹⁸Original quote of representative of SO2-1: “Zur Zeit nehmen wir jeden.”

¹⁹Original quote of representative of MAC: “Wir haben zum Beispiel jemanden gehabt, der war wahnsinnig gut, hat jahrelang Android Erfahrung gehabt, (...) hat [aber] einfach nicht in das Team hineingepasst.”

a personnel consultant, the second one is done in house with those we want to invite and then one more interview with the leader of the business unit, that's the decisive round.”²⁰

“During the interview one tries to find out whether they would be able to work with the applicant.”²¹

3.3.1 Organizations examined

Nine organizations were examined as part of the qualitative part of the research²². The names of the organizations were changed in accordance with the data protection rules defined above.

“**Energy Company**” (EC) is an electricity and natural gas provider and network operator from Austria. It has about 7,500 employees, the majority of whom are engineers, in more than 20 countries and five business units.

“**Future Building Company**” (FBC) is a business unit of a large consulting company with several hundred employees in offices around the world. It specializes in participation in tendering procedures for public contracts, mainly construction/development projects in third-world countries financed by European or international organizations.

“**IT Giant**” (IG) is a large, European IT company employing roughly 75,000 people worldwide, over 1,000 of them in Austria. The company was created by a series of mergers of IT companies and exists in the current form for only a few years. The company focusses on two business units: consulting and customer-specific solutions on the one hand, as well as support of outsourcing of IT processes on the other.

“**Machine Builders**” (MB) is a family-owned enterprise specializing in the design, development and manufacturing of industrial machines (e.g. for factory automatization). It has 250 employees, 150 of them at the main branch in Linz, Austria. It was founded in the 1930s and is under sole ownership of the family's third generation.

“**Mobile App Company**” (MAC) is a software development start-up specializing in “apps” for mobile devices. At the time of the analysis, there were three founders and three additional employees working for MAC in two business units.

²⁰Original quote of representative of EC: “Es ist im Prinzip ein mehrstufiges Interview, also wir haben sozusagen ein Erstinterview beim Personalberater sehr häufig das zweite im Haus, all jene die wir dann einladen wollen und das Entscheidungsgespräch nochmal beim Leiter [des Geschäftsbereichs], sozusagen die Entscheidungsrunde.”

²¹Original quote of representative of Uni: “Beim Vorstellungsgespräch versucht man auch herauszufinden, wieweit man mit der Person auch arbeiten kann.”

²²The list below lists eight organizations, but Student Organization 2 contains two independent groups that were considered as separate units of analysis.

“Student Organization 1” (SO1) is a student organization focussing on international cooperation. The organization is organized hierarchically – there is a global organization, as well as national and university groups. One local university group of the organization is being examined.

“Student Organization 2” (SO2) like SO1 focusses on international cooperation. It is smaller and younger than SO1 and concentrates on different fields of study. Like SO1 also SO2 has international, national and university level structures. To gain additional insights, I examined two different university level groups of SO2 which will be referred to as SO2-1 and SO2-2. Both SO2-1 and SO2-2 have about 15 active members each (although the number fluctuates between 10 and 30).

“University” (Uni) is a faculty of a large university in Austria. The faculty is separated into institutes, which are further separated into departments. Each department has 15 to 30 employees.

Table 3.1 provides an overview of the studied organizations.

Org.	Operation focus	Location of subsidiary examined	Industry	Technical background?	Ownership	Size Category	Structure
FBC	Worldwide	Vienna	Consulting / civil engineering	Yes	Group of owners	$10^2 - 10^3$	Project-oriented
EC	Europe-wide	Suburb of Vienna	Energy / utilities	Yes	Exchange-Traded	$10^3 - 10^4$	Hierarchy
MAC	Vienna	Vienna	Software	Yes	Group of owners	$10^0 - 10^1$	Single team
MB	Central and Eastern Europe	Linz	Industrial machines	Yes	Family-owned	$10^2 - 10^3$	Hierarchy
IG	Worldwide	Vienna	IT Services	Yes	Exchange-Traded	$10^4 - 10^5$	Hierarchy
SO1	Worldwide	Vienna	International cooperation	No	Association	$10^1 - 10^3$	Hierarchy
SO2-1	Worldwide	Vienna	International cooperation	Yes	Association	$10^1 - 10^2$	Hierarchy / Garbage Can
SO2-2	Worldwide	Vienna	International cooperation	Yes	Association	$10^1 - 10^2$	Hierarchy / Garbage Can
Uni	Vienna	Vienna	Research	Yes	State	$10^2 - 10^4$	Hierarchy / Garbage Can

Table 3.1: Location, industry, ownership, size and structure of the organizations examined in qualitative research. “Garbage Can” organizations are discussed in Section 3.3.4

3.3.2 Personnel marketing

Organizations used a surprisingly wide variety of marketing methods.

Three of the examined organizations first try to fill openings by internal movement of employees (IG, EC, MB), for EC this works very well and they can fill the majority of positions this way, for IG it results in few internal transfers. MB indicated that although they try to fill positions with existing personnel, issues arise such as the need for training periods for both the internally transferred employee as well as the replacement for the transferred employee.

Only EC and MB use newspaper adverts to look for personnel. However, SO2-1 and SO2-2 regularly publish articles in student union newspapers.

Organizations had very different answers to the question of how most of their applications were generated. Answers included campus recruiting (IG), online platforms (MAC), friends (SO1, SO2-1), and contacting acquaintances who are known to be experienced (Uni). In case of SO2-2 most members had become interested in joining as they had used the services of the organization before.

Culture in marketing Most examined organizations' personnel marketing material contained some information about culture, for example an introductory paragraph about the organization on job offers (IG, EC, MB, SO1, SO2). On the other hand, Uni and FBC deliberately did not want to mention culture in their marketing – however, this decision could also be interpreted as a reflection of the organization's culture. The representative of EC said that it was difficult for them to express information about culture:

“Yes, it is on the one hand written in ‘what the company does’, so maybe a culture can be derived from that, but we do not say ‘that is our culture’, no. Of course the imagery and being represented on Kununu, Facebook, etc has culturally implicit moment and content.” (interview partner of EC)²³

MB found that the number and quality of applicants did not vary according to whether there was information about culture in job offers or not.

The interview partner in SO2-1 said that members of organizations communicate culture subconsciously when meeting non-members, for example they believed that when there are internal problems within the organization members would talk about this with their friends, presenting a negative image. Therefore, SO2-1 believes that internal harmony within the organization and internal friendships attract members.

Recruiting in person Several organizations relied heavily on recruiting methods that involved personal contact such as referrals (EC, SO1, SO2-1, SO2-2, Uni) and campus

²³Original quote from the interview with EC: “Hm. Ja, ich mein einerseits natürlich verschriftlicht in Form von, ‘Was macht das Unternehmen’, insofern lässt sich vielleicht eine Kultur ableiten, aber wir sagen jetzt nicht, ‘Das ist unsere Kultur’, das nicht, nein. Natürlich auch die Bildsprache und, und das Vertreten sein auf Kununu, auf Facebook und Co und so weiter, natürlich hat das auch Kulturimplizite Momente und Inhalte.”

recruiting (EC, IG, SO1, SO2-1, SO2-2). SO1 and SO2-2 even believed that people would frequently get wrong impressions about their organizations from written (online or paper) recruiting advertisements.

EC is not only very active in university campus recruiting but also performs personnel marketing on high schools. EC also indicated that engineers would join recruiters during campus recruiting activities to provide potential applicants with more detailed information about their day-to-day work.

MAC, SO1 and IG said that personal contact was much better than written communication to find people who fit well into their organization.

IG and MB offer bonuses to employees who refer a candidate who is then hired and stays more than 6 months. They said that employee recommendations work better than other marketing methods as friends could trust each other to tell the truth about job opportunities.

Online personnel marketing MB said that they believed that online marketing was superior to newspapers because more information could be transmitted, also online a direct link to the website for more information could be included. FBC was the only organization which mentioned accessing CV databases of online platforms to look for employees.

EC found that people who find job offers via external platforms and do not read the organization's own website usually do not know a lot about the company, on the other hand, EC and FBC said that people who read their website seemed to be better qualified.

Three of the organizations have their own online recruiting tools in use (SO1, IG, EC), two of them even require applicants to use them to apply (SO1, IG). The remaining organizations provide information about recruiting (job offers, ways to apply) on their website (MAC, FBC, MB). SO2 only provides very little, static information about recruiting on its website and no information about any positions. Uni indicated that online job marketing was not usually used as it was believed that qualified people wouldn't be found that way.

Table 3.2 provides an overview of the marketing methods used by the different organizations.

Org.	Non-electronic channels	Referrals	Online recruiting channels	Social media channels	Online recruiting tool
FBC	Not mentioned	Not mentioned	industry-specific platforms	None	No
EC	Career Fairs High-potential days University cooperation Printed career guides	Yes	Karriere.at Monster.at Jobnavi.at Kununu.at Whatchado.at	Facebook Youtube Twitter	Yes
IG	Career fairs	Yes; employees can receive bonus for referrals	Karriere.at Monster.at	Xing	Yes; use mandatory
MAC	Not used	Yes	UniJobs.at Jobwohnen.at Whatchado.net	Student forums	No
MB	Newspaper Headhunting National employment agency	Yes; employees can receive bonus for referrals	Karriere.at Monster.at iaeste.at job wall	None	No
SO1	Booths on campus Lecture presentations Personal contacts Mail sent via university	Yes	Free job walls	Facebook Twitter	Yes; use mandatory
SO2-1	Flyers on campus Booths on campus Lecture presentations	Yes	Student union website	None	No
SO2-2	Flyers on campus Booths on campus Lecture presentations	Yes	Student union website	None	No
Uni	Not mentioned	Not mentioned	University message board E-Mail to other universities Mailing lists	None	No

Table 3.2: Marketing channels used for recruiting by organizations in examined in qualitative research (the organization's own website is used by all organizations and therefore not mentioned)

3.3.3 Personnel selection

Organizations mentioned a wide range of criteria they consider when deciding whether to select an employee and also a large variety of methods that they use to find out whether candidates had the desired properties.

Selection criteria The most skill-oriented organization in the study was FBC – they bid for projects which require expert knowledge and the organization that can provide the most experienced experts receives the contract. For them, experience measured in years is the most important criterion as it was critical in bidding for contracts; languages and expert skills can also be important for some projects. While FBC denied that cultural fit was of any importance they also mentioned issues with experts from other national cultures who did not keep important deadlines or respond to messages in a timely manner.

MB hires most of its employees directly after graduating from school or university. They also recruited people who have experience in the field, especially if they have used the exact type of machine before. They prefer to either hire completely inexperienced or considerably experienced people as they believe that people who have a little bit of experience would have acquired only inconsiderable skills but instead would already have developed fixed opinions and be less open-minded. Also, as the company is becoming more and more active internationally, good knowledge of English is becoming a relevant criterion. MB also indicated that fit is an important criterion and that non-fitting employees would leave the organization after a short time.

For EC education and experience are the most important criteria. In addition, flexibility regarding time and place of work and cultural openness (possibility to work on projects in other countries or even relocate there) were mentioned as possible criteria.

Also for Uni finding the most talented people was essential. During an interview they not only verify qualifications but also check how well the superiors can get along with the applicant, which indicates that fit is a criterion. They, however, denied that (P-O) fit is used to select applicants but instead believe that people who do not fit the university environment would not apply anyway.

IG mentioned that in addition to skills, fit is also very important, but not with the organization (P-O fit) as the company was too diverse, but instead fit with the team (P-G fit) or the superior (P-S fit).

MAC even considers fit to be more important than skills as long as applicants have basic programming skills and are willing to learn.

SO1 denied that cultural fit is a criterion for them, instead they consider skills and “mindset” to be most important. The mindset is determined using a questionnaire which includes items such as open-mindedness, entrepreneurial and social thinking, and the willingness to improve oneself. It appears that the “mindset” could be interpreted as fit with certain desired values.

SO2-1 and SO2-2 said that they have no specific criteria members have to fulfill and that they welcome everyone who fit in the organization, ignoring skills or experience.

They do not have any particular procedure to determine fit but believe that if a person would not fit the culture, they would leave on their own.

Selection methods Most organizations indicated using the classical approach to selection which includes a review applicants' CVs, inviting some to an interview and with the final decision made by one or more of the superiors (MB, Uni, IG, EC).

For FBC, only the CV is decisive of whether a person can become a member of the expert pool and get a chance of eventually being hired if a consulting contract is won in the future.

MAC said that they test P-O fit in an informal setting after the interview by having a small dinner ("beer and pizza") together. They said that this method allows them to get to know candidates much better than in a formal interview setting. In addition, MAC indicated that the low wages they are offering lead to self-selection so that only very motivated individuals would apply for the positions:

"The motivation is actually easily measurable. We don't pay much, if the person is not motivated, then they don't accept the offer anyway." (Interview partner of MAC)²⁴

In MB and EC apprentices first have to complete a written test which about 80-90% of applicants fail. In MB apprenticeship applicants additionally do a "small internship" taking a few days during which they get to know the each other better. After this, about 50% of applicants remain.

SO1 uses an assessment center to find the best applicants for membership. In it, participants are subjectively rated by board members on a number of criteria.

SO2-2 and IG use trial periods to find out who fits their organization. In IG the first employment contract is always limited to 6 months after which the organization decided whom to keep. However, only a single digit percentage of contracts are not prolonged after the trial (IG). SO2-2 uses a trial period of about three months before a person can become a member.

In SO2-1 there is no formal selection mechanism from the side of the organization, individuals become members as soon as they appear a second time but many members leave after a short period of time.

Table 3.3 provides an overview of the organizations' personnel selection methods and criteria.

²⁴Original quote from interview with MAC: "Also die Motivation ist im Grunde ganz einfach messbar. Wir zahlen wenig, wenn der motiviert ist, dann nimmt er das Angebot so und so nicht."

Org.	Mentioned selection criteria	Mentioned relevance of fit	Mentioned selection methods
EC	education; experience; flexibility regarding time and place of work; cultural openness	not mentioned	CV; multi-level, structured interview; for apprentices: written test
FBC	years of experience; skills; sometimes languages	none	CV
IG	skills; fit; for some positions: all-time availability	P-O fit is not important, but P-G fit is.	CV; structured interview; 6 month trial contract
MAC	willingness to learn; motivation, basic programming skills	very important	CV; interview; informal dinner
MB	education; experience; English	important; non-fitting individuals tend to leave on their own	CV; interview; for apprentices: written test
SO1	skills; mindset	no relevance of fit but “mindset” is important	application, assessment center
SO2-1	interest; willingness to participate	important; non-fitting individuals tend to leave on their own	none
SO2-2	none	important; non-fitting individuals tend to leave on their own	Trial membership of about three months before full membership.
Uni	expertise in a certain field	no relevance of fit but “getting along” with the applicant is important; non-fitting individuals tend to leave on their own	CV; interview

Table 3.3: Selection criteria and selection methods of organizations examined in qualitative research

3.3.4 Differences between type, size, structure of organizations

Type The examined organizations include privately owned, exchange-traded and public organizations as well as associations. The various companies are very different from one another ranging from FBC which hires experts found online based only on their experience to MAC which places relatively little emphasis on skills and aims to find employees that fit the organization. The examined associations SO1 and SO2 are also very different from one another, SO1 uses a very competitive selection process while SO2 is very open and accepts everyone who wants to participate. No relationship between type of organization and recruiting behaviors was found.

Size Recruiting appears to be somewhat related to organization size. It is obvious that the larger organizations in the sample use a greater variety of marketing methods in a greater intensity. MAC and SO2 which are both below 100 members put a very high emphasis on fit. For all other organizations fit is less important and skills are more important (in varying degrees). This can possibly be explained by Schneider et al. (1995, pp. 765-766) who argued that early in the organization development there would be a higher need for homogeneity; probably Schneider's theory is more applicable in relation to organization size and not organization age.

