Portland State University

PDXScholar

Dissertations and Theses

Dissertations and Theses

Fall 11-22-2019

Recruitment Marketing: How Do Wellness and Work-Life Benefits Influence Employer Image Perceptions, Organizational Attraction, and Job Pursuit Intentions?

Amy Christine Pytlovary
Portland State University

Follow this and additional works at: https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/open_access_etds

Part of the [Industrial and Organizational Psychology Commons](#), and the [Organizational Behavior and Theory Commons](#)

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Recommended Citation

Pytlovary, Amy Christine, "Recruitment Marketing: How Do Wellness and Work-Life Benefits Influence Employer Image Perceptions, Organizational Attraction, and Job Pursuit Intentions?" (2019). *Dissertations and Theses*. Paper 5342.

<https://doi.org/10.15760/etd.7215>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations and Theses by an authorized administrator of PDXScholar. Please contact us if we can make this document more accessible: pdxscholar@pdx.edu.

Recruitment Marketing: How Do Wellness and Work-Life Benefits Influence Employer
Image Perceptions, Organizational Attraction, and Job Pursuit Intentions?

by

Amy Christine Pytlovany

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy
in
Applied Psychology

Dissertation Committee:
Donald M. Truxillo, Chair
Charlotte Fritz
Talya N. Bauer
Elizabeth D. Almer

Portland State University
2019

Abstract

A global talent shortage is motivating employers to change the way they approach recruitment. To stay competitive, business leaders are strategizing new ways to attract employees and market their organizations to prospective employees. This research examined the impact of work-life and wellness programs on employer image perceptions (instrumental, symbolic, and experiential) and recruitment outcomes (organizational attraction and job pursuit intentions). It integrated these literatures to inform evidence-based organizational decision-making.

Study materials were developed with pilot testing conducted using Amazon Mechanical Turk (MTurk). Pilot 1 ($N = 40$) assessed the value of 32 types of benefits across traditional (e.g., health insurance, retirement plans), work-life (e.g., remote work options, paid parental leave), and wellness (e.g., gym memberships, stress management resources) benefit categories to guide creation of recruitment advertisements for the three experimental conditions. In Pilot 2, instrumental (2a: $N = 193$) and symbolic (2b: $N = 225$) measures were analyzed and reduced from 33 instrumental and 42 symbolic items to 14 instrumental and 16 symbolic items. A newly developed wellness-salient identity scale was also piloted for use in the main study.

Participants in the main study were 404 undergraduate students (300- and 400-level) from Portland State University randomly assigned to one of the three experimental conditions (traditional job ad, $n = 142$; work-life job ad, $n = 130$; wellness job ad, $n = 132$). Regression analyses revealed that work-life and wellness benefits were significantly and positively related to recruitment outcomes, and that some, but not all,

employer image attributes mediated these effects. Participants who read the work-life or wellness benefits perceived the employer as having more useful benefits (instrumental), being more sophisticated and exciting (symbolic), and as treating their employees better (experiential), and consequently reported higher attraction and job pursuit intentions compared to participants who were assigned the traditional benefits advertisement. Age, gender, and perceived health were significant moderators of some relationships, suggesting that individual differences are important considerations for the design of recruitment materials.

This research enhances understanding of the effects of work-life benefits and introduces wellness benefits as important signals impacting recruitment outcomes. Further, the link between these benefits and employer image is a unique contribution to the literature and useful for practitioners wanting to compete in the current talent wars. These results provide significant guidance for organizational best practices and future research on the role of work-life and wellness programs on employer branding and recruitment strategies.

Table of Contents

Abstract.....	i
List of Tables	iv
List of Figures.....	vi
Chapter 1: Introduction.....	1
Signaling Theory	5
Employer Benefits as Predictors of Attraction and Intentions	7
Employer Image as Mediator	18
Individual Characteristics as Moderators	30
Chapter 2: Method	45
Chapter 3: Results.....	59
Chapter 4: Discussion.....	73
Tables	88
Figures	115
References	119
Appendices	
Appendix A: Pilot 1	138
Appendix B: Job Advertisements	
Appendix B1: Condition 1 - Traditional Benefits (Control)	140
Appendix B2: Condition 2 - Traditional Plus Work-life Benefits	141
Appendix B3: Condition 3 - Traditional Plus Wellness Benefits.....	142
Appendix C: Pilot 2	
Appendix C1: Instrumental Attributes Measure.....	143
Appendix C2: Symbolic Attributes Measure	145
Appendix D: Primary Survey Measures	
Appendix D1: Recruitment Outcomes	146
Appendix D2: Instrumental Attributes	147
Appendix D3: Symbolic Attributes	148
Appendix D4: Experiential Attributes.....	149
Appendix D5: Deep-level Individual Characteristics (work-life benefits)	150
Appendix D6: Deep-level Individual Characteristics (wellness benefits).....	151

List of Tables

Table 1: Overview of Employer Image Components	88
Table 2: Participant Characteristics	89
Table 3: Pilot 1 Results Rating Attractiveness of Employer Benefits and Categorized into Traditional, Work-life, and Wellness Benefit Types.....	91
Table 4: Descriptive Statistics, Scale Reliabilities, and Correlations among Study Variables	93
Table 5: Summary of Hypotheses and Results	95
Table 6: Direct Effects of Job Advertisements on Recruitment Outcomes.....	100
Table 7: Bootstrapped Results for Indirect Effects of Work-life Job Advertisement on Recruitment Outcomes	101
Table 8: Bootstrapped Results for Indirect Effects of Wellness Job Advertisement on Recruitment Outcomes	102
Table 9: Direct Effects of Job Advertisements on Employer Image Outcomes.....	103
Table 10: Interaction Effect of Job Advertisement and Gender on Recruitment Outcomes	104
Table 11: Interaction Effect of Job Advertisement and Family Stage on Recruitment Outcomes	105
Table 12: Results for a Moderated Mediation Model of Work-life Job Advertisement on Recruitment Outcomes through Instrumental Attributes Moderated by Family Stage ...	106
Table 13: Interaction Effect of Job Advertisement and Age on Job Pursuit Intentions ..	107
Table 14: Results for a Moderated Mediation Model of Work-life Job Advertisement on Recruitment Outcomes through Employer Image Moderated by Age	108
Table 15: Results for a Moderated Mediation Model of Wellness Job Advertisement on Recruitment Outcomes through Employer Image Moderated by Age	109
Table 16: Results for a Moderated Mediation Model of Work-life Job Advertisement on Recruitment Outcomes through Employer Image Moderated by Gender	110

Table 17: Results for a Moderated Mediation Model of Wellness Job Advertisement on Recruitment Outcomes through Employer Image Moderated by Gender..... 111

Table 18: Results for a Moderated Mediation Model of Wellness Job Advertisement on Recruitment Outcomes through Employer Image Moderated by Perceived Health 112

Table 19: Results for a Moderated Mediation Model of Work-life Job Advertisement on Recruitment Outcomes through Employer Image Moderated by Family-salient Identity 113

Table 20: Results for a Moderated Mediation Model of Wellness Job Advertisement on Recruitment Outcomes through Employer Image Moderated by Wellness-Salient Identity 114

List of Figures

Figure 1. Conceptual model	115
Figure 2. Significant interaction between the work-life job advertisement and age on job pursuit intentions	116
Figure 3. Significant interaction between the work-life job advertisement and gender on organizational attraction.	117
Figure 4. Significant interaction between the work-life job advertisement and gender on job pursuit intentions	118

Chapter 1: Introduction

The current recruitment environment is laden with challenges driving business leaders to strategize how best to attract and retain top candidates (Society for Human Resource Management, 2018). Across the globe, talent shortages have been steadily growing in large part due to increased hiring demand and a lack of required skills in the face of changing skills needs (ManPower Group, 2018). In a survey of CEOs in financial services, around 25% said they had to cancel or delay strategic initiatives within the past year because the right people were not available to execute them (PWC, 2012). Adding to these challenges, the U.S. is experiencing the lowest unemployment rate in nearly 50 years (Bureau of Labor and Statistics, 2019). Top in-demand roles include skilled trades, sales representatives, engineers, technicians, drivers, IT, accounting and finance, professionals, office support, and manufacturing. In the US, the list includes healthcare professionals, teachers, management/executives, and restaurant and hotel staff. Employers indicate lack of applicants is the top reason for hiring challenges (ManPower Group, 2018). This suggests organizations need to focus greater attention on the early stages of recruitment to increase attraction and encourage job seekers to apply.

A highly qualified team of employees is critical for business success, and this starts with hiring managers having the best candidates from which to choose. Business leaders are currently motivated to rethink their recruitment approaches in response to stiff competition for talent. This is resulting in more proactive strategies to increase attraction (and retention), and an increasing number of organizations recognizing the critical importance of recruitment marketing (HR.com, 2018; Theurer et al., 2018). HR.com

(2018) reports that 91% of the recruiters, talent acquisition professionals, and human resource executives they surveyed believed recruitment marketing will become increasingly more important (39%) or much more important (52%) in the future. In sum, there is a growing focus by organizational leaders to create an image of their company as one where people really want to work and to sell that image to prospective employees.

One strategy gaining traction among employers is to differentiate themselves from others through providing nontraditional employer rewards. Historically, compensation and benefits packages offered through human resources (HR) were fairly standard across organizations. These generally included salary, basic health plans (medical/dental/vision insurance), and a retirement option (e.g., 401k). Maternity leave has been granted equally by the federally mandated Family and Medical Leave Act (see <https://www.dol.gov/whd/fmla/>). Now, a growing number of companies are seeking to gain competitive advantage by offering attractive benefits they hope will set them apart from others. These benefits may include generous paid time off, paid maternity leave, and health management resources. Although there has been some research examining if benefits attract job applicants (Bourhis & Mekkaoui, 2010; Carless & Wintle, 2007; Casper & Buffardi, 2004; Casper, Wayne, & Manegold, 2015; Clifton & Shepard, 2004; Ehrhart, Mayer, & Ziegert, 2012; Honeycutt & Rosen, 1997), little research has examined how wellbeing-focused recruitment messages affect job seeker reactions. This is despite the fact that benefits focused on wellness are often cited as a way to attract the best talent (The Economist, 2014; Forbes, 2018; Society for Human Resource Management, 2018).

Objectives of the Current Study

The current study investigated how employer benefits beyond the traditional benefits package influence prospective employees' organizational attraction and job pursuit intentions toward the organization. Companies are increasingly offering benefits to help employees balance work and life roles (e.g., flextime and remote work). Another type of benefits being provided with greater frequency are wellness benefits to support employee health and wellness (e.g., onsite fitness classes and stress management). In the current study, traditional benefits are contrasted with 1) those also including work-life balance benefits and 2) those also including wellness benefits to determine if organizational strategies to attract prospective employees with nontraditional packages are empirically supported. The primary goal is to inform best practices for building a strong applicant pool through recruitment materials by determining how benefits packages influence perceptions of an organization as an employer, and ultimately job seeker *attitudes* (i.e., organizational attraction) and *intentions toward the organization* (i.e., job pursuit intentions), which have been demonstrated to be robust indicators of actual behaviors (Ajzen, 1985; Fishbein & Ajzen, 1975).

Signaling theory provides a framework to explain that job seekers, due to having limited information about a company, make inferences about a company based on the messaging received from the organization (Connelly, Certo, Ireland, & Reutzel, 2011; Rynes, 1991; Spence, 1973). The current study investigated whether nontraditional benefits packages signal information that are interpreted positively by prospective employees, thereby positively influencing organizational attraction and job pursuit intentions. The inferences made about the company were investigated to gain a better

understanding of this process. Specifically, perceptions about the organization's image as an employer, or *employer image*, were assessed as mediating mechanisms. Pulling from the brand marketing and recruiting literatures, employer image is comprised of *instrumental* (objective, tangible), *symbolic* (subjective, imagery), and *experiential* (expected treatment by the organization, expected coworker relations) *attributes* (Keller, 1993; Lievens & Highhouse, 2003).

In sum, this study aimed to identify the effects of different benefits packages (traditional, work-life, and wellness) on prospective employees' organizational attraction and job pursuit intentions. Further, this research investigated underlying mechanisms for these effects, namely, if these effects occur by influencing perceptions of the company as an employer, specifically the perceived instrumental and symbolic value and expected employee experience.

Overview

The theoretical background, empirical support, and specific hypotheses for the current study are presented throughout the remainder of this chapter. First, an overview of signaling theory (Rynes, 1991; Spence, 1974) provides a framework for hypotheses linking employer benefits to employer image, organizational attraction, and job pursuit intentions. Next, benefits packages, or employer rewards, specifically those relating to work-life balance and wellness are considered as predictors of these outcomes. Then a discussion of employer image is presented to clarify conceptual issues, outline the dimensions of employer image, and to provide theoretical and empirical background for

mediation hypotheses. Concluding this chapter, individual difference variables are introduced as potential moderators.

Chapter 2 includes a detailed account of the method, followed by results in Chapter 3. Chapter 4 closes with a discussion of expected contributions, limitations, and future directions. Supplemental materials as indicated throughout the document can be found in the Appendices.

Signaling Theory

The premise of signaling theory (Spence, 1973) is straightforward: It states that when information asymmetry exists, that is, when one party has insider information the other is lacking, then individuals rely on cues or signals from the knowledgeable party to gain information. Applied to recruitment (first credited to Rynes, 1991) it can be understood that job seekers have limited information about what it would be like to work for an employer and therefore rely on the signals organizations transmit (e.g., job ads, career websites) to make inferences about organizational characteristics. The perceptions that form about the organization can then predict attraction (e.g., Jones, Willness, & Heller, 2016; Walker et al., 2013) and intentions to pursue employment (e.g. Casper et al, 2013; Wayne & Casper, 2012). Signaling theory within a recruitment context focuses on deliberate and positive content positioned to enhance attitudes about the organization (Connelly et al., 2011). This is because organizations have control of the information being broadcast and are unlikely to put forward negative information.

Signaling theory has been widely applied as a framework examining predictors of organizational attraction. Indeed, one advantage of this theory is the broad applicability

such that just about any information can be conceptualized as a signal. Research using this framework has revealed a large range of predictors including recruiter behaviors (Turban, Forret, & Hendrickson, 1998); recruiting activities such as campus presence, recruitment materials, and recruitment process (Turban, 2001); website content and design (Chen, Lin, & Chen, 2012; Gregory, Meade, & Thompson, 2013); firm reputation (Cable & Turban, 2003; Wayne & Casper, 2012); justice perceptions (Walker et al., 2013), organizational characteristics (e.g., size; Lievens, Decaesteker, Coetsier, & Geirnaert, 2001); and organizational policies such as relating to pay, promotions, layoffs (Aiman-Smith, Bauer, & Cable, 2001), corporate social responsibility (e.g., Aiman-Smith et al., 2001; Gully, Phillips, Castellano, Han, & Kim, 2013; Jones, Willness, & Madey, 2014), diversity initiatives (Avery & McKay, 2006; Williams & Bauer, 1994), and work-family balance (Ehrhart et al., 2012; Wayne & Casper, 2012).

Although simple to understand and broadly apply, Ehrhart and Ziegert (2005) make clear the disadvantage of signaling theory is, “it lacks the depth to specifically predict which variables are the most important at particular stages of the attraction process” (p. 904). Further, assumptions are too often made about the mechanisms linking signals to attraction outcomes and researchers have been called to focus greater attention on testing proposed mediating variables (Breaugh, 2008; Celani & Singh, 2010; Ehrhart & Ziegert, 2005).

Researchers are responding to this call with more thoughtful research designs. For example, organizational prestige, perceived value fit, and expected treatment have been shown to mediate the relation between corporate social performance and organizational

attractiveness (Jones et al., 2014; Jones et al., 2016). Jones and colleagues (2016) further revealed that inferences about a positive work environment, company's financial standing, and coworker relations resulted from corporate social responsibility signals and positively influenced attraction. Another example comes from Walker and colleagues (2013) who demonstrated that experiences of justice in recruitment interactions (signals) were positively related to relational certainty, in turn having a positive effect on organizational attraction. In a different study, Wayne and Casper (2012) tested and revealed organizational prestige and anticipated organizational support explained the relation between pay, work-family reputation, and diversity reputation with job pursuit intentions.

The current study tested direct effects of nontraditional benefits on organizational attraction and job pursuit intentions and also assessed the dimensions of employer image as signal-based mechanisms explaining the link between these employer rewards and the recruitment-relevant outcomes. In other words, employer benefits are expected to signal to prospective employees about what it would be like to work for the organization, and these perceptions of employer image will be associated with enhanced attraction and intentions to pursue employment.

Employer Benefits as Predictors of Attraction and Intentions

One way companies are seeking to attract prospective employees is by providing and marketing nontraditional rewards packages (e.g., The Economist, 2014; Forbes, 2018; Society for Human Resource Management, 2018). In this section I first define the outcomes of interest for this study, namely organizational attraction and job pursuit

intentions. Next, nontraditional benefits that serve as differentiators are discussed. One approach seen with increasing frequency is provision of benefits to support work-life balance (referred to in this study as work-life benefits). Another trend in nontraditional employer rewards are benefits to support employee overall health and wellbeing (these will be called wellness benefits). Following discussion about these types of benefits, related empirical evidence that motivated this study is provided and the first two hypotheses are presented.

Outcomes of Interest

Attracting qualified job seekers and retaining them through the recruitment process is critical for organizational success and a key source of competitive advantage (Barber & Roehling, 1993; Rynes & Barber, 1990). *Organizational attraction* can be intuitively understood as a prospective employee's desire to be aligned with a particular organization, or more specifically, the company is perceived as a place they would like to work (Rynes, 1991). Aiman-Smith and colleagues (2001) formally conceptualized organizational attraction as "an attitude or expressed general positive affect toward an organization, toward viewing the organization as a desirable entity with which to initiate some relationship" (p. 221). These authors suggested organizational attraction is most relevant for the first stage of recruiting when individuals are making initial assessments about the company as an employer of interest. They recommend *job pursuit intentions* instead align with the second recruiting phase, intensive search (Barber, 1998). Indeed, job pursuit intentions focus on plans to take action. For example, requesting information from the company and actively pursuing a job with the company (Aiman-Smith et al.,

2001). These conceptualizations align with the theory of planned behavior (Ajzen, 1985) which proposes a sequence of events starting with behavioral beliefs (e.g., a belief that working for the company would provide positive value) producing an attitude toward behavior (e.g., attraction to working for the organization), which along with subjective norms and perceived control, predict behavioral intentions (e.g., job pursuit intentions), and ultimately actual behavior (e.g., job pursuit). Research results support the convergent validity of organizational attraction and job pursuit intentions as two distinct, though highly interrelated constructs (Aiman-Smith et al., 2001; Highhouse, Lievens, & Sinar, 2003).

Because prospective employees focus attention on different organizational characteristics across the recruitment process (Uggerslev, Fassina, & Kraichy, 2012), the current study includes both organizational attraction and job pursuit intentions. The results elucidate if organizational strategies using nontraditional benefits packages are more effective than traditional strategies for influencing job seeker attraction and job pursuit intentions.

What Are Companies Doing to Differentiate Themselves through Recruitment?

Work-life benefits. One strategy companies are using to differentiate themselves from competitors for talent is to offer benefits that help employees create and sustain work-life balance. For example, an increasing number of companies are offering employees the flexibility to get work done when and where they want with occasional or full-time remote work and flexible hours. The Society for Human Resource Management (SHRM; 2018) reports U.S. companies now offering some type of telecommuting option

is up 11% since 2014. However, most companies implement these options on a limited case-by-case basis and fully implemented telecommuting benefits are provided by only 37% of companies for part-time telecommuting and 23% of companies for full-time telecommuting. SHRM also reports more companies in the U.S. are starting to offer parental leave options above and beyond the 12 weeks allocated with FMLA. Examples include paid maternity (35% of companies) and paternity leave (29% of companies), and also paid leave for adoptive parents, those fostering children, and for surrogacy.

Additional support for parents includes increased availability of lactation rooms and lactation support services, as well as adoption and foster care assistance. Further, the number of companies offering creative solutions to help parents return to work (i.e., on-ramping programs) has increased 10% over the last five years. Elder care support has also increased in the past five years, with the most common support being referral services (e.g., professional support for narrowing down choices for senior housing and care). Organizations are also now beginning to provide spousal benefits beyond basic health care coverage (Society for Human Resource Management, 2018). A review of online career pages show companies are advertising generous allowances for paid time off (PTO) with some even advertising unlimited PTO (e.g., Netflix) and paid sabbaticals (e.g., Patagonia). Indeed, the *2018 Employee Benefits* report (Society for Human Resource Management, 2018) indicates a 4% increase of unlimited PTO being offered over the past five years, as well as more companies providing paid bereavement leave and paid time off for volunteering or serving on the board of a community group or professional association. Although these types of rewards are being offered with

increasing frequency, it is important to note that the percentages are still low overall and therefore providing work-life benefits can still be a discriminating HR strategy.

Wellness benefits. A second category of benefits relates to employee wellness, with a growing number of companies striving to support employee health and wellbeing. According to the *2018 Employee Benefits* report (Society for Human Resource Management, 2018), 62% of employers now offer wellness programs of some sort. However, “wellness programs” were not defined, and it is important to note that the only wellness activities reported by over half of respondents were providing resources and information at least quarterly or seasonal flu vaccinations. Other less frequently offered benefits include onsite gyms and fitness classes (or paid gym memberships), company-organized fitness challenges, onsite health services such as screenings, and massage therapy. Additional wellness offerings may include making healthy food options available (e.g., cafeterias, break rooms, onsite farmers markets), disease management resources and health coaching, nutritional counseling, weight loss programs, stress management tools, and workshops on mindfulness (Bauer, Erdogan, Caughlin, & Truxillo, 2019; Society for Human Resource Management, 2018). Attention to financial health is also growing, with a 20% increase of financial advice services benefits in the past five years, and 15% of companies now offering loans to employees for emergency/disaster assistance (Society for Human Resource Management, 2018). It should be noted that although wellness benefits are being offered with increasing frequency, the number of companies offering some, or all of these benefits remains quite low and thus these still serve as potential important differentiators. For example, although

60% of companies offer flu vaccinations, only 30% offer health screenings. Less than 30% offer onsite fitness center, classes, or gym membership subsidies. Stress management programs have increased 9% since 2014 but the total number of companies who report offering these is still quite low at 12% (Society for Human Resource Management, 2018).

Organizational motivations. Empirical evidence demonstrates that negative individual and organizational outcomes result when work and nonwork roles are in conflict. Meta-analytic results (Amstad, Meier, Fasel, Elfering, & Semmer, 2011) show work-family conflict is related to burnout and exhaustion, work-related stress, stress in general, psychological strain, reduced commitment, lower performance, increased turnover, and reduction of organizational citizenship behaviors. When family roles interfere with work roles individuals experience higher work stress, stress in general, burnout, and health problems. Family interfering with work is also associated with reduced marital satisfaction and organizational citizenship behaviors (Amstad et al., 2011).

Research also links work with employee wellbeing, and reciprocally employee wellbeing to important business outcomes. For example, job-related factors are linked to cardiovascular disease (Landsbergis et al., 2011), burnout, stress, negative emotional states, (Robbins, Ford, & Tetrick, 2012) and impaired mental health (Hershcovis & Barling, 2010; Robbins et al., 2012). Employee illnesses cost organizations hundreds of billions of dollars each year in health care costs and lost productivity largely due to absenteeism and reduced performance resulting from working while sick, or presenteeism

(Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2016; Collins et al., 2005; Mitchell & Bates, 2011).

Clearly organizations and individuals stand to benefit in a myriad of ways when employers support employee work-life balance and wellbeing. Organizational motivations for implementing work-life and wellness programs are likely to include goals for maximizing performance and reducing costs. Organizations may also be motivated by an altruistic concern for workers, and a desire to be seen as a company that cares. Attracting prospective employees is an additional motivation. Meta-analysis supports claims that traditional compensation packages positively influence organizational attraction. Reported effects of general compensation and benefits range from $r_c = .29$ (total compensation including pay/salary and benefits) as a predictor of an aggregated measure of organizational attraction (attraction, job pursuit intentions, and acceptance intentions; Uggerslev et al., 2012) to $\rho = .27$ as a predictor of job/organizational attraction and $\rho = .14$ as a predictor of job pursuit intentions (Chapman, Uggerslev, Carroll, Piasentin, & Jones, 2005). Assumptions abound that work-life and wellness benefits enhance recruitment efforts (The Economist, 2014; Forbes, 2018; SHRM, 2018), but what do we really know about how nontraditional benefits attract prospective employees?