Structure Most of the examined organizations have a hierarchical structure except for a few exceptions. Among the hierarchical organizations, recruiting behavior is very diverse.

FBC is organized around projects and people are only hired for the duration of projects. FBC is also the organization that places the least importance on fit and the highest importance on skills (measured in years of experience).

While most of the examined organizations have a clear distribution of tasks, SO2-1, SO2-2 and Uni show many features that are typical of *Garbage Can*²⁵ structures. For example, they stated that recruiting was a responsibility of every member, that responsibilities vary over time, that member participation fluctuates and that positions were not clearly defined. Also the statement that members would have a lot of freedom indicates a Garbage Can structure. The three Garbage Can organizations have in common that it is very hard for them to recruit enough members and that they are all very long-term oriented. They heavily rely on recruiting methods that involve personal contact, possibly to be able to explain their complex structures and working methods. SO2-1 and SO2-2 also indicated that they do not have clear selection criteria, which indicates that self-selection of members was the main selection process.

²⁵The Garbage Can model was defined by Cohen et al. (1972). The model describes an organization that is characterized by organized anarchy (Cohen et al., 1972): There are various problems, issues and feelings looking for decision situations; preferences are not structured, but instead a loose collection of ideas; preferences are discovered through action; participation of members is fluid – member devote a varying amount of time and effort to the organization (Cohen et al., 1972). These features can be observed in most organizations part of the time but is most present in public, educational and illegitimate organizations (Cohen et al., 1972).

Individual perspective by quantitative research

The second part of the research aimed to explore the perspective of potential applicants on cultural fit in recruiting. A quantitative survey was chosen as the best tool to collect data about individuals' opinions.

Schein (2010, pp. 161-163) asserted that surveys were a good tool to find out about the perceptions of individuals and whether there are subcultures that can be objectively differentiated.

Mayring (2010, p. 20) argued that pure quantitative research was not possible as measuring the quantity of something always also requires knowledge about the quality of that object. Therefore quantitative research always has to be preceded by a qualitative step Mayring (2010, pp. 20-21). In case of this research, the data from the independent qualitative research was used to generate items for the survey.

4.1 Research objectives

Question 3. *How important is perceived fit for individuals in choosing an organization? What are the differences between individuals of different gender, age, education level, employability? Are there differences between the preferences for choosing an organization for paid employment versus one for voluntary work?*

The aim of this question is to discover how fit compares to other benefits organizations may be offering, for example remuneration. In addition, tests for differences between different demographic groups were conducted to see whether job choice criteria are the same for all groups. It should also be evaluated whether individuals have the same preferences for choosing an organization for paid employment as for voluntary work.

Chapman et al. (2005) found that the type of work, organization image and perceived fit were the strongest predictors for job pursuit intentions. The importance of image is also supported by Barber (1998, pp. 32-36).

Hypothesis 1. Type of work, organization image and perceived fit are the most relevant items for individuals in choosing an employer.

Taylor (2004) argued that unpaid work is not conceptually different from paid work. Therefore I hypothesize that the preferences regarding the two will be related to one another.

Hypothesis 2. The preferences regarding organizations for voluntary work are positively correlated to the preferences regarding organizations for employment.

Hypothesis 3. The mean preferences regarding organizations for voluntary work are not statistically different from the mean preferences regarding organizations for employment.

The last question concerns communication of fit – personnel marketing. If individuals in fact make decisions based on perceived fit, the natural question is how they find out about fit and what the effects of different marketing methods are on individual's perceptions of fit.

Question 4. *What sources of information are preferred by individuals to inform themselves about organizations and jobs? Is there a correlation between the perceived importance of fit and the job search methods used by individuals?*

Several papers have found that friends/family are the most important sources of information for job search (e.g. Holzer, 1988; Montgomery, 1991; Caliendo et al., 2011; Weber and Mahringer, 2008).

Hypothesis 4. The most important source of information in job searches are friends and family.

Suvankulov et al. (2012) found that online recruiting had a positive effect on employment probability. However, Lang et al. (2011), on the other hand, said that the possibility to provide organization- and job-specific information was limited on online job portals. Therefore I assume that online recruiting will be a popular method to search for information, but online recruiting portals will be rated lower than the organizations' websites.

Hypothesis 5. The organization website is the most popular method to obtain information about employers among the online recruiting methods.

However, the main focus of this research question, lies in the last part: Do individuals who put more emphasis on the importance of fit and other cultural aspects use different information sources about jobs?

The findings by Lang et al. (2011) suggest that online recruiting is not very efficient at the transmission of cultural information, therefore I predict that individuals who put a

high emphasis on cultural aspects will prefer other sources of information. On the other hand, the results of Montgomery (1991) indicate that individuals who were referred by a friend are better fitting to the organization than other applicants.

Hypothesis 6. There is a negative correlation between the individual's rated importance of cultural fit and their use of online recruiting.

Hypothesis 7. There is a positive correlation between the individual's rated importance of culture and their use of friends/family for job searching.

4.2 Survey procedure

The survey was performed as an online questionnaire using the "SoSciSurvey.de" platform. The language of the survey was German.

The target group of the survey were university students, alumni and other adults – people who could be potential future members of the organizations I have examined. Preferably, participants should be employed already or should have had a job in the past so that they would have clear preferences regarding employment.

The participation link for the survey was published to friends of the author via Facebook and E-Mail with the request to forward it to others (snowball sampling). It was also sent to interview-partners of the qualitative study with the request to forward the survey to members of those organizations.

Also in this part of the research, protection of research participants had to be considered. Ethikkommission Psychologie (2011, Sec. III. b,c) suggested that in online research, the researchers have to make themselves familiar with relevant data protection technologies and that special care is taken that participants are able to contact the researchers in order to clarify questions about the research. Therefore, the online survey website contained information about the research and contact information in case of questions. No data was published in the thesis that could lead to identification of individuals. The survey platform used a secure SSL connection to protect data during transfer.

4.3 Measures

The questionnaire contained 5 groups of questions: demographics, preferences regarding employers, preferences regarding voluntary organizations, voluntary termination of employment and a scenario question. Due to resource constraints not all questions were analyzed.

ID	Topic	Answer Type	Description
D001	Age	Open	
D002	Highest completed education	Select One	Levels of education in Austria
D003	Gender	Select One	Male Female No answer
D004	Main occupation	Select One	
D006	Country of residence	Select One	List of 192 UN recognized countries
A002	Industry	Select One	ÖNACE 2008 (Classification of Economic Activitiy; Source: Statistics Austria (2008))
A003	Past work	Checkboxes	
A004	Voluntary work participation	Checkboxes	
J001	Employability	7-step Likert scale	4 items based on De Cuyper et al. (2004) and De Cuyper and De Witte (2011)
J002	Most important employer selection criterion	Open	
J003	Preferences when choosing an employer	7-step Likert scale	28 items based on employee advantages mentioned by organizations examined in qualitative research
J004	Sources of information about employers	7-step Likert scale	25 items based on marketing methods used by organizations examined in qualitative research
E002	Preferences regarding organizations for voluntary work	7-step Likert scale	18 items based on J003
V001-V004	Scenario Questions A-D	Select One	Participants received one of four possible questions.
V005	Explaining scenario choice	Open	up to 5 answers

Table 4.1: Survey questions overview

Table 4.1 provides an overview of the questions that were analyzed, the complete survey including the original German wording can be found in Appendix A.

Demographics Questions (D001-D006) were used to determine participant demographics. D001 asks for the participant’s age in years. Question D002 is about the highest completed education – there were 9 options based on the Austrian education system. In question D003 the participants were asked for their gender, but they also had the option not to answer. Question D006 asked participants for their current country of residence.

Work The topic of questions A002-A004 was the employment and voluntary work of participants, past and current. Participants who had indicated that they work in the private economy in question D004 were asked for their industry in question A002. The option list for question A002 was derived from Statistics Austria ÖNACE 2008 – Classification of Economic Activity Statistics Austria (2008). A003 was about where participants had worked in the past. A004 queried participants for their participation in voluntary work.

Self-rated employability (SRE) It seemed important to include a measure of employability as participants who felt finding another job would be hard for them may have different preferences regarding their employment. In question J001 participants had to rate their SRE based on four standardized statements on a 7-step Likert scale (the scale included the option “I cannot judge this”). The items were based on De Cuyper et al. (2004) and De Cuyper and De Witte (2011):

- J001_01 Self-rated employability scale 1 (SRE1): “I am optimistic that I would find another job if I looked for one.”⁰
- J001_02 Self-rated employability scale 2 (SRE2): “I could easily find another job instead of my present job.”⁰
- J001_03 Self-rated employability scale 3 (SRE3): “I could easily switch to another employer, if I wanted to.”⁰
- J001_04 Self-rated employability scale 4 (SRE4): “I am confident that I could quickly get a similar job to the one I have now.”⁰

Employer selection In question J002-J005 participants were queried about their preferences regarding employers.

J002 was an open question asking participants for the most important criterion when choosing an employer. Participants were asked to only provide one item.

J003 then asked participants to rate the importance of 28 criteria for selecting an employer on a 7-step Likert scale (no answer was also an option). The items were generated from features the organizations in qualitative research had mentioned as attracting potential employees.

Although Kristof (1996) found that Likert-type scales of values were problematic due to social desirability bias and suggested hierarchical arrangement of values, I decided to still use a Likert scale as it allowed me to perform factor analysis to discover underlying constructs.

Sources of information about employers In J004 participants had to rate which sources of information they were likely to use when looking for a new employer. The items of J004 were based on the personnel marketing methods found in qualitative research. Participants had to rate each item on a 7-step Likert scale from “not likely to use” to “very likely to use”. They also had the option to select “do not know this / no answer”.

Voluntary work The next group of questions was concerned with voluntary work and was asked to all participants except those who had indicated in question A004 that they were never and never wanted to be involved in voluntary work. The questions regarding preferences for voluntary organizations were similar to those as the preferences regarding employment.

Question E001 asked for the most important selection criterion when selecting an organization for voluntary work. E002 asked the participants to rate various criteria for selecting an organization. The criteria for voluntary organizations were based on the criteria for choosing an employer. Items were re-phrased to fit the context, for example item “getting along well with co-workers” for employment became “good relations with other members” in the voluntary context. Some items were removed as they did not make sense for voluntary work.

Scenario questions As ranking preferences can be very abstract, the aim of the last question was to present participants with a concrete situation. Participants were instructed to imagine that they had finished their studies already and are working in an “average” job. The story further explained that they meet a friend who tells them about a job with their employer. The participant then had to decide whether they want to apply for the job, knowing that there are no other applicants.

One of four possible scenarios was chosen at random and shown to the participant. In half of the scenarios the friend told them about a job that pays better than their current one but in which the friend cannot identify with the company; in the other half of cases the opposite was the case; in half of the cases the friend is male in the other half female. See Table 4.2.

	Male friend	Female friend
Friend cannot identify with values of their employer, but participant would earn 20% more than in current job.	Scenario A	Scenario C
Friend can fully identify with values of their employer, but participant would earn 20% less than in current job.	Scenario B	Scenario D

Table 4.2: Overview of scenario questions

The exact phrasing of the scenarios can be found in Appendix A.

Participants were given four possible choices: apply and already state that they would accept if they are selected by the employer; apply, but think about the decision later; not to apply, but keep looking for alternatives to their current job; not to apply and to keep their current job.

Afterwards, participants were asked to explain their decision in a text field (V005).

4.4 Data analysis

The analysis of the collected data was performed using IBM SPSS 21 and LibreOffice Calc.

4.4.1 Participants

The goal was to achieve at least 160 survey participants to draw meaningful conclusions. The participation link was sent to friends and acquaintances of the author as well as qualitative research participants. Participants were asked to forward the participation link further, which they also did in several cases. In the end, 408 visits were counted to the survey page, the survey was started 256 times and 201 persons completed the survey.

Age and gender The mean participant age was 28.7 years ($SD = 7.16$), 55.7% of participants were male, 44.3% were female (no participant chose the option “no answer” in the gender question).

Education The participants of the survey were well-educated, only 2.5% did not finish high school, 64.2% even had some kind of university degree. Table 4.3 shows the education levels of participants.

D002 Education	Frequency	Percent
Compulsory education	1	.5
Apprenticeship	2	1.0
“Fachschule” (3 year lower high school)	2	1.0
“Matura” (4-5 year high school with school leaving exam)	67	33.3
Bachelor	52	25.9
Master	71	35.3
Doctorate	6	3.0
Total	201	100.0

Table 4.3: Survey participant education

Occupation The largest group of participants were students at 43% and private sector employees at 31% (see Table 4.4). Participants employed in the private sector in addition

were asked about the industry they work in. However, the low number of respondents per industry meant that no conclusions could be drawn from this.

D004 Occupation	Frequency	Percent
Employed in private sector	62	30.8
Employed in public sector	9	4.5
Employed at university	15	7.5
Civil Servant	3	1.5
Student	87	43.3
Homemaker / maternity leave	2	1.0
Unemployed	5	2.5
Self-employed / entrepreneur	12	6.0
Other	6	3.0
Total	201	100.0

Table 4.4: Survey participant occupation

Country of residence 88% of the participants indicated that their country of residence was Austria, the remaining were from other European countries, except for one participant from China and one from Australia (see Table 4.5).

The (to me) surprisingly high number of non-Austrians is believed to be caused by primarily by students who were doing an exchange semester abroad or individuals who have temporarily relocated for work who may have selected the country where they were staying at the moment.

D006 Country	Frequency	Percent
Australia	1	.5
Austria	177	88.1
Belgium	1	.5
China	1	.5
France	1	.5
Germany	9	4.5
UK	1	.5
Italy	1	.5
Netherlands	2	1.0
Norway	2	1.0
Romania	1	.5
Switzerland	3	1.5
Ungarn	1	.5
Total	201	100.0

Table 4.5: Survey participant country of residence

Participation in voluntary work Question A004 asked about whether they perform any kind of voluntary work at the moment, in the past or whether they plan to do so in the future – results see Table 4.6.

A004	Frequency	Percent
I was doing voluntary work in the past.	97	48.3
I am currently doing voluntary work.	100	49.8
I want to work voluntarily in the future.	42	20.9
I have not worked voluntarily in the past and do not want to in the future.	25	12.4

Table 4.6: Survey participants about voluntary work (multiple answers possible)

Employability Table 4.7 shows that participants rated their employability at means between 4.9 and 6.1. Cronbach’s Alpha of the four items was calculated at 0.870. Due to the high internal consistency, variable EE was introduced representing the unweighted average of the four variables. All references to employability from this point onward will refer to the variable EE.

		N	M	SD
J001_01	SRE 1	197	6.05	1.15
J001_02	SRE 2	189	5.52	1.47
J001_03	SRE 3	189	5.33	1.59
J001_04	SRE 4	184	4.91	1.81
EE	SRE average	181	5.47	1.29

Table 4.7: Descriptive statistics of self-rated employability (SRE)

4.4.2 Preferences regarding employers

Participants were asked in an open question (J002) what was most important to them when selecting an employer. The items were then manually assigned to groups. As shown in Table 4.8, the most frequently mentioned aspects were type of work, working climate and pay. fit-related items (working climate, co-workers, corporate culture, respect, sympathy) account for 52 entries (25.9%). The complete list of answers and the categorization can be found in the Appendix B.

Next, survey participants had to rate the importance of 28 criteria for selecting an employer on a 7-step Likert scale, including the option to not rate individual items. As shown in Table 4.9, “soft” factors such as “getting along well with co-workers” and “organizational culture” were rated highest with mean scores between 4.78 and 6.34. The level of salary is also important at 5.49. Practical factors (e.g. proximity to one’s place of living) and non-monetary benefits (e.g. corporate mobile phone) were at the lower end of the spectrum.