Empirical Evidence

Work-life benefits and recruitment. Research examining the influence of work-life benefits on organizational attraction and job pursuit intentions is limited. In their 2012 meta-analysis assessing predictors of organizational attraction (operationalized as an aggregation of attraction, job pursuit intentions, and acceptance intentions), Uggerslev

and colleagues (2012) were only able to identify five “flextime/work-life balance” studies for inclusion. They reported an effect $r_c = .12$ for flextime/work-life balance as a predictor of organizational attraction (same aggregation of attraction, job pursuit intentions, and acceptance intentions). Flextime, or the ability to work flexible working hours, has been shown to positively influence the quantity and quality of an applicant pool (Clifton & Shepard, 2004), and schedule flexibility has also been linked to increased attraction (Bourhis & Mekkaoui, 2010) and job pursuit intentions (Casper & Buffardi, 2004).

Bourhis and Mekkaoui (2010) also looked at other work-life benefits and reported generous personal leaves, on-site childcare, and telework were positively associated with organizational attraction. Additional research examining the influence of individual values have found prospective employees who were family oriented expressed greater attraction to an organization with flextime (Honeycutt & Rosen, 1997) and work-family policies (Casper et al., 2015).

Research with a more targeted, empirical approach also suggests a positive impact of work-life balance programs on organizational attraction and job pursuit intentions, particularly among younger populations. Organizations offering flexible career paths were more attractive to potential applicants younger than 30 years of age (Carless & Wintle, 2007), and Ehrhart and colleagues (2012) demonstrated an increase of organizational attraction with a Millennial sample (participants born between 1978 and 1987) when company websites contained information about work-life balance policies. In another young sample (average age of 20), Wayne and Casper (2012) reported college

students perceived organizations with a strong work-family reputation would be more prestigious and supportive, and would enable better work performance. Work-family reputation was directly, and indirectly through these perceptions, positively related to job pursuit intentions.

Some other research has merely assessed manager and incumbent opinions about the effectiveness of strategies such as reduced workload (Kossek & Lee, 2005; Lee, MacDonald, Williams, Buck, & Leiba-O'Sullivan, 2002) and flexible working hours (Evans, 2012) to improve recruitment. These studies revealed positive attitudes, with Lee and colleagues (2002) reporting 76% of senior managers believe a reduced workload benefit recruitment efforts, and nursing educators listing flexible working hours as a top five attraction factor (Evans, 2012).

In sum, research supports the proposition that work-life benefits aid recruitment efforts. However, the empirical evidence is largely focused on flexible work and is limited overall. Additional studies are needed to provide a more comprehensive understanding about how work-life benefits influence organizational attraction and job pursuit intentions.

This literature, though limited, suggests work-life benefits will be positively related to job seeker attitudes and intentions toward working for the company. Guided by the existing research and signaling theory (Rynes, 1991; Spence, 1973), the current study investigated the differentiating effect of comprehensive work-life benefits on organizational attraction and job pursuit intentions within a multigenerational sample.

Hypothesis 1: Participants in a work-life benefits recruitment condition (i.e., traditional benefits plus benefits such as unlimited PTO and paid parental leave)

will report greater a) organizational attraction and b) job pursuit intentions than those in a traditional benefits condition (i.e., standard salary, health insurance, and retirement package).

Wellness benefits and recruitment. Evidence supporting claims that wellbeing programs attract prospective employees is almost exclusively anecdotal. One related study (Catano & Hines, 2016) looked at attraction outcomes based on recruitment materials that advertised companies as a “psychologically healthy workplace” (PHW) and/or as focused on corporate social responsibility (CSR). Developed from the American Psychological Association (APA) definition of a PHW, the advertisement focused on marketing practices relating to employee growth and development, work-life balance, health and safety, employee recognition, and employee involvement. They defined and operationalized CSR policies as “those that show concern for the environment, promote community relations, improve employee relations, and improve diversity and benefits” (p. 143). These authors reported that perceptions of an organization as a “good workplace” were not significantly influenced by PHW alone, but that the combination of PHW and CSR resulted in significantly more positive attitudes about the organization as a good place to work. In another related study, employer benefits “beyond those required by law” were positively related to job pursuit intentions in a Mexican sample (Garcia, Posthuma, & Quiñones, 2010). The benefits included in this study: a grocery coupon, cafeteria benefit, attendance bonus, and punctuality bonus, are quite different from the types of benefits included in this study as differentiators. Moreover, the recruitment outcomes measured in both of these studies were limited to attraction, and there was no examination of the underlying mechanisms.

Perceptions of a strong link between wellness benefits and recruitment efforts persist despite a lack of empirical evidence supporting these claims. Examples can be seen in the popular media and across industry reporting. Recently *Forbes* (2018) posted an article titled “Win with wellness: Attract and retain talent,” and cited “87% of employees consider health and wellness packages when choosing an employer.” A different survey reported 70% of senior executives knowledgeable about their company’s wellness programs ($N = 255$) considered these to be cost effective despite only 31% having used rigorous evaluation methods. More than half indicated implementation of wellness programs produced intangible benefits for the organization, including aiding recruitment by positioning the company as an “employer of choice” (The Economist, 2014). Further, SHRM report in their *2018 Employee Benefits* survey results that over one-third of organizations reported increasing benefits offerings within the last year. Of these, 44% increased wellness benefits, specifically, and 51% reported increasing other health-related benefits. Attracting new talent was listed as a motivation by 58% of respondents.

Employers forge ahead making strategic decisions about the attraction value of wellness programs without empirical support. The current study addresses this gap, aiming to stimulate future research and to provide a source for evidence-based decision-making about recruitment strategy. The second hypothesis is grounded in signaling theory (Rynes, 1991; Spence, 1973), which would suggest that marketing of wellness benefits in a recruitment advertisement provides prospective employees with information to inform attitudes and intentions toward the organization. It is further guided by

practitioner anecdotal evidence indicating job seekers will have a positive response to wellness benefits information.

Hypothesis 2: Participants in a wellness benefits condition (i.e., traditional benefits plus benefits such as stress management resources and nutritional coaching) will report greater a) organizational attraction and b) job pursuit intentions than those in the traditional benefits condition (i.e., standard salary, health insurance, and retirement package).

Employer Image as Mediator

A critique of research using signaling theory is that little is known about the underlying processes involved (Ehrhart & Ziegert, 2005) and that these processes are too often simply assumed to exist rather than actually tested (Breugh, 2008; Celani & Singh, 2010). To provide a more comprehensive understanding of how benefits influence job seeker attitudes and intentions, the current study investigated employer image components as mediating mechanisms. Employer image is first defined to provide conceptual clarity. Then, the theoretical background including specification of employer image dimensions (instrumental, symbolic, and experiential attributes) is discussed. Empirical evidence guiding the use of employer image attributes in this study is presented along with formal mediation hypotheses. See Figure 1 for a visual representation of the conceptual model.

Defining Employer Image

Employer image has been studied across multiple disciplines leading to varied conceptual and empirical approaches to studying this phenomenon, and resulting in a muddled literature with much construct confusion. Terms such as “employer reputation,” “organizational image,” “employer knowledge,” “employer familiarity,” and even

“organizational attractiveness” have been used inconsistently with similar concepts given different labels and different concepts given the same label (Cable & Turban, 2001; Theurer et al., 2018).

Lievens and Slaughter (2016) provide clarification by defining employer image in their recent review. According to these authors, *employer image* is a mental representation held by individuals. It is generally transient and malleable, very specific in its focus on “image as an employer,” and a cognitive evaluation (versus affective). With this clarification, employer image differs from *employer reputation*, which is conceptualized as an enduring and stable (in contrast to transient and malleable), collective (as opposed to individual) perception.

Other construct confusion results from referencing employer image in terms of higher order constructs such as organizational image or employer knowledge. *Organizational image* results from impressions collected across multiple groups including stakeholders, consumers, the community, as well as employees and potential employees. Thus employer image, or perceptions from a job seeker about what the company is like as an employer, is just one factor. Other dimensions have been identified as financial image, corporate social responsibility image, and brand image (Jones & Willness, 2013; Lievens & Slaughter, 2016). *Employer knowledge* is also a higher order construct comprised of multiple factors for which employer image is just one. Other components include *employer familiarity* (i.e., brand awareness, name recognition) and employer reputation (Cable & Turban, 2001; Theurer et al., 2018).

Some researchers have likened employer image to an affective *organizational attraction* construct, but from an elementalistic (rather than holistic) perspective, employer image perceptions are cognitive evaluations. Viewing the constructs (organizational attraction and employer image) as distinct provides an opportunity to better understand the process of how attraction responses develop (as tested in previous research, e.g., Jones et al., 2014; Wayne & Casper, 2012; and tested in the current study).

Finally, one construct that does align throughout the literature with employer image is *employer brand*. Employer image reflects brand associations and therefore it may be appropriate to use these interchangeably (Theurer et al., 2018).

Theoretical Background of Employer Image

Since 2003 the instrumental-symbolic framework has come to comprise the factors of employer image and has widely been applied to explain organizational attraction within a recruitment context (Theurer et al., 2018). This framework originated from the brand marketing literature and was heavily influenced by a seminal article written a decade prior (Keller, 1993).

Keller (1993) defined brand image as “perceptions about a brand as reflected by the brand associations held in consumer memory” (p. 3). She listed three major categories of brand associations including product attributes, brand attributes, and benefits to consumer. Benefits to the consumer were further categorized into those that provided functional, symbolic, or experiential value. For example, a consumer may be interested in buying a car to drive them from point A to point B and are likely to consider price tier and safety ratings associated with particular brands (function). Additionally, consumers

will consider the personal image (symbolism) conveyed by driving a particular brand (e.g., Prius versus an Escalade). Finally, the experience of driving a particular car will influence perceptions about that brand (e.g., cloth or leather upholstery, trim materials, electronic components).

Lievens and Highhouse (2003) applied marketing concepts of brand image to conceptualize employer image. These authors retained instrumental and symbolic attributes as employer image factors able to explain organizational attraction. Applied within a recruitment context, *instrumental attributes* are objective, tangible, functional characteristics of a job or organization such as pay and benefits, job security, location, advancement opportunities, task demands, task diversity, and working conditions (Lievens & Highhouse, 2003; Lievens, Van Hove, & Schreurs, 2005; Van Hove et al., 2014). These characteristics attract prospective employees because of their utilitarian value.

Symbolic attributes are inferences that are subjective and drawn from intangible imagery information. Symbolic attributes are generally comprised of five dimensions with some slight variations in categorization. Most research on symbolic attributes traces back to a measure created by Aaker (1997) to assess dimensions of brand personality. Aaker identified five dimensions and called them “sincerity,” “excitement,” “competence,” “sophistication,” and “ruggedness.” Lievens and Highhouse (2003) used a slightly adapted version of this measure and labeled dimensions similarly as “sincerity,” “innovativeness,” “competence,” “prestige,” and “robustness.” Because Aaker’s (1997) scale is frequently the starting point for most measures, the various scales tend to overlap.

For example, items frequently indicate perceptions that an organization is wholesome and honest (sincerity/trustworthiness); daring and imaginative (excitement/innovativeness); and successful and intelligent (competence). Sophistication (from Aaker, 1997) and prestige (Lievens & Highhouse, 2003) factors contain the same, or similar adjectives. The same is true for ruggedness (Aaker, 1997) and robustness (Lievens & Highhouse, 2003) dimensions.

The *experiential* component of brand image was omitted from the Lievens and Highhouse (2003) framework. This omission leads to an incomplete understanding about how prospective employees perceive organizations “as employers.” Indeed, in their employer image review, Lievens and Slaughter (2016) call for its inclusion in future research. Experiential attributes refer to what it feels like to work for an organization (adapted from Keller, 1993) and are particularly relevant with a growing focus by organizations on creating positive “employee experiences” to engage, retain, and attract top talent. Employee experience is comprised of three primary work experience components: culture, technology, and physical workspace. Experiential attributes in this study tap into the cultural component, specifically two categories of employee experience that are linked to organizational attraction and job pursuit intentions: expected treatment by the organization and expected relationships with coworkers (e.g., Uggerslev et al., 2012). Table 1 provides an overview of employer image components.

Empirical Support and Mediation Hypotheses

Instrumental and symbolic attributes. The instrumental-symbolic framework (Lievens & Highhouse, 2003) has been tested across a wide variety of industries (e.g.,

banks, Army), cultures (e.g., Belgian, Turkish, American), and job seeker status.

Research has supported an instrumental attributes effect on organizational attraction. For example, travel opportunities (Lievens, 2007), task diversity (Lievens, 2007; Lievens et al., 2005), and job security (Lievens, Van Hoyer, & Anseel, 2007) were related to attraction for joining the Belgian Army. Further, symbolic attributes consistently explain incremental variance over instrumental attributes for predicting attraction (although instrumental attributes explain a larger proportion; e.g., Lievens, 2007; Lievens & Highhouse, 2003; Slaughter & Greguras, 2009). Innovativeness and competence were related to attraction for banks in a student and employee sample. Overall, symbolic attributes explained an additional 8.9% variance over instrumental attributes (Lievens & Highhouse, 2003). A significant relation between symbolic attributes with job pursuit intentions has also been seen. Slaughter, Zickar, Highhouse, and Mohr (2004) reported that (symbolic) organizational personality attributes “boy scout,” “innovativeness,” “thrift,” and “style” were significantly associated with attraction and job pursuit intentions among college students, explaining 32% and 29% of the variance, respectively. In a separate study by these authors, an organization’s “dominance” rated by one sample was related to attraction ($p < .10$) and intentions ($p < .05$) of a second sample (Slaughter et al., 2004).

Research conducted by Lievens and colleagues with the Belgian Army reveal instrumental and symbolic attributes related to organizational attraction for potential applicants (Lievens, 2007; Lievens et al., 2005; Van Hoyer & Saks, 2011) and actual applicants (Lievens, 2007; Lievens et al., 2007). In these studies, instrumental attributes

accounted for 22% to 43% of variance in attraction, with symbolic attributes explaining 5 to 10% incremental variance. Additionally, Schreurs, Druart, Proost, and De Witte (2009) reported symbolic traits explained 14% incremental variance over individual personality traits and controls. It is important to note that the significant factors of each attribute slightly varied across samples. For example, social activities consistently related to attraction for joining the Army (Lievens, 2007; Lievens et al., 2005; Lievens et al., 2007; Van Hove & Saks, 2011), but advancement opportunities were only significant in one study (Van Hove & Saks, 2011).

Other research has focused on sampling potential applicants from colleges and universities. In the United States, instrumental attributes explained 25% to 32% variance in organizational attraction, with symbolic explaining an additional 6% to 12% (Kausel & Slaughter, 2011; Lievens & Highhouse, 2003; Slaughter & Greguras, 2009). In a Turkish sample the results were lower with 7% explained variance in attraction resulting from instrumental attributes and 6% incremental variance from symbolic traits (Van Hove, Bas, Cromheecke, & Lievens, 2013). Discriminant function analysis indicated symbolic attributes, namely prestige and innovativeness provided the most differentiation in attraction among banks (Lievens & Highhouse, 2003). In a different study, sincerity and innovativeness were best at differentiating attraction between “Most Admired Companies in Turkey” (Van Hove et al., 2013).

These data indicate that perceptions about the instrumental and symbolic value of an organization predict attraction and intentions toward working for an organization. Work-life benefits such as flextime and paid parental leave provide tangible, instrumental

value for employees. Therefore, it seems likely that work-life benefits marketed in recruitment advertisements signal (Rynes, 1991; Spence, 1973) to prospective employees that an employer provides valuable instrumental attributes, and that the information about attributes in turn is positively related to organizational attraction and job pursuit intentions (Lievens & Highhouse, 2003).

Hypothesis 3: Perceived instrumental attributes will mediate the effects of work-life benefits recruitment information on a) organizational attraction and b) job pursuit intentions.

Similarly, wellness benefits including healthy lifestyle support, onsite medical care, and massage therapy are objective, tangible benefits likely to be desired by prospective employees. Wellness benefits listed on a recruiting advertisement provide information for job seekers to help them have a better understanding about the organization as an employer (Rynes, 1991; Spence, 1973). Knowledge of these instrumental benefits provided by the employer should be positively related to attraction and intentions (Lievens & Highhouse, 2003).

Hypothesis 4: Perceived instrumental attributes will mediate the effects of wellness benefits recruitment information on a) organizational attraction and b) job pursuit intentions.

Symbolic inferences are a subjective assessment about an organization that have been shown to serve as differentiators among various competing organizations (Lievens & Highhouse, 2003; Van Hove et al., 2013). This study proposes work-life benefits provide information that helps prospective employees discriminate between organizations such that work-life benefits marketed in recruitment materials inform job seekers about organizational values (Rynes, 1991; Spence, 1973), such as being family-friendly. The

inferences drawn from this signal should explain a positive relation between work-life benefits with attraction and job pursuit intentions (e.g., Lievens & Highhouse, 2003; Slaughter et al., 2004; Uggerslev et al., 2012).

Hypothesis 5: Perceived symbolic attributes will mediate the effects of work-life benefits recruitment information on a) organizational attraction and b) job pursuit intentions.

Wellness benefits, like work-life benefits will provide a type of differentiating information that signal (Rynes, 1991; Spence, 1973) to job seekers about organizational characteristics that can be expected including symbolic imagery and “personality” traits about the employer (Lievens & Highhouse, 2003; Slaughter et al., 2004). For example, wellness benefits may direct job seekers to infer the organization is innovative or competent because these types of employer rewards are often associated with hip, successful tech companies such as Apple, Google, or Facebook. Anecdotal evidence (e.g., The Economist, 2014) suggesting employees are attracted to wellness benefits, as well as empirical evidence linking organizational traits such as innovativeness to organizational attraction, suggest wellness benefits will be positively related to symbolic attributes that in turn will enhance organizational attraction and increase job pursuit intentions.

Hypothesis 6: Perceived symbolic attributes will mediate the effects of wellness benefits recruitment information on a) organizational attraction and b) job pursuit intentions.

Experiential attributes. In addition to perceived instrumental and symbolic attributes, I propose to examine the role of experiential attributes in explaining the effects of recruitment information on attraction and job pursuit intentions.

Expected treatment by the organization. Job seekers have limited information about what it would be like to work for an organization and this is particularly true in the first phases of the recruiting process (Barber, 1998). They glean whatever they can from the sources available to them such as recruitment advertisements, career webpages, and employer reputation. Individuals want to work for companies that value caring for and helping others (Grant, Dutton, & Rosso, 2008; Ravlin & Meglino, 1989) and desire to be treated well (Hom, Griffeth, Palich, & Bracker, 1999). When organizations promote information signaling care and concern for others, then prospective employees infer they will be positively treated, and in turn will more positive attitudes and intentions toward the organization. This is not a new claim (e.g., Grover & Crocker, 1995; Morgan & Tucker, 1991) but has only recently been fully tested and supported empirically. For example, Jones and colleagues (2014) demonstrated corporate social performance policies predicted organizational attraction through a positive effect on perceptions of expected treatment. Additionally, dependent care assistance and schedule flexibility policies were positively associated with anticipated organizational support and ultimately job pursuit intentions in a study by Casper and Buffardi (2004). Wayne and Casper (2014) replicated this with work-family reputation as the independent variable in place of the family-friendly policies.

Similar to these studies, work-life and wellness benefits are likely to signal (Rynes 1991, Spence, 1973) to job seekers that the organization values their employees as people with life priorities beyond work, and not just labor to be exploited. Job seekers may infer the employer provides a positive work culture supportive of balancing work

and nonwork roles as well as maintaining a healthy lifestyle. In other words, that employees are treated well by the organization. Perceptions of a positive work experience, an experiential attribute, will then be associated with increased organizational attraction and job pursuit intentions.

Hypothesis 7: Anticipated experiential attributes, operationalized as expected treatment, will mediate the effects of work-life benefits recruitment information on a) organizational attraction and b) job pursuit intentions.

Hypothesis 8: Anticipated experiential attributes, operationalized as expected treatment, will mediate the effects of wellness benefits recruitment information on a) organizational attraction and b) job pursuit intentions.

Expected coworker relations. Interpersonal relationships with coworkers are an important aspect of work. This has been demonstrated with multiple meta-analytic investigations. For example, social support and group cohesion positively influence numerous important work attitudes and behaviors including job satisfaction, job involvement, and commitment. Consequently, coworker relations through these mechanisms are predictive of withdrawal cognitions and behaviors such as turnover intentions and actual turnover (Kinicki, McKee-Ryan, Schriesheim, & Carson, 2002; Meyer, Stanley, Herscovitch, & Topolnytsky, 2002; Schleicher, Hansen, & Fox, 2011). On the dark side, interpersonal mistreatment at work by coworkers is also meta-analytically linked to important work outcomes including decreased job satisfaction and affective commitment and increased turnover intentions, and deviance (Hershcovis & Barling, 2010). This link between interpersonal relationships at work and work outcomes indicates it may also be possible that expectations about relationships with coworkers

inferred during the recruitment process will influence recruitment outcomes such as organizational attraction and job pursuit intentions.

Recruitment research examining the effects of anticipated coworker relationships is limited. Most of the research considering the effect of coworkers is focused on later stages of the recruitment process. For example, it has been shown that individuals will hold more positive attitudes and intentions toward the organization when site visit hosts are likeable. This may be due to expectations about having this person as a coworker (Turban et al., 1995). Additionally, other organizational representatives can influence attraction. Carless and Imber (2007) found interviewers signal expectations about organizational characteristics such as coworker warmth and friendliness that predicted attraction and pursuit intentions (aggregated). In another study, perceived similarity to coworkers increased attraction to the organization (Devendorf & Highhouse, 2010)

As presented earlier, work-life and wellness benefits may signal (Rynes, 1991; Spence, 1973) to prospective employees about the organizational culture and how employees are treated by the organization. Individuals may make deduce that an organization with a supportive and healthy culture also promotes a positive interpersonal work climate. From the literature about coworker relationships with commitment and turnover (Hershcovis & Barling, 2010; Kinicki et al., 2002; Meyer et al., 2002; Schleicher et al., 2011), as well as research about coworkers and attraction (Carless & Imber, 2007; Devendorf & Highhouse, 2010; Turban et al., 1995), it can be presumed that expectations about coworker relationships (an experiential attribute) will be positively related to job seeker attitudes and behavioral intentions.

Hypothesis 9: Anticipated experiential attributes, operationalized as coworker relations, will mediate the effects of work-life benefits recruitment information on a) organizational attraction and b) job pursuit intentions.

Hypothesis 10: Anticipated experiential attributes, operationalized as coworker relations, will mediate the effects of wellness benefits recruitment information on a) organizational attraction and b) job pursuit intentions.

Individual Characteristics as Moderators

Attraction research is overwhelmingly focused on organizational characteristics, however individual differences can play an important role and must be taken into consideration (Breugh, 2013). Breugh (2013) explains the individual difference hypothesis as “different recruitment methods bring a job opening to the attention of individuals who systematically vary on personal attributes that are linked to recruitment outcomes” (p. 397). In other words, individual differences can have a critical impact on who ultimately applies for job openings. Examination of individual characteristics is necessary to fully understand the impact of organizational characteristics on recruitment outcomes.

An understanding of how individual and organizational characteristics influence the recruitment process is critical for developing effective recruitment strategies. For example, this information is necessary if organizational goals indicate the need for targeted recruitment strategies aimed at hiring particular segments of the labor force. One situation is if a company focusing on gender equity wants to increase the proportion of women in their organization, or for particular roles. Another example includes targeting workers of different age groups. The Millennial generation (those born in the 1980s and 1990s) is the largest generational cohort in the U.S. labor force and comprises the largest

proportion of job seekers – 56 million as of 2017 (Pew Research Center, 2018).

Consequently, they are a coveted group for recruitment targeting. Accordingly, companies may strive to tap into the growing population of older workers looking for a job, a segment that has doubled since 2007 (AARP, 2014). Conversely, companies wanting to take a more generalized recruitment approach will want to understand how individual and organizational characteristics influence recruitment outcomes to make sure advertisements do not unintentionally result in a biased applicant pool.

Individual characteristics such as demographics, background, experiences, and historical differences in the workplace are believed to influence responses to recruitment materials (Volpone, Thomas, Sinisterra, & Johnson, 2013). However, which differences matter, and the extent of these, is still not fully understood. In several studies including a meta-analysis, results indicate that surface-level traits (e.g., age, race, gender) have little to no effect on attraction outcomes (Casper et al., 2013; Swider, Zimmerman, Charlier, & Pierotti, 2015), but looking deeper at qualities such as personality (e.g., extraversion and conscientiousness), ability (Swider et al., 2015) or personal values (e.g., family, work, and diversity values; Casper et al., 2013) can illuminate how individual differences impact attraction.

To enhance understanding of the phenomena examined in the current study, surface-level and deep-level individual characteristics were examined as potential moderators of the direct and indirect relations between employer benefits packages with organizational attraction and job pursuit intentions. Surface-level variables include age and gender. Digging deeper, this research investigated if family stage (e.g., unmarried,

children at home, empty nest) or family-identity salience resulted in variations of attraction and intentions when work-life benefits are included in recruitment materials. This was explored directly and indirectly (via employer image components) with moderated mediation analyses. Additionally, perceived health and a personal identity associated with health and wellbeing, or “wellness-salient identity,” a new contribution to the literature, were investigated to determine if these resulted in different direct or indirect effects on attraction and intentions when wellness benefits were presented in a job advertisement.

Surface-level Individual Characteristics

Age. Work motivations may vary across the lifespan (Kanfer, Beier, & Ackerman, 2013; Kooij, De Lange, Jansen, Kanfer, & Dikkers, 2011), but research has not supported suggestions that organizational attraction varies across age groups (Almıaçık & Almıaçık, 2012; Casper et al., 2013; Swider et al., 2015). This section provides empirical background for moderator hypotheses and research questions relating to differential effects across ages.

Age and work-life benefits. A quick Google search makes it clear that employers and the popular press believe work-life balance is a key priority for attracting and retaining Millennial employees (e.g., “This Is Why Millennials Care so Much About Work-Life Balance”, Inc.com, n.d.). Indeed, studies have shown that many in this generation value a fulfilling personal life over salary (Eisner, 2005), and a PWC survey (2012) of Millennials in the financial sector revealed flexible work arrangements as one of the top five attraction factors. However, older workers also value benefits that help

them balance work and personal life. A study conducted by AARP and SHRM (2012) reported 80% of respondents, aged 50 and older, indicated paid time off was very important when considering staying a job or accepting a job offer. Further, 62% of workers thought it was very or somewhat important that employers offer flex time. A compressed workweek (52%), telecommuting arrangements (44%), and job sharing (33%) were also seen as important. Supporting the AARP and SHRM survey results, Rau and Adams (2005) reported schedule flexibility was significantly related to attraction of older workers.

Research also suggests that work-family conflict is not a phenomenon uniquely experienced by particular age groups (e.g., Allen & Finkelstein, 2014; Darcy, McCarthy, Hill, & Grady, 2012; Ng & Feldman, 2010), but that other factors such as life stages, life priorities, and family demands (Allen & Finkelstein, 2014) may also be important. Based on these data, age is not expected to moderate the effects of work-life benefits

Age and wellness benefits. A study by the American Institute of Preventive Medicine (2016) suggests all ages are likely to be interested in wellness benefits, although preference for particular wellness activities may differ by age. They report older age is associated with greater interest in health risk assessments, disease prevention, and onsite workshops. Younger individuals preferred weight-loss programs, fitness apps, and onsite exercise classes. Advertising a comprehensive wellness benefits package may attract different age groups with different elements but could still have an overall equal effect on attraction and job pursuit intentions. I was not able to identify any studies specifically assessing the impact of wellness benefits on attraction, and also did not find

reports of participation rates in wellbeing interventions according to age. Without stronger evidence to formalize a hypothesis, effects of wellness benefits were examined as a research question in this study.

Age, benefit packages, employer image, and recruitment outcomes. Little is known about how benefit packages presented in job advertisements influence perceptions of employer image. It is possible that members of different age groups respond uniquely to recruitment materials based on age-related characteristics such as life experiences and historical workplace differences (Volpone et al., 2013). Consequently, job seekers of different ages may vary in their perceptions and responses to recruitment materials presenting work-life or wellness benefits.

Research conducted by Soulez and Guillot-Soulez (2011) suggests younger workers (20 to 26 years old) may be more attracted by symbolic attributes over instrumental attributes. However, this study was limited in that it only sampled from one generational group and did not operationalize experiential attributes. Further the measurement of symbolic attributes included employer reputation, workplace atmosphere, and type of work. These are not commonly used for assessing this construct and arguably a questionable operationalization.

There is a lack of robust empirical guidance indicating whether age will have a moderating effect. Yet work-related stereotypes about age differences persist and influence organizational decision-making (e.g., Bal, Reiss, Rudolph, & Baltes, 2011). Age was examined as an individual difference moderator to contribute to an empirical understanding of age differences within a work context.

Research Question 1: Will the direct effect of work-life or wellness benefits on recruitment outcomes, or indirect effects via employer image components, vary by age?

Gender. Gender differences are assumed to permeate the workplace but more research is needed to fully understand if, when, and how gender influences recruitment-related processes.

Gender and work-life benefits. One set of assumptions, and the associated social expectations, revolve around gendered work and family roles. These have implications for how family life differently impacts men and women's experience at work (Greenhaus & Kossek, 2014), yet empirical research is not able to clearly convey if conflict between work and home varies by gender. In general, findings indicate men and women experience similar levels of work-family conflict (WFC), with some exceptions. For example, a meta-analysis examining antecedents of work-to-family and family-to-work conflict revealed gender differences in only two of 20 tests. The relationship between role ambiguity and job autonomy with WFC was stronger for males (Michel, Kotrba, Mitchelson, Clark, & Baltes, 2011). A more recent meta-analysis also showed similar levels of WFC across gender with a few exceptions that had small effects (Shockley, Shen, DeNunzio, & Arvan, 2017). Allen and Finkelstein (2014) reported differences between men and women depending on family life stage. That is, men experienced more work interference with family when a teenager lived at home, and women experienced more family interference with work in general.

Similar inconsistencies are reported when looking at gender and attraction. Alniaçık, and Alniaçık (2012) found men and women placed different importance on

employer attractiveness components (social value, market value, appreciation value, and cooperation value). Another study revealed gender differences in job pursuit intentions according to an organization being depicted as supportive or competitive (Catanzaro, Moore, & Marshall, 2010). A meta-analysis examining gender as a moderator of recruitment predictors on attraction, job pursuit intentions, and job choice concluded gender was a factor in 2 of 11 analyses. Women assigned more weight to job characteristics (e.g., pay) than men, and less weight to perceptions of fairness (Chapman et al., 2005). Other research investigating gender in relation to attraction outcomes have revealed no significance (Carless & Wintle, 2007; Casper & Buffardi, 2004; Casper et al., 2013; Swider et al., 2015). A clear direction for hypotheses is not apparent from the literature and therefore a research question was presented to explore if men and women have different attraction and intentions responses to work-life benefits presented in a job advertisement.

Research Question 2: Will the relation between work-life benefits recruitment information and a) organizational attraction or b) job pursuit intentions be different for men and women?

Gender and wellness benefits. The review above illustrates a lack of empirical clarity regarding the relationship between gender and organizational attraction or job pursuit intentions. Gender differences were found in some studies (Alniaçık & Alniaçık, 2012; Catanzaro et al., 2010; Chapman et al., 2005) but not others (Carless & Wintle, 2007; Casper & Buffardi, 2004; Casper et al., 2013; Swider et al., 2015). A search of the literature did not uncover any studies to inform how men and women may be differently attracted to an organization advertising wellness benefits. However, research about

employee participation in wellness programs suggests women may be more attracted by wellness benefits than men. For example, an assessment of employee participation in and incentive-based wellness program at Vanderbilt University indicated women were about twice as likely as men to participate (Byrne et al., 2011). Robroek, van Lenthe, van Emptelen, and Burdorf (2009) also found women were more likely than men to participate in worksite health promotion programs with one exception. Men and women participated equally in interventions consisting of access to fitness centers. Research also indicates women are more sensitive to the implementation process for health promotion (e.g., fitness activities) and disease prevention (e.g., health risk assessment) programs including the structure of the program, communication/marketing, and the presence of barriers and facilitating resources for participation. Although men and women were both influenced by removal of barriers and presence of facilitators (e.g., participation during work hours), the relationship was stronger for women (Crump, Earp, Kozma, & Hertz-Picciotto, 1996). Overall these data suggest women are more likely to participate in wellness-related programs and may pay more attention to wellness information presented in a recruitment advertisement. Therefore, it is probable that an organization offering these types of benefits will be more attractive to and will evoke stronger pursuit intentions for women.

Hypothesis 11: The relation of wellness benefits recruitment information with a) organizational attraction and b) job pursuit intentions is stronger for women than for men.

Gender, benefit packages, employer image, and recruitment outcomes.

Responses to recruitment information are thought to be influenced by individual

characteristics such as demographics (Volpone et al., 2013), but the literature does not suggest how different employer reward packages will be perceived according to gender. Some indication comes from a study finding the importance of employer attractiveness components are weighted differently by men and women (Alnıaçık & Alnıaçık, 2012). This suggests gender may differently influence perceptions of employer image based on the types of benefits packages offered. Although this is possible, the literature on this is not clear, and therefore a research question was posed to investigate the possible moderated mediation effect of gender with instrumental, symbolic, and experiential attributes when individuals were presented with work-life benefits or wellness benefits recruitment information.

Research Question 3: Will the indirect effect of work-life benefits or wellness benefits recruitment information via employer image components influence a) organizational attraction and b) job pursuit intentions differently for men and women?

Deep-level Individual Characteristics

Family factors. Family represents a highly personal part of life with much variation in what family looks like and how it is experienced. As a result, the intersection of family and work is different for each individual. This study explored two family-related characteristics (family stage and family-salient identity) as moderators of the relation between work-life benefits with organizational attraction and job pursuit intentions. Indirect effects were investigated to determine if instrumental value explained variations in attraction and job pursuit intentions according to family stage, and if symbolic attributes were more relevant for those with a family-salient identity.

Family stage and work-life benefits. For families that have children, there are six stages of family life that have been identified by family science scholars. These stages are 1) early marriage before children, 2) families with infants and toddlers, 3) families with preschool age children, 4) families with school-age children, 5) families with teens, and 6) families that no longer have children in the home, often referred to as having an “empty nest” (Erickson, Martinengo, & Hill, 2010). Each stage is associated with its own unique set of responsibilities and challenges (Duvall & Miller, 1985) and therefore the instrumental value of work-life benefits is likely to vary over the course of most individuals’ lifespans (Dore, 2008).

Allen and Finkelstein (2014) proposed that family stage would be related to work-family conflict and found support for their hypotheses. Work interference with family (WIF) and family interference with work (FIW) was significantly related to family stage. Individuals in the empty nest stage of family life reported the least amount of conflict, and the most conflict was indicated for families with children under six years old. It should be noted the authors investigated the relationship between age and family stage and reported these each to be unique contributors.

Because family stage is related to work-life conflict, it is likely to also influence how attractive work-family policies are to prospective employees. Based on this, family stage was examined as a potential moderator of the relation between work-life benefits recruitment information with organizational attraction and job pursuit intentions.

Hypothesis 12: The relation between work-life benefits recruitment information and a) organizational attraction and b) job pursuit intentions will vary according to family stage such that individuals with children under six years old will be more attracted and report greater intentions.

Each stage of family life is associated with different responsibilities (Duvall & Miller, 1985) and need for resources (Dore, 2008). Higher levels of conflict exist when families include children five years of age and younger (Allen & Finkelstein, 2014) indicating it is at this stage that work-life resources would be most valuable. Based on this work-life benefits should be positively related to organizational attraction and job pursuit intentions because of the instrumental value provided at a time in life when they are particularly needed.

Hypothesis 13: The indirect effect of work-life benefits on a) organizational attraction and b) job pursuit intentions via instrumental attributes will vary according to family stage such that the effect will be stronger for individuals with children under six years old.

Family-salient identity and work-life benefits. Research suggests HR policies are related to attraction when personal identities (Honeycutt & Rosen, 1997) or values (Casper et al., 2013) are congruent with those policies. Casper and colleagues (2013) found family values positively influenced attraction when work-family policies were advertised; diversity values and attitudes toward homosexuals positively influenced attraction when diversity policies were emphasized; and work values positively, and education negatively, affected attraction when an employee development policy was presented. Other research reported individual attraction to organizations varied according to congruency between types of career paths offered and personal identity as family-salient, career-salient, or balanced family and career salient identities (Honeycutt & Rosen, 1997). These authors noted a surprising proportion of men reported a family-salient identity. This again points to the criticality of examining individual characteristics

beyond basic demographics. It should be noted these results could not be replicated by Carless and Wintle (2007) who did not find identity salience moderated the relationship between career paths offered and attraction.

Based on these overall findings it is possible that work-life benefits recruitment information similarly has a stronger impact on attraction and job pursuit intentions when individuals have a more family-salient identity.

Further, the symbolic attributes of employer image are theorized to attract prospective employees based on expected fulfillment of self-identity or self-expression needs (Lievens & Highhouse, 2003). With work-life benefits acting as a signal (Rynes, 1991; Spence, 1973), prospective employees may draw inferences from recruitment materials that the organization represents an outlet for expressing a family-salient identity, which in turn will be positively related to attraction and job pursuit intentions. A lack of consistent results relating family-salient identity to attraction (Carless & Wintle, 2007; Honeycutt & Rosen, 1997) led me to proceed with examining this as a research question rather than as a formal hypothesis.

Research Question 4: Will the direct effect of work-life benefits on a) organizational attraction or b) job pursuit intentions, or indirect effects via symbolic attributes, be stronger for those individuals with a family-salient identity?

Health and wellness factors. Little to no research has examined how health and wellness factors relate to perceptions about an organization, organizational attraction, or job pursuit intentions. Perceived health and personal identification with health and wellbeing were explored as potential individual differences impacting the effect of wellness benefits on employer image and recruitment outcomes.

Perceived health. Health is a critical factor impacting an individual's life and ability to do things they desire. Wellness benefits offered by employers provide a potential resource for improving one's health and therefore may influence perceptions about, and attraction to, an organization promoting these in recruitment materials. From one perspective, someone in poor health with greater need of these types of resources would be motivated to work for an organization offering access to wellness benefits. Or conversely, someone who already lives a healthy lifestyle may be more apt to respond positively because they are motivated to maintain their current health, and perhaps to gain access to new resources to enhance their wellbeing (Hobfoll, 1989). To my knowledge perceptions of personal health have not been investigated in a recruitment context.

Wellness benefits are being positioned here is an attractive resource to support health. As such, they are potentially attracting prospective employees through assessments that a job with the employer provides instrumental value (Lievens & Highhouse, 2003). In other words, wellness benefits signal (Rynes, 1991; Spence, 1973) to a prospective job seeker that the organization provides desired resources to gain and maintain health. This knowledge is expected to increase attraction and intentions toward the organization (Lievens & Highhouse, 2003). The current study explored if variations in perceived health resulted in different responses to wellness benefits presented in job advertisements.

Research Question 5: Will the direct effect of wellness benefits on organizational attraction or job pursuit intentions, or indirect effects via instrumental attributes, be stronger for individuals who perceive themselves to be in good versus poor health?

Wellness identity. Various factors can contribute to how a person perceives and values their health, and living a healthy lifestyle is not equally important for all people. As discussed earlier, family values, diversity values, and work values are related to attraction outcomes when these align with advertised HR policies (Casper et al., 2013). Some research also shows congruence between HR policies with personal identity are related to organizational attraction (Honeycutt & Rosen, 1997). Although research has not investigated personal feelings about health and wellbeing influence recruitment, it seems plausible that someone who identifies as the type of person who practices healthy habits and wellness activities will have a different response from someone who does not prioritize a healthy lifestyle, and that they are likely to be more attracted to an organization offering these types of benefits.

As reviewed earlier, job seekers are attracted to organizations when aligning with the company provides an outlet for self-identity or self-expression (Lievens & Highhouse, 2003). Informed by signaling theory (Rynes, 1991; Spence, 1973) and the instrumental-symbolic framework (Lievens & Highhouse, 2003), wellness benefits presented in recruitment advertisements may signal to prospective employees that association with the organization will be congruent with personal identity. Researchers have not yet examined personal identity as an individual difference relating to wellness in a recruitment context so the current study assessed self-identification with wellness, or “wellness-salient identity”, and tested to determine if wellness benefits have a stronger effect on organizational attraction and job pursuit intentions for individuals with a wellness-salient identity, and if symbolic attributes are an explanatory mechanism.

Research Question 6: Will the direct effect of wellness benefits on a) organizational attraction or b) job pursuit intentions, or indirect effects via symbolic attributes, be stronger for individuals who incorporate health and wellbeing as a part of their personal identity?

Chapter 2: Method

Participants

Prior to data collection, the research proposal was reviewed and approved by Portland State University's (PSU's) Institutional Review Board as part of requirements for the Human Research Protection Program overseen by the PSU Office of Research Integrity.

Pilot studies. Participants for the pilot studies were recruited from Amazon Mechanical Turk (MTurk). Qualification criteria included a HIT (Human Intelligence Task) approval rate of 90% and a U.S. Bachelor's Degree. Workers were paid \$0.85 and average completion times were between 9-13 minutes across the three rounds of pilot testing. If participants failed an attention check the survey ended immediately. Their data were omitted, and they did not receive compensation (per Amazon's Worker Agreement).

Primary study. Participants for the primary study were recruited from upper-level undergraduate student population at Portland State University (PSU) in Spring Term of 2019. Students were invited from 21, 300- or 400-level courses across a variety of departments including management, business administration, accounting, psychology, computer science, and communications. The majority of participants were recruited from the School of Business (management, business administration, accounting).

Data were collected from 516 students. The final sample was $N = 404$ (traditional: $n = 142$, work-life: $n = 130$, wellness: $n = 132$) after removing cases for failed attention checks and missing data. Participants ranged in age from 18 to 64 years old with a mean age of 27 ($SD = 8.01$); 76% were under the age of 30. Sixty percent of participants

identified as female. More than half of the participants were White (54%). Asians comprised 17% of the sample, 15% were Hispanic or Latino, 2% were Black/African American, 9% selected “Other” or multiple options, and 3% preferred not to answer. Sixty-six percent of respondents indicated some college education, 79% were attending full-time to earn a bachelor’s degree, and 81% reported a current grade point average (GPA) of 3.1 or higher. Seventy-six percent were currently working (30% full-time, 46% part-time) and most had at least one year of work experience (92%). Sixty percent had never been married, 17% were parents, and only 7% had children under the age of six. Twenty-one percent of participants indicated adult care responsibilities. Finally, 15% of respondents preferred not to answer the question about household income. For those who answered, income ranged from less than \$20,000 (13%) to \$150,000 or more (10%). Table 2 provides a full overview of participant characteristics.

Procedure and Design

Pilot 1. In Pilot 1, 32 individual components of benefits packages were presented to participants recruited through MTurk ($N = 40$). These items were selected from overviews of the literature on wellness (e.g., Bauer et al., 2019), the SHRM 2018 *Employee Benefits* report, and based on a review of career webpages from actual organizations. In part one, respondents were presented a list of the 32 items (randomized order) and asked to indicate on a scale of 1 to 5 how important each benefit is for influencing attraction to an organization as an employer, with “1” being not important and “5” indicating an extremely attractive benefit. Next, they were asked to select the top 10 most attractive items and distribute 100 points among these 10 (higher values

indicating items of higher importance). The full instructions and list of employer rewards is provided in Appendix A.

Results from this pilot were examined to determine the most important benefits to include in job advertisements across conditions. Traditional benefits including competitive salary, health and life insurance, retirement benefits, and profit sharing were consistently in the top ten. Flexible hours were rated in the top ten by 100% of participants. Other work-life benefits consistently rated as attractive included generous vacation days, remote work, and maternity leave. Paternity leave and childcare fell within the top fifteen rated benefits. For the wellness condition, only partner wellness benefits broke into the top ten. Other top-rated wellness offerings included financial education/resources, stress management, and gym memberships. Results can be seen in Table 3. Three job advertisements were created based on these results: traditional condition, work-life condition, and wellness condition. These can be seen in Appendix B.

Pilot 2. Amazon MTurk Participants were randomly assigned to one of the three benefits conditions in both versions of pilot two. The purpose of pilot two was to test the stimulus developed from pilot one and to reduce the number of items in the instrumental and symbolic scales. Because each of these instruments are quite long (instrumental: 33 items; symbolic: 42 items), two separate surveys were distributed, one for each dimension. The instrumental pilot contained instrumental items and also included an additional attention check embedded within one of the matrix tables. Failing to answer this item correctly did not end the survey as with the other attention check. Seven cases were removed from the instrumental sample for failing the additional attention check (*N*

= 193; $n = 66$, work-life: $n = 61$, wellness: $n = 66$). The symbolic pilot ($N = 225$; traditional: $n = 74$, work-life: $n = 69$, $n = 82$) was comprised of symbolic items and also included measures for family-salient identity and wellness-salient identity to assess how these measures performed in terms of factor structure and reliability. This was particularly important for wellness-salient identity since it was a new scale that I developed for this study (adapted from family-salient identity; Lobel & St. Clair, 1992; 5 items).

Exploratory factor analyses were conducted in SPSS with direct oblimin rotation. Eigenvalue and scree plots were examined to determine the number of factors. For the instrumental measures, the scree plot turns at one factor (eigen value = 14.78), and again at 3 factors (eigen values of 2nd and 3rd factors are 3.20 and 2.64). Three additional factors had an eigen value above one. Three factors explained 63% of the variance and all six explained 75% of the variance. Loadings with a minimum of .4 were considered. Looking at the pattern matrix, the six factors that emerged were (in order): 1) job security and advancement opportunities, 2) benefits, 3) working conditions and work scheduling autonomy, 4) pay, 5) task diversity, and 6) task demands. I approached data reduction from both a quantitative and qualitative perspective. Task diversity and demands were eliminated because these factors had the lowest eigen values, each explained less than 1.5% of the total variance, and the content is not as relevant to the independent variables. Within each of the remaining four factors, the items with highest factor loadings were retained. The final instrumental measures were comprised of 14 items explaining 85%

variance: pay (3 items; $\alpha = .93$), benefits (3 items; $\alpha = .88$), security/advancement (4 items; $\alpha = .89$), and autonomous working conditions (4 items; $\alpha = .91$).

The symbolic measure had six factors with an eigenvalue above 1, explaining 62% of the variance. Inspection of the scree plot suggested one to three primary factors. Eigenvalues for the first three factors were 16.52, 3.30, and 2.25. The remaining three factors had eigen values of 1.07 to 1.63. First, nine items with a mean score less than three were removed. This included three of four items that comprised the “ruggedness” dimension so the fourth item, “western” was also removed. A follow-up factor analysis indicated the reduced scale had four factors (based on eigenvalues and scree plot). Additional items were removed based on cross loading, and the four items that loaded highest on each factor were retained. The symbolic measure was reduced from 42 items and five dimensions to 16 items and four dimensions representing perceptions of the employer as wholesome ($\alpha = .82$), exciting ($\alpha = .87$), competent ($\alpha = .87$), and sophisticated ($\alpha = .80$). Family-salient identity ($\alpha = .80$) and wellness-salient identity ($\alpha = .84$) were reliable and loaded onto family/career and wellness factors as expected. The original scales can be reviewed in Appendices C1 and C2 and the reduced survey measures are presented in Appendices D2 and D3.