Category	N
Type of work	31
Working climate / work environment	29
Pay	26
Flexibility / family friendliness	19
Career / possibilities for advancement	8
Co-workers / team cohesion	8
Work-Life-Balance	8
Corporate culture	5
Respect	5
Sympathy	5
Place of work	3
Other	53
Invalid entries	1
Total	201

Table 4.8: Survey participants' most important employer criterion when choosing an employer (question J002). Participants entered free text which was manually assigned to categories.

Principal components analysis A principal component analysis (PCA) was conducted on the 28 items. The procedure suggested by Field (2009, Ch. 17) was used as a guideline.

Field (2009, p. 644) suggested using oblique rotation for naturalistic data, especially psychological constructs, thus Direct Oblimin rotation ($\delta = 0$) was used.

The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure initially was inadequate as four items (quality of the employer's products, company doctor, company psychologist, being able to identify with the employer) had KMO values below the acceptable limit (.5, according to Field, 2009, p. 659). After they were removed, the KMO measure verified the sampling adequacy for the analysis, $KMO = .733$ ('good', according to Field, 2009, p. 659), KMO values for individual items were $\geq .517$. Bartlett's test of sphericity ($\chi^2(253) = 1104, p < .000$), indicated that correlations between items were sufficiently large for PCA.

The scree plot was ambiguous and showed inflexions that would justify 4, 5, 11 or 12 components. Eight items had Eigenvalues over Kaiser's criterion of 1. Therefore, this is the number of components that was retained in the final analysis (also, interpretation of the resulting eight components was easier than for different numbers). Table 4.10 shows the resulting pattern matrix which also contains the rotation sums of squared loadings.

Stevens (2002, as cited by Field, 2009, pp. 644-645) said that for a sample size of 200 values greater than 0.364 can be considered significant and recommends interpreting only factor loadings with an absolute value greater than 0.4.

The component correlation matrix (see Table 4.23) shows that some components are considerably correlated, which confirms that oblique rotation had to be used (Field, 2009, pp. 667-668).

J003 Descriptive Statistics			
Employer selection criterion	N	M	SD
Getting along well with co-workers	201	6.34	.765
Good relations with superior(s)	199	6.16	.843
Sense/purpose/meaning of work	200	6.14	1.080
Full use of my potential	200	5.88	1.138
Organizational culture of the employer	198	5.86	1.143
Possibility of further education	201	5.56	1.211
The employer has to fit me personally.	201	5.55	1.334
Level of salary	201	5.49	.996
Being able to identify with the employer	199	5.44	1.308
Flexible working time I can choose	201	5.42	1.409
Quality of the employer's products	200	5.36	1.338
Long-term orientation of employer	195	5.24	1.364
Good relations of the employer to its customers	198	4.96	1.388
Work place easily reachable by public transport	201	4.93	1.729
Proximity of work place to my place of living	201	4.87	1.521
Image of employer	201	4.78	1.368
Tools (e.g. good laptop)	201	4.74	1.498
Nice office / lab / working space	200	4.67	1.364
Large amount of holidays.	197	4.26	1.558
Possibility of home office (working from home)	200	4.05	1.709
low stress	200	3.63	1.589
Cantine	200	3.09	1.717
Free parking place at work place.	194	2.90	1.936
Corporate Mobile Phone	200	2.51	1.810
Free drinks	197	2.29	1.513
Corporate Car	198	2.23	1.519
Company doctor	195	2.11	1.337
Company psychologist	196	2.01	1.403

Table 4.9: Survey participant employer preferences. 7-step Likert scale with option not to answer. Table sorted by mean.

Pattern Matrix								
	Component							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Full use of my potential	.742	-.244	-.033	.051	-.217	.109	.097	.038
Sense/purpose/meaning of work	.666	-.045	-.041	.017	.129	-.008	-.034	-.117
Possibility of further education	.640	.224	-.118	.186	.002	-.177	-.064	-.135
Nice office / lab / working space	.481	.189	.131	-.129	-.109	.275	-.229	.067
Large amount of holidays	.055	.765	.139	.276	-.079	.023	.080	.032
Low stress	.030	.707	.059	-.202	-.115	.072	-.062	-.035
Proximity of work place to my place of living	-.214	.600	-.255	.146	.084	.076	-.159	-.104
Free parking place at work place.	-.114	.249	.779	-.038	.044	.069	-.186	.006
Work place easily reachable by public transport	-.012	.228	-.663	-.021	-.107	.138	-.421	-.123
Corporate Car	-.036	-.117	.590	.235	-.209	-.084	-.127	-.243
Possibility of home office (working from home)	.025	.049	.057	.769	-.069	-.100	-.047	-.090
Flexible working time I can choose	.077	.024	-.006	.757	.026	.169	-.040	.169
Level of salary	.112	.230	.055	.038	-.682	.078	.188	-.038
Tools (e.g. good laptop)	.168	-.115	-.018	.163	-.475	.209	-.233	-.167
Organizational Culture of the employer	.322	.046	.108	.021	.469	.288	-.048	-.255
Good relations with superior(s)	.076	-.019	.074	-.038	-.061	.866	.070	.010
Getting along well with co-workers	-.150	.082	-.139	.120	.023	.748	-.060	-.083
Free drinks	-.108	-.088	.120	.137	.074	.056	-.821	.027
Cantine	.197	.179	-.029	-.050	.022	-.042	-.661	.080
Good relations of the employer to its customers	-.054	.024	-.051	.073	-.030	.183	.243	-.837
Long-term orientation of employer	.138	.198	.074	-.061	-.044	-.107	-.047	-.608
Image of employer	.124	-.085	-.003	-.243	.028	.136	-.206	-.529
The employer has to fit me personally.	.281	-.097	.070	.208	.412	.075	.047	-.488
Corporate Mobile Phone	-.051	-.252	.127	.060	-.436	-.105	-.335	-.477
Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings [a]	2.845	2.279	1.760	1.849	1.570	2.367	2.303	3.011

Extraction Method: Principal component analysis.
Rotation Method: Oblimin with Kaiser Normalization.
Rotation converged in 18 iterations.
[a] When components are correlated, sums of squared loadings cannot be added to obtain a total variance.

Table 4.10: PCA pattern matrix of survey participant's employer preferences. Note: Loadings over .40 appear in yellow. Also includes information on rotation sums of squared loadings.

Component Correlation Matrix								
Component	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1	1.000	.044	.048	.110	-.036	.216	-.122	-.320
2	.044	1.000	-.069	.066	-.038	.172	-.192	-.012
3	.048	-.069	1.000	.074	-.109	-.058	-.065	-.097
4	.110	.066	.074	1.000	-.070	.068	-.048	-.131
5	-.036	-.038	-.109	-.070	1.000	-.009	.075	.058
6	.216	.172	-.058	.068	-.009	1.000	-.152	-.197
7	-.122	-.192	-.065	-.048	.075	-.152	1.000	.212
8	-.320	-.012	-.097	-.131	.058	-.197	.212	1.000

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.
Rotation Method: Oblimin with Kaiser Normalization.

Table 4.11: PCA Component Correlation Matrix of survey participants' employer preferences

Scales based on components The items were assigned to scales based on their strongest component in the pattern matrix. The resulting scales are shown in Table 4.12.

Alpha was low for all scales. Field (2009, p. 675) said that $\alpha > .7$ was desirable, but for psychological constructs also values below .7 have to be expected. On the other hand, Cronbach's α depends very much on the number of items per scale and the problematic scales here all have only two or three items.

I checked if removal of single items would increase the α of the scales. This was the case only for one item: The removal of "organizational culture of the employer" from scale 5 would increase its α to .330, which is, however, still unacceptable, thus its interpretation is unclear.

The item "corporate mobile phone" in scale 8 appears to not fit the semantic context of scale 8, however its removal would lower the α value of the scale. The interpretation of this occurrence is unclear. It appears that an organization's providing a mobile phone is somehow related to its overall image.

Mean and standard deviation shown in Table 4.12 were calculated using the un-weighted average of its components to make them comparable to the original Likert scale. Please note that scales 7 and 8 contain all negative elements which have not been inverted in Table 4.12 to allow easier interpretation (otherwise, e.g. scale 7 would show the not-preference of food and drink, etc.).

Further calculations will use the complete component score calculated in principal components analysis stored using the regression method, which means that numerical results regarding scale 7 and 8 will have interpretations opposite to those of the scales.

Scale	Scale name	Item	N of items	Valid N	Cronbach's Alpha	M [a]	SD [a]
1	Work environment	Full use of my potential Sense/purpose/meaning of work Possibility of further education Nice office / lab / working space	4	198	.639	5.56	0.83
2	Work-life balance	Large amount of holidays Low stress Proximity of work place to my place of living	3	197	.623	4.26	1.18
3	Car over public transport	Free parking place at work place. Work place easily reachable by public transport [b] Corporate Car	3	193	.550	2.72	1.26
4	Flexibility / family friendliness	Possibility of home office (working from home) Flexible working time I can choose	2	200	.578	4.74	1.31
5	Non-materialism	Level of salary [b] Tools (e.g. good laptop) [b] Organizational Culture of the employer	3	201	.068	3.89	0.72
6	Good relations	Good relations with superior(s) Getting along well with co-workers	2	199	.654	6.25	0.69
7	Food and drink [c]	Free drinks Cantine	2	197	.504	2.69	1.33
8	Organizational culture and image [c]	Good relations of the employer to its customers Long-term orientation of employer Image of employer The employer has to fit me personally. Corporate Mobile Phone	5	192	.666	4.60	0.95

[a]: Scale values represent the unweighted average of its components.
[b]: Scale of the item was inverted as its value in pattern matrix was negative.
[c]: All items in this scale are negative, therefore item scales did not have to be inverted.

Table 4.12: Employer selection preferences component scales

Analysis I consider scales 6 and 8 to be related to perceived cultural fit. Scale 6 was by far the most important one to participants while scale 8 was only the fourth most relevant item at a moderate score of 4.60.

In addition to the general importance of fit, research question 3 (see page 33) also asks whether preferences regarding fit differ between gender, age, education or employability. Tests were conducted on the component scores.

A t-test showed that means per gender of component 8 are not significantly different ($t(180) = -.585; sig = .560$), but for component 6 they are ($t(180) = -2.565; sig = .011$). Men appear to put less emphasis on good relations with colleagues and superiors than women.

Component 6 is also significantly negatively correlated with age ($r = -.199; sig = .007$) which indicates that older respondents put less emphasis on good relations. No other correlation between scale 6 or 8 with age or employability was found.

One-way ANOVA of the scales with the factor education level found no significant results.

Hypothesis 1 (see page 34) predicted that type of work, organizational image and perceived fit would be the most important items for individuals in choosing an employer.

Among the scales that resulted from PCA, good relations (scale 6; $M = 6.25$) were found to be most important followed by work environment (scale 1; $M = 5.56$), flexibility / family friendliness (scale 4; $M = 4.74$) and organizational culture and image (scale 8; $M = 4.60$). Type of work was not a topic participants could select in question J003, but 31 participants (15.4%) named this as most important in the open question J002.

Altogether, these numbers show mixed support for the hypothesis: Although scale 6, which is associated with fit was the highest rated scale, scale 8, which is associated with both fit and image, was only the fourth most important one. The work environment and flexibility / family friendliness were the second and third most important topics to participants – however, these topics had not appeared in the literature review.

4.4.3 Scenario: decision between values and money

Table 4.13 shows the results of the four scenario questions. The replies varied greatly among scenarios, but if the “apply” and “do not apply” answers are summed up, the numbers become more similar. In each scenario, about 70% of participants would apply to the offered job.

Table 4.14 shows the results split into four summary groups. “More money” summarizes scenarios A and C, “Better identification” scenarios B and D, furthermore the “male friend” group summarizes scenarios A and B while “female friend” consists of scenarios C and D. I also created a summary of all cases combined. Again, the “apply” and “do not apply” answers were summed up. The number of accepts is slightly higher for the scenarios with better pay and with a female friend.

Statistical analysis To perform statistical analyses, answers were given values on an interval scale – see values in Table 4.15.

	Scenario A	Scenario B	Scenario C	Scenario D
N	37	48	62	54
Apply + would accept	2.7%	8.3%	16.1%	1.9%
Apply + think later	67.6%	60.4%	56.5%	66.6%
Do not apply + look elsewhere	8.1%	18.8%	16.1%	22.2%
Do not apply + keep job	21.6%	12.5%	11.3%	9.3%
Total apply	70.3%	68.7%	72.6%	68.5%
Total do not apply	29.7%	31.3%	27.4%	31.5%

Table 4.13: Participants' responses to scenario questions

	More money	Better identification	Male friend	Female friend	All combined
N	99	102	85	116	201
Do Apply + would accept	11.1%	4.9%	5.9%	9.5%	8.0%
Do Apply + think later	60.6%	63.7%	63.5%	61.2%	62.2%
Do not apply + look elsewhere	13.1%	20.6%	14.1%	19.0%	16.9%
Do not apply + keep job	15.2%	10.8%	16.5%	10.3%	12.9%
Total do apply	71.7%	68.6%	69.4%	70.7%	70.2%
Total do not apply	28.3%	31.4%	30.6%	29.3%	29.8%

Table 4.14: Participants' responses to scenario questions (grouped)

	Value
Do Apply + would accept	1
Do Apply + think later	2
Do not apply + look elsewhere	3
Do not apply + keep job	4

Table 4.15: Scenario answer values

As a consequence, it was possible to calculate descriptive statistics of each scenario. The results are shown in Table 4.16. The differences in mean between the groups is not statistically significant.

Gender effects Covariance analysis of factors “friend’s gender” and “type of offer” (dummy variables) with the covariate “survey participant gender” (D003) showed no significant effects of the factors “friend’s gender” ($F = .764; p = .383; \eta^2 = .004$), “type of offer” ($F = .001; p = .970; \eta^2 = .000$) as well as no significant interaction between “friend’s gender” and “type of offer” ($F = 1.453; p = .230; \eta^2 = .007$). The influence of the covariate survey participant gender was significant ($F = 5.678; p = .018; \eta^2 = .028$). This means that women are significantly more likely to switch jobs than men are while the type of offer and the friend’s gender had no effect.

	N	M	SD
Scenario A	37	2.49	.870
Scenario B	48	2.35	.812
Scenario C	62	2.23	.857
Scenario D	54	2.39	.685
More money (A,C)	99	2.32	.867
Better identification (B,D)	102	2.37	.744
Male friend (A,B)	85	2.41	.835
Female friend (C,D)	116	2.30	.783
All combined	201	2.35	.805

Table 4.16: Scenario answers descriptive statistics

Table 4.18 shows an ANOVA of scenario answers depending on the factor participant's gender (D003), Table 4.17 shows the corresponding descriptives. Differences between participant's gender groups are significant ($Sig < .05$) in all scenarios combined, in Scenario D as well as in groups "better identification" and "male friend". In all these cases women are significantly more likely to change jobs than men are.