Pilot 3. A test of final materials was completed among Amazon MTurk participants ($N = 10$) to confirm functionality. This included random assignment of participants to the three job advertisement conditions (traditional: $n = 4$, work-life: $n = 3$, $n = 3$) and all proposed mediating, moderating, and dependent variable measures, as well

as demographic items. An open text box at the end allowed for respondents to leave feedback about any issues or errors. None was reported.

Primary study. Final surveys were administered to PSU undergraduate students from May 1st to June 15th, 2019. Instructors from 21, 300- and 400-level courses agreed to make an in-class announcement and post an invitation to the survey on the university's online learning program (D2L). The criteria of only 300- and 400-level courses was to target students who would soon be graduating and might already be thinking about job hunting. A raffle to win one of three, \$20 Amazon gift cards provided incentive to participate. Additionally, students were offered course extra credit for participation in 15 of the 21 classes. A total of approximately 1140 students were in these 21 classes. This number reflects full enrollment capability of each class, and each of these enrolled students was not unique because of cross-enrollment.

The link posted on D2L took students directly to the first page of the survey where they were informed of the purpose and asked to consent to participate. Participants were then randomly assigned to one of the three conditions. The randomly selected job advertisement was presented for review, and the same job ad was repeated throughout the instrumental, symbolic, and experiential questions for reference. Upon completion of the primary survey, a link was provided to a second survey for students to provide name, email address, and course information. This information was collected for the gift card raffle and to assign extra credit. No identifying information was linked to the primary survey.

Measures

Recruitment outcomes. This study investigated the effect of work-life and wellness benefits on job seeker attitudes and intentions to inform recruitment research and practice. Specific outcomes of interest were organizational attraction and job pursuit intentions. These were measured as follows below. Scales can be viewed in their entirety in Appendix D1.

Organizational attraction. Participant attraction to the organization was measured using the organizational attractiveness scale from Highhouse and colleagues (2003; $\alpha = .88$). This assessment is comprised of five items with examples including, “This company is attractive to me as a place for employment” and “A job at this company is very appealing to me.” Agreement (or disagreement) was indicated on a five-point scale. As expected, the scale demonstrated high internal consistency ($\alpha = .91$)

Job pursuit intentions. Job pursuit intentions were assessed with six items from Aiman-Smith and colleagues (2001; $\alpha = .91$). Participants rated the extent to which they agreed or disagreed (five-point scale) to items such as “I would accept a job offer from this company” and “I would attempt to gain an interview with this company.” Cronbach’s alpha was .90.

Employer image. Inferences are drawn about the functional value gained from working for an organization (instrumental attributes), how working for an organization will impact one’s personal image and self-expression (symbolic attributes), and what the day-to-day experience of working for an organization might be like (experiential attributes). Work-life and wellness benefits are likely to increase positive responses toward the organization (organizational attraction and job pursuit intentions) because

benefits information influences perceptions about what it is like to work for the employer, which in turn are expected to affect reactions about wanting to work for the organization. A description of employer image measures follow and can be reviewed in full in Appendices D2, D3, and D4.

Instrumental attributes. Thirty-three items were assembled to measure instrumental attributes and were reduced to 14 items during pilot testing. The original seven dimensions frequently identified as instrumental attributes through inductive methods include 1) pay, 2) benefits, 3) job security, 4) advancement, 5) task demands, 6) task diversity, and 7) working conditions, as well as an eighth dimension, 8) work scheduling autonomy. Items were adapted primarily from Lievens, Van Hoyer, and Schreurs (2005; $\alpha = .85-.89$). Additional items were adapted from Lievens and Highhouse (2003; $\alpha = .64-.77$), Van Hoyer, Bas, Cromheecke, and Lievens (2013; $\alpha = .65-.84$), and Van Hoyer and Saks (2011; $\alpha = .78-.87$). Five new items were created for the benefits dimension because previous work using benefits as a category descriptor did not treat these as a unique attribute (grouped with pay/compensation). The autonomy measure was a sub-scale from Breugh (1985; $\alpha = .81$) and was added given the relevance to work-life benefits.

Pilot two exploratory factor analyses identified 14 items to assess instrumental attributes representing: pay, benefits, security/advancement, and autonomous working conditions. Participants were asked to indicate the extent to which they agreed or disagreed (five-point) to statements such as, “This company offers useful benefits” and “I

have control over the scheduling of my work at this company.” Cronbach’s alpha for the primary sample was .88 indicating it was a reliable measure.

Symbolic attributes. Aaker’s (1997) 42-item, five-factor measure of brand was reduced to 16 items and four factors during pilot testing. The five original factors included sincerity ($\alpha = .93$), excitement ($\alpha = .95$), 3) competence ($\alpha = .93$), 4) sophistication ($\alpha = .91$), and 5) ruggedness ($\alpha = .90$). The final measure included 16 items representing perceptions of the employer as wholesome (4 items; $\alpha = .77$), exciting (4 items; $\alpha = .87$), competent (4 items; $\alpha = .86$), and sophisticated (4 items; $\alpha = .78$). Respondents were asked to indicate the degree to which each adjective represented the recruiting organization from 1 = “Not at all descriptive of the organization” to 5 = “Extremely descriptive of organization.”

Experiential attributes. Participants were asked to report their perceptions of what it would be like to work at the organization represented by their condition. They were asked to indicate expected treatment by the company in general, and also expected interpersonal treatment by coworkers.

Expected treatment by the organization was measured using five items (Jones et al., 2014; $\alpha = .92$) on a five-point scale ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree. Jones and colleagues selected these items to capture perceptions of overall justice, individual fairness, and day-to-day treatment. Examples are, “This company probably treats its employees well,” “This company probably treats its employees fairly,” and “Employees are probably treated with dignity and respect at this company.” The internal consistency of this measure was high ($\alpha = .91$).

Expectations of coworker relations were assessed with the coworker treatment subscale from the Perceptions of Fair Interpersonal Treatment (PFIT) scale (Donovan, Drasgow, & Munson, 1998; $\alpha = .92$). Four items on a five-point scale measured participants' agreement or disagreement on the following items, "Coworkers help each other out," "Coworkers argue with each other" (reverse-scored), "Coworkers put each other down" (reverse-scored), and "Coworkers treat each other with respect." The full scale had low reliability ($\alpha = .70$), and confirmatory factor analyses indicated the positively and negatively worded items loaded as separate factors. Final analyses relied on only the two positively worded items ($\alpha = .80$).

Moderator and control variables. Two items collected the surface-level characteristics of *age* (in years) and *gender* ("male," "female," "not listed" with a text box, and "prefer not to answer").

Work-life benefits moderators. Deep-level characteristics that were tested in relation to work-life benefits include family stage and family-salient identity. To determine *family stage* the participants were asked if they have children in their household, and if yes, the number of children and their ages. *Family-salient identity* was measured according to Lobel and St. Clair (1992; $\alpha = .76$). One item asked participants to indicate "which best describes you and your day-to-day priorities" with response options: I am primarily a family person; I am a family and career person but lean a bit more towards family; I am a career and family person; I am a career and family person but lean a bit more towards career; I am primarily a career person. Four other items asked participants the extent to which they agreed (or disagreed) on a five-point scale: "The

most important things that happen to me involve my family [job]” and “The major satisfactions in my life come from my family [job].” Items were scored so that higher values were related to family orientation. Cronbach’s alpha for the family-salient identity measure was .74. The full measures are provided in Appendix D5.

Wellness benefits moderators. Deep-level characteristics investigated in relation to wellness benefits were perceived health and “wellness-salient identity.” *Perceived health* was measured using four items from Hobfoll, Vinoku, Pierce, and Lewandowski-Romps (2012; $\alpha = .81$). Participants respond to “In general, would you say your health is...” in terms of “poor,” “fair,” “good,” or “excellent.” They were also asked about health-related experiences over the “past 2 months.” Specifically, “To what extent do you have any particular health problems?” and “To what extent to you feel healthy enough to carry out things that you would like to do?” were replied to on a five-point scale from “A very great extent” to “To no extent.” The fourth items asked, “How much of the time has your health kept you from doing the kind of things other people your age do?” and again uses a five-point scale with responses from “All of the time” to “Never.” Items were scored so that a higher value indicated greater health. Reliability for this measure was low with Cronbach’s alpha of .69. Reverse coding and one item with different response options (four instead of five) may have contributed to the poor performance of this measure. Improvement of scale reliability was not indicated by removing any items.

Wellness-salient identity was assessed with items adapted from Lobel and St. Clair’s (1992; $\alpha = .76$) family-salient identity measure because I was unable to locate a scale assessing the extent which individuals incorporate health and wellbeing into their

personal identity. References to family or career were modified to instead reflect the importance (or non-importance) of living a healthy lifestyle. One item asked participants to indicate “which best describes you and your day-to-day priorities” with response options: I live a healthy lifestyle; I primarily live a healthy lifestyle but sometimes participate in unhealthy activities; I live a healthy lifestyle about half of the time; I sometimes participate in healthy activities but primarily do not live a healthy lifestyle; I do not live a healthy lifestyle. Four other items asked participants the extent to which they agreed (or disagreed) on a five-point scale: “My health is important to me,” “My health is not a priority,” I am proud of living a healthy lifestyle,” and “Living a healthy lifestyle is not important to me.” High scores indicate a wellness-salient identity. The reliability of this measure was good ($\alpha = .84$). Perceived health and the wellness-salient identity measures can be reviewed in the appendices, Appendix D6.

Control variables. In addition to the individual characteristics described above, personal characteristic information was collected for use as potential controls: age, gender, race/ethnicity, family-salient identity, wellness-salient identity, and income. The decision to retain or omit variables for analyses was made according to best practice recommendations provided by Bernerth and Aguinis (2016). These authors endorse the use of control variables only if inclusion is based on theoretical rationale, established empirical relationships, and if the variable can be reliably measured.

It could be argued that because work motivations differ across *age* groups (e.g., Kooij et al., 2011), age should be included as a covariate for hypothesis testing. However, the current literature, including meta-analytic results, do not indicate a significant

relationship between age and attraction (e.g., Alnıaçık & Alnıaçık, 2012; Casper et al., 2013; Swider et al., 2015). There is a stronger theoretical foundation and empirical support to suggest using *gender* as a control in hypothesis testing but results of this research are inconsistent. Specifically, recent meta-analyses suggest gender is not an important factor for attraction (Chapman et al., 2005; Swider et al., 2015). *Race* has been shown to relate to attraction outcomes in some meta-analytic research on recruitment (Swider et al., 2015) but not others (Chapman et al., 2005). When race matters for attraction, the theoretical foundation often relates to similarity-attraction which is not relevant for this study. Because existing research does not provide a clear answer, these demographic variables were collected and examined analytically to inform inclusion/exclusion decisions.

Family-salient identity and *wellness-salient identity* were also considered as potential control variables because of their relevance to the independent variables (work-life and wellness job advertisements). Research does suggest personal identity variables such as these could influence interpretations of signals relating to employer attribute perceptions (Celani & Singh, 2011) and personal identity. In particular, family- versus career-salient identity has been shown to influence career decisions (Honeycutt & Rosen, 1997).

Finally, *income* was measured as a potential control variable because financial circumstances are likely to influence how attractive employer rewards are. Meta-analytic research indicates that financial need is a significant predictor of employment pursuit

behaviors (Kanfer, Wanberg, & Kantrowitz, 2001), and a recent review identifies income as a relevant control in many work-related studies (Bernerth & Aguinis, 2016).

Power Analysis

Fritz and MacKinnon (2007) provided guidance regarding required sample size for .80 power with commonly used methods for mediation analysis including the bias-corrected bootstrap test that will be used for this study. Their empirical estimates indicate a minimum sample of $N = 462$ to demonstrate a significant mediation effect when both the $\alpha = .14$ and $\beta = .14$. Required sample size decreases as effect sizes increase for either path, and a required $N = 148$ when $\alpha = .26$ and $\beta = .26$.

Meta-analytic estimates indicate a small effect of pay ($r = .20$; $r_c = .23$), benefits ($r = .29$; $r_c = .31$), and flextime/work-life balance ($r = .11$; $r_c = .12$) on organizational attraction (aggregated, including studies examining job pursuit intentions). This same research indicates moderate effects of organizational image constructs ($r = .39-.45$; $r_c = .48-.53$), work environment ($r = .25$; $r_c = .30$), and employee relations/treatment ($r = .49$; $r_c = .58$) on organizational attraction (Uggerslev et al., 2012). An earlier meta-analysis by Chapman and colleagues (2005) report similar effects. For example, these authors reported a small effect of pay ($r = .22$; $\rho = .27$), and moderate effects of organizational image ($r = .40$; $\rho = .48$) and work environment ($r = .47$; $\rho = .60$) on job/organizational attraction. Based on these calculations and the recommendations of Fritz and MacKinnon, the goal was to collect data from a sample of $N = 462$. The primary study sample ($N = 404$) meets the threshold for what these authors indicate would detect a significant effect ($N = 400$) with a small α path (.014) and medium β path (.26).

Chapter 3: Results

Preliminary Analyses

Data were examined for accuracy, outliers, and missing values. Two attention checks were included in the survey. One indicated to “Please select the color blue to continue” and the other directed the participant to “Select ‘somewhat disagree.’” Failure to comply with these directions resulted in 111 cases being excluded, reducing the total sample from $N = 516$ to $N = 405$. One additional case was removed because responses were omitted for all dependent variable items. The final sample included 404 cases (traditional: $n = 142$, work-life: $n = 130$, wellness: $n = 132$). Responses of “prefer not to answer” were coded as missing. This was a frequent answer to the income question resulting in a loss of 60 additional participants when income was included. When income was included as a covariate the sample was comprised of 344 cases (traditional: $n = 122$, work-life: $n = 109$, wellness: $n = 113$).

Tests of assumptions required for application of an ordinary least squares (OLS) regression-based approach (normality, linearity, homoscedasticity, independence) were all satisfactory. Negatively worded items for family-salient identity, wellness-salient identity, perceived health, organizational attraction, and coworker relations were reverse coded so that higher scores indicated a more family-salient identity, a more wellness-salient identity, good health, greater attraction, and expectations of having better coworker relations.

Descriptive statistics, correlations, and reliability coefficients are reported in Table 4. As expected, organizational attraction and job pursuit intentions were highly

correlated ($r = .80, p < .01$). Correlations between employer image variables ranged from $r = .22$ (assumptions about pay and coworker relations) to $r = .77$ (perceptions of employer competence and sophistication. All were significant ($p < .01$) and positive in direction. Employer image and recruitment outcomes were also significantly ($p < .01$) and positively related, with correlations ranging from $r = .27$ (pay and job pursuit intentions) to $r = .64$ (perceptions of employer as exciting and organizational attraction).

Confirmatory factor analyses. Confirmatory factor analyses (CFAs) were conducted using the lavaan package in R version 3.6.1. First, recruitment items were examined to determine if two separate factors (organizational attraction and job pursuit intentions) emerged. A two-factor structure was an adequate fit ($CFI = .93$, $TLI = .90$, $SRMR = .05$) and significantly better than a one-factor model ($\chi^2 = (1) = 177.77, p < .001$). Second, a four-factor structure was determined to be the best fit for the instrumental component of employer image. A model with factors: pay, security/advancement, benefits, and autonomous working conditions was an adequate fit ($CFI = .94$, $TLI = .93$, $SRMR = .07$). Third, CFA confirmed a model with four dimensions of symbolic attributes: perceptions of the employer as wholesome, exciting, competent, and sophisticated ($CFI = .95$, $TLI = .94$, $SRMR = .04$). Finally, experiential items were assessed for factor structure. These items were intended to measure two distinct constructs – expected treatment from the organization and anticipated interpersonal treatment among coworkers (PFIT). CFA results indicated sensitivity to reverse-coded items resulting in a distinction between the positively worded and negatively worded PFIT items. A model with three factors was the only model with

acceptable fit (CFI = .97, TLI = .95, SRMR = .04). Consequently, the reverse-coded items were dropped from the scale for testing hypotheses.

Selecting Control Variables

Age, gender, race, family-salient identity, wellness-salient identity, and income were all examined as potential control variables. Correlations among the study variables and potential controls can be viewed in Table 4.

The literature did not provide clear direction about inclusion or exclusion of age, gender, or race/ethnicity for hypotheses testing. Age was significantly and negatively correlated with most of the focal variables. However, when analyses were run with and without age, there were no differences in results and therefore age was excluded from the reported results. Gender was only significantly correlated with one instrumental attribute (benefits). Without a stronger indication for the inclusion of gender, and because results did not differ if gender was included or not, the variable was omitted as a control in the results reported. Race was also considered as a potential control variable but was ultimately not included in hypothesis and research question testing presented. Race was only significantly correlated with one proposed mediator (coworker relations). Analyses were conducted with and without race included and there were no differences in results.

Family-salient identity and *wellness-salient identity* were also considered for use as control variables. In the current study, both family-salient and wellness-salient identities were significantly correlated with job pursuit intentions, and family-salient identity was also significantly correlated with three employer image attributes. These

identity variables were ultimately excluded because results were identical with or without them.

Finally, *household income* was examined for inclusion as a control variable. In the current study income was significantly correlated with 10 of the 12 mediator/dependent variables. Including income did have an impact on results of analyses with some effects becoming significant and others losing significance. With income included as a control variable instrumental benefits perceptions became a significant mediator of three conditional processes, one mediation, and marginally significant for two additional conditional processes; sophistication was lost as a mediator relating to age (work-life) but gained as a mediator relating to gender (wellness) for both recruitment outcomes; perceptions of excitement and expected treatment became non-significant mediators of conditional processes relating to work-life and gender for both recruitment outcomes. Further, perceived health became a significant moderator (attraction and job pursuit intentions) but the significance of family-salient identity as a moderator was lost (job pursuit intentions only).

Where significance was gained, the influence of income makes theoretical sense for understanding the results. For example, with income controlled for, the instrumental value of benefits becomes a significant mediator. Losses of significance are less theoretically explainable and can potentially be attributed to a loss of statistical power (60 cases who responded “Prefer not to answer” removed). For example, an interaction between work-life and gender on attraction via perceptions of expected treatment lost significance with income added. It can be understood that financial need (or lack thereof)

will influence the perceived usefulness of benefits, and that parsing out the income effect provides a less-biased view about how the job ads influence participant employer image attributions and recruitment outcomes. It makes less theoretical sense that income would be related to expectations of treatment. Based on this rationale, and with a goal of including relevant contextual factors, income was retained and included as control variable in all analyses.

Hypothesis Testing

All hypotheses were tested using the PROCESS macro version 3.4 (Hayes, 2018) in SPSS version 26. Continuous variables used to create products for moderation analyses were grand mean centered. The percentile method was used for bootstrapping with 5000 iterations. All results are summarized in Table 5.

Hypotheses 1 and 2: Direct effects. Hypotheses 1 and 2 proposed respondents receiving recruitment materials promoting work-life (H1) and wellness (H2) programs would be a) more attracted to an organization and b) more likely to pursue employment. Regression results fully supported these hypotheses and are reported in Table 6. Participants in the work-life condition ($b = .64, p < .001$) and wellness condition ($b = .39, p < .01$) reported higher organizational attraction. Work-life condition ($b = .46, p < .001$) and wellness condition ($b = .22, p = .049$) also predicted increased job pursuit intentions.

Hypotheses 3-10: Indirect effects. Hypotheses 3-10 were tested using OLS path analysis (PROCESS model 4) with all ten mediators included in one model for organizational attraction and a second model for job pursuit intentions. Results supported mediation hypotheses for some instrumental, symbolic, and experiential attributes, but

not all dimensions within each. Results pertaining to the work-life benefits condition are reported in Table 7. Results for the wellness conditions can be found in Table 8.

Work-life condition. In comparison to the traditional condition, participants in the work-life condition reported greater attraction via perceptions of the employer as more exciting (relative indirect effect = .18, CI: [.07-.31]), more sophisticated (relative indirect effect = .09, CI: [.02-.20]), and via higher expectations for treatment (relative indirect effect = .18, CI: [.08-.30]). Job pursuit intentions were also greater in response to the work-life job ad (as compared to traditional) and this effect was also mediated by perceptions of the employer as sophisticated (relative indirect effect = .08, CI: [.01-.16]) and expectations about better treatment (relative indirect effect = .13, CI: [.05-.23]). These results support hypotheses 5 and 7. Instrumental benefits and perceptions of interpersonal treatment (coworker relations) did not have relative indirect effects on attraction or job pursuit intentions thus hypothesis 3 and 9 were not supported.

Wellness condition. Similar results were revealed for the wellness condition and supported hypotheses 6 and 8. Excitement (relative indirect effect = .13, CI: [.05-.23]), sophistication (relative indirect effect = .07, CI: [.01-.16]) and expected treatment (relative indirect effect = .17, CI: [.07-.28]) mediated the effect of the wellness job ad on organizational attraction. Like the work-life condition, sophistication (relative indirect effect = .06, CI: [.01-.14]) and expected treatment (relative indirect effect = .12, CI: [.05-.22]) perceptions were significant mediators of job pursuit intentions, however excitement was not. Unique to the wellness condition, the wellness job advertisement increased perceptions of the employer having instrumental benefits, and consequently

participants were more likely to report increased attraction (relative indirect effect = .03, CI: [.003-.08]) and higher rates of intentions to pursue employment (relative indirect effect = .06, CI: [.02-.12]). These findings support Hypothesis 4. Hypothesis 10 was not supported: the indirect effect relating to coworker relations was not significant.

Summary of mediation results. In the wellness condition, participants inferred the employer offers benefits of value and thus were more likely to be attracted and indicate intentions to pursue employment. No other instrumental variables (pay, security/advancement, autonomous working conditions) mediated, and none were significant for the work-life condition.

Participants were more attracted to an organization and likely to seek employment in both the work-life and wellness condition because of perceptions that the employer is sophisticated and will treat workers well. Attraction, but not pursuit intentions, was also mediated by perceptions of the employer as exciting. Finally, assumptions about employee experience explained greater attraction and job pursuit intentions in both the work-life and wellness conditions, but only in regard to expectations about organizational treatment, not relating to interpersonal relations.

Summary of direct effects on employer image. Although mediation hypotheses were specific to recruitment outcomes, understanding the direct effects of benefits conditions on employer image is relevant to inform how recruitment marketing influences employer brand. Results are reported in Table 9. Pay and perceptions of coworker relations were not significantly related to work-life or wellness job advertisements. Both job ad conditions did have a significant and positive impact on

respondent beliefs that the company had autonomous working conditions (instrumental), was wholesome, exciting, and sophisticated; and that they treated employees well. In the wellness condition, employers were perceived to offer valuable benefits, and to be more competent (as compared to traditional condition). In the work-life condition, the effect of nontraditional benefits on competence inferences was marginally significant. Two other marginally significant relationships occurred: benefits and job security/advancement opportunities were perceived as better when participants were presented with the wellness job ad.

Hypotheses 11-13: Conditional effects. Moderation effects proposed in hypotheses 11 and 12 were tested using PROCESS model 1 and included only the four significant mediators (benefits, excitement, sophistication, and expected treatment). Hypothesis 11 proposed the wellness job advertisement would have a stronger effect for women than for men on both recruitment outcomes. Results did not support this hypothesis (Table 10). An interaction between wellness condition and gender was not a significant predictor of organizational attraction ($b = -.17, p = .52$) or job pursuit intentions ($b = .05, p = .82$).

Hypothesis 12 suggested participants with young children, under 6 years of age, would be more attracted and more likely to pursue employment in the work-life condition compared to participants with older children or no children. This hypothesis was also not supported for organizational attraction ($b = .21, p = .73$) or job pursuit intentions ($b = .73, p = .16$). See Table 11.