	Participant's				95% Confidence Interval for Mean		
	Gender	N	M	SD	SE	Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Scenario A	Male	21	2.71	.902	.197	2.30	3.13
	Female	16	2.19	.750	.188	1.79	2.59
	Total	37	2.49	.870	.143	2.20	2.78
Scenario B	Male	29	2.45	.783	.145	2.15	2.75
	Female	19	2.21	.855	.196	1.80	2.62
	Total	48	2.35	.812	.117	2.12	2.59
Scenario C	Male	30	2.23	.774	.141	1.94	2.52
	Female	32	2.22	.941	.166	1.88	2.56
	Total	62	2.23	.857	.109	2.01	2.44
Scenario D	Male	32	2.56	.801	.142	2.27	2.85
	Female	22	2.14	.351	.075	1.98	2.29
	Total	54	2.39	.685	.093	2.20	2.58
More money	Male	51	2.43	.855	.120	2.19	2.67
	Female	48	2.21	.874	.126	1.95	2.46
	Total	99	2.32	.867	.087	2.15	2.50
Better identification	Male	61	2.51	.788	.101	2.31	2.71
	Female	41	2.17	.629	.098	1.97	2.37
	Total	102	2.37	.744	.074	2.23	2.52
Male friend	Male	50	2.56	.837	.118	2.32	2.80
	Female	35	2.20	.797	.135	1.93	2.47
	Total	85	2.41	.835	.091	2.23	2.59
Female friend	Male	62	2.40	.799	.101	2.20	2.61
	Female	54	2.19	.754	.103	1.98	2.39
	Total	116	2.30	.783	.073	2.16	2.45
All combined	Male	112	2.47	.816	.077	2.32	2.63
	Female	89	2.19	.767	.081	2.03	2.35
	Total	201	2.35	.805	.057	2.24	2.46

Table 4.17: Scenario answers descriptives depending on participant's gender

ANOVA						
		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Scenario A	Between Groups	2.520	1	2.520	3.568	.067
	Within Groups	24.723	35	.706		
	Total	27.243	36			
Scenario B	Between Groups	.649	1	.649	.984	.326
	Within Groups	30.330	46	.659		
	Total	30.979	47			
Scenario C	Between Groups	.003	1	.003	.004	.947
	Within Groups	44.835	60	.747		
	Total	44.839	61			
Scenario D	Between Groups	2.367	1	2.367	5.480	.023
	Within Groups	22.466	52	.432		
	Total	24.833	53			
More money	Between Groups	1.230	1	1.230	1.647	.202
	Within Groups	72.426	97	.747		
	Total	73.657	98			
Better identification	Between Groups	2.792	1	2.792	5.264	.024
	Within Groups	53.051	100	.531		
	Total	55.843	101			
Male friend	Between Groups	2.668	1	2.668	3.960	.050
	Within Groups	55.920	83	.674		
	Total	58.588	84			
Female friend	Between Groups	1.372	1	1.372	2.265	.135
	Within Groups	69.068	114	.606		
	Total	70.440	115			
All combined	Between Groups	3.949	1	3.949	6.254	.013
	Within Groups	125.672	199	.632		
	Total	129.622	200			

Table 4.18: ANOVA of scenario answers depending on participant's gender

Interpretation I had initially hoped for a clear difference in favor of either money or identification with cultural values, however the various groups are not significantly different from one another. How can the responses be interpreted?

One possible explanation is that the current situation was phrased too negatively so that respondents wanted to leave the current job and try something else instead of staying, regardless of what the offer was. This would mean that instead of finding out about the preferences regarding values and money, it was discovered how many respondents would try to leave an "average" job in order to try something else without much information. On the other hand, the results could also show that individuals need

a lot of information to choose an employer – just one statement of a friend is apparently for most respondents not enough to make an informed decision.

Another interesting finding is that women are significantly more likely than men to switch jobs in all situations.

4.4.4 Preferences regarding voluntary organizations

The aim of the next set of questions was to discover whether the preferences regarding voluntary work were similar as those regarding employment. Table 4.19 shows descriptive statistics of all items and a comparison to related items from the question about preferences regarding employers.

E002 Descriptive Statistics				
Voluntary work organization selection criterion	N	M	SD	Mean of related item in J003
The organization has to fit me personally	176	6.53	.894	5.55
Being able to identify with the organization	176	6.40	1.112	5.44
Good relations with members	175	6.37	1.013	6.34
Flexible working time I can choose	176	5.80	1.498	5.42
Organizational culture	174	5.76	1.284	5.86
Good relations of the organization to its environment	174	5.63	1.472	4.96
Long-term orientation of organization	174	5.50	1.590	5.24
Quality of products/services	175	5.48	1.485	5.36
Image of the organization	174	5.40	1.430	4.78
Proximity of work place to my place of living	176	4.44	1.869	4.87
Easily reachable by public transport	175	4.11	1.955	4.93
Possibility to work from home	173	4.03	2.099	4.05
Full reimbursement of expenses	173	3.62	1.936	N/A
Nice office / working space	175	2.73	1.634	4.67
Good tools (e.g. laptop)	174	2.45	1.654	4.74
Free drinks	174	1.97	1.549	2.29
Free parking space at organization	173	1.75	1.514	2.90
Organization mobile phone	174	1.43	1.005	2.51

Table 4.19: Survey participant preferences regarding voluntary work organizations. 7-step Likert scale with option not to answer. Table includes comparison to preferences regarding employers. Table sorted by mean.

Comparison with preferences regarding employment At first glance, items that had to do with culture such as “the organization has to fit me personally” and “being able to identify with the organization” which were of medium importance for choosing an employer and now moved to the top of the list. “Good relations with members” which was compared with “getting along well with co-workers” received a similar score in both questions. “flexible working time” is slightly more important for voluntary work as for employment. Practical items such as office, tools and drinks were again at the bottom

of the list, but were in absolute numbers rated as slightly more important for employer selection as for selecting a voluntary work organization.

As predicted by hypothesis 2 (see page 34), all items from preferences regarding voluntary organizations were significantly positively correlated with the respective item from preferences regarding employment ($.044 < r < .579; p \leq .015$) – see Table 4.20. However, hypothesis 3 (see page 34) had to be rejected; a paired samples t-test for similar means revealed that of the 17 voluntary work preference items that were comparable with employer preference items, 13 had significantly different means ($p > .05$) – see Table 4.21.

Paired Samples Correlations		N	Correlation	Sig.
Pair 1	Employment: Corporate Mobile Phone & Voluntary work: Organization mobile phone	173	.363	.000
Pair 2	Employment: Tools (e.g. good laptop) & Voluntary work: Good tools (e.g. laptop)	174	.280	.000
Pair 3	Employment: Organizational Culture of the employer & Voluntary work: Organizational culture	173	.298	.000
Pair 4	Employment: Getting along well with co-workers & Voluntary work: Good relations with members	175	.282	.000
Pair 5	Employment: Free drinks & Voluntary work: Free drinks	170	.511	.000
Pair 6	Employment: Quality of the employer's products & Voluntary work: Quality of products/services	174	.409	.000
Pair 7	Employment: The employer has to fit me personally. & Voluntary work: The organization has to fit me personally	176	.183	.015
Pair 8	Employment: Free parking place at work place. & Voluntary work: Free parking space at organization	167	.503	.000
Pair 9	Employment: Flexible working time I can choose & Voluntary work: Flexible working time I can choose	176	.210	.005
Pair 10	Employment: Possibility of home office (working from home) & Voluntary work: Possibility to work from home	172	.350	.000
Pair 11	Employment: Nice office / lab / working space & Voluntary work: Nice office / working space	174	.299	.000
Pair 12	Employment: Proximity of work place to my place of living & Voluntary work: Proximity of work place to my place of living	176	.417	.000
Pair 13	Employment: Good relations of the employer to its customers & Voluntary work: Good relations of the organization to its environment	174	.367	.000
Pair 14	Employment: Long-term orientation of employer & Voluntary work: Long-term orientation of organization	171	.292	.000
Pair 15	Employment: Image of employer & Voluntary work: Image of the organization	174	.434	.000
Pair 16	Employment: Work place easily reachable by public transport & Voluntary work: Easily reachable by public transport	175	.579	.000
Pair 17	Employment: Being able to identify with the employer & Voluntary work: Being able to identify with the organization	175	.334	.000

Table 4.20: Paired samples correlations of preferences regarding employment and regarding voluntary organizations

Paired Samples Test		Paired Differences								
		M	SD	SE	95% CI		t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	
					Lower	Upper				
Pair 1	Employment: Corporate Mobile Phone - Voluntary work: Organization mobile phone	1.046	1.725	.131	.787	1.305	7.979	172	.000	
Pair 2	Employment: Tools (e.g. good laptop) - Voluntary work: Good tools (e.g. laptop)	2.213	1.898	.144	1.929	2.497	15.379	173	.000	
Pair 3	Employment: Organizational Culture of the employer - Voluntary work: Organizational culture	.133	1.435	.109	-.082	.348	1.219	172	.225	
Pair 4	Employment: Getting along well with co-workers - Voluntary work: Good relations with members	-.040	1.085	.082	-.202	.122	-.488	174	.626	
Pair 5	Employment: Free drinks - Voluntary work: Free drinks	.235	1.509	.116	.007	.464	2.034	169	.044	
Pair 6	Employment: Quality of the employer's products - Voluntary work: Quality of products/services	-.132	1.554	.118	-.365	.100	-1.122	173	.264	
Pair 7	Employment: The employer has to fit me personally. - Voluntary work: The organization has to fit me personally	-.938	1.435	.108	-1.151	-.724	-8.668	175	.000	
Pair 8	Employment: Free parking place at work place. - Voluntary work: Free parking space at organization	1.072	1.748	.135	.805	1.339	7.925	166	.000	
Pair 9	Employment: Flexible working time I can choose - Voluntary work: Flexible working time I can choose	-.381	1.823	.137	-.652	-.110	-2.771	175	.006	
Pair 10	Employment: Possibility of home office (working from home) - Voluntary work: Possibility to work from home	-.012	2.192	.167	-.342	.318	-.070	171	.945	
Pair 11	Employment: Nice office / lab / working space - Voluntary work: Nice office / working space	1.856	1.798	.136	1.587	2.125	13.617	173	.000	
Pair 12	Employment: Proximity of work place to my place of living - Voluntary work: Proximity of work place to my place of living	.364	1.877	.142	.084	.643	2.570	175	.011	
Pair 13	Employment: Good relations of the employer to its customers - Voluntary work: Good relations of the organization to its environment	-.707	1.634	.124	-.951	-.462	-5.706	173	.000	
Pair 14	Employment: Long-term orientation of employer - Voluntary work: Long-term orientation of organization	-.275	1.769	.135	-.542	-.008	-2.032	170	.044	
Pair 15	Employment: Image of employer - Voluntary work: Image of the organization	-.661	1.500	.114	-.885	-.437	-5.814	173	.000	
Pair 16	Employment: Work place easily reachable by public transport - Voluntary work: Easily reachable by public transport	.766	1.708	.129	.511	1.020	5.932	174	.000	
Pair 17	Employment: Being able to identify with the employer - Voluntary work: Being able to identify with the organization	-.989	1.414	.107	-1.200	-.778	-9.248	174	.000	

Table 4.21: Paired samples test of preferences regarding employment and regarding voluntary organizations

Principal components analysis A principal component analysis (PCA) was conducted on the 18 items. The procedure was similar to the one used in the previous section.

The item “good tools (e.g. laptop)” had an inadequate KMO value and was therefore removed. After that, all items had adequate individual KMO values $\geq .517$ and the combined KMO measure was adequate at $KMO = .758$ (‘good’, according to Field, 2009, p. 659). Bartlett’s test of sphericity ($\chi^2(136) = 796, p < .000$), indicated that correlations between items were sufficiently large for PCA.

The scree plot showed inflexions that would justify four to six components. Five items had Eigenvalues over Kaiser’s criterion of 1. Therefore, this is the number of components that was retained in the final analysis.

Table 4.22 shows the resulting pattern matrix with rotation sums of squared loadings and α -values and Table 4.23 shows the component correlation matrix. The correlations between components again support the decision to use of oblique rotation. Component scores were stored using the regression method for further analysis.

Pattern Matrix	Component				
	1	2	3	4	5
Long-term orientation of organization	.816	.043	-.111	-.179	-.097
Good relations of the organization to its environment	.679	.064	-.191	-.037	.150
Quality of products/services	.678	-.120	.239	.087	-.023
Image of the organization	.571	.065	.122	.127	.183
Free drinks	-.135	.800	-.052	-.068	.123
Organization mobile phone	.116	.700	-.014	.005	-.211
Nice office / working space	.104	.697	.021	-.184	-.076
Free parking space at organization	.035	.649	.130	.465	.002
Full reimbursement of expenses	-.015	.456	.175	-.432	.124
Proximity of work place to my place of living	.089	-.053	.861	.153	-.003
Easily reachable by public transport	-.090	.134	.800	-.158	-.010
Possibility to work from home	.086	.121	-.015	-.763	-.054
Flexible working time I can choose	.049	-.053	.462	-.518	.131
The organization has to fit me personally	-.120	-.075	.047	-.035	.876
Being able to identify with the organization	.092	-.048	-.025	.180	.784
Good relations with members	.285	.056	-.031	-.158	.566
Organizational culture	.395	.154	.022	-.175	.412
Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings [a]	3.012	2.691	2.059	1.815	2.698
α [b]	.697	.696	.695	.512	.747
Scale item unweighted average	5.50	2.28	4.27	3.09[c]	6.27
Scale item unweighted std. dev.	1.08	1.03	1.67	1.50	0.82

Extraction Method: Principal component analysis.
 Rotation Method: Oblimin with Kaiser Normalization.
 Rotation converged in 9 iterations.
 [a] When components are correlated, sums of squared loadings cannot be added to obtain a total variance.
 [b] To calculate scale reliability, each item was clustered in the scale of its strongest coefficient.
 [c] Item scores were inverted as their coefficients in pattern matrix were negative. For positive item scores the unweighted mean would be 4.91.

Table 4.22: PCA pattern matrix of survey participants’ voluntary work organization preferences. Note: Loadings over .40 appear in yellow.

Component Correlation Matrix					
Component	Component				
	1	2	3	4	5
1	1.000	.185	.131	-.119	.348
2	.185	1.000	.146	-.165	-.010
3	.131	.146	1.000	-.084	.163
4	-.119	-.165	-.084	1.000	-.120
5	.348	-.010	.163	-.120	1.000

Table 4.23: PCA component correlation matrix of survey participants' voluntary work organization preferences.

Analysis Items that cluster on the same components suggest that component 1 represents the organizational values, component 2 personal benefits for members, component 3 concerns of being able to reach the organization easily, component 4 the inflexibility of the work¹ and component 5 the perceived fit in the organization.

Cronbach's α was again low for all scales, especially scale 4. Scales 5 and 1 were rated highest by the participants, indicating a high importance of fit in choosing a voluntary organization compared to a much lower relevance of transportation, in/flexibility or personal benefits.

Due to the considerable correlation of component 1 and 5 I also tried combining them into a more complete scale of fit. This resulted in a scale of 8 items, $\alpha = .795$, unweighted mean = 5.89 and std. dev. = 0.84. The high mean further supports the importance of fit in choosing voluntary organizations.

Components 2 and 3 are significantly negatively correlated with age (Component 2: $r = -.275$; $p = .000$; Component 3: $r = -.174$; $p = .025$), which indicates that personal benefits and being able to reach the organization easily are less important for older individuals.

Employability is not correlated with either of the components.

Components 3 and 5 showed significantly different means between genders (Component 3: $t(164) = -3.577$; $p = .000$; Component 5: $t(135.277) = -3.963$; $p = .000$). Being able to reach the organization easily as well perceived fit was less important for men than for women.

4.4.5 Sources of information about employers

Table 4.24 shows that the four items that were rated as most important for getting information about jobs/employers are related to getting direct information - the company's website, friends or search on the web. The second group of items is a number of specialized career websites and also career fairs. The lower half of the spectrum is a mix

¹The scale coefficient scores for component 4 are negative, therefore their meaning had to be inverted. This component therefore represents the inability to work from home and not being able to choose working times.

of printed sources, company tours and the social web. Career fairs, company tours and social media were rated surprisingly low – in the qualitative study, organizations had frequently praised these methods.

J004 Source of information	N	M	SD
Company website	199	5.98	1.460
Friends / acquaintances in the industry	198	5.77	1.339
Friends / acquaintances who work there	200	5.63	1.405
Internet search (e.g. Google)	200	5.55	1.795
Karriere.at (Website)	186	4.66	2.042
derstandard.at (Website)	189	4.43	2.099
Career fairs (e.g. Career Calling, IAESTE TECONOMY)	193	4.21	2.059
diepresse.at (Website)	191	3.99	2.070
Monster.at (Website)	181	3.85	2.169
Xing (Website)	186	3.56	2.024
Der Standard (printed newspaper)	194	3.46	2.036
bulletin board at school, university, etc.	193	3.38	2.094
Die Presse (printed newspaper)	194	3.37	2.025
kurier.at (Website)	190	3.21	1.942
Company tours (e.g. IAESTE FirmenShuttle)	186	3.16	2.010
LinkedIn (Website)	178	3.15	1.987
State employment agency (“AMS”)	197	2.98	1.961
Kurier (printed newspaper)	193	2.84	1.898
Printed career guides	190	2.61	1.655
Facebook (Website)	196	2.48	1.681
Kununu.com (Website)	148	2.48	1.842
Whatchado.net (Website)	150	2.07	1.514
krone.at (Website)	189	1.88	1.394
Kronenzeitung (printed newspaper)	193	1.75	1.347
Twitter (Website)	189	1.74	1.238

Table 4.24: Sources of information about employers rated by survey participants. 7-step Likert scale with option not to answer. Table sorted by mean.

Attempted principal components analysis Nearly all of the items had a KMO value below the critical value of .50, therefore I had to conclude that no reliable PCA was possible for the collected sample size.

Exploratory construction of scales Items were assigned to scales based on their context and exploratory attempts to maximize α . The resulting scales are shown in Table 4.25. It was possible to reach acceptable values of α for all scales. Several items were excluded as they would have reduced α -values, most notably the most important individual item, organization website, was not included in any of scales.

Of the resulting scales, “friends / acquaintances” received by far the highest mean score of 5.69. General-purpose job boards were still on the “likely to use” side of the

scale at a mean score of 4.24. All other scales have mean values that are on the “unlikely to use” side (≤ 4).

Analysis Hypothesis 4 (see page 34) predicted that friends/family would be the most preferred method of job search, however this had to be rejected as the organization website was even more preferred. Friends were rated as second most important.

Hypothesis 5 (see page 34) said that the organization website would be the most preferred method of job search among the online recruiting methods. The collected data supports this hypothesis.

Exploratory analysis showed that scale 5 is significantly negatively correlated with age of the participants ($r = -.292; p = .000$), indicating that older individuals use less campus recruiting, which seems logical. Among students, career fairs are the fourth most important single source of information item after the organization’s website and friends.

As shown in Table 4.26 there are numerous correlations between information sources and employer preferences.

Regarding the topic of fit, the most important correlation is the one between information source scale 6 (friends/acquaintances) and employer preference component 8 (culture) ($r = -.197; p = .008$) (the items on the culture component have negative coefficients, which means the correct interpretation is that the higher the importance of culture, the more the person prefers to use friends to get information). A correlation between culture and the use of friends was predicted in hypothesis 7 (see page 35).

However, no support was found for a significant negative correlation of the importance of culture (component 8) with online recruiting methods as hypothesis 6 (see page 35) had predicted.

The preference to use general-purpose job boards is significantly correlated with employer preference component 2 (“work-life balance”; $r = .174; p = .027$) and 5 (“non-materialism”, $r = -.198; p = .012$). This was not predicted and the reasons are unclear.

Factor	Factor Name	Item	N of Items	Valid N	Cronbach's Alpha	M	SD
1	General-purpose job boards	Karriere.at (Website) Monster.at (Website)	2	172	.803	4.24	1.94
2	Hybrid provider job boards	derstandard.at (Website) diepresse.at (Website) kurier.at (Website) krone.at (Website)	4	187	.813	3.38	1.52
3	Social media	Facebook (Website) Twitter (Website) Xing (Website) LinkedIn (Website) Kununu.com (Website) Whatchado.net (Website)	6	138	.758	2.54	1.15
4	Classical recruiting channels	Der Standard (printed newspaper) Die Presse (printed newspaper) Kurier (printed newspaper) Kronenzeitung (printed newspaper) State employment agency ("AMS") Printed career guides	6	185	.832	2.80	1.34
5	Campus recruiting	Career fairs (e.g. Career Calling, IAESTE TECONOMY) Company tours (e.g. IAESTE FirmenShuttle)	2	185	.789	3.68	1.85
6	Friends / acquaintances	Friends / acquaintances in the industry Friends / acquaintances who work there	2	198	.849	5.69	1.28

Table 4.25: Scales of information sources

Pearson Correlation		Information sources (scales)					
		1	2	3	4	5	6
Preferences regarding employers (components)		General-purpose job boards	Hybrid provider job boards	Social media	Classical recruiting channels	Campus recruiting	Friends
1	“Work environment”	.060	.048	.171	-.012	.201**	.130
2	“Work-life balance”	.174*	.097	-.039	.157*	.078	.110
3	“Car over public transport”	-.039	.064	.003	.151	.045	.029
4	“Family friendliness”	.074	-.050	.085	-.052	.054	-.059
5	“Non-materialism”	-.198*	-.095	-.141	.003	.017	-.049
6	“Good relations”	.100	.078	-.040	-.003	.110	.069
7	Not “Food and drink” [a]	-.032	-.053	-.133	-.062	-.105	-.079
8	Not “Organizational culture” [a]	-.045	.037	-.156	.006	.032	-.197**

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

[a] The interpretation of this scale is inverted as its coefficients from PCA were negative.

Table 4.26: Correlations between preferred sources of information (scales) and preferences regarding employers (components)

Discussion

This work aimed to analyze how both organizations and individuals deal with the issue of cultural fit when making decisions about hiring employees or choosing an employer. Special consideration was given to the influence of online recruiting on the process as it has in recent years become a very popular recruiting method and may have changed the situation compared to earlier studies.

Following the suggestion of Taylor (2004) that the concept of work should not be limited to paid employment, this thesis analyzes both voluntary work as well as employment.

First, qualitative research on nine different organizations was conducted to examine the recruiting processes of organizations and the perspective of recruiters. The results from the first step were used to generate hypotheses for the second step of research, which was a quantitative survey of potential applicants. 201 individuals participated in the survey.

Fit in personnel marketing (organizational perspective) The examined organizations use a wide variety of personnel marketing channels. Online recruiting was used by all organizations to varying degrees, however no indication was found that organizations which put a higher priority on cultural fit use it less: Five organizations (MAC, IG, MB SO2-1, SO2-2) explicitly stated that fit was relevant for them, however three of them (MAC, IG, MB) use several online recruiting channels.

Lang et al. (2011) stated that the possibility to provide organization- and job-specific information was limited on online job portals. Three of the organizations (EC, FBC and MB) supported this statement by indicating that their website contained a lot of information about their organization and applicants who had read it before applying were much more fitting.

Five of the examined organizations (EC, SO1, SO2-1, SO2-2, Uni) actively use referrals for recruiting and two (IG, MB) even pay bonuses to employees who refer friends

who are eventually hired. Campus recruiting is another method used by five organizations (EC, IG, SO1, SO2-1, SO2-2) to reach many potential applicants which enables the personal communication of organizational values.

Some organizations (MAC, SO1 and IG) said that communicating information about their values in written form was generally difficult and informing people personally about the organization through campus recruiting or referrals led to applications from better fitting applicants.

These statements indicate that more information about the organization leads to better self-selection on the part of the applicants so that only those that fit the organization send an application.

It was also attempted to find relationships between organization type, size, structure and personnel marketing. The only relation that was discovered was that organizations which show features of a “garbage can” organization appear to have problems transmitting information about their culture and prefer personal marketing methods over written communication.

Fit in personnel selection (organizational perspective) According to classical recruiting literature, employees are supposed to be selected based on the skills required for performing their future work (e.g. Achouri, 2010, p. 27; Holtbrügge, 2007, pp. 103-104). However, it is well-known that fit plays an important role in personnel selection (e.g. Kristof, 1996).

Skills are considered to be important by seven out of nine organizations (all except SO2-1 and SO2-2) while fit is relevant for five organizations (SO2-1, SO2-2, IG, MAC, MB). Fit was said to be important for working effectively together in teams.

Four organizations (MB, SO2-1, SO2-2, Uni) indicated that fit was important for them but that they did not actively try to select fitting individuals, instead they said that individuals tended to leave on their own if they did not perceive themselves to fit in. Hiring individuals who leave after a short period of time appears to be an inefficient method of selection, but on the other hand leaving the decision to the individual appears to be a good solution to the unclarity about whether selection by fit is really legitimate.

Two organizations (Uni and SO1) said that fit has no relevance for them but used terms such as “getting along” and “mindset” which seemed to convey a similar meaning. Only one examined organization (FBC) said that fit has no role in its personnel selection and that only skills matter to them.

Selecting fitting applicants appeared to be difficult for organizations as there was no commonly established method among the participating organizations to detect fit. One organization (MAC) invited applicants to an informal dinner, another (IG) used six month limited trial contracts to get to know individuals better before making a final decision, but most organization relied on impressions from the job interview.

Schneider et al. (1995, pp. 765-766) suggested that early in an organization’s lifetime fit may be of higher relevance than in later stages to facilitate coordination, communication and cooperation. No relationship between organization age and the relevance of fit was found, but it was found that the smaller organizations in the sample (MAC, SO2-1,

SO2-2) were the ones that put the highest emphasis on the importance of culture and see it as more relevant than skills. Larger organizations (IG, Uni, EC) also consider fit to a lesser degree, however they put less emphasis on person-organization fit, instead considering person-group or person-superior fit as relevant.

Schneider's (1987) suggestion that organizations in later stages of their development should use personality tests in order to select a more diversified range of cultures was not implemented by any of the examined organizations.

Fit in choosing organizations (individual perspective) The conducted survey found that individuals take many different aspects into consideration when choosing an employer.

Survey participants rated good relations to colleagues and superiors as most important in selecting an employer followed by work environment, flexibility / family friendliness as well as the organizational culture / image.

These findings are similar to the findings of Barber (1998, pp. 32-36) and Chapman et al. (2005) who said that type of work, organization image and perceived fit were the strongest predictors for job pursuit intentions.

It was also found that good relations with colleagues and superiors are less important for male individuals and for individuals who are older.

The preferences regarding organizations for employment and regarding voluntary work were found to be positively correlated, but a paired samples t-test showed that 13 out of 17 items had different means from one another, showing that the preferences regarding voluntary work are different from those regarding employment.

Fit in finding information about employers and jobs (individual perspective)

For individuals the organization's website and friends are by far the most preferred methods of informing themselves about organizations. Online job boards and campus recruiting are of medium importance while classical recruiting channels and social media were selected by most survey participants as unlikely methods of looking for information about employment.

A weak positive correlation was found between survey participants' rating of the importance of organizational culture when selecting an employer and the use of friends / acquaintances to find information ($r = .197; p = .008$). This indicates that friends are considered to be better sources for information about organizational culture.

On the other hand, the hypothesis that individuals who rate organizational culture as more important would use less online recruiting had to be rejected.

An unexpected finding was that survey participants who put more emphasis on their work-life balance (holidays, low stress, etc.) and materialism (salary, tools provided by employer, etc.) in their decision are more likely to use general-purpose job boards. There is no theory about the reasons behind this phenomenon.

Connections between both perspectives The majority of both organizations and individuals indicated that cultural fit was important to them. However, organizations

stated that communication about these aspects was difficult.

In prior studies recommendations by friends were frequently found to be the most frequent method of establishing contact between potential applicants and organizations. (e.g. Holzer, 1988; Montgomery, 1991; Caliendo et al., 2011; Weber and Mahringer, 2008). Five of the nine organizations in the qualitative study also use referrals and indicated that they result in applications from better fitting candidates. Participants of the survey rated referrals to be the second most important source of information about employers. Individuals who indicated that cultural fit was important to them were more likely to use friends as sources of information.

Organizations indicated that applicants who had read their website were usually better informed and better fitting than those who had not done so. Similarly, survey participants rated the organization's website as the best source of information about employers.

Campus recruiting is a method that was used by five of the nine examined organizations which reported it to be very effective. Individuals rated this method as the third most important source of information after friends and online job boards. Younger individuals and students rated campus recruiting as even more important.

5.1 Limitations and strengths

The results of course must be interpreted within the limitations of this study. The small sample size limits the generalizability of both the qualitative (sample size: 9 organizations) as well the quantitative part (sample size: 201 individuals) of the research. Also the analysis of organizations was limited to one interview in each organization and a review of marketing material.

All the organization branches that were researched in qualitative research were based in Austria (five of ten were of Austrian origin) and the majority of the survey participants of the quantitative research were also Austrians (88.1%). Therefore this is a considerable limitation to this research and the findings may only be applicable to Austria.

The majority of organizations researched in qualitative research had a technical background (8 of 9). Also a large part of the participants of the quantitative research were from the milieu of the author, which may lead to a over-representation of individuals who study or studied technology or natural sciences. In terms of recruiting, the field of technology in Austria may have atypical features as engineers and scientists are in such high demand and frequently can choose employers as they desire.

In addition, the participants of quantitative research had a much higher education level than average Austrians which may have lead to distorted results. Also the majority of organizations researched in the qualitative part were focussing on recruiting academics.

On the other hand, this means that this data may provide a good general image of the group of university-educated engineers and natural scientists in Austria.

Hofstede (2001, pp. 2, 373-375, 378-379) warned that one has to consider that social scientists are also part of culture and their results are therefore biased by their experiences. They stated that the authors of the foundational theories of organizations

(Tolstoy, Taylor, Weber, . . .) were looking for universal theories, but their own culture was clearly visible in their work – for example, methods suggested by the American Frederick Taylor were confirmed through surveys to be not acceptable in France (Hofstede, 2001). Sociological work therefore has to use simplified models to be verified by scientists with different backgrounds (Hofstede, 2001).

5.2 Implications and recommendations for further research

One major problem of research into fit, in my opinion, is the ambiguity about its effects on the organization. According to Kristof-Brown et al. (2005) studies about the effects of fit on organizational performance have been inconclusive, except for P-G fit, which was found to have positive effects on performance. Even if there were clearly confirmed positive effects on organizational performance there is also an ethical-philosophical dimension to the question that has not been answered yet. Therefore it is, in my opinion, still unclear whether the use of fit as a selection criterion in recruiting decisions can be considered a legitimate way to improve performance or as unethical discrimination of individuals different to those already in the organization. These questions still have to be answered. However, fit was repeatedly found to positively influence work attitudes of individuals (Kristof, 1996; Kristof-Brown et al., 2005). Hence the following remarks will only address possibilities to maximize individuals' possibilities to select organizations to which they are best fitted.

The more information is available, the better decisions potential candidates can make. Organizations frequently only advertise the tasks associated with a job – information about the team and organizational values is inaccessible to applicants even though they rate them as very important for their decision. Communication about these aspects is difficult and further research will be needed to find out how to improve communication between organizations and potential candidates.

Many corporate recruiting departments today put a lot of effort into social media which are, however, not the primary sources of information individuals prefer to use. These portals are probably important to reach a larger quantity of potential applicants but in their current form they do not provide enough information about topics individuals are interested in. Respondents rated personal contacts and their own research on the web as most important when trying to inform themselves about an employer or jobs. Campus recruiting is another possibility mentioned by organizations to provide rich information about themselves to individuals.

In response to both the belief of several organizations in the necessity of online job boards in order to reach a large enough quantity of potential applicants and the better applications resultant from the rich information on the organization's website, I propose that offers posted on job boards be linked back to the organization's websites as a simple measure to increase applicants' quality. Some organizations refrain from this in order to use the convenient features of the platforms. However, it also hinders potential

candidates from finding out more about their organization and making the best decision for themselves.

On their website, organizations should provide as much rich content about their culture, values and their way of work as possible in order to enable potential applicants to make informed decisions about whether to apply. Possibilities that have been mentioned by organizations were videos, team presentations, weblogs, etc..

On the other hand, I propose that use of online recruiting may be particularly useful for organizations that have a “Garbage Can” structure. They lack internal structure and many people are involved in recruiting. Electronic tools may be able to support them as they can provide a unified platform for recruiting that all members can use and provide a better-structured approach. A unified online recruiting portal that already contains general information about the organizational culture and values as well as other details, which enforces a certain structure and procedure may make the recruiting process easier for the members involved and provide better information for potential candidates.