Hypothesis 13 stated that indirect effects of work-life condition on attraction and pursuit intentions via instrumental attributes would be stronger for parents of children under 6 years of age (as compared to non-parents or parents of older children). Analyses using PROCESS model 8 were conducted to examine moderation of the indirect effect. A test of the linear relation between the indirect effect and moderator returns an “index of moderated mediation.” A conditional indirect effect is indicated when the bootstrap confidence interval does not include zero. Results can be reviewed in Table 12. Confidence intervals for all eight tests (four potential mediators and two outcomes) contained zero. Based on these findings, hypothesis 13 cannot be supported.

Research Questions

In addition to the proposed conditional effects in Hypotheses 11-13 that were guided by the literature, six additional research questions were posed to examine if direct and indirect effects of recruitment information vary by age, gender, perceived health, family identity, and wellness identity. Only the four significant mediators from Hypothesis tests 1-10 (benefits, excitement, sophistication, and expected treatment) were included in conditional process analyses.

Age. Age did not interact with work-life ($b = .25, p = .11$) or wellness ($b = .01, p = .38$) conditions to directly predict organizational attraction. In the work-life condition, job pursuit intentions did vary significantly by age ($b = .03, p < .01$). At age 20, there were no differences in job pursuit intentions (effect = .24, $p = .09$), but at the median age (23 years; effect = .37, $p < .01$) and 84th percentile (33 years; effect = .68, $p < .01$) the differences were significant with older participants reporting higher job pursuit intentions

in the work-life condition as compared to the traditional condition. The results were similar for the wellness condition ($b = .03, p = .049$); pairwise inferential tests revealed a significant difference only at the oldest age point (20 years: effect = .04, $p = .76$; 23 years: effect = .15, $p = .19$; 33 years: effect = .39, $p < .01$).

These results are reported in Table 13 and the interaction is illustrated in Figure 2. The figure illustrates that non-traditional benefits buffer against a negative effect of age seen in the traditional condition. That is, job pursuit intentions declined dramatically for older age participants in the traditional condition. This decline was not seen in the work-life and wellness conditions. Job pursuit intention levels were maintained across ages when nontraditional benefits were advertised.

Investigation of moderated mediation effects revealed that age and job advertisement condition interacted to predict job pursuit intentions via instrumental benefits perceptions in both the work-life (index = .01, 95% CI: [.001, .02] and wellness condition (index = .01, 95% CI: [.001, .01]. When the model included attraction as the outcome of interest, the results. However, the lower limit confidence interval equaled exactly zero with benefits as a mediator in the work-life condition (index = .004, 95% CI: [.0000, .01]), and in the wellness condition (index = .004, 95% CI: [.0000, .01]). Full results are reported in Tables 14 and 15.

Gender. A significant interaction effect was found for gender in the work-life condition such that women reported higher organizational attraction ($b = .56, p < .05$) and job pursuit intentions than men ($b = .49, p < .05$). These results are reported in Table 10 and graphically presented in Figures 3 and 4.

Gender also moderated the indirect effect of the work-life job advertisement on attraction (index = .09, 95% CI: [.01, .21]) and job pursuit intentions (index = .15, 95% CI: [.04, .31] via benefits. The positive indirect effect was stronger for females. In the wellness condition there was also significant moderated indirect effect with males reporting higher attraction (index = -.12, 95% CI: [-.25, -.01]) and job pursuit intentions (index = -.07, 95% CI: [-.16, -.002]) via perceptions of employer sophistication. These conditional process results are presented in Tables 16 and 17.

Perceived health. There were not significant interactions between wellness condition and perceived health for direct effects on organizational attraction ($b = -.24, p = .21$) or job pursuit intentions ($b = -.15, p = .38$). Moderated indirect effects did occur with the product of wellness condition and perceived health predicting attraction (index = .06, 95% CI: [.01, .14]) and job pursuit intentions (index = .09, 95% CI: [.01, .18]) via benefits attributions. Results can be reviewed in Table 18.

Family-salient and wellness-salient identities. There were no significant conditional effects for the proposed personal identity variables. These results are presented in Tables 19 and 20. Recruitment outcomes did not vary directly or indirectly according to differences in family-salient identity or wellness-salient identity. In the work-life condition, organizational attraction ($b = .02, p = .92$) and job pursuit intentions ($b = .05, p = .68$) did not differ significantly according to having a more family-salient or career-salient identity. The importance of wellness to one's personal identity did not have a moderating effect on organizational attraction ($b = -.07, p = .68$) or job pursuit intentions ($b = .01, p = .97$) in the wellness conditions.

Post-hoc Analyses

All hypotheses and research questions investigated effects comparing the work-life job advertisement to the traditional ad or comparing the wellness job advertisement to the traditional ad. Additional analyses were conducted to examine if any direct or indirect effects were significantly different between the work-life and wellness conditions. The results reveal a significant difference between the work-life and wellness conditions for predicting job pursuit intentions ($b = -.24, p < .05$). In the work-life condition, job pursuit intentions were significantly higher ($M = .3.82$) than in the wellness condition ($M = 3.68$). A marginally significant difference was indicated when comparing the work-life and wellness conditions as predictors of organizational attraction ($b = -.25, p = .06$). Attraction was higher in the work-life condition ($M = 3.59$) as compared to the wellness condition ($M = 3.43$). There were no significant indirect effects differences between work-life and wellness job advertisement conditions.

Summary of Significant Results

All results of hypothesis and research question testing can be reviewed in Table 5. To summarize significant effects, work-life benefits and wellness benefits had a *direct effect* on both organizational attraction and job pursuit intentions. The work-life advertisement was marginally more attractive than the wellness advertisement, and a significantly stronger predictor of job pursuit intentions.

Hypotheses pertaining to indirect effects of *instrumental attributes* were partially supported. The wellness job advertisement predicted organizational attraction and job pursuit intentions through benefits attributes. None of the instrumental attributes

mediated effects of the work-life job advertisement on recruitment outcomes. Indirect effects of job advertisements on recruitment outcomes through *symbolic attributes* were significant for both advertisement conditions and outcomes via perceptions of the employer as sophisticated. Excitement attributions also mediated the effects between both work-life and wellness conditions and organizational attraction. In regard to *experiential attributes*, expected treatment but not coworker relations explained the link between both job advertisements with both recruitment outcomes.

Age, gender, and perceived health moderated some effects; all models with family-salient identity, wellness-salient identity, and family stage as moderators were not significant. A direct effect of the interaction between benefits condition and age was only significant for job pursuit intentions, not organizational attraction. Age did interact with both work-life and wellness job advertisements to predict both recruitment outcomes via instrumental benefits. Results indicate that younger applicants do not differentiate between traditional and work-life or wellness benefits, but at older ages work-life benefits in particular are perceived as instrumental and associated with increased intentions to pursue employment.

Effects of job advertisements on recruitment outcomes differed by *gender*. The effect of the work-life job advertisement on recruitment outcomes was stronger for women than for men. This can be explained via perceptions of instrumental benefits. Conversely, in the wellness condition males saw the employer as more sophisticated and in turn were more attracted and reported higher job pursuit intentions.

Finally, individuals who believe they are in good *health* were more likely to see wellness benefits as instrumental and therefore are more attracted and more likely to pursue employment when an organization promotes these.

Chapter 4: Discussion

Recruiting top talent is becoming increasingly difficult, and simultaneously more important for achieving and maintaining competitive advantage. Organizations are responding by finding new ways to differentiate themselves from the competition (Society for Human Resource Management, 2018). One strategy is through offering nontraditional employer rewards packages beyond the basic salary, medical benefits, and 401ks. Two different types of these packages, work-life benefits and wellness benefits, were examined in this study in relation to organizational attraction and job pursuit intentions. The results support hypotheses that nontraditional benefits positively influence recruitment outcomes, and these effects occur because of a positive effect on some (but not all) instrumental, symbolic, and experiential employer image attributes dimensions.

Participants who read the work-life or wellness job advertisement perceived the employer as having more useful benefits (instrumental), as being more sophisticated and exciting (symbolic), and had expectations the company treated employees better (experiential). Consequently, these participants reported higher organizational attraction and job pursuit intentions compared to those who read the traditional benefits job advertisement. In contrast, perceptions of employer pay, job security, advancement, or autonomous working conditions (instrumental attributes) did not appear to play a role in the ads' effects on attraction and pursuit. The work-life and wellness job ads did have a significant impact on all symbolic attributes, but perceptions about employer competence or wholesomeness did not explain attraction or job pursuit intentions. Finally, perceptions of coworker relationships were not influenced by the job advertisements.

Theoretical Contributions

Work-life and wellness programs. Research indicates work-life and wellness programs provide value for the companies that implement them (Tetrick & Winslow, 2015), but there is still much unknown about how these employer rewards are perceived by applicants and if they impact recruitment goals. The current study provides empirical evidence that work-life and wellness programs have an important pre-hire effect by positively influencing employer image and supporting recruitment efforts.

First, although existing empirical evidence does indicate work-life benefits are useful for attracting prospective employees (Uggerslev et al., 2012), this research is limited. Many of the findings focus on flexibility (e.g., Carless & Wintle, 2007; Clifton & Shepard, 2004; Honeycutt & Rosen, 1997), targeted samples (i.e., young workers; Carless & Wintle, 2007; Ehrhart et al., 2012; Wayne & Casper, 2012), or have only assessed perceptions about how well these programs work rather than using direct tests (Evans, 2012; Kossek & Lee, 2005; Lee et al., 2002). The current research supplements the literature by linking a full package of work-life benefits with two recruitment outcomes via a rigorous experimental design.

Second, a link between wellness programs with both employee and organizational outcomes is established, but little is known about their influence on potential applicants. Claims about a positive link between wellness benefits and recruitment outcomes are based almost entirely on anecdotal evidence. The empirical results reported from this study expand what is known about the consequences of wellness programs, supporting a link with recruitment outcomes that was previously assumed but had not been tested.

Results from Pilot 1 and *post hoc* analyses are informative about both work-life and wellness benefits, providing insight about the value individuals place on different employer rewards. It was clear that traditional benefits are standard for a reason: Health insurance, competitive salary, and retirement benefits consistently scored as highly attractive, ranking in the top five across items in the first pilot study. Select work-life benefits were also ranked highly; consistently placing among the top ten most valuable benefits. And only one item was rated as a “top ten” benefit by 100% of respondents - scheduling flexibility (work-life benefit). Generous vacation days and remote work were also very important to respondents. The only wellness benefit that broke into the top ten was “wellness benefits available for spouse/partner.” Other select wellness benefits placed in the 10-15 range of importance (e.g., gym memberships, financial education/resources, stress management). The pilot results combined with *post hoc* results that the work-life job advertisement was more likely to increase pursuit intentions show a prioritization of work-life benefits over wellness benefits, at least as they were operationalized in this research.

It makes intuitive sense that people are motivated to pursue employment that first meets basic expectations of the employee/employer transaction, that is pay and health insurance (at least in the United States, where health insurance is typically obtained through an employer), and to place secondary value on benefits that are not exclusively associated with work. And again, it makes sense that wellness benefits rank lower than work-life benefits, because many of these types of offerings are only beneficial if one has time to take advantage of them. Having time off and flexible schedule enables behaviors

such as mindfulness practice or going to the gym. The Pilot 1 and *post hoc* results offer a preliminary understanding about the varying importance of many different types of benefits options.

Employer image/brand. These results also contribute to the literature on employer image. A link between employer rewards and employer image is a recently acknowledged gap (Theurer et al., 2018) that the present study addresses. The findings illuminate a leverage point for organizations to modify their employer brand. Work-life and wellness job advertisements positively influenced perceptions of an employer including inferences that an organization was wholesome, exciting, competent (wellness condition only), sophisticated, and that employees are treated well and provided autonomy.

Further, the results supplement previous research linking instrumental and symbolic employer image attributes to recruitment outcomes (e.g., Lievens, 2007; Lievens & Highhouse, 2003; Slaughter & Greguras, 2009) by demonstrating nontraditional job advertisements increase organizational attraction and job pursuit intentions via instrumental benefits attributes and perceptions of employer as sophisticated and exciting (symbolic).

In addition to identifying new antecedents of employer image (employer rewards), this research introduces new measures that can be used in future research. Items were added to assess instrumental benefits perceptions because these have been traditionally operationalized as part of pay but not exclusively measured. Additionally, the measure of perceptions about autonomous working conditions was a new

contribution. Although instrumental value placed on autonomous working conditions did not predict recruitment outcomes, these were significantly influenced by job advertisements and could be relevant for assessing the employer image relationship with other outcomes.

There has been much variety in the how instrumental and symbolic attributes have been measured in the past. Instrumental measurement has often been conducted using an inductive method to assess attributes most relevant to the context of each study. Several different measures of symbolic attributes have been used; many derived from Aaker's (1997) scale of brand personality. The piloting and factor analyses performed for the present research reduced 33 instrumental items to 14, and 42 symbolic items to 16, and in doing so provide short, reliable scales for assessing instrumental and symbolic attributes that can be used in future research.

Another contribution of the present study is the inclusion of two additional experiential attributes, expected treatment and anticipated coworker relations, as components of employer image. Experiential attributes were omitted when Lievens and Highhouse (2003) applied Keller's (1993) concepts of brand image to operationalize employer image in a recruitment context. Lievens and Slaughter (2016) noted this omission in a recent review of employer image and called for future exploration about the effect of recruitment-related experiences (though they referred to actual experiences such as recruitment events).

The employee experience is becoming an increasingly critical part of competitive strategy because of its presumed effects on job seeker attitudes. Thus, it is noteworthy

that the present study examined how recruitment marketing can impact the expected employee experience. It was suspected that benefits information could signal to an applicant about a supportive culture and positive interpersonal work climate, but results indicate inferences were made only about the organizational experience, and respondents did not extrapolate about anticipated experiences with coworkers. It was revealed that work-life and wellness benefits were related to expectations of better treatment by the organization, and in turn better recruitment outcomes. This suggests employee experience may be construed from the earliest applicant contact point, and these inferences are influenced by the benefits offered by the employer. Companies concerned with managing employee experience will want to incorporate these findings into their organizational strategies.

Recruitment. The primary outcomes of interest were organizational attraction and job pursuit intentions. The data show the direct effects of work-life and wellness benefits on these recruitment outcomes and that some employer image components (attributions about benefits, inferences that the employer is exciting and/or sophisticated, and expectations about treatment) explain the positive relationship between work-life and wellness packages and recruitment outcomes.

These findings contribute to recruitment research by establishing that work-life and wellness benefit packages are relevant signals for supporting recruitment efforts. The present study adds to existing theory (signaling theory; Rynes, 1991; Spence, 1973) by showing *how* the signal of interest (benefits information) increases attraction. Specifically, recruitment materials had a positive impact on employer image, and these

favorable perceptions of the organization as an employer were related to greater attraction and pursuit. Investigation of employer image attributes as explanatory mechanisms addresses criticisms that the theory is too broad and without sufficient testing of underlying processes (Breugh, 2013; Celani & Singh, 2010; Ehrhart & Ziegert, 2005). Results indicate that employer benefits provide useful information to job seekers (signals) that is used to draw inferences about the organization (employer image attributes) and positively impact recruitment efforts (organizational attraction and job pursuit intentions).

Individual differences. The individual characteristics explored here provide a more nuanced understanding about if, and which, individual differences matter to the effects of benefits on recruitment. Do job seekers of different ages, genders, family stage, health status, or personal identity salience (family or wellness) interpret benefit signals differently when making inferences about employer image attributes? That is, when presented with the same information, are they making different assessments about the company (path α). And do these differently influence organizational attraction and job pursuit intentions (path β)? Results revealed that age, gender, and perceived health do interact with recruitment materials messaging to impact perceptions of employer image and recruitment attitudes and intentions. These findings indicate work-life and wellness recruitment marketing content can be useful for targeted recruiting. They also highlight that these signals may be require thoughtful consideration so as not to unintentionally introduce bias into the recruitment process.

Respondents of younger ages did not differentiate between job conditions, but as age increased there were significant differences with work-life and wellness benefits

being associated with higher intentions to pursue employment than in the traditional condition, where pursuit intentions declined rapidly with age. A significant indirect effect via inferences about benefits suggests that as people age, they place more value on nontraditional employer rewards and are more likely to seek employment when employers offer benefits beyond the historical standard.

In this research, women inferred greater value from the advertised work-life benefits, and in turn were more likely to want to work for that employer. Although empirical evidence is inconsistent regarding gender differences in experiences of work-life conflict, these results align with pervasive assumptions and traditional social role expectations (women as caregivers) that influence women at work.

The results that healthier individuals view wellness benefits as instrumentally valuable and are therefore more interested in being employed with that company are not a big surprise. Although one may presume that less healthy individuals would want to take advantage of wellness benefits, the wellness literature reports a similar phenomenon in that it is generally the employees who are already health-minded that take advantage of wellness programs (Tetrick & Winslow, 2015).

One possible explanation for gender as a significant moderator in the work-life condition (i.e., women are responsible for more childcare) suggests family stage and family-salient identity would also be important for predicting reactions in the work-life condition, but these did not interact with work-life benefits to predict recruitment outcomes (with income controlled for). These non-significant results could also be due to low power. Alternatively, these results could reflect that work-life balance is important

for all individuals, not just parents. Additionally, the family-salient identity measure does not define “family” or identify if family is related to strain or support. For example, a mother with a young child could have a very close family and family support that makes work-life benefits support less relevant.

Finally, wellness-salient identity was not a significant moderating variable.

Although self-reports of health related to recruitment outcomes because the benefits were seen as instrumental, the symbolic link between identity and employer image does appear to be relevant for recruitment. Again, this could be a power issue. Or respondents are not looking to merge their employee and wellness identities. Even without significant results, the introduction of a new, reliable measure to assess a wellness-salient identity was a unique contribution.

Practical Implications

This research addressed relevant organizational challenges (e.g., talent shortage, recruitment marketing, employer branding, employee experience) and provides useful insights about leverage points to implement evidence-based best practices. Using an occupational health psychology lens, this research offers a unique perspective, with results that are likely quite salient to employers. It shifts the focus away from individual wellbeing as a cause or consequence of work issues and instead examines how wellness programs can directly support organizational goals. These findings could have important implications for influencing financially motivated decision-making. Specifically, the findings of this study could further bolster arguments to organizational decision-makers on the value of these types of benefits programs.

Results indicate that having a work-life or wellness program and marketing it on recruiting materials can have a positive influence on employer branding and applicant attraction. These results not only support organizational recruitment and staffing goals but are likely to also impact other stakeholders. For example, customers, investors, and community members may view a company more favorably because of a positive employer image.

Potential Limitations and Future Directions

One potential limitation of the primary study is sampling from university undergraduate students. The skewed age distribution limits interpretation of age-related interaction effects because 85% of participants were under the age of 33. However, college students are an in-demand segment of the workforce frequently targeted for recruitment, so the results reported are relevant for supporting the recruitment goals of many organizations. Moreover, Portland State University provides a unique sample because students represent a wide range of ages, and the population is, on average, older than at more traditional universities. College Factual (n.d.) noted PSU enrollment in the 18 to 21 age range is 26.6% compared to a national average of 60%. The mean age of this sample is 27 years old.

Another potential sample limitation is that hypotheses relating to family stage were based on a condition relevant to only 7% of the sample. A recent report by the Institute for Women's Policy Research (IWPR) indicates 22% of college undergraduates are parents, and over half have children under the age of six years. Seventeen percent of the primary sample had children and less than half (41%) had children under six.

Although below the average reported by IWPR, the numbers are in the general range and may still be representative of undergraduates targeted for recruitment. Future research should examine these hypotheses in samples that have larger numbers of parents with young children.

Only nine percent of the population in the primary study reported they were seeking employment. However, 76% were currently working and 92% had at least one year of work experience. So, although the majority of the sample were not active job seekers, the majority were familiar with obtaining work and working a job. Again, future research should examine the effects of these employer benefits on recruitment in actual job seeker samples.

The size of the sample may also hinder a full understanding of the phenomenon because of limited statistical power. A pre-study power analysis indicated a minimum sample of $N = 462$ to demonstrate a significant mediation effect when both α and β effect sizes are small (Fritz & MacKinnon, 2007). Although data were collected from $N = 516$, removal of cases with failed attention checks and missing data resulted in a final sample short of that recommended by this power analysis ($N = 404$). According to Fritz and MacKinnon (2007), this sample size was sufficient to detect a significant mediation effect with a small α path (.14) and a medium β path (.26). As reported, the collected data support many of the hypotheses. Yet, the relatively small sample size suggests that some non-significant findings were due to insufficient power and suggests that more research is needed to determine the full effects of these different benefits packages on recruitment outcomes in larger samples.

Although the sample characteristics are appropriate to support critical decision-making in organizations as discussed, additional research with a different population would be informative. Greater diversity in terms of age and parental status have been discussed above. It would also be interesting to look at possible differential effects relating to career stage and industry because different benefits packages may be more or less attractive at different stages in one's career or within different industries. For example, a corporate-level executive may have different expectations about benefits based on perks they have earned across their career, and someone in the tech industry is likely to assume the availability of nontraditional benefits (because of industry standards) as compared to someone in agriculture. A recent meta-analysis on applicant attraction revealed stronger effects for field studies than those done in the lab (Swider et al., 2015) so future research should also explore the effects of employer rewards with job seekers actively looking for a job with actual organizations. Finally, replication with a larger sample would be helpful to address potential power issues and concerns about Type II error (failing to find a significant effect where one exists). This could be especially important for detecting smaller effect sizes that may be important when recruitment materials are used on large applicant pools.

One of the measures used in this study did not perform as expected and thus limits interpretation of the data. Two reverse-scored items had to be dropped from the coworker relations scale because positively and negatively worded items loaded as separate factors. Future research could re-examine the effect of benefits on perceptions of interpersonal work relationships with the full measure, rewording the items to all be positively worded.

The recruitment literature would also benefit from measurement of actual job seeking behaviors and decisions.

The lack of longitudinal research design for mediation analyses could be considered a limitation. However, the decision to omit a time lag was based on the real-world phenomenon of interest. Job seekers are likely to have perceptions and attitudes form very quickly and thus assessing employer image perceptions and attraction attitudes over time does not make the best sense. Support for causal order comes from theory and empirical data indicating employer image dimensions precede organizational attraction and job pursuit intentions. Further, random assignment of participants to different conditions supports inferences that employer rewards reviewed in recruitment advertisements preceded perceptions of employer image and attitudinal outcomes. Following manipulation of the independent variable, the mediator and then the outcomes were measured, simulating the real-world phenomenon and helping to reduce concerns about common methods bias.

In addition to the research directions noted above, there are many other avenues for researchers to build from these results. Results from this study should inspire additional investigation about the effects of other types of rewards and different benefit package bundles on employer image and recruitment outcomes. For example, it would be helpful to better understand how people are interpreting and placing value on benefits packages. Are ratings of employer image and recruitment outcomes based on a holistic, comprehensive assessment, or in response to one or more specific items? Also, how does the current job market and economic climate affect these results? That is, are

nontraditional benefits relevant for recruitment when jobs are hard to obtain? Another avenue for exploration would be to look beyond the effects of benefits packages to assess their value in relation to other organizational characteristics such as a company's reputation regarding the environmental or ethics. It would also be good to learn about how marketing of different benefits packages influences other stakeholders beyond job applicants. Do customers make the same employer image inferences? How do the inferences customers make impact their attitudes, intentions, and behaviors toward the organization? What about investors and shareholders? What about members of the community? If effects are wide-reaching, it would provide even greater incentive for organizations to implement work-life and wellness benefits.

A better understanding about the role of experiential attributes as a component of employer image is also needed. The current research findings indicted recruitment materials influence a potential applicant's expectations for how they will be treated, or what they anticipate would be their employee experience. Particularly with growing attention given to employee experience, research should be conducted to build the nomological network of this construct in an employer branding and recruitment context. It would be helpful for researchers and practitioners to have a better understanding about what type of information signaled by recruitment materials influences perceptions of employee experience, and to what degree. Additionally, it is important to find out how persistent the effects of job advertisement signals are, particularly pertaining to employee experience. That is, do pre-hire expectations of employee experience influence reports of employee experience post-hire?