On a side note: During the research it was found that many organizations do not collect data about how applicants got to know about the job openings and why they decided to apply. I suggest that collecting this kind of data would be important for every organization in order to continuously improve the organizational recruiting processes.

Fit appears to be an important aspect of recruiting both for organizations as well as individuals, but the existing science of the topic is still very incomplete.

APPENDIX **A**

Survey design

See next page

Table A.1: Quantitative survey design overview

ID	Question and Options (original)	Question and Options (translated)	Input type
Page 1			
[Introduction]			
Page 2			
D001	Alter (Jahre)	Age (Years)	Open (1 item)
D002	Höchste abgeschlossene Ausbildung	Highest completed education	Select One
	Kein Schulabschluss	No finished school	
	Pflichtschule	Mandatory school	
	Polytechnikum	Polytechnical school	
	Lehre	Apprenticeship	
	Fachschule	Professional School	
	Matura	High school	
	Bachelor	Bachelor	
	Master / Mag / DI	Master	
	Doktorat	Doctorate	
D003	Geschlecht	Gender	Select One
	Männlich	Male	
	Weiblich	Female	
	Keine Angabe	No answer	
D004	Hauptberuf	Main occupation	Select One
	ArbeiterIn / Angestellt in Privatwirtschaft	Working in private economy	
	ArbeiterIn / Angestellt in öffentlicher Verwaltung	Working in public administration	
	ArbeiterIn / Angestellt bei Universität	Working at university	
	Beamtin / Beamter	Civil servant	
	Studentin / Student in Ausbildung	Student in training	
	Hausfrau / Hausmann / Kinderbetreuung / Karenz	Homemaker / maternity leave	
	Arbeitslos	Unemployed	
	Pension	Retired	
	Selbstständig / UnternehmerIn	Self-employed / entrepreneur	
	Sonstiges	Other	
If D004 == „Other“:			
D004_10	Hauptberuf: Sonstiges	Other occupation	Open (1 item)
D006	Wohnsitz	Country of residence	Select One
	[List of UN member countries]	[List of UN member countries]	
Page 3			
If D004 == „Working in private economy“:			
A002	Branche	Industry	Select One
	LAND- UND FORSTWIRTSCHAFT, FISCHEREI	AGRICULTURE, FORESTRY AND FISHING	
	BERGBAU UND GEWINNUNG VON STEINEN UND ERDEN	MINING AND QUARRYING	
	HERSTELLUNG VON WAREN	MANUFACTURING	
	ENERGIEVERSORGUNG	ELECTRICITY, GAS, STEAM AND AIR CONDI- TIONING SUPPLY	

Continued on next page

Table A.1 – Continued from previous page

	WASSERVERSORGUNG; ABWASSER- UND ABFALLENTSORGUNG UND BESEITIGUNG VON UMWELTVERSCHMUTZUNGEN	WATER SUPPLY; SEWERAGE, WASTE MANAGEMENT AND REMEDIATION ACTIVITIES	
	BAU	CONSTRUCTION	
	HANDEL; INSTANDHALTUNG UND REPARATUR VON KRAFTFAHRZEUGEN	WHOLESALE AND RETAIL TRADE; REPAIR OF MOTOR VEHICLES AND MOTORCYCLES	
	VERKEHR UND LAGEREI	TRANSPORTATION AND STORAGE	
	BEHERBERGUNG UND GASTRONOMIE	ACCOMMODATION AND FOOD SERVICE ACTIVITIES	
	INFORMATION UND KOMMUNIKATION	INFORMATION AND COMMUNICATION	
	ERBRINGUNG VON FINANZ- UND VERSICHERUNGSDIENSTLEISTUNGEN	FINANCIAL AND INSURANCE ACTIVITIES	
	GRUNDSTÜCKS- UND WOHNUNGSWESEN	REAL ESTATE ACTIVITIES	
	ERBRINGUNG VON FREIBERUFLICHEN, WISSENSCHAFTLICHEN UND TECHNISCHEN DIENSTLEISTUNGEN	PROFESSIONAL, SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL ACTIVITIES	
	ERBRINGUNG VON SONSTIGEN WIRTSCHAFTLICHEN DIENSTLEISTUNGEN	ADMINISTRATIVE AND SUPPORT SERVICE ACTIVITIES	
	ÖFFENTLICHE VERWALTUNG, VERTEIDIGUNG; SOZIALVERSICHERUNG	PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION AND DEFENCE; COMPULSORY SOCIAL SECURITY	
	ERZIEHUNG UND UNTERRICHT	EDUCATION	
	GESUNDHEITS- UND SOZIALWESEN	HUMAN HEALTH AND SOCIAL WORK ACTIVITIES	
	KUNST, UNTERHALTUNG UND ERHOLUNG	ARTS, ENTERTAINMENT AND RECREATION	
	ERBRINGUNG VON SONSTIGEN DIENSTLEISTUNGEN	OTHER SERVICE ACTIVITIES	
	PRIVATE HAUSHALTE MIT HAUSPERSONAL; HERSTELLUNG VON WAREN UND ERBRINGUNG VON DIENSTLEISTUNGEN DURCH PRIVATE HAUSHALTE FÜR DEN EIGENBEDARF OHNE AUSGEPRÄGTEN SCHWERPUNKT	ACTIVITIES OF HOUSEHOLDS AS EMPLOYERS; UNDIFFERENTIATED GOODS- AND SERVICES-PRODUCING ACTIVITIES OF HOUSEHOLDS FOR OWN USE	
	EXTERRITORIALE ORGANISATIONEN UND KÖRPERSCHAFTEN	ACTIVITIES OF EXTRATERRITORIAL ORGANISATIONS AND BODIES	
	Sonstige	Other	
A003	Wo haben Sie in der Vergangenheit gearbeitet?	Where have you worked in the past?	Multiple choice
	Privatwirtschaft	Past work: Private economy	
	Öffentliche Verwaltung	Past work: Public administration	
	Universität	Past work: university	
	Sonstiges	Past work: Other	
	Ich habe noch nie gearbeitet	I have not worked before	
A004	Wie ist ihre Erfahrung bzw. Einstellung zu ehrenamtlicher, unbezahlter Arbeit?	What is your experience with or opinion about voluntary work?	Multiple choice
	Ich war in der Vergangenheit ehrenamtliches Mitglied bei einer gemeinnützigen Organisation.	I was a member of a voluntary organization in the past	
	Ich bin zur Zeit ehrenamtliches Mitglied bei einer gemeinnützigen Organisation.	I am currently a member of a voluntary organization	
	Ich will in Zukunft Mitglied einer gemeinnützigen Organisation werden.	I want to be a member of a voluntary organization in the future	

Continued on next page

Table A.1 – Continued from previous page

	Ich habe noch nie und will auch nicht ehrenamtlich arbeiten.	I have never and I am not planning to work voluntarily.	
Page 4			
	(No label)	(No label)	
J001_01	Ich bin optimistisch, dass ich einen anderen Job finden würde, wenn ich danach suchen würde.	I am optimistic that I would find another job if I looked for one.	7-step Likert scale
J001_02	Ich könnte leicht einen anderen Job finden statt meinem jetzigen Job.	I could easily find another job instead of my present job.	7-step Likert scale
J001_03	Ich könnte sehr leicht meinen Arbeitgeber wechseln, wenn ich wollte.	I could easily switch to another employer, if I wanted to.	7-step Likert scale
J001_04	Ich bin überzeugt, dass ich sehr schnell einen Job finden könnte, der meinem jetzigen Job ähnlich ist.	I am confident that I could quickly get a similar job to the one I have now.	7-step Likert scale
J002_01	Was wäre Ihnen bei der Auswahl eines Arbeitgebers am wichtigsten?	What would be most important to you when choosing a new employer?	Open (1 item)
Page 5			
J003	Welche Kriterien wären für Sie bei der Auswahl eines neuen Arbeitgebers wichtig?	Which criteria are important to you when choosing a new employer?	
J003_01	Höhe des Gehalts	Salary	7-step Likert scale
J003_02	Diensthandy	Corporate phone	7-step Likert scale
J003_03	Arbeitsgeräte (z.B. guter Laptop)	Tools (e.g. good laptop)	7-step Likert scale
J003_04	Unternehmenskultur des Arbeitgebers	Organizational culture of the employer	7-step Likert scale
J003_05	Dienstwagen	Corporate car	7-step Likert scale
J003_06	Gutes Auskommen mit Kolleginnen und Kollegen	Getting along with co-workers well	7-step Likert scale
J003_07	Gratis Getränke	Free drinks	7-step Likert scale
J003_08	Qualität der Produkte des Arbeitgebers	Quality of the employer's products	7-step Likert scale
J003_09	Das Unternehmen muss zu mir persönlich passen	The employer has to fit to me personally	7-step Likert scale
J003_10	Gratis Parkplatz bei Arbeitsplatz	Free parking space at work place.	7-step Likert scale
J003_11	Viel Urlaub / freie Tage	Large amount of holidays	7-step Likert scale
J003_12	Kantine	Canteen	7-step Likert scale
J003_13	flexible Arbeitszeiten, die ich mir aussuchen kann	Flexible working time I can choose	7-step Likert scale
J003_14	Möglichkeit von Home Office (arbeiten von zu Hause)	Possibility of home office (working from home)	7-step Likert scale
J003_15	Schönes Büro / Labor / Arbeitsplatz	Nice office / lab / working space	7-step Likert scale
J003_16	Nähe des Arbeitsplatzes zu meinem Wohnort	Proximity of work place to my place of living	7-step Likert scale
J003_17	Gute Beziehungen des Arbeitgebers zu seinen Kunden	Good relations of the employer to its customers	7-step Likert scale
J003_18	Langfristige Ausrichtung des Arbeitgebers	Long-term orientation of employer	7-step Likert scale
J003_19	Gute Erreichbarkeit mit öffentlichen Verkehrsmitteln	Work place easily reachable by public transport	7-step Likert scale
J003_20	Betriebsarztin / Betriebsarzt	Company doctor	7-step Likert scale
J003_21	Betriebspsychologin / Betriebspsychologe	Company psychologist	7-step Likert scale
J003_22	Image des Arbeitgebers	Image of employer	7-step Likert scale
J003_23	Sich mit dem Arbeitgeber identifizieren können	Being able to identify with the employer	7-step Likert scale
J003_24	Sinn der Arbeit	Sense / purpose / meaning of work	7-step Likert scale
J003_25	Wenig Stress	Low stress	7-step Likert scale
J003_26	Volles Ausschöpfen meines Potentials	Full use of my potential	7-step Likert scale
J003_27	Gutes Auskommen mit Vorgesetzten	Good relations with superior(s)	7-step Likert scale
J003_28	Weiterbildungsmöglichkeiten	Possibility of further education	7-step Likert scale
Page 6			

Continued on next page

Table A.1 – Continued from previous page

J004	Wie wahrscheinlich ist es, dass Sie folgende Angebote nutzen würden, um nach offenen Stellen und/oder Informationen über Arbeitgeber zu suchen?	How probable is it that you would use the following offers to search for information about employers and/or job openings?	
J004_01	Arbeitsmarktservice (AMS) / Arbeitsamt	State employment agency ("AMS")	7-step Likert scale
J004_02	Karrieremessen (z.B. Career Calling, IAESTE TECONOMY)	career fairs (e.g. Career Calling, IAESTE TECONOMY)	7-step Likert scale
J004_03	Exkursionen (z.B. IAESTE FirmenShuttle)	company tours (e.g. IAESTE FirmenShuttle)	7-step Likert scale
J004_04	Die Presse (gedruckte Zeitung)	Die Presse (printed newspaper)	7-step Likert scale
J004_05	Der Standard (gedruckte Zeitung)	Der Standard (printed newspaper)	7-step Likert scale
J004_06	Kurier (gedruckte Zeitung)	Kurier (printed newspaper)	7-step Likert scale
J004_07	Kronenzeitung (gedruckte Zeitung)	Kronenzeitung (printed newspaper)	7-step Likert scale
J004_08	schwarzes Brett in Schule / auf Uni o.ä.	bulletin board at school, university, etc.	7-step Likert scale
J004_09	gedruckte Karriereführer	printed career guides	7-step Likert scale
J004_10	Suche im Internet (z.B. mit Google)	Internet search (e.g. Google)	7-step Likert scale
J004_11	Monster.at (Website)	Monster.at (Website)	7-step Likert scale
J004_12	Karriere.at (Website)	Karriere.at (Website)	7-step Likert scale
J004_13	Kununu.com (Website)	Kununu.com (Website)	7-step Likert scale
J004_14	Whatchado.net (Website)	Whatchado.net (Website)	7-step Likert scale
J004_15	diepresse.at (Website)	diepresse.at (Website)	7-step Likert scale
J004_16	derstandard.at (Website)	derstandard.at (Website)	7-step Likert scale
J004_17	kurier.at (Website)	kurier.at (Website)	7-step Likert scale
J004_18	krone.at (Website)	krone.at (Website)	7-step Likert scale
J004_19	Xing (Website)	Xing (Website)	7-step Likert scale
J004_20	Facebook (Website)	Facebook (Website)	7-step Likert scale
J004_21	Twitter (Website)	Twitter (Website)	7-step Likert scale
J004_22	LinkedIn (Website)	LinkedIn (Website)	7-step Likert scale
J004_23	Freunde / Bekannte, die dort arbeiten	Friends / acquaintances who work there	7-step Likert scale
J004_24	Freunde / Bekannte in der Branche	Friends / acquaintances in the industry	7-step Likert scale
J004_25	Website des Unternehmens	Company website	7-step Likert scale
J005	Welche anderen Informationsangebote würden Sie nutzen, um nach offenen Stellen oder Informationen über einen Arbeitgeber zu suchen?	Which other sources of information would you use to look for job openings or information about employers?	Open (up to 5 items)
Page 7			
FK01	Haben Sie schon einmal eine Arbeit freiwillig gekündigt?	Have you ever quit a job voluntarily?	Select One
	Ja	Yes	
	Nein	No	
	Keine Angabe	No answer	
Page 8			
If FK01 != „Yes“; jump to page 9			
FK02	Was waren die Gründe dafür, dass Sie die Stelle freiwillig gekündigt haben?	What were the reasons that you quit the job in the past?	
FK02_01	Höhe des Gehalts	Wage	7-step Likert scale
FK02_02	fehlendes / schlechtes Diensthandy	Missing / bad corporate phone	7-step Likert scale
FK02_03	fehlende / schlechte Arbeitsgeräte (z.B. Laptop)	Missing / bad tools (e.g. laptop)	7-step Likert scale
FK02_04	Unternehmenskultur des Arbeitgebers	Corporate culture of the employer	7-step Likert scale
FK02_05	Dienstwagen	Corporate car	7-step Likert scale