Conclusion

The current study offers many contributions to research and practice. Specifically, it suggests that wellness benefits are related to perceptions about a potential employer, as well as attitudes and intentions towards it. It also expands knowledge about work-life benefits by revealing the effects of a full work-life benefits package (rather than individual components or overall reputation) on an organization's image as an employer and important recruitment outcomes. Signaling theory is supported with evidence that employer image is an important mechanism explaining how signals affect attraction. Further, the employer image literature was extended by identifying a novel antecedent (employer rewards), and with the addition of experiential attributes to the existing instrumental-symbolic framework. Finally, the effects of work-life and wellness job ads were shown to differ according to individual differences: age, gender, and perceived health. In addition to advancing multiple literatures, this study provides an evidence-base for organizational leaders to make decisions about implementing and marketing work-life and wellness benefits. In doing so, it will aid them in recruiting top talent for competitive advantage and business success.

Tables

Table 1

Overview of Employer Image Components

Employer Image Components	Definitions	Examples of how these are operationalized
Instrumental	Objective, tangible, functional, utilitarian organizational characteristics ^{ab}	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pay • Benefits • Location • Advancement opportunities • Job security • Task demands & diversity • Autonomy^c
Symbolic	Subjective, intangible, trait inferences about the organization ^{ab}	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sincerity, Trustworthiness • Excitement, Innovativeness • Competence • Sophistication, Prestige • Ruggedness, Robustness
Experiential	The day-to-day employee experience, or “what it feels like,” working for an organization ^b	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expected organizational treatment^c • Expected coworker relations^c

^aLievens & Highhouse (2003)^bAdapted from Keller (1993)^cNew for the current study

Table 2

Participant Characteristics

Age		
Mean (SD)		27 years (8.1)
Range		18 to 64 years
Under 21 years		16%
21-29 years		60%
30-39 years		16%
40-64 years		8%
Gender		
Male		38%
Female		60%
Prefer Not to Answer or Not Listed		< 2%
Race/Ethnicity		
White		54%
Asian		17%
Hispanic or Latino		15%
African American or Black		2%
Other		9%
Prefer Not to Answer		3%
Education		
High School or Equivalent		9%
Some College		66%
Bachelor's Degree		17%
Master's Degree		1%
Other		7%
Working Toward Bachelor's Degree		
Part-time		15%
Full-time		79%
No		6%
Current Grade Point Average (GPA)		
3.1 to 4.0		81%
2.1 to 3.0		19%
Prefer Not to Answer		< 1%
Current Employment Status		
Working, Full-time		30%
Working, Part-time		46%
Looking for Work		9%
Self-employed		3%
Not Working (Leave or Other)		11%
Unable to Work		1%
Work Experience		
Less Than 1 Year		8%

1-3 years	22%
3-5 years	24%

Table 2 continued.

5-10 years	23%
More than 10 years	23%
<hr/>	
Marital Status	
Married	19%
Divorced or Separated	5%
Never Married	60%
Living with Significant Other	13%
Prefer Not to Answer	3%
<hr/>	
Has Children (Yes)	17%
How Many Children Live at Home?	
1	7%
2	7%
3	2%
4 or 5	1%
Ages of Children	
Infant (0-11 months)	9%
1 year	12%
2 years	3%
3 years	9%
4 years	4%
5 years	6%
6-9 years	27%
10-14 years	28%
15-18 years	30%
<hr/>	
Children Under 6 years	7% (of full
No Children or Only Older Children	sample)
	93%
<hr/>	
Adult Care Responsibilities (Yes)	21%
<hr/>	
Household income	
Less than \$20,000	13%
\$20,000 to \$29,999	9%
\$30,000 to \$39,999	7%
\$40,000 to \$49,999	8%
\$50,000 to \$59,999	6%
\$60,000 to \$69,999	5%
\$70,000 to \$99,999	16%
\$100,000 to \$149,999	11%
\$150,000 or More	10%
Prefer Not to Answer	15%
<hr/>	

Table 3

Pilot 1 Results Rating Attractiveness of Traditional, Work-life, and Wellness Employer Benefits

Rank	Q1. Rate from 1 to 5 (not attractive to extremely attractive)					Q2. Select top ten			Q3. Assign 100 points to top ten				
	Type	Min	Max	M	SD	Type	N	%	Type	N	Min	Max	M
1	Medical benefits	T 3	5	4.78	0.58	Flexible hours	F 40	100%	Salary	T 38	0	80	20.79
2	Competitive salary	T 3	5	4.75	0.49	Generous vacation days	F 38	95%	Health insurance	T 34	4	80	19.24
3	Retirement benefits	T 3	5	4.70	0.52	Salary	T 38	95%	Flexible hours	F 40	0	30	9.85
4	Dental benefits	T 3	5	4.68	0.62	Health insurance	T 34	85%	Retirement benefits	T 31	0	30	11.35
5	Generous vacation days	F 3	5	4.38	0.74	Retirement benefits	T 31	78%	Generous vacation days	F 38	0	20	9.16
6	Flexible hours	F 3	5	4.25	0.78	Remote work	F 30	75%	Remote work	F 30	0	25	7.70
7	Vision benefits	T 1	5	4.18	1.30	Profit sharing	T 27	68%	Life insurance	T 27	0	15	8.11
8	Life insurance	T 1	5	3.78	1.44	Life insurance	T 27	68%	Profit sharing	T 27	0	20	8.00
9	Profit sharing	T 1	5	3.70	1.22	Partner benefits	S 21	53%	Partner benefits	S 21	0	15	6.86
10	Remote work	F 1	5	3.68	1.35	Maternity leave	F 15	38%	Maternity leave	F 15	0	20	8.40
11	Partner benefits	S 1	5	3.40	1.53	Gym membership	S 13	33%	Paternity leave	F 10	2	15	7.70
12	Financial education & resources	S 1	5	3.00	1.45	Financial education & resources	S 12	30%	Gym membership	S 13	0	10	5.46
13	Maternity leave	F 1	5	2.95	1.71	Paternity leave	F 10	25%	Financial education & resources	S 12	0	15	5.58
14	Stress management	S 1	5	2.95	1.38	Stress management	S 10	25%	Stress management	S 10	0	20	6.20

15	Paternity leave	F	1	5	2.83	1.72	Quiet rooms	S	9	Child care	F	7	0	10	5.71
16	Health screening	S	1	5	2.78	1.39	Child care	F	7	Quiet rooms	S	9	0	10	4.33
17	Gym membership	S	1	5	2.78	1.29	Massage	S	6	Risk Assessments	S	4	1	10	7.75
18	Flu vaccinations	S	1	5	2.63	1.35	Flu vaccinations	S	5	Massage	S	6	0	10	4.17
19	Child care	F	1	5	2.60	1.46	Risk Assessments	S	4	Weight loss support	S	3	2	10	5.67
20	Risk Assessments	S	1	5	2.60	1.34	Health screening	S	4	Mindfulness	S	3	1	10	5.33
21	Quiet rooms	S	1	5	2.45	1.48	Adoption assistance	F	3	Flu vaccinations	S	5	1	5	2.80
22	Massage	S	1	5	2.43	1.24	Elder care	F	3	Adoption assistance	F	3	1	5	3.67
23	Elder care	F	1	5	2.40	1.46	Mindfulness	S	3	Elder care	F	3	0	10	3.67
24	On-ramping for parents	F	1	5	2.40	1.39	Weight loss support	S	3	Health screening	S	4	0	5	2.75
25	Mindfulness	S	1	5	2.38	1.39	Lactation support	F	2	On-ramping for parents	F	1	1	10	10.00
26	Onsite fitness	S	1	5	2.38	1.21	Nutrition support	S	2	Lactation support	F	2	0	10	5.00
27	Lactation room	F	1	5	2.25	1.56	On-ramping for parents	F	1	Nutrition support	S	2	0	8	4.00
28	Nutrition support	S	1	5	2.20	1.26	Fitness challenges	S	1	Fitness challenges	S	1	5	5	5.00
29	Fitness challenges	S	1	5	2.13	1.07	Onsite fitness	S	1	Onsite fitness	S	1	1	1	1.00
30	Weight loss support	S	1	5	2.13	1.28	Lactation room	F	0	Lactation room	F	0			
31	Lactation support	F	1	5	2.00	1.34									
32	Adoption assistance	F	1	5	1.93	1.29									

Note. $N = 40$. T = traditional benefits, F = work-life benefits, S = wellness benefits. Medical, dental, vision benefits listed separately for Q1, aggregated Q2/Q3.

Table 4

Descriptive Statistics, Scale Reliabilities, and Correlations among Study Variables

	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1 Organizational Attraction	404	3.34	1.00	(.91)									
2 Job Pursuit Intentions	404	3.64	0.85	.80**	(.90)								
3 Pay (I)	404	3.09	0.78	.37**	.27**	(.88)							
4 Security & Advancement (I)	404	3.01	0.79	.48**	.38**	.63**	(.82)						
5 Benefits (I)	404	4.13	0.77	.40**	.41**	.38**	.41**	(.81)					
6 AWC (I)	404	3.14	0.90	.43**	.39**	.39**	.46**	.40**	(.87)				
7 Wholesome (S)	404	3.20	0.78	.59**	.51**	.41**	.57**	.42**	.53**	(.77)			
8 Excitement (S)	404	2.76	0.92	.64**	.52**	.44**	.57**	.35**	.51**	.68**	(.87)		
9 Competence (S)	404	3.38	0.83	.57**	.46**	.54**	.64**	.43**	.39**	.71**	.61**	(.86)	
10 Sophistication (S)	404	3.00	0.78	.61**	.52**	.48**	.61**	.40**	.51**	.69**	.77**	.70**	(.78)
11 Expected Treatment (E)	404	3.60	0.76	.63**	.56**	.37**	.49**	.47**	.41**	.66**	.55**	.63**	.57**
12 Coworker Relations (E)	404	3.25	0.67	.35**	.34**	.22**	.31**	.24**	.25**	.40**	.36**	.41**	.29**
13 Family-salient Identity	404	3.79	0.82	.09	.11*	-.05	.06	.14**	.05	.12*	.07	.07	.06
14 Wellness-salient Identity	404	4.16	0.73	.08	.12*	-.02	-.04	.07	.00	-.02	.06	.01	.06
15 Family Stage	404	0.06	0.24	.00	.00	.01	.03	.03	.01	.07	.05	.03	.02
16 Perceived Health	404	3.92	0.65	.03	.10*	-.08	-.08	.11*	-.02	-.02	.00	-.04	-.05
17 Age (years)	404	26.6	8.17	-.12*	-.08	-.13**	-.14**	-.10*	-.10*	-.13**	-.20**	-.19**	-.19**
18 Gender	399	0.61	0.49	.04	.01	.06	.09	.13**	.10	.06	.07	.09	.07
19 Race/ethnicity	404	0.46	0.50	.04	.05	.02	.06	.00	.07	.03	.04	.07	.06
20 Education	404	3.44	1.35	.08	.07	-.07	-.03	.05	.00	.03	.09	-.05	.01
21 GPA	402	2.81	0.39	-.02	-.02	-.02	.04	-.03	-.02	.07	-.03	.05	.00
22 Employment Status	404	2.59	2.08	-.02	.00	.03	.00	-.03	.03	-.04	-.06	-.07	-.03
23 Work Experience	404	3.29	1.27	-.01	-.02	-.11*	-.10*	-.01	-.04	-.02	-.03	-.12*	-.08
24 Adult Care	404	1.79	0.41	-.04	.00	.01	-.06	.06	.00	.04	-.05	.00	-.03
25 Income	344	6.72	3.60	-.18**	-.19**	-.16**	-.21**	-.07	-.10	-.12*	-.14**	-.23**	-.20**

Note. (I) = Instrumental, (S) = Symbolic, (E) = Experiential; AWC = autonomous working conditions. Gender and race/ethnicity are dummy coded.

Male = 0, female = 1, White = 0, other = 1. Cronbach's alpha on diagonal (none indicates a single item)

** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$. All significant correlations are bolded.

Table 4 continued

	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24
11 Expected Treatment (E)	(.91)													
12 Coworker Relations (E)	.49**	(.80)												
13 Family-salient Identity	.08	.11*	(.74)											
14 Wellness-salient Identity	-.01	-.03	.15**	(.84)										
15 Family Stage	.03	-.01	.17**	.01										
16 Perceived Health	.02	-.02	.16**	.37**	.02	(.69)								
17 Age (years)	-.24**	-.14**	.08	.07	.18**	.08								
18 Gender	.04	.02	.13*	.09	.08	-.06	.00							
19 Race/ethnicity	.03	.10*	.09	-.06	-.05	-.18**	-.21**	-.01						
20 Education	.00	.00	.02	.13**	.15**	.12*	.19**	.00	-.06					
21 GPA	.02	.13*	-.02	.06	.04	.05	-.04	.03	-.16**	-.03				
22 Employment Status	-.06	-.01	.00	.04	-.03	-.01	.09	-.06	.04	-.03	.05			
23 Work Experience	-.13**	-.10*	.04	.07	.17**	.13**	.61**	.05	-.31**	.17**	-.16**	-.19**		
24 Adult Care	.05	-.07	-.08	-.07	.03	.02	-.01	-.01	-.09	.03	.04	.00	-.03	
25 Income	-.13**	-.12*	.07	-.01	.11*	.07	.13*	-.06	-.16**	.10	.11*	-.07	.07	.03

Note. (I) = Instrumental, (S) = Symbolic, (E) = Experiential; AWC = autonomous working conditions. Gender and race/ethnicity are dummy coded. Male = 0, female = 1, White = 0, other = 1. Cronbach's alpha on diagonal (none indicates a single item)

** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$. All significant correlations are bolded.

Table 5

Summary of Hypotheses and Results

	Summary	Supported?
Direct effect hypotheses		
Hypothesis 1: Participants in a work-life benefits recruitment condition (i.e., traditional benefits plus benefits such as unlimited PTO and paid parental leave) will report greater a) organizational attraction and b) job pursuit intentions than those in a traditional benefits condition (i.e., standard salary, health insurance, and retirement package).	Work-life → Org Attraction	Y
	Work-life → JPI	Y
Hypothesis 2: Participants in a wellness benefits condition (i.e., traditional benefits plus benefits such as stress management resources and nutritional coaching) will report greater a) organizational attraction and b) job pursuit intentions than those in the traditional benefits condition (i.e., standard salary, health insurance, and retirement package).	Wellness → Org Attraction	Y
	Wellness → JPI	Y
Mediation hypotheses		
Hypothesis 3: Perceived instrumental attributes will mediate the effects of work-life benefits recruitment information on a) organizational attraction and b) job pursuit intentions.	Work-life → Instrumental → Attraction	N
	Work-life → Instrumental → JPI	N
Hypothesis 4: Perceived instrumental attributes will mediate the effects of wellness benefits recruitment information on a) organizational attraction and b) job pursuit intentions.	Wellness → Instrumental → Attraction	Y Benefits
	Wellness → Instrumental → JPI	Y Benefits
Hypothesis 5: Perceived symbolic attributes will mediate the effects of work-life benefits recruitment information on a) organizational attraction and b) job pursuit intentions.	Work-life → Symbolic → Attraction	Y Excitement Sophistication
	Work-life → Symbolic → JPI	Y Sophistication

Summary	Wellness → Symbolic → Attraction	Supported?
Hypothesis 6: Perceived symbolic attributes will mediate the effects of wellness benefits recruitment information on a) organizational attraction and b) job pursuit intentions.	Wellness → Symbolic → Attraction	Y Excitement Sophistication
	Work-life → Symbolic → JPI	Y Sophistication
Hypothesis 7: Anticipated experiential attributes, operationalized as expected treatment, will mediate the effects of work-life benefits recruitment information on a) organizational attraction and b) job pursuit intentions.	Work-life → Treatment → Attraction	Y
	Work-life → Treatment → JPI	Y
Hypothesis 8: Anticipated experiential attributes, operationalized as expected treatment, will mediate the effects of wellness benefits recruitment information on a) organizational attraction and b) job pursuit intentions.	Wellness → Treatment → Attraction	Y
	Wellness → Treatment → JPI	Y
Hypothesis 9: Anticipated experiential attributes, operationalized as coworker relations, will mediate the effects of work-life benefits recruitment information on a) organizational attraction and b) job pursuit intentions.	Work-life → Coworkers → Attraction	N
	Work-life → Coworkers → JPI	N
Hypothesis 10: Anticipated experiential attributes, operationalized as coworker relations, will mediate the effects of wellness benefits recruitment information on a) organizational attraction and b) job pursuit intentions.	Wellness → Coworkers → Attraction	N
	Wellness → Coworkers → JPI	N
Moderation hypotheses		
Hypothesis 11: The relation of wellness benefits recruitment information with a) organizational attraction and b) job pursuit intentions is stronger for women than for men.	Wellness x Gender → Attraction	N
	Wellness x Gender → JPI	N
Hypothesis 12: The relation between work-life benefits recruitment information and a) organizational attraction and b) job pursuit intentions will vary according to family stage such that individuals with children under six years old will be more attracted and report greater intentions.	Work-life x Family Stage → Attraction	N
	Work-life x Family Stage → JPI	N

Summary	Supported?
Moderated mediation hypothesis	
Hypothesis 13: The indirect effect of work-life benefits on a) organizational attraction and b) job pursuit intentions via instrumental attributes will vary according to family stage such that the effect will be stronger for individuals with children under six years old.	N N
	Work-life x Family Stage → Instrumental → Attraction Work-life x Family Stage → Instrumental → JPI
Research questions: Moderation & moderated mediation	
Research Question 1: Will the direct effect of work-life or wellness benefits on recruitment outcomes, or indirect effects via employer image components, vary by age?	N
	<u>Proposed moderator: Age</u> Work-life x Age → Attraction
	Y
	Work-life x Age → JPI
	Y
	Work-life x Age → EI → Attraction
	Benefits
	Y
	Work-life x Age → EI → JPI
	Benefits
	N
	Wellness x Age → Attraction
	N
	Wellness x Age → JPI
	Y
	Wellness x Age → EI → Attraction
	Y
	Benefits
	Y
	Wellness x Age → EI → JPI
	Benefits
	<u>Proposed moderator: Gender</u>
Research Question 2: Will the relation between work-life benefits recruitment information and a) organizational attraction or b) job pursuit intentions be different for men and women?	Y
	Work-life x Gender → Attraction
	Y
	Work-life x Gender → JPI
	Y
*Summary of significant results: Women reported higher attraction and job pursuit intentions than men in the work-life condition.	

Summary	Supported?
Research Question 3: Will the indirect effect of work-life or wellness benefits recruitment information via employer image components influence a) organizational attraction and b) job pursuit intentions differently for men and women?	Y Benefits
	Work-life x Gender → EI → Attraction
	Y Benefits
	Work-life x Gender → EI → JPI
*Summary of significant results: In the work-life condition, women reported higher attraction and job pursuit intentions than men via benefits attributions. In the wellness condition, men reported higher attraction and job pursuit intentions than women via perceptions of employer sophistication.	Y Sophistication
	Wellness x Gender → EI → Attraction
	Y Sophistication
	Wellness x Gender → EI → JPI
Research Question 4: Will the direct effect of work-life benefits on a) organizational attraction or b) job pursuit intentions, or indirect effects via symbolic attributes, be stronger for those individuals with a family-salient identity?	
	<u>Proposed moderator: Family identity</u>
	Work-life x Family Id → Attraction
	N
	Work-life x Family Id → JPI
	N
	Work-life x Family Id → SYM → Attraction
	N
	Work-life x Family Id → SYM → JPI
	N
Research Question 5: Will the direct effect of wellness benefits on organizational attraction or job pursuit intentions, or indirect effects via instrumental attributes, be stronger for individuals who perceive themselves to be in good versus poor health?	
	<u>Proposed moderator: Health</u>
	Wellness x Health → Attraction
	N
	Wellness x Health → JPI
	N
	Wellness x Health → INS → Attraction
	Y Benefits
	Wellness x Health → INS → JPI
	Y Benefits

Summary	Supported?
Research Question 6: Will the direct effect of wellness benefits on a) organizational attraction or b) job pursuit intentions, or indirect effects via symbolic attributes, be stronger for individuals who incorporate health and wellbeing as a part of their personal identity?	<u>Proposed moderator: Wellness identity</u>
	Wellness x Wellness Id → Attraction
	N
	Wellness x Wellness Id → JPI
	N
	Wellness x Wellness Id → SYM → Attraction
	N
	Wellness x Wellness Id → SYM → JPI
	N
<i>Note.</i> N = 344. Work-life and Wellness represent the job advertisement conditions. Attraction = organizational attraction, JPI = job pursuit intentions; Treatment = expected treatment, Coworkers = coworker relations; EI = employer image, SYM = symbolic attributes, INS = instrumental attributes; Family Id = family-salient identity, Wellness Id = wellness-salient identity. Y = yes, N = no, M = marginal support (lower level confidence interval = .000)	

Table 6

Direct Effects of Job Advertisements on Recruitment Outcomes

	<u>Organizational Attraction</u>		<u>Job Pursuit Intentions</u>	
	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>
Constant	3.29**	.14	3.69**	.12
Work-life Job Ad	.65**	.13	.46**	.11
Wellness Job Ad	.40**	.13	.22*	.11
Income	-.05**	.02	-.05**	.01

$R^2 = .10$, $F(3, 340) = 12.52$, $p < .001$ $R^2 = .09$, $F(3, 340) = 10.51$, $p < .001$

Note. $N = 344$. Constant = Traditional Job Ad.

** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$. Significant estimates are bolded.

Table 7

Bootstrapped Results for Indirect Effects of Work-life Job Advertisement on Recruitment Outcomes

Mediator	<u>Organizational Attraction</u>				<u>Job Pursuit Intentions</u>			
	Effect	SE	LLCI	ULCI	Effect	SE	LLCI	ULCI
Pay (I)	.00	.01	-.02	.01	.00	.01	-.02	.02
Security/Advancement (I)	.00	.01	-.02	.02	-.01	.01	-.04	.01
Benefits (I)	.02	.02	-.01	.06	.03	.03	-.02	.09
AWC (I)	.04	.07	-.11	.18	.10	.07	-.04	.23
Wholesome (S)	-.01	.05	-.11	.10	.04	.05	-.06	.14
Excitement (S)	.18*	.06	.07	.31	.08	.05	-.01	.20
Competence (S)	.02	.03	-.02	.08	-.01	.02	-.05	.03
Sophistication (S)	.09*	.05	.02	.20	.08*	.04	.01	.16
Expected Treatment (E)	.18*	.06	.08	.30	.13*	.04	.05	.23
Coworker Relations (E)	.00	.01	-.01	.03	.01	.01	-.01	.05

Note. $N = 344$. (I) = Instrumental, (S) = Symbolic, (E) = Experiential; AWC = autonomous working conditions. LLCI = lower limit 95% confidence interval, ULCI = upper limit 95% confidence interval. Bootstrap sample size = 5000. Percentile bootstrap results.

* indicates a significant effect (confidence interval does not include zero). Significant estimates are bolded.

Table 8

Bootstrapped Results for Indirect Effects of Wellness Job Advertisement on Recruitment Outcomes

Mediator	Organizational Attraction				Job Pursuit Intentions			
	Effect	SE	LLCI	95% ULCI	Effect	SE	LLCI	95% ULCI
Pay (I)	.00	.01	-.03	.01	.00	.01	-.03	.02
Security/Advancement (I)	.00	.02	-.03	.04	-.02	.02	-.05	.02
Benefits (I)	.03*	.02	.003	.08	.06*	.03	.02	.12
AWC (I)	.01	.02	-.03	.05	.03	.02	-.01	.07
Wholesome (S)	-.01	.04	-.09	.07	.03	.04	-.04	.11
Excitement (S)	.13*	.05	.05	.23	.06	.04	-.01	.14
Competence (S)	.03	.03	-.02	.09	-.01	.02	-.06	.03
Sophistication (S)	.07*	.04	.01	.16	.06*	.03	.01	.14
Expected Treatment (E)	.17*	.05	.07	.28	.12*	.05	.05	.22
Coworker Relations (E)	.00	.01	-.01	.03	.01	.01	-.01	.05

Note. $N = 344$. (I) = Instrumental, (S) = Symbolic, (E) = Experiential; AWC = autonomous working conditions. LLCI = lower limit 95% confidence interval, ULCI = upper limit 95% confidence interval. Bootstrap sample size = 5000. Percentile bootstrap results.

* indicates confidence interval does not include zero. Significant estimates are bolded.

Table 9

Direct Effects of Job Advertisements on Employer Image Outcomes

Employer Image Outcome	Job Ad Condition	<i>b</i>	<i>p</i>
Pay (I)	Work-life	.03	.80
	Wellness	.06	.56
Security/Advancement (I)	Work-life	.11	.28
	Wellness	.20 [†]	.05
Benefits (I)	Work-life	.14	.18
	Wellness	.29***	< .001
AWC (I)	Work-life	1.07***	< .001
	Wellness	.30**	.004
Wholesome (S)	Work-life	.59***	< .001
	Wellness	.44***	< .001
Exciting (S)	Work-life	.69***	< .001
	Wellness	.49***	< .001
Competent (S)	Work-life	.21	.06
	Wellness	.26*	.046
Sophisticated (S)	Work-life	.44***	< .001
	Wellness	.34***	< .001
Expected Treatment (E)	Work-life	.46***	< .001
	Wellness	.44***	< .001
Coworker Relations (E)	WL	.09	.33
	WS	.09	.31

Note. $N = 344$. Traditional benefits are comparator. (I) = Instrumental, (S) = Symbolic, (E) = Experiential; AWC = autonomous working conditions.

*** $p < .001$, ** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$, [†] $p < .10$. Significant estimates are bolded.

Table 10

Interaction Effect of Job Advertisement and Gender on Recruitment Outcomes

	<u>Organizational Attraction</u>		<u>Job Pursuit Intentions</u>	
	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>p</i>
Constant	3.34**	.16	3.77**	.00
Work-life Job Ad	.29	.21	.15	.40
Wellness Job Ad	.48*	.20	.18	.28
Gender	-.09	.18	-.15	.33
Work-life x Gender	.56*	.26	.49*	.03
Wellness x Gender	-.17	.26	.05	.82
Income	-.05**	.02	-.04**	.00

$R^2 = .12$, $F(6, 336) = 7.58$, $p < .001$. $R^2 = .10$, $F(6, 336) = 6.15$, $p < .001$

Note. $N = 344$. Constant = Traditional Job Ad.

** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$. Significant estimates are bolded.

Table 11

Interaction Effect of Job Advertisement and Family Stage on Recruitment Outcomes

	<u>Organizational Attraction</u>			<u>Job Pursuit Intentions</u>		
	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>p</i>
Constant	3.28**	.14	.00	3.71**	.12	.00
Work-life Job Ad	.65**	.13	.00	.43**	.11	.00
Wellness Job Ad	.41**	.13	.00	.19†	.11	.08
Family Stage	.27	.36	.46	-.15	.30	.62
Work-life x Family Stage	.21	.61	.73	.73	.52	.16
Wellness x Family Stage	-.20	.52	.70	.30	.44	.51
Income	-.05**	.02	.00	-.05**	.01	.00

$R^2 = .10$, $F(6, 337) = 6.47$, $p < .001$ $R^2 = .09$, $F(6, 337) = 5.63$, $p < .001$

Note. $N = 344$. Constant = Traditional Job Ad.

** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$, † $p < .10$. Significant estimates are bolded.

Table 12

Results for a Moderated Mediation Model of Work-life Job Advertisement on Recruitment Outcomes through Instrumental Attributes Moderated by Family Stage

Mediator	<u>Organizational Attraction</u>				<u>Job Pursuit Intentions</u>			
	Index	SE	95% LCI	95% ULCI	Index	SE	95% LCI	95% ULCI
Pay	.02	.06	-.09	.16	-.01	.06	-.12	.07
Security/Advancement	.17	.19	-.15	.64	.07	.19	-.07	.28
Benefits	.11	.13	-.13	.39	.12	.12	-.15	.42
Autonomous Working Conditions	.04	.08	-.09	.23	.05	.11	-.12	.24

Note. $N = 344$.

Table 13

	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>p</i>
Constant	3.66**	.11	.00
Work-life Job Ad	.47**	.11	.00
Wellness Job Ad	.22*	.11	.04
Age	-.03**	.01	.00
Work-life x Age	.03*	.01	.01
Wellness x Age	.03*	.01	.049
Income	-.04**	.01	.00
$R^2 = .11, F(6, 337) = 6.92, p < .001.$			

Note. $N = 344$. Constant = Traditional Job Ad.

** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$. Significant estimates are bolded.

Table 14

Results for a Moderated Mediation Model of Work-life Job Advertisement on Recruitment Outcomes through Employer Image Moderated by Age

Mediator	<u>Organizational Attraction</u>				<u>Job Pursuit Intentions</u>			
	Index	SE	95% LLCI	95% ULCI	Index	SE	95% LLCI	95% ULCI
Benefits (I)	.004†	.003	.0000	.01	.01*	.004	.001	.015
Excitement (S)	.01	.004	-.001	.01	.004	.002	-.0003	.009
Sophistication (S)	.003	.003	-.001	.01	.002	.002	-.001	.006
Expected Treatment (E)	.004	.005	-.01	.01	.003	.004	-.005	.01

Note. $N = 344$. (I) = Instrumental, (S) = Symbolic, (E) = Experiential; AWC = autonomous working conditions. LLCI = lower limit 95% confidence interval, ULCI = upper limit 95% confidence interval. Bootstrap sample size = 5000. Percentile bootstrap results. * indicates confidence interval does not include zero. † indicates confidence interval equals zero. Significant estimates are bolded.

Table 15

Results for a Moderated Mediation Model of Wellness Job Advertisement on Recruitment Outcomes through Employer Image Moderated by Age

Mediator	<u>Organizational Attraction</u>				<u>Job Pursuit Intentions</u>			
	Index	SE	LLCI	95% ULCI	Index	SE	LLCI	95% ULCI
Benefits (I)	.004†	.002	.000	.009	.01*	.003	.001	.012
Excitement (S)	-.002	.005	-.01	.006	-.001	.003	-.007	.003
Sophistication (S)	-.001	.003	-.008	.006	-.001	.002	-.01	.004
Expected Treatment (E)	-.001	.004	-.01	.006	-.001	.004	-.009	.006

Note. $N = 344$. (I) = Instrumental, (S) = Symbolic, (E) = Experiential; AWC = autonomous working conditions. LLCI = lower limit 95% confidence interval, ULCI = upper limit 95% confidence interval. Bootstrap sample size = 5000. Percentile bootstrap results. * indicates confidence interval does not include zero. † indicates confidence interval equals zero. Significant estimates are bolded.

Table 16

Results for a Moderated Mediation Model of Work-life Job Advertisement on Recruitment Outcomes through Employer Image Moderated by Gender

Mediator	<u>Organizational Attraction</u>				<u>Job Pursuit Intentions</u>			
	Index	SE	95% LLCI	95% ULCI	Index	SE	95% LLCI	95% ULCI
Benefits (I)	.09*	.05	.01	.21	.15*	.07	.04	.31
Excitement (S)	.06	.07	-.06	.20	.03	.04	-.03	.12
Sophistication (S)	-.01	.05	-.12	.09	-.01	.03	-.08	.06
Expected Treatment (E)	.15	.09	-.01	.32	.11	.06	-.001	.25

Note. $N = 344$. (I) = Instrumental, (S) = Symbolic, (E) = Experiential; AWC = autonomous working conditions. LLCI = lower limit 95% confidence interval, ULCI = upper limit 95% confidence interval. Bootstrap sample size = 5000. Percentile bootstrap results. * indicates confidence interval does not include zero. Significant estimates are bolded.

Table 17

Results for a Moderated Mediation Model of Wellness Job Advertisement on Recruitment Outcomes through Employer Image Moderated by Gender

Mediator	<u>Organizational Attraction</u>				<u>Job Pursuit Intentions</u>			
	Index	SE	LLCI	95% ULCI	Index	SE	LLCI	95% ULCI
Benefits (I)	-.001	.03	-.05	.06	-.002	.04	-.08	.09
Excitement (S)	-.08	.07	-.22	.05	-.04	.04	-.14	.03
Sophistication (S)	-.12*	.06	-.25	-.01	-.07*	.04	-.16	-.002
Expected Treatment (E)	-.14	.08	-.31	.02	-.10	.07	-.24	.02

Note. $N = 344$. (I) = Instrumental, (S) = Symbolic, (E) = Experiential; AWC = autonomous working conditions. LLCI = lower limit 95% confidence interval, ULCI = upper limit 95% confidence interval. Bootstrap sample size = 5000. Percentile bootstrap results. * indicates confidence interval does not include zero. Significant estimates are bolded.

Table 18

Results for a Moderated Mediation Model of Wellness Job Advertisement on Recruitment Outcomes through Employer Image Moderated by Perceived Health

Mediator	<u>Organizational Attraction</u>				<u>Job Pursuit Intentions</u>			
	Index	SE	LLCI	95% ULCI	Index	SE	LLCI	95% ULCI
Benefits (I)	.06*	.03	.01	.14	.09*	.05	.01	.18
Excitement (S)	-.01	.05	-.12	.09	-.01	.03	-.07	.05
Sophistication (S)	.04	.05	-.04	.14	.03	.03	-.03	.10
Expected Treatment (E)	.05	.07	-.08	.18	.04	.05	-.06	.14

Note. $N = 344$. (I) = Instrumental, (S) = Symbolic, (E) = Experiential; AWC = autonomous working conditions. LLCI = lower limit 95% confidence interval, ULCI = upper limit 95% confidence interval. Bootstrap sample size = 5000. Percentile bootstrap results. * indicates confidence interval does not include zero. Significant estimates are bolded.

Table 19

Results for a Moderated Mediation Model of Work-life Job Advertisement on Recruitment Outcomes through Employer Image Moderated by Family-salient Identity

Mediator	<u>Organizational Attraction</u>				<u>Job Pursuit Intentions</u>			
	Index	SE	95% LCI	95% ULCI	Index	SE	95% LCI	95% ULCI
Benefits (I)	.02	.02	-.01	.07	.04	.03	-.02	.11
Excitement (S)	-.03	.04	-.12	.05	-.02	.02	-.07	.03
Sophistication (S)	.01	.03	-.06	.07	.003	.02	-.04	.04
Expected Treatment (E)	-.04	.06	-.15	.08	-.03	.04	-.11	.06

Note. $N = 344$. (I) = Instrumental, (S) = Symbolic, (E) = Experiential; AWC = autonomous working conditions. LCI = lower limit 95% confidence interval, ULCI = upper limit 95% confidence interval. Bootstrap sample size = 5000. Percentile bootstrap results.

Table 20

Results for a Moderated Mediation Model of Wellness Job Advertisement on Recruitment Outcomes through Employer Image Moderated by Wellness-Salient Identity

Mediator	<u>Organizational Attraction</u>				<u>Job Pursuit Intentions</u>			
	Index	SE	LLCI	95% ULCI	Index	SE	LLCI	95% ULCI
Benefits (I)	.03	.02	-.004	.08	.05	.03	-.01	.12
Excitement (S)	-.02	.04	-.11	.06	.00	.03	-.06	.06
Sophistication (S)	.05	.04	-.02	.14	.03	.03	-.01	.09
Expected Treatment (E)	.09	.07	-.03	.24	.07	.05	-.02	.19

Note. $N = 344$. (I) = Instrumental, (S) = Symbolic, (E) = Experiential; AWC = autonomous working conditions. LLCI = lower limit 95% confidence interval, ULCI = upper limit 95% confidence interval. Bootstrap sample size = 5000. Percentile bootstrap results.

Figures

Figure 1. Conceptual model for hypotheses examining the direct and indirect effects of employer rewards on organizational attraction and job pursuit intentions via employer image components, with additional hypotheses and research questions investigating the moderating effect of surface-level and deep-level individual characteristics. Superscripts associated with individual characteristics indicate hypotheses and research questions limited to specific variables. a = work-life benefits; b = wellness benefits, c = instrumental attributes; d = symbolic attributes.

Figure 2. A significant interaction between the work-life job advertisement and age on job pursuit intentions is illustrated ($p < .01$). The ages tested represent the 16th, 50th, and 84th percentiles. At age 20, there were not significant differences between rating of job pursuit intentions in the work-life condition, but at age 23 and 33 job pursuit intentions were significantly higher than in the traditional condition. It can be seen here that this interaction results from a negative relationship between age and job pursuit intentions in the traditional condition and a positive relationship between age and job pursuit intentions in the work-life condition. An interaction between the wellness condition and age on job pursuit intentions is also significant ($p < .05$). Significant differences in job pursuit intention exist only among those who are 33 years old. The graph illustrates this difference relies on a decrease in job pursuit intentions among older participants in the traditional condition as there is little change across age groups in the wellness condition.

Figure 3. Graphical representation of a significant interaction between the work-life job advertisement and gender on organizational attraction ($p < .05$). In the work-life condition, women are significantly more attracted to the organization than men are.

Figure 4. A significant interaction between the work-life job advertisement and gender on job pursuit intentions is illustrated ($p < .05$). In the work-life condition, women report significantly higher intentions to pursue employment than men.

References

- Aaker, J. L. (1997). Dimensions of brand personality. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 34(3), 347-356.
- Aaker, J. L., Benet-Martinez, V., & Garolera, J. (2001). Consumption symbols as carriers of culture: A study of Japanese and Spanish brand personality constructs. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 81(3), 492-508.
- AARP (2014). *Staying ahead of the curve 2013: The AARP work and career study. Older workers in an uneasy job market*. Retrieved from https://www.aarp.org/content/dam/aarp/research/surveys_statistics/general/2014/Staying-Ahead-of-the-Curve-2013-The-Work-and-Career-Study-AARP-res-gen.pdf
- AARP and SHRM (2012). *What are older workers seeking?: An AARP/SHRM survey of 50+ workers*. Retrieved from https://www.aarp.org/content/dam/aarp/research/surveys_statistics/econ/2012/What-Are-Older-Workers-Seeking-An-AARP-SHRM-Survey-of-50-Plus-Workers-AARP.pdf
- Aiman-Smith, L., Bauer, T. N., & Cable, D. M. (2001). Are you attracted? Do you intend to pursue? A recruiting policy-capturing study. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 16(2), 219-237.
- Ajzen, I. (1985). From intentions to actions: A theory of planned behavior. In *Action Control* (pp. 11-39). Springer: Berlin.

- Allen, T. D., & Finkelstein, L. M. (2014). Work–family conflict among members of full-time dual-earner couples: An examination of family life stage, gender, and age. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 19*(3), 376-384.
- Alınışık, E., & Alınışık, Ü. (2012). Identifying dimensions of attractiveness in employer branding: effects of age, gender, and current employment status. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 58*, 1336-1343.
- American Institute of Preventative Medicine (2016). *Generational wellness: An analysis of generational attitudes toward health improvement* [White Paper]. Retrieved from https://healthylife.com/generations/assets/generation-white-paper_2016.pdf
- Amstad, F. T., Meier, L. L., Fasel, U., Elfering, A., & Semmer, N. K. (2011). A meta-analysis of work–family conflict and various outcomes with a special emphasis on cross-domain versus matching-domain relations. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 16*(2), 151-169.
- Avery, D. R., & McKay, P. F. (2006). Target practice: An organizational impression management approach to attracting minority and female job applicants. *Personnel Psychology, 59*(1), 157-187.
- Bal, A. C., Reiss, A. E., Rudolph, C. W., & Baltes, B. B. (2011). Examining positive and negative perceptions of older workers: A meta-analysis. *Journals of Gerontology Series B: Psychological Sciences and Social Sciences, 66*(6), 687-698.
- Barber, A. E. (1998). *Recruiting employees: Individual and organizational perspectives*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

- Barber, A. E., & Roehling, M. V. (1993). Job postings and the decision to interview: A verbal protocol analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78(5), 845-856.
- Bauer, T., Erdogan, B., Caughlin, D., & Truxillo, D (2019). *Human resource management: People, data, and analytics*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Bernerth, J. B., & Aguinis, H. (2016). A critical review and best-practice recommendations for control variable usage. *Personnel Psychology*, 69(1), 229-283.
- Bourhis, A., & Mekkaoui, R. (2010). Beyond work-family balance: Are family-friendly organizations more attractive? *Relations Industrielles/Industrial Relations*, 65(1), 98-117.
- Breaugh, J. A. (2008). Employee recruitment: Current knowledge and important areas for future research. *Human Resource Management Review*, 18, 103–118.
- Breaugh, J. A. (2013). Employee recruitment. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 64, 389-416.
- Bureau of Labor and Statistics (2019). *Civilian unemployment chart*. Retrieved from <https://www.bls.gov/charts/employment-situation/civilian-unemployment-rate.htm#>
- Byrne, D. W., Goetzel, R. Z., McGown, P. W., Holmes, M. C., Beckowski, M. S., Tabrizi, M. J., ... & Yarbrough, M. I. (2011). Seven-year trends in employee health habits from a comprehensive workplace health promotion program at

- Vanderbilt University. *Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine*, 53(12), 1372-1381.
- Cable, D. M., & Turban, D. B. (2001). Establishing the dimensions, sources and value of job seekers' employer knowledge during recruitment. *Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management*, 20, 115-163.
- Cable, D. M., & Turban, D. B. (2003). The value of organizational image in the recruitment context: A brand equity perspective. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 33, 2244–2266.
- Carless, S. A., & Imber, A. (2007). The influence of perceived interviewer and job and organizational characteristics on applicant attraction and job choice intentions: The role of applicant anxiety. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 15(4), 359-371.
- Carless, S. A., & Wintle, J. (2007). Applicant attraction: The role of recruiter function, work–life balance policies and career salience. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 15(4), 394-404.
- Casper, W. J., Wayne, J. H., & Manegold, J. G. (2013). Who will we recruit? Targeting deep- and surface-level diversity with human resource policy advertising. *Human Resource Management*, 52(3), 311-332.
- Catano, V. M., & Morrow Hines, H. (2016). The influence of corporate social responsibility, psychologically healthy workplaces, and individual values in attracting millennial job applicants. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science/Revue Canadienne des Sciences du Comportement*, 48(2), 142-154.

- Catanzaro, D., Moore, H., & Marshall, T. R. (2010). The impact of organizational culture on attraction and recruitment of job applicants. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 25(4), 649-662.
- Celani, A., & Singh, P. (2010). Signaling theory and applicant attraction outcomes. *Personnel Review*, 40(2), 222-238.
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (2016). *Workplace health promotion: Using the workplace to improve the nation's health*. Retrieved from <https://www.cdc.gov/chronicdisease/resources/publications/aag/pdf/2016/aag-workplace-health.pdf>
- Chapman, D. S., Uggerslev, K. L., Carroll, S. A., Piasentin, K. A., & 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.
- Chen, C. C., Lin, M. M., & Chen, C. M. (2012). Exploring the mechanisms of the relationship between website characteristics and organizational attraction. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 23(4), 867-885.
- Clifton, T. J., & Shepard, E. (2004). Work and family programs and productivity: Estimates applying a production function model. *International Journal of Manpower*, 25, 714-728.
- College Factual (n.d.). *Portland State University diversity: How good is it?* Retrieved February 26, 2019 from <https://www.collegefactual.com/colleges/portland-state-university/student-life/diversity/>

- Collins, J. J., Baase, C. M., Sharda, C. E., Ozminkowski, R. J., Nicholson, S., Billotti, G. M., ... & Berger, M. L. (2005). The assessment of chronic health conditions on work performance, absence, and total economic impact for employers. *Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine*, 47(6), 547-557.
- Connelly, L. M. (2008). Pilot studies. *Medsurg Nursing*, 17(6), 411-412.
- Connelly, B. L., Certo, S. T., Ireland, R. D., & Reutzel, C. R. (2011). Signaling theory: A review and assessment. *Journal of Management*, 37(1), 39-67.
- Crump, C. E., Earp, J. A. L., Kozma, C. M., & Hertz-Picciotto, I. (1996). Effect of organization-level variables on differential employee participation in 10 federal worksite health promotion programs. *Health Education Quarterly*, 23(2), 204-223.
- Darcy, C., McCarthy, A., Hill, J., & Grady, G. (2012). Work-life balance: One size fits all? An exploratory analysis of the differential effects of career stage. *European Management Journal*, 30(2), 111-120.
- Davies, G., Chun, R., da Silva, R. V., & Roper, S. (2004). A corporate character scale to assess employee and customer views of organization reputation. *Corporate Reputation Review*, 7(2), 125-146.
- Deloitte Insights (2018). *The rise of the social enterprise: 2018 Deloitte global human capital trends*. Retrieved from <https://www2.deloitte.com/insights/us/en/focus/human-capital-trends/2018/network-of-teams-connected-workplace.html>

- Devendorf, S. A., & Highhouse, S. (2008). Applicant–employee similarity and attraction to an employer. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 81(4), 607-617.
- Dore, M. M. (2008). Family systems theory. In B. A. Thyer, K. M. Sowers, & C. N. Dulmus (Eds.), *Comprehensive handbook of social work and social welfare, Vol. 2. Human behavior in the social environment* (pp. 431-462). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons Inc.
- Duvall, E. M., & Miller, B. C. (1985). *Marriage and family development* (6th ed.). New York, NY: Harper & Row.
- Ehrhart, K. H., Mayer, D. M., & Ziegert, J. C. (2012). Web-based recruitment in the Millennial generation: Work–life balance, website usability, and organizational attraction. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 21(6), 850-874.
- Ehrhart, K. H., & Ziegert, J. C. (2005). Why are individuals attracted to organizations? *Journal of Management*, 31(6), 901-919.
- Eisner S.P. (2005). Managing generation Y. *Advanced Management Journal*, 70(4), 4-15.
- Erickson, J. J., Martinengo, G., & Hill, E. J. (2010). Putting work and family experiences in context: Differences by family life stage. *Human Relations*, 63, 955–979.
- Evans, J. D. (2013). Factors influencing recruitment and retention of nurse educators reported by current nurse faculty. *Journal of Professional Nursing*, 29(1), 11-20.

- Faul, F., Erdfelder, E., Buchner, A., & Lang, A.-G. (2009). Statistical power analyses using G*Power 3.1: Tests for correlation and regression analyses. *Behavior Research Methods*, 41, 1149-1160.
- Fishbein, M., & Ajzen, I. (1975). *Belief, attitude, intention, and behavior: An introduction to theory and research*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Fritz, M. S., & MacKinnon, D. P. (2007). Required sample size to detect the mediated effect. *Psychological Science*, 18(3), 233-239.
- García, M. F., Posthuma, R. A., & Quiñones, M. (2010). How benefit information and demographics influence employee recruiting in Mexico. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 25(3), 523-531.
- Grant, A. M., Dutton, J. E., & Rosso, B. D. (2008). Giving commitment: Employee support programs and the prosocial sensemaking process. *Academy of Management Journal*, 51, 898-918.
- Greenhaus, J. H., & Kossek, E. E. (2014). The contemporary career: A work-home perspective. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 1(1), 361-388.
- Gregory, C. K., Meade, A. W., & Thompson, L. F. (2013). Understanding internet recruitment via signaling theory and the elaboration likelihood model. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 29(5), 1949-1959.
- Grover, S. L., & Crocker, K. J. (1995). Who appreciates family-responsive human resource policies: The impact of family-friendly policies on the organizational attachment of parents and non-parents. *Personnel Psychology*, 48(2), 271-288.