Continued on next page

Table A.1 – Continued from previous page

FK02_06	Auskommen mit Kollegen	Getting along with co-workers	7-step Likert scale
FK02_08	Qualität der Produkte des Arbeitgebers	Quality of the employer's products	7-step Likert scale
FK02_09	Nicht-passen zum Unternehmen	Not fitting the company	7-step Likert scale
FK02_10	Kein Parkplatz bei Arbeitsplatz	No parking space at work place	7-step Likert scale
FK02_11	Wenig oder unflexibler Urlaub / freie Tage	Too little holiday	7-step Likert scale
FK02_12	Fehlende / schlechte Kantine	Missing / bad canteen.	7-step Likert scale
FK02_13	Mangel an flexiblen Arbeitszeiten	Lack of flexible working times	7-step Likert scale
FK02_14	fehlende Möglichkeit von Home Office (Arbeit von zu Hause)	Lack of possibility for home office (working from home)	7-step Likert scale
FK02_15	Unschönes Büro / Labor / Arbeitsplatz	Office / lab / place of work was not nice	7-step Likert scale
FK02_16	Entfernung des Arbeitsplatzes zu meinem Wohnort	Distance of workplace from my place of living	7-step Likert scale
FK02_17	Beziehungen des Arbeitgebers zu seinen Kunden	Relations of employer to its customers	7-step Likert scale
FK02_18	Zu wenig langfristige Ausrichtung des Arbeitgebers	Lacking long-term orientation of the employer	7-step Likert scale
FK02_19	Schlechte Erreichbarkeit mit öffentlichen Verkehrsmitteln	Bad to reach by public transport	7-step Likert scale
FK02_20	Fehlender / schlechter Betriebsarzt	Missing / bad company doctor	7-step Likert scale
FK02_21	Fehlender / schlechter Betriebspsychologe	Missing / bad company psychologist	7-step Likert scale
FK02_22	Image des Arbeitgebers	Image of employer	7-step Likert scale
FK02_23	Auskommen mit Vorgesetzten	Relations with superiors	7-step Likert scale
FK02_24	Krankheit	Illness	7-step Likert scale
FK02_25	Stress	Stress	7-step Likert scale
FK02_26	Mangelnde Weiterbildungsmöglichkeit	Lack of possibility for further education	7-step Likert scale
FK02_27	Mangelnder Sinn der Arbeit	Lack of purpose of work	7-step Likert scale
FK05	Gibt es weitere wichtige Gründe, warum Sie gekündigt haben?	Are there other important reasons why you quit?	Open (up to 5 items)
FK04	Welche Informationsangebote haben Sie genutzt, um sich über den/die Arbeitgeber zu informieren, bei dem Sie dann freiwillig gekündigt haben? Beziehungsweise: Von wo hatten Sie Informationen über den/die Arbeitgeber?	Which information sources did you use to inform yourself about the employer, where you quit afterwards? Put differently: Where did you get information about the employer?	7-step Likert scale
FK04	Arbeitsmarktservice (AMS) / Arbeitsamt	State employment agency ("AMS")	7-step Likert scale
FK04_02	Karrieremessen (z.B. Career Calling, IAESTE Firmenmesse)	career fairs (e.g. Career Calling, IAESTE TECONOMY)	7-step Likert scale
FK04_03	Exkursionen (z.B. IAESTE FirmenShuttle)	company tours (e.g. IAESTE FirmenShuttle)	7-step Likert scale
FK04_04	Zeitung	Die Presse (printed newspaper)	7-step Likert scale
FK04_11	Monster.at (Website)	Monster.at (Website)	7-step Likert scale
FK04_12	Karriere.at (Website)	Karriere.at (Website)	7-step Likert scale
FK04_09	gedruckte Karriereführer	printed career guides	7-step Likert scale
FK04_13	Kununu.com (Website)	Kununu.com (Website)	7-step Likert scale
FK04_10	Suche im Internet (z.B. mit Google)	Internet search (e.g. Google)	7-step Likert scale
FK04_14	Whatchado.net (Website)	Whatchado.net (Website)	7-step Likert scale
FK04_19	Xing (Website)	Xing (Website)	7-step Likert scale
FK04_20	Facebook (Website)	Facebook (Website)	7-step Likert scale
FK04_21	Twitter (Website)	Twitter (Website)	7-step Likert scale
FK04_22	LinkedIn (Website)	LinkedIn (Website)	7-step Likert scale
FK04_23	Freunde / Bekannte, die dort arbeiten	Friends / acquaintances who work there	7-step Likert scale
FK04_24	Freunde / Bekannte in der Branche	Friends / acquaintances in the industry	7-step Likert scale
FK04_25	Website des Unternehmens	Company website	7-step Likert scale

Continued on next page

Table A.1 – Continued from previous page

Page 9			
If A004 == „I have never and I am not planning to work voluntarily.“; jump to page 11			
E001_01	Was wäre Ihnen bei der Auswahl einer Organisation (um sich ehrenamtlich zu engagieren) am wichtigsten?	What is the most important criterion when you select an organization (for voluntary work)?	Open (1 item)
Page 10			
E002	Welche Kriterien wären für Sie bei der Auswahl einer neuen Organisation (um sich ehrenamtlich zu engagieren) wichtig?	Which criteria would be important to you when choosing a new organization (for voluntary work)?	
E002_01	Voller Ersatz von Spesen	Full reimbursement of expenses	7-step Likert scale
E002_02	Diensthandy	Organization phone	7-step Likert scale
E002_03	Arbeitsgeräte (z.B. guter Laptop)	Good tools (e.g. laptop)	7-step Likert scale
E002_04	Organisationskultur	Organizational culture	7-step Likert scale
E002_06	Gutes Auskommen mit Mitgliedern	Good relations with members	7-step Likert scale
E002_07	Gratis Getränke	Free drinks	7-step Likert scale
E002_08	Qualität der Produkte/Leistungen	Quality of products/services	7-step Likert scale
E002_09	Die Organisation muss zu mir persönlich passen	The organization has to fit to me personally	7-step Likert scale
E002_10	Gratis Parkplatz bei Organisation	Free parking space at organization	7-step Likert scale
E002_13	flexible Einsatzzeiten, die ich mir aussuchen kann	flexible working time I can choose	7-step Likert scale
E002_14	Möglichkeit von zu Hause zu arbeiten	Possibility to work from home	7-step Likert scale
E002_15	Schönes Büro / Arbeitsplatz	Nice office / working space	7-step Likert scale
E002_16	Nähe der Organisation zu meinem Wohnort	Proximity of work place to my place of living	7-step Likert scale
E002_17	Gute Beziehungen der Organisation zu seinem Umfeld	Good relations of the organization to its environment	7-step Likert scale
E002_18	Langfristige Ausrichtung der Organisation	Long-term orientation of organization	7-step Likert scale
E002_22	Image der Organisation	Image of the organization	7-step Likert scale
E002_19	Gute Erreichbarkeit mit öffentlichen Verkehrsmitteln	Easily reachable by public transport	7-step Likert scale
E002_23	Sich mit dem Organisation identifizieren können	Being able to identify with the organization	7-step Likert scale
Page 11: Scenario questions			
Each participant was presented with ONE of four possible stories which were chosen randomly.			
(Intro)	Bitte stellen Sie sich vor, Sie hätten Ihr Studium abgeschlossen und Sie hätten seit einem Jahr einen Job bei einem Unternehmen. Sie verdienen für Ihre Verhältnisse durchschnittlich, auf jeden Fall genug, um Ihren Lebensstil zu finanzieren. Die Arbeit gefällt Ihnen mittelmäßig gut. Mit den meisten Kolleginnen und Kollegen verstehen Sie sich ganz gut, es gibt es kaum Streit, aber umgekehrt würden Sie die Leute auch nicht als besonders gute Freunde bezeichnen. Zu Ihrem Geburtstag laden Sie mehrere Freunde zu sich nach Hause ein. ...	Please imagine you finished your studies and are working for one year at a company already. Your salary is average, it is enough to finance your lifestyle. You neither like nor dislike your job very much. The co-workers are okay, there is almost no struggle, but on the other hand you would not consider them as good friends either. For your birthday you invite a few friends to your home. ...	
V001	<i>Fall A:</i> Ihr guter Freund Michael erzählt Ihnen von seiner Arbeit. Michael kann sich mit dem Unternehmen und den herrschenden Wertvorstellungen nicht identifizieren. Trotzdem mag er seinen Job, denn er verdient gut. Im Vergleich zu seinen ehemaligen SchulkollegInnen hat er ein höheres Gehalt. Michael schlägt Ihnen vor, Sie könnten auch in sein Unternehmen wechseln, denn es ist gerade eine Stelle frei. Sie würden dort 20% mehr verdienen als in ihrem jetzigen Job.	<i>Case A:</i> Your friend Michael tells you about his work. Michael cannot identify with his company and its values. However, he still likes his job because it pays well. He earns more than his former classmates from school. Michael suggests, that you could also work at his company as there is a job opening. You would earn 20% more than in your current job.	

Continued on next page

Table A.1 – Continued from previous page

V002	<i>Fall B:</i> Ihr guter Freund Michael erzählt Ihnen von seiner Arbeit. Michael verdient nicht so gut. Im Vergleich zu seinen ehemaligen SchulkollegInnen hat er ein niedrigeres Gehalt. Trotzdem mag er seinen Job, denn er identifiziert sich mit dem Unternehmen und den herrschenden Wertvorstellungen. Michael schlägt Ihnen vor, Sie könnten auch in sein Unternehmen wechseln, denn es ist gerade eine Stelle frei. Sie würden dort 20% weniger verdienen als in ihrem jetzigen Job.	<i>Case B:</i> Your friend Michael tells you about his work. Michael does not earn a lot. He earns less than his former classmates from school. However, he still likes his job because he can identify with the company and its values. Michael suggests, that you could also work at his company as there is a job opening. You would earn 20% less than in your current job.	
V003	<i>Fall C:</i> Ihre gute Freundin Stefanie erzählt Ihnen von ihrer Arbeit. Stefanie kann sich mit dem Unternehmen und den herrschenden Wertvorstellungen nicht identifizieren. Trotzdem mag sie ihren Job, denn sie verdient gut. Im Vergleich zu ihren ehemaligen SchulkollegInnen hat sie ein höheres Gehalt. Stefanie schlägt Ihnen vor, Sie könnten auch in ihr Unternehmen wechseln, denn es ist gerade eine Stelle frei. Sie würden dort 20% mehr verdienen als in ihrem jetzigen Job.	<i>Case C:</i> Your friend Stephanie tells you about her work. Stephanie cannot identify with her company and its values. However, she still likes her job because it pays well. She earns more than her former classmates from school. Stephanie suggests, that you could also work at her company as there is a job opening. You would earn 20% more than in your current job.	
V004	<i>Fall D:</i> Ihre gute Freundin Stefanie erzählt Ihnen von ihrer Arbeit. Stefanie verdient nicht so gut. Im Vergleich zu ihren ehemaligen SchulkollegInnen hat sie ein niedrigeres Gehalt. Trotzdem mag sie ihren Job, denn sie identifiziert sich mit dem Unternehmen und den herrschenden Wertvorstellungen. Stefanie schlägt Ihnen vor, Sie könnten auch in ihr Unternehmen wechseln, denn es ist gerade eine Stelle frei. Sie würden dort 20% weniger verdienen als in ihrem jetzigen Job.	<i>Case D:</i> Your friend Stephanie tells you about her work. Stephanie does not earn a lot. She earns less than her former classmates from school. However, she still likes his job because he can identify with the company and its values. Stephanie suggests, that you could also work at her company as there is a job opening. You would earn 20% less than in your current job.	
...	Es gibt keine anderen BewerberInnen, Sie müssten sich aber schnell melden, denn schon am nächsten Tag ist Bewerbungsschluss. Sie führen kurz Nachforschungen im Internet durch und finden heraus, dass Sie für die gebotene Stelle qualifiziert sind und dass der Arbeitsplatz gleich weit von Ihrem Wohnort entfernt ist, wie Ihre jetzige Arbeit. Mehr Informationen waren in so kurzer Zeit nicht zu finden.	There are no other applicants, but you would have to decide quickly, because the application period closes the next day already. You perform a quick search on the internet and find out that you are qualified for the job and the work place is in similar distance as your current job. More information was not available on such short time.	
...	Wie würden Sie entscheiden?	How would you decide?	Select One
	Ich bewerbe mich auf alle Fälle und würde das Angebot annehmen.	I apply and I would accept the offer.	
	Ich bewerbe mich auf alle Fälle und überlege später.	I apply and think about it later.	
	Ich bewerbe mich nicht auf diese Stelle, suche aber nach alternativen Jobangeboten.	I do not apply, but I search for alternatives.	
	Ich bewerbe mich nicht auf diese Stelle und behalte meinen Job.	I do not apply and keep my job.	
Page 12			
V005	Warum würden Sie so entscheiden?	Why would you choose this way?	Open (up to 5 items)
Page 13			
[Thank you message]			

Responses from question J002

Survey question J002 was an open question asking: "What would be most important to you when choosing a new employer?".

Participants were asked to provide one item only. If they provided more than one word/phrase, only the first entry was considered. Spelling and capitalization was ignored if the meaning was clearly understandable.

Table B.1: Grouping of responses to question J002

Original item	Group	Number of occurrences
Aufstiegschancen	Career	4
Entwicklungsmöglichkeiten	Career	1
Entwicklungspotenzial	Career	1
Karriere	Career	1
Weiterbildung, Karriereschiene - Aufstieg	Career	1
Gutes Betriebsklima	Climate	1
angenehmens Arbeitsklima	Climate	2
Angenehmes Arbeitsumfeld	Climate	1
arbeitsklima	Climate	9
Arbeitsklima, Arbeitsumfeld, Soziales Angebot	Climate	1
Arbeitsumfeld	Climate	2
Betriebsklima	Climate	3
das angenehme Arbeitsklima	Climate	1
dass man dort als Mensch behandelt wird	Climate	1
Firmenklima; Aufgabenbereiche; Bezahlung; Nähe zum Arbeitsplatz	Climate	1
gute Arbeitsbedingungen	Climate	1
gutes Arbeitsklima	Climate	4
gutes Arbeitsklima, flexible Arbeitszeit, wenig Überstunden und gute Bezahlung	Climate	1
sehr gutes Arbeitsklima	Climate	1
Team	Co-workers	1
Teamgefüge, Motivatoren, Anreizsystem	Co-workers	1
Die Arbeitskollegen, das Lernpotential im Job und generell dass die Firma tolle Produkte/Service macht.	Co-workers	1
freundliches und kollegiales Team	Co-workers	1
Mitarbeiterumfeld	Co-workers	1
Team	Co-workers	1
Team und Aufgabe	Co-workers	1

Continued on next page

Table B.1 – Continued from previous page

Original item	Group	Number of occurrences
tolles team, spannende arbeit	Co-workers	1
Unternehmenskultur	Corporate Culture	5
Flexibilität der Arbeitszeit	Flexibility	1
Flexibilität	Flexibility	6
Flexibilität, Spannende Projekte mit komplexeren Zielsetzungen, Challenges, Gute Mitarbeiter, Geld	Flexibility	1
flexible Arbeitszeiten	Flexibility	2
flexible Arbeitszeiten/-einteilung	Flexibility	1
flexible Zeiteinteilung	Flexibility	1
freie Zeiteinteilung	Flexibility	1
Freie Zeiteinteilung / gute Bezahlung / Aufstiegsperspektiven	Flexibility	1
Gleitzeit	Flexibility	2
Vereinbarkeit mit Familie	Flexibility	1
Vereinbarkeit von Arbeit und Familie, möglichst kurze Pendelzeiten	Flexibility	1
Vereinbarkeit von Familie und beruf	Flexibility	1
-	Invalid	1
Toleranz	Other	1
Anerkennung	Other	2
Beständigkeit	Other	1
Dass was weitergeht	Other	1
die firma leistet einen beitrag zum fortschritt der gesellschaft	Other	1
Entscheidungsfreiheit	Other	1
Ethik	Other	1
faire behandlung, interessanter aufgabenbereich, angenehme atmosphäre	Other	1
Fairness	Other	2
Freude daran	Other	1
Freundlichkeit	Other	1
Gesamteindruck	Other	1
Gestaltungsfreiraum, Verantwortung	Other	1
Gestaltungsmöglichkeiten	Other	1
gute Werksküche	Other	1
Herausforderung	Other	1
Hund erlaubt :)	Other	1
In der Nähe des Wohnortes	Other	1
Innovation	Other	1
innovativ, zukunftsorientiert, managment mit viel selbstverantwortung (nicht hierarchisch)	Other	1
Integrität der leitenden Personen, Selbstbestimmung und Flexibilität am Arbeitsplatz (Urlaub, Zeiteinteilung,...)	Other	1
Internationalität	Other	2
klare und strukturierte Abläufe/ Regelungen	Other	1
Klugheit	Other	1
Kreativer Freiraum	Other	1
langfristige Perspektive	Other	1
lustig, nett, freundlich	Other	1
Menschlichkeit	Other	1
Mitarbeiterfreundlich	Other	1
Nachhaltigkeit	Other	1
neues lernen können	Other	1
Ob das Unternehmen eine Gemeinwohlbilanz erstellt oder nicht	Other	1
Ort der Arbeit, flexibilität	Other	1
Position mit Eigenverantwortung	Other	1
Projekte statt Produkt	Other	1
richtige Werte	Other	1
Ruf, insbesondere im näheren Umfeld - gibt es mit diesem Arbeitgeber schon Erfahrungen im Verwandten/Bekanntenkreis...	Other	1
Selbstverwirklichung	Other	1
Sicherer Arbeitsplatz	Other	1
Sinn	Other	1
Sozial	Other	1
soziale & nachhaltige Ausrichtung des Unternehmens, faires Gehalt, Möglichkeit für Teilzeit-Arbeit	Other	1
Soziales Arbeitsumfeld	Other	1
stimulierende Umgebung und Mitarbeiter	Other	1
Umfeld	Other	1

Continued on next page

Table B.1 – Continued from previous page

Original item	Group	Number of occurrences
unternehmerische Freiheit	Other	1
Verlässlichkeit	Other	1
von meinem Fach	Other	1
Wohlfühlen	Other	1
Zweck, den der/die ArbeitgeberIn verfolgt	Other	1
Bezahlung	Pay	4
Bezahlung, Anstellung (kein Werkvertrag), lokal und nett	Pay	1
Bezahlung, respektvoller Umgang, abwechslungsreiche Arbeit	Pay	1
der Lohn	Pay	1
entgelt	Pay	1
Entlohnung	Pay	1
gehalt	Pay	4
Gehalt, Arbeitsklima, Arbeitsumfeld, Tätigkeit, Nähe zum Wohnort	Pay	1
Gehalt, Aufgabengebiet	Pay	1
Gehalt, Lage	Pay	1
Gehaltsentwicklung (Integral ueber die naechsten 10 Jahre)	Pay	1
Geld	Pay	5
Geld, Klima	Pay	1
gute Bezahlung	Pay	1
gutes Honorar-Aufwand-Verhaeltnis	Pay	1
Mehr Gehalt, besseres Arbeitsklima	Pay	1
Nähe zum Wohnort	Place	1
Standort Wien	Place	1
Wohnort	Place	1
Respekt	Respect	1
Respekt am Arbeitsplatz	Respect	1
Respekt für erbrachte Leistung	Respect	1
Respekt und Geld	Respect	1
Respektvoller Umgang, gutes Arbeitsklima	Respect	1
sympahtisch	Sympathy	1
Sympathie	Sympathy	2
Sympathie zum Unternehmen	Sympathy	1
Sympathie, Unterstützung und Wertschätzung meiner Arbeit	Sympathy	1
Abwechslungsreiche Arbeit	Tasks	1
abwechslungsreiches selbständiges arbeiten	Tasks	1
Arbeitsaufgaben	Tasks	1
Arbeitsgebiet	Tasks	1
Aufgabe	Tasks	1
Aufgabe/Themengebiet	Tasks	1
Aufgabenbereich	Tasks	2
Aufgabengebiet	Tasks	1
ausfüllende Tätigkeit	Tasks	1
bietet Arbeit an, die Sinn macht, nützlich ist	Tasks	1
eigenverantwortlicher Arbeitsbereich	Tasks	1
interessante Arbeit	Tasks	1
Interessante Aufgaben	Tasks	1
Interessante projekte, unternehmenskultur	Tasks	1
interessante Tätigkeit	Tasks	2
Interessante Tätigkeit und gutes Arbeitsklima	Tasks	1
interessante, vielseitige und herausfordernde Tätigkeiten	Tasks	1
interessanter Tätigkeitsbereich	Tasks	2
Interessantes Arbeitsfeld	Tasks	1
Interesse	Tasks	1
job ist in meinem studienbereich	Tasks	1
meiner Ausbildung entsprechende Arbeit	Tasks	1
Ob die Stelle für mich attraktiv wirkt	Tasks	1
sehr breites Aufgabengebiet	Tasks	1
Spannende Aufgabe	Tasks	1
spannendes Aufgabengebiet	Tasks	1
Tätigkeit & Arbeitsumfeld	Tasks	1
Tätigkeitsbereich	Tasks	1
ausgeglichene Work/Life-Balance	Work-Life-Balance	1
Work Life Balance	Work-Life-Balance	6
Work-Life-Balance und damit auch Berufliche und Persönliche Weiteretnwicklung	Work-Life-Balance	1

References

- Achouri, C. (2010). *Recruiting und Placement: Methoden und Instrumente der Personalauswahl und -platzierung [Recruiting and Placement: Methods and instruments of personnel selection and placement]*. Gabler Verlag / GWV Fachverlage GmbH, Wiesbaden, Wiesbaden.
- Barber, A. E. (1998). *Recruiting employees: individual and organizational perspectives*. Foundations for organizational science. Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, Calif.
- Barnard, C. I. (1938). *The functions of the executive*. Harvard University Press, Cambridge.
- Berger, U. and Bernhard-Mehlich, I. (2002). The behavioral decision theory (german: "Die verhaltenswissenschaftliche entscheidungstheorie"). In *Organisationstheorien*, volume 5. W. Kohlhammer Verlag.
- Brodbeck, F. C., Hanges, P. J., Dickson, M. W., Gupta, V., and Dorfman, P. W. (2004). Societal culture and industrial sector influences on organizational culture. In House, R. J., Hanges, P. J., Javidan, M., Dorfman, P. W., and Gupta, V., editors, *Culture, leadership, and organizations: the GLOBE study of 62 societies*, Global Leadership and Organizational Behavior Effectiveness Research Program, pages 654–668. Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, Calif.
- Caliendo, M., Schmidl, R., and Uhlendorff, A. (2011). Social networks, job search methods and reservation wages: evidence for germany. *International Journal of Manpower*, 32(7):796–824.
- Chapman, D. S., Uggerslev, K. L., Carroll, S. A., Piasentin, K. A., and Jones, D. A. (2005). Applicant attraction to organizations and job choice: A meta-analytic review of the correlates of recruiting outcomes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90(5):928–944.
- Cohen, M. D., March, J. G., and Olsen, J. P. (1972). A garbage can model of organizational choice. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 17(1):1–25.
- De Cuyper, N. and De Witte, H. (2011). The management paradox: Self-rated employability and organizational commitment and performance. *Personnel Review*, 40(2):152–172.

- De Cuyper, N., De Witte, H., Rigotti, T., and Mohr, G. (2004). Psychological contracting across employment situations: PSYCONES. *Unpublished work*.
- Dickson, M. W., BeShears, R. S., and Gupta, V. (2004). The impact of societal culture and industry on organizational culture: Theoretical explanations. In House, R. J., Hanges, P. J., Javidan, M., Dorfman, P. W., and Gupta, V., editors, *Culture, leadership, and organizations: the GLOBE study of 62 societies*, Global Leadership and Organizational Behavior Effectiveness Research Program, pages 74–90. Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, Calif.
- Dyer, F. and Jost, U. (2007). *Recruiting volunteers: attracting the people you need*. Directory of Social Change, London.
- Ethikkommission Psychologie (2011). Ethikkommission psychologie, universität wien: Ethische richtlinien für die psychologische forschung [university of vienna, ethics commission of the faculty for psychology: Ethics guidelines for psychological research]. http://www.univie.ac.at/ethikkommission/richtlinien_lang.php. Accessed: 2013-07-02.
- Eurostat (2011). Eurostat, the statistical office of the European Union: EUROPOP2010 - convergence scenario, national level. <http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/population/data/database> http://appsso.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/nui/show.do?dataset=proj_10c2150p&lang=en Accessed: 2013-07-02.
- Field, A. (2009). *Discovering Statistics using SPSS*. Sage Publications, London, 3rd edition.
- Herzberg, F. (1987). One more time: How do you motivate employees? *Harvard Business Review*, 65(5):109–120.
- Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's consequences : comparing values, behaviors, institutions, and organizations across nations*. Thousand Oaks, California; Sage, 2. ed., 11. [print.] edition.
- Holtbrügge, D. (2007). *Personalmanagement [Personnel Management]*, volume 3. Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg.
- Holzer, H. J. (1988). Search method use by unemployed youth. *Journal of Labor Economics*, 6(1):pp. 1–20. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2534865>.
- House, R. J., Hanges, P. J., Javidan, M., Dorfman, P. W., and Gupta, V., editors (2004). *Culture, leadership, and organizations: the GLOBE study of 62 societies*. Global Leadership and Organizational Behavior Effectiveness Research Program. Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, Calif.
- IAESTE: Job wall. Jobbörse | IAESTE firmenportal [job wall - IAESTE company portal]. <https://firmenportal.iaeste.at/jobboerse>. Accessed: 2013-10-04.

- JobWohnen. Für stellenanbieter [for job posters]. <http://jobwohnen.unijobs.at/stellenanbieter>. Accessed: 2013-12-11.
- Karriere.at. Arbeitgeber [employers]. <http://hr.karriere.at/go/company/index/117>. Accessed: 2013-10-04.
- Kristof, A. L. (1996). Person-organization fit: An integrative review of its conceptualizations, measurement, and implications. *Personnel Psychology*, 49(1):1–49.
- Kristof-Brown, A. L. (2000). Perceived applicant fit: Distinguishing between recruiters' perceptions of person-job and person-organization fit. *Personnel Psychology*, 53(3):643–671.
- Kristof-Brown, A. L., Zimmerman, R. D., and Johnson, E. C. (2005). Consequences of individuals' fit at work: A meta-analysis of person–job, person–organization, person–group, and person–supervisor fit. *Personnel Psychology*, 58(2):281–342.
- Kununu: Example page. ÖBB-Konzern in Wien - Job, Gehalt, Lehre [ÖBB-corporation in vienna - job, wage, apprenticeship]. <http://www.kununu.com/at/all/at/vt/oebb-konzern>. Accessed: 2013-10-05.
- Kununu: Prices. Personalmarketing und recruiting auf kununu.com [personnel marketing and recruiting at kununu.com]. <http://www.kununu.com/unternehmen>. Accessed: 2013-10-05.
- Kununu: Top Company. kununu top company – authentisches arbeitgeber gütesiegel [kununu top company - authentic employer seal of quality]. <http://www.kununu.com/unternehmen/topcompany>. Accessed: 2013-10-05.
- Lang, S., Laumer, S., Maier, C., and Eckhardt, A. (2011). Drivers, challenges and consequences of e-recruiting: A literature review. In *Proceedings of the 49th SIGMIS Annual Conference on Computer Personnel Research, SIGMIS-CPR '11*, pages 26–35, New York, NY, USA. ACM.
- Lee, I. (2005). The evolution of e-recruiting: A content analysis of fortune 100 career web sites. *Journal of Electronic Commerce in Organizations*, 3(3):57–68.
- Lee, I. (2007). An architecture for a next-generation holistic e-recruiting system. *Commun. ACM*, 50(7):81–85.
- Lueger, M. (2000). *Basics of qualitative field research: Methods, Organisation, Material Analysis (Grundlagen qualitativer Feldforschung: Methodologie, Organisation, Materialanalyse)*. WUV-Verlag, Wien.
- Mayring, P. (2010). *Qualitative Content Analysis Basics and Techniques (German: Qualitative Inhaltsanalyse Grundlagen und Techniken)*. Beltz, Weinheim, 11th ed. edition.

- Monster (a). Stellenanzeigen und stellenangebote aufgeben und online schalten [publish job inserts and job offers]. http://arbeitsgeber.monster.at/produkte/stellenanzeige.aspx?intcid=BUY_HP:JP.
- Monster (b). Lebenslaufdatenbank, mitarbeiter- & personalsuche im internet [cv database, personnel search in the internet]. <http://arbeitsgeber.monster.at/produkte/lebenslauf-datenbank.aspx>.
- Montgomery, J. D. (1991). Social networks and labor-market outcomes: Toward an economic analysis. *The American Economic Review*, 81(5):1408–1418.
- ÖWA. ÖWA - April 2013 [ÖWA (austrian advertisement analysis) - april 2013]. <http://www.oewa.at/index.php?id=16647&sort=DESC&by=visit&cat=gesamt#ea>. Accessed: 2013-10-04.
- Ravlin, E. C. and Ritchie, C. M. (2006). Perceived and actual organizational fit: Multiple influences on attitudes. *Journal of Managerial Issues*, 18(2):175–192.
- Schein, E. H. (2010). *Organizational culture and leadership*. Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, 4th edition.
- Schneider, B. (1987). The people make the place. *Personnel Psychology*, 40(3):437–453. doi:10.1111/j.1744-6570.1987.tb00609.x.
- Schneider, B., Goldstein, H. W., and Smith, D. B. (1995). The ASA framework: An update. *Personnel Psychology*, 48(4):747–773. doi:10.1111/j.1744-6570.1995.tb01780.x.
- Sekiguchi, T. (2003). *The role of person-organization fit and person-job fit in managers' hiring decisions: The effects of work status and occupational characteristics of job openings*. PhD thesis, University of Washington.
- Sekiguchi, T. (2007). A contingency perspective of the importance of pj fit and po fit in employee selection. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 22(2):118–131.
- Statistics Austria (2008). Classification database – ÖNACE 2008. <http://www.statistik.at/KDBWeb/kdb.do?FAM=WZWEIG>. Accessed: 2013-11-18.
- Statistics Austria (2010). Freiwilligenarbeit in österreich [voluntary work in austria]. http://www.statistik.at/web_de/statistiken/soziales/freiwilligenarbeit/index.html. Accessed: 2013-01-15.
- StepStone. Stellenanzeigen buchen [book job advertisements]. <https://www.stepstone.at/arbeitsgeber/stellenausschreibung/stellenanzeigen-aufgeben/>. Accessed: 2013-10-05.
- Suvankulov, F., Chi Keung Lau, M., and Ho Chi Chau, F. (2012). Job search on the internet and its outcome. *Internet Research*, 22(3):pp. 298–317.

- Taylor, R. F. (2004). Extending conceptual boundaries: Work, voluntary work and employment. *Work, Employment & Society*, 18(1):29–49.
- The Economist (2006). The battle for brainpower. http://www.economist.com/node/7961894?story_id=7961894. Accessed: 2013-05-12.
- VUT (2007). Technische Universität Wien : Code of conduct - Regeln zur Sicherung guter wissenschaftlicher Praxis, Beschluss des Rektorates vom 23. Oktober 2007 [vienna university of technology : Code of conduct - rules for ensuring good scientific practice, decision of the rectorate of 23 october 2007]. http://www.tuwien.ac.at/en/services/recht/studium_und_forschung/information_betreffend_studierende/code_of_conduct_regeln_zur_sicherung_guter_wissenschaftlicher_praxis_beschluss_des_rektorates_vom_23_oktober_2007_deutsche_fassung_englische_fassung/. Accessed: 2013-05-15.
- Weber, A. and Mahringer, H. (2008). Choice and success of job search methods. *Empirical Economics*, 35(1):153–178.
- Whatchado. whatchado - alle videostories [whatchado - all video stories]. <http://www.whatchado.net/interviews>. Accessed: 2013-10-05.
- WillHaben: Prices. <https://www.willhaben.at/jobs/#AdvertsAndRequests>:. Accessed: 2013-10-04.
- WillHaben: Special offers. <http://www.willhaben.at/jobs/#SpecialOffers>:. Accessed: 2013-10-04.
- Wolfswinkel, J., Furtmueller, E., and Wilderom, C. (2010). Reflecting on e-recruiting research using grounded theory. In *18th European Conference on Information Systems*, volume ECIS2010-0477.R1.
- Yin, R. K. (2009). *Case study research: design and methods*. Number v. 5 in Applied social research methods. Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, CA, 4th ed edition.