- Gully, S. M., Phillips, J. M., Castellano, W. G., Han, K., & Kim, A. (2013). A mediated moderation model of recruiting socially and environmentally responsible job applicants. *Personnel Psychology*, 66(4), 935-973.
- Hayes, A. F. (2018). *Introduction to mediation, moderation, and conditional process analysis second edition: A regression-based approach*. New York, NY: The Guilford Press.
- Hershcovis, M. S., & Barling, J. (2010). Comparing victim attributions and outcomes for workplace aggression and sexual harassment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 95(5), 874-888.
- Highhouse, S., Lievens, F., & Sinar, E. F. (2003). Measuring attraction to organizations. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 63(6), 986-1001.
- Hom, P. W., Griffeth, R. W., Palich, L. E., & Bracker, J. S. (1999). Revisiting met expectations as a reason why realistic job previews work. *Personnel Psychology*, 52(1), 97-112.
- Hill, R. (1998). What sample size is “enough” in internet survey research? *Interpersonal Computing and Technology: An Electronic Journal for the 21st Century*, 6(3-4), 1-10.
- Hobfoll, S. E. (1989). Conservation of resources: A new attempt at conceptualizing stress. *American Psychologist*, 44(3), 513-524.
- Hobfoll, S. E., Vinokur, A. D., Pierce, P. F., & Lewandowski-Romps, L. (2012). The combined stress of family life, work, and war in Air Force men and women: A

test of conservation of resources theory. *International Journal of Stress Management*, 19(3), 217-237.

Honeycutt, T. L., & Rosen, B. (1997). Family friendly human resource policies, salary levels, and salient identity as predictors of organizational attraction. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 50(2), 271-290.

HR.com (2018). *The state of recruitment marketing 2018: Attract top talent and build the employer brand to achieve business success*. Retrieved from https://www.hr.com/en/resources/free_research_white_papers/the-state-of-recruitment-marketing-may2018_jgmskkqq.html.

Inc.com (n.d.). *This Is Why Millennials Care so Much About Work-Life Balance*. Retrieved from <https://www.inc.com/ryan-jenkins/this-is-what-millennials-value-most-in-a-job-why.html>

Institute for Women's Policy Research (IWPR). *Parents in College: By the numbers*. Retrieved September 30, 2019, from: https://iwpr.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/04/C481_Parents-in-College-By-the-Numbers-Aspen-Ascend-and-IWPR.pdf

Isaac, S., & Michael, W. B. (1995). *Handbook in research and evaluation*. San Diego, CA: Educational and Industrial Testing Services.

Jones, D. A., & Willness, C. R. (2013). Corporate social responsibility, organizational reputation, and recruitment. In K. Y. T. Yu & D. Cable (Eds.), *The Oxford*

Handbook of Recruitment (pp. 298-313). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

- Jones, D. A., Willness, C. R., & Heller, K. W. (2016). Illuminating the signals job seekers receive from an employer's community involvement and environmental sustainability practices: Insights into why most job seekers are attracted, others are indifferent, and a few are repelled. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 7, 1-16.
- Jones, D. A., Willness, C. R., & Madey, S. (2014). Why are job seekers attracted by corporate social performance? Experimental and field tests of three signal-based mechanisms. *Academy of Management Journal*, 57(2), 383-404.
- Judge, T. A., & Bretz, R. D. (1992). Effects of work values on job choice decisions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 77(3), 261-271.
- Kanfer, R., Beier, M. E., & Ackerman, P. L. (2013). Goals and motivation related to work in later adulthood: An organizing framework. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 22(3), 253-264.
- Kanfer, R., Wanberg, C. R., & Kantrowitz, T. M. (2001). Job search and employment: A personality-motivational analysis and meta-analytic review. *Journal of Applied psychology*, 86(5), 837-855.
- Kausel, E. E., & Slaughter, J. E. (2011). Narrow personality traits and organizational attraction: Evidence for the complementary hypothesis. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 114(1), 3-14.
- Keller, K. L. (1993). Conceptualizing, measuring, and managing customer-based brand equity. *The Journal of Marketing*, 57(1) 1-22.

Kinicki, A. J., McKee-Ryan, F. M., Schriesheim, C. A., & Carson, K. P. (2002).

Assessing the construct validity of the Job Descriptive Index: A review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(1), 14-32.

Kooij, D. T., De Lange, A. H., Jansen, P. G., Kanfer, R., & Dikkers, J. S. (2011). Age

and work-related motives: Results of a meta-analysis. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 32(2), 197-225.

Kossek, E., & Lee, M. (2005). *Making flexibility work: What managers have learned*

about implementing reduced-load work (Alfred P. Sloan Foundation Study

Technical Report). Williamsburg and Toronto, Ontario, Canada: Michigan State University and McGill University.

Landsbergis, P. A., Schnall, P. L., Belkic, K. L., Baker, D., Schwartz, J. E., & Pickering,

T. G. (2011). Workplace and cardiovascular disease: Relevance and potential role for occupational health psychology. In J. C. Quick & L. E. Tetrick (Eds.),

Handbook of occupational health psychology (pp. 243-264). Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association.

Lee, M. D., MacDermid, S. M., & Buck, M. L. (2000). Organizational paradigms of

reduced load work: Accommodation, elaboration, transformation. *Academy of Management Journal*, 43, 1211-1226.

Lemmer, G., & Gollwitzer, M. (2017). The “true” indirect effect won't (always) stand up:

When and why reverse mediation testing fails. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 69, 144-149.

- Lievens, F. (2007). Employer branding in the Belgian Army: The importance of instrumental and symbolic beliefs for potential applicants, actual applicants, and military employees. *Human Resource Management, 46*(1), 51-69.
- Lievens, F., Decaestecker, C., Coetsier, P., & Geirnaert, J. (2001). Organizational attractiveness for prospective applicants: A person-organisation fit perspective. *Applied Psychology: An International Review, 50*, 30-51.
- Lievens, F., & Highhouse, S. (2003). The relation of instrumental and symbolic attributes to a company's attractiveness as an employer. *Personnel Psychology, 56*(1), 75-102.
- Lievens, F., & Slaughter, J. E. (2016). Employer image and employer branding: What we know and what we need to know. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior, 3*, 407-440.
- Lievens, F., Van Hove, G., & Anseel, F. (2007). Organizational identity and employer image: Towards a unifying framework. *British Journal of Management, 18*, S45-S59.
- Lievens, F., Van Hove, G., & Schreurs, B. (2005). Examining the relationship between employer knowledge dimensions and organizational attractiveness: An application in a military context. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 78*(4), 553-572.
- Lobel, S. A., & Clair, L. S. (1992). Effects of family responsibilities, gender, and career identity salience on performance outcomes. *Academy of Management Journal, 35*(5), 1057-1069.

ManpowerGroup (2018). *Solving the talent shortage: Build, buy, borrow, and bridge*.

Retrieved from <https://go.manpowergroup.com/talent-shortage-2018#thereport>.

Meyer, J. P., Stanley, D. J., Herscovitch, L., & Topolnytsky, L. (2002). Affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organization: A meta-analysis of antecedents, correlates, and consequences. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 61(1), 20-52.

Michel, J. S., Kotrba, L. M., Mitchelson, J. K., Clark, M. A., & Baltes, B. B. (2011).

Antecedents of work–family conflict: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 32(5), 689-725.

Mitchell, R. J., & Bates, P. (2011). Measuring health-related productivity loss. *Population Health Management*, 14(2), 93-98.

Morgan, H., & Tucker, K. (1991). *Companies that care*. New York: Fireside.

Ng, T. W., & Feldman, D. C. (2012). Evaluating six common stereotypes about older workers with meta-analytical data. *Personnel Psychology*, 65(4), 821-858.

Pew Research Center (2018). *Millennials are the largest generation in the U.S. labor force*. Retrieved from [http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-](http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2018/04/11/millennials-largest-generation-us-labor-force/)

[tank/2018/04/11/millennials-largest-generation-us-labor-force/](http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2018/04/11/millennials-largest-generation-us-labor-force/)

PWC (2012). *Millennials at work: Reshaping the workplace in financial services*.

Retrieved from <https://www.pwc.com/gx/en/financial-services/publications/assets/pwc-millennials-at-work.pdf>

- Rau, B. L., & Adams, G. A. (2005). Attracting retirees to apply: Desired organizational characteristics of bridge employment. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 26*(6), 649-660.
- Ravlin, E. C., & Meglino, B. M. (1989). The transitivity of work values: Hierarchical preference ordering of socially desirable stimuli. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 44*(3), 494-508.
- Robbins, J. M., Ford, M. T., & Tetrick, L. E. (2012). Perceived unfairness and employee health: A meta-analytic integration. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 97*(2), 235-272.
- Robroek, S. J., Van Lenthe, F. J., Van Empelen, P., & Burdorf, A. (2009). Determinants of participation in worksite health promotion programmes: A systematic review. *International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity, 6*(1), 26.
- Rynes, S. L. (1991). Recruitment, job choice, and post-hire consequences. In M. D. Dunnette (Ed.) *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (2nd ed., pp. 399-444). Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Rynes, S. L., & Barber, A. E. (1990). Applicant attraction strategies: An organizational perspective. *Academy of Management Review, 15*(2), 286-310.
- Schleicher, D. J., Hansen, S. D., & Fox, K. E. (2011). Job attitudes and work values. In S. Zedeck (Ed.), *APA Handbooks in Psychology. APA handbook of industrial and organizational psychology, Vol. 3. Maintaining, expanding, and contracting the*

- organization* (pp. 137-189). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Schreurs, B., Druart, C., Proost, K., & De Witte, K. (2009). Symbolic attributes and organizational attractiveness: The moderating effects of applicant personality. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 17(1), 35-46.
- Shockley, K. M., Shen, W., DeNunzio, M. M., Arvan, M. L., & Knudsen, E. A. (2017). Disentangling the relationship between gender and work–family conflict: An integration of theoretical perspectives using meta-analytic methods. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 102(12), 1601-1635.
- Slaughter, J. E., & Greguras, G. J. (2009). Initial attraction to organizations: The influence of trait inferences. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 17(1), 1-18.
- Slaughter, J. E., Zickar, M. J., Highhouse, S., & Mohr, D. C. (2004). Personality trait inferences about organizations: development of a measure and assessment of construct validity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89(1), 85-103.
- Society for Human Resource Management (2018). *2018 Employee Benefits Report*. Retrieved from <https://www.shrm.org/hr-today/trends-and-forecasting/research-and-surveys/Documents/2018%20Employee%20Benefits%20Report.pdf>
- Soulez, S., & Guillot-Soulez, C. (2011). Recruitment marketing and generational segmentation: a critical analysis based on a sub-segment of Generation Y. *Recherche et Applications en Marketing (English Edition)*, 26(1), 39-55.

Spence, M. (1973). Job market signaling. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 87, 355-374.

Swider, B. W., Zimmerman, R. D., Charlier, S. D., & Pierotti, A. J. (2015). Deep-level and surface-level individual differences and applicant attraction to organizations: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 88, 73-83.

Tetrick, L. E., & Winslow, C. J. (2015). Workplace stress management interventions and health promotion. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 2(1), 583-603.

The Economist Intelligence Unit (2014). *Measuring wellness: From data to insights*.

Retrieved on from https://www.shrm.org/ResourcesAndTools/hr-topics/benefits/Documents/EIU_HUMANA_WEB_FINAL_0.pdf

Theurer, C. P., Tumasjan, A., Welpe, I. M., & Lievens, F. (2018). Employer branding: a brand equity-based literature review and research agenda. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 20(1), 155-179.

Thoemmes, F. (2015) Reversing Arrows in Mediation Models Does Not Distinguish Plausible Models. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 37, 226-234.

Turban, D. B. (2001). Organizational attractiveness as an employer on college campuses: An examination of the applicant population. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 58, 293-312.

Turban, D. B., Campion, J. E., & Eyring, A. R. (1995). Factors related to job acceptance decisions of college recruits. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 47, 193-213.

- Turban, D. B., Forret, M. L., & Hendrickson, C. L. (1998). Applicant attraction to firms: Influences of organization reputation, job and organizational attributes, and recruiter behaviors. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 52, 24-44.
- Uggerslev, K. L., Fassina, N. E., & Kraichy, D. (2012). Recruiting through the stages: A meta-analytic test of predictors of applicant attraction at different stages of the recruiting process. *Personnel Psychology*, 65(3), 597-660.
- Van Belle, G. (2002). *Statistical rules of thumb*. New York: John Wiley.
- Van Hove, G., Bas, T., Cromheecke, S., & Lievens, F. (2013). The instrumental and symbolic dimensions of organisations' image as an employer: A large-scale field study on employer branding in Turkey. *Applied Psychology*, 62(4), 543-557.
- Van Hove, G., & Saks, A. M. (2011). The instrumental-symbolic framework: Organisational image and attractiveness of potential applicants and their companions at a job fair. *Applied Psychology*, 60(2), 311-335.
- Volpone, S. D., Thomas, K. M., Sinisterra, P., & Johnson, L. (2013). Targeted recruiting: Identifying future employees. In K. Y. T. Yu & D. M. Cable (Eds.) *The Oxford handbook of recruitment* (pp. 110-125). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Walker, H. J., Bauer, T. N., Cole, M. S., Bernerth, J. B., Feild, H. S., & Short, J. C. (2013). Is this how I will be treated? Reducing uncertainty through recruitment interactions. *Academy of Management Journal*, 56(5), 1325-1347.
- Wayne, J. H., & Casper, W. J. (2012). Why does firm reputation in human resource policies influence college students? The mechanisms underlying job pursuit intentions. *Human Resource Management*, 51(1), 121-142.

Wein, D. (2018). *Win with wellness: Attract and retain talent*. Retrieved from <https://www.forbes.com/sites/forbesbusinessdevelopmentcouncil/2018/08/27/win-with-wellness-attract-and-retain-talent/#3eefd9041648>

Williams, M. L., & Bauer, T. N. (1994). The effect of a managing diversity policy on organizational attractiveness. *Group & Organization Management*, 19(3), 295-308.

Appendices

Appendix A: Pilot 1

Q1. Organizations offer a variety of compensation and benefits to attract potential job seekers. Some of these employer benefits are listed below. Please indicate how attractive each of these benefits is on a scale of 1 to 5. **1 = Not an important benefit to me and 5 = An extremely valuable benefit that would make you want to work for an organization.**

Note: Item order was randomized.

1. Competitive salary
2. Medical health insurance*
3. Dental health insurance*
4. Vision health insurance*
5. Life insurance
6. Retirement support (e.g., 401(k) plan)
7. Profit sharing
8. Financial education resources/coaching
9. Gym memberships (onsite or subsidy/reimbursement)
10. On-site fitness classes
11. Nutritional counseling
12. Weight loss support
13. Voluntary health screenings
14. Workshops on mindfulness
15. Stress management resources
16. Flexible work hours
17. Remote work options
18. Generous vacation days
19. Paid maternity leave
20. Paid paternity leave
21. On-site or subsidized child care
22. Elder care referral services
23. Onsite seasonal flu vaccinations
24. Health risk assessments
25. Company-organized fitness challenges
26. Massage therapy services
27. Onsite “quiet room” for personal use
28. Onsite lactation/mother’s room
29. Lactation support services
30. On-ramping programs or parents re-entering the workforce
31. Adoption assistance
32. Spousal benefits (not including health insurance)

*These three items were combined in subsequent questions as “Medical health insurance (including dental and vision).”

Q2. Select 10 benefits that you find MOST ATTRACTIVE.”

Q3. “You have 100 points (total) to assign across the ten employer rewards that you found most attractive. **Please distribute these points with higher values indicating benefits that are most important to you when applying for a job.**

Appendix B: Job Advertisements**Appendix B1: Condition 1 - Traditional Benefits (Control)**

You are participating in a study about organizational recruitment. Please carefully review this job posting and answer the survey questions that follow.

Our Great Company is hiring in your city!

General Skills Required

- **Leadership**
- **Communication**
- **Collaboration**
- **Time Management**

Education Required

- **Bachelor's Degree or higher**

Compensation & Benefits

- **We offer a competitive compensation and benefits package including:**
 - **Medical insurance**
 - **Dental insurance**
 - **Vision insurance**
 - **Life insurance**
 - **401(k) plan**

Appendix B2: Condition 2 - Traditional Plus Work-life Benefits

You are participating in a study about organizational recruitment. Please carefully review this job posting and answer the survey questions that follow.

Our Great Company is hiring in your city!

General Skills Required

- **Leadership**
- **Communication**
- **Collaboration**
- **Time Management**

Education Required

- **Bachelor's Degree or higher**

Compensation & Benefits

- **We offer a competitive compensation and benefits package including:**
 - **Complete medical, dental, and vision plans**
 - **401(k) plan and life insurance**
 - **Support for a healthy work-life balance including:**
 - **Flexible work hours**
 - **Remote work options**
 - **Generous vacation days**
 - **Paid maternity & paternity leave**

Appendix B3: Condition 3 - Traditional Plus Wellness Benefits

You are participating in a study about organizational recruitment. Please carefully review this job posting and answer the survey questions that follow.

Our Great Company is hiring in your city!

General Skills Required

- **Leadership**
- **Communication**
- **Collaboration**
- **Time Management**

Education Required

- **Bachelor's Degree or higher**

Compensation & Benefits

- **We offer a competitive compensation and benefits package including:**
 - **Complete medical, dental, and vision plans**
 - **401(k) plan and life insurance,**
 - **Support for personal wellness including:**
 - **Stress management resources**
 - **Financial education resources and coaching**
 - **Gym memberships**
 - **Wellness benefits available for spouse/partner**

Appendix C: Pilot 2

Appendix C1: Instrumental Attributes Measure

Primarily from Lievens, Van Hoyer, and Schreurs (2005; $\alpha = .85-.89$); also reviewed and pulled items from Lievens & Highhouse (2003; $\alpha = .64-.77$); Van Hoyer, Bas, Cromheecke, and Lievens (2013; $\alpha = .65-.84$); and Van Hoyer & Saks (2011; $\alpha = .78-.87$). In addition to existing items, five “benefits” items were created for testing with pilot. Previous work categorized benefits as an important instrumental attribute, but items did not explicitly measure benefits as a unique attribute (grouped with pay/compensation). The work scheduling autonomy measure comes from Breugh (1985; $\alpha = .81$).

Instructions: Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements.

Scale: 5-point, strongly disagree – strongly agree

Pay

1. This company offers above average pay.
2. Employees are paid high salaries at this company.
3. Employees at this company are paid well.
4. In general, pay is high at this company.
5. This company offers the possibility to make a lot of money.

Benefits

6. This company offers useful benefits.
7. Employees are provided with good benefits.
8. This company provides a valuable benefits package.
9. Employees are rewarded well through the company benefits.
10. This company offers better than average benefits.

Job security

11. This company offers job security.
12. This company offers the possibility to hold a permanent position.
13. This company offers people a job for life.
14. The company offers prospects for a certain future.
15. People who work at this company have a “solid” job.

Advancement

16. This company offers many opportunities for advancement.
17. This company offers diverse career opportunities.
18. This company offers the possibility to build a career.
19. This company offers prospects for higher positions.
20. Employees at this company are frequently promoted.

Task demands

21. Employees at this company work on challenging tasks.
22. Employees at this company are always busy.

Task diversity

- 23. This company offers the possibility to practice a diverse range of jobs.
- 24. This company offers the possibility to choose from a diversity of jobs.
- 25. Working at this company offers a lot of variety.
- 26. This company offers a wide range of jobs.
- 27. Working at this company involves doing a number of different things.

Working conditions

- 28. This company offers flexible working arrangements.
- 29. This company has comfortable working conditions.
- 30. This company provides a good work environment.

Work scheduling autonomy

- 31. I have control over the scheduling of my work.
- 32. I have some control over the sequencing of my work activities (when I do what).
- 33. My job is such that I can decide when to do particular work activities.

Appendix C2: Symbolic Attributes Measure

(Aaker, 1997; $\alpha = .90-.93$)

Instructions: Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree that the following traits describe this company.

Scale: 5-point, strongly disagree – strongly agree

1. Down-to-earth	15. Spirited	29. Successful
2. Family-oriented	16. Cool	30. Leader
3. Small-town	17. Young	31. Confident
4. Honest	18. Imaginative	32. Upper class
5. Sincere	19. Unique	33. Glamorous
6. Real	20. Up to date	34. Good looking
7. Wholesome	21. Independent	35. Charming
8. Original	22. Contemporary	36. Feminine
9. Cheerful	23. Reliable	37. Smooth
10. Sentimental	24. Hard working	38. Outdoorsy
11. Friendly	25. Secure	39. Masculine
12. Daring	26. Intelligent	40. Western
13. Trendy	27. Technical	41. Tough
14. Exciting	28. Corporate	42. Rugged

Appendix D: Primary Survey Measures**Appendix D1: Recruitment Outcomes**

Instructions: Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements.

Scale: 5-point, strongly disagree – strongly agree

Organizational attractiveness

(Highhouse, Lievens, & Sinar, 2003; $\alpha = .88$)

1. For me, this company would be a good place to work.
2. I would not be interested in this company except as a last resort.
3. This company is attractive to me as a place for employment.
4. I am interested in learning more about this company.
5. A job at this company is very appealing to me.

Job pursuit intentions

(Aiman-Smith, Bauer, & Cable, 2001; $\alpha = .91$)

1. I would accept a job offer from this company.
2. I would request more information about this company.
3. If this company visited campus I would want to speak with a representative
4. I would attempt to gain an interview with this company
5. I would actively pursue obtaining a position with this company

Appendix D2: Instrumental Attributes

Reduced scale based on Pilot 2 analyses.

Instructions: Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements.

Scale: 5-point, strongly disagree – strongly agree

Pay

1. Employees are paid high salaries at this company.
2. Employees at this company are paid well.
3. In general, pay is high at this company.

Benefits

4. This company offers useful benefits.
5. Employees are provided with good benefits.
6. Employees are rewarded well through the company benefits.

Job security and Advancement

7. This company offers job security.
8. The company offers prospects for a certain future.
9. This company offers many opportunities for advancement.
10. This company offers prospects for higher positions.

Work scheduling autonomy

11. This company offers flexible working arrangements.
12. I have control over the scheduling of my work.
13. I have some control over the sequencing of my work activities (when I do what).
14. My job is such that I can decide when to do particular work activities.

Appendix D3: Symbolic Attributes

Reduced scale based on Pilot 2 analyses.

Instructions: Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree that the following traits describe this company.

Scale: 5-point, strongly disagree – strongly agree

1. Down-to-earth	9. Reliable
2. Family-oriented	10. Hard working
3. Honest	11. Secure
4. Wholesome	12. Successful
5. Exciting	13. Upper class
6. Cool	14. Good looking
7. Imaginative	15. Charming
8. Unique	16. Smooth

Appendix D4: Experiential Attributes

Instructions: Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements.

Scale: 5-point, strongly disagree – strongly agree

Expected treatment

(Jones, Willness, & Madey, 2014; $\alpha = .92$)

1. This company probably treats its employees well.
2. I think this company would treat me well.
3. This company probably treats its employees fairly.
4. Employees are probably treated with dignity and respect at this company.
5. If I worked at this company, I could trust them to fulfill the promises they make.

Perceptions of fair interpersonal treatment (PFIT)

(Donovan, Drasgow, & Munson, 1998; $\alpha = .92$)

Coworker subscale

1. Coworkers help each other out.
2. Coworkers argue with each other.
3. Coworkers put each other down.
4. Coworkers treat each other with respect.

Appendix D5: Deep-level Individual Characteristics (work-life benefits)***Family stage***

(Allen & Finkelstein, 2014)

Instructions: Please answer.

1. Do you have children living at home?
2. If yes, how many?
3. What are their ages?

Family-salient identity

(Lobel & St. Clair, 1992; $\alpha = .76$).

1. Please indicate “which best describes you and your day-to-day priorities.”
 - a. I am primarily a family person.
 - b. I am a family and career person but lean a bit more towards family.
 - c. I am a career and family person.
 - d. I am a career and family person but lean a bit more towards career.
 - e. I am primarily a career person.

Instructions: Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements.

Scale: 5-point, strongly disagree – strongly agree

2. The most important things that happen to me involve my family.
3. The most important things that happen to me involve my job.
4. The major satisfactions in my life come from my family.
5. The major satisfactions in my life come from my job.

Appendix D6: Deep-level Individual Characteristics (wellness benefits)***Perceived health***

(Hobfoll, Vinoku, Pierce, & Lewandowski-Romps, 2012; $\alpha = .81$).

1. In general, would you say your health is...
 - a. Poor
 - b. Fair
 - c. Good
 - d. Excellent

Instructions: In the PAST 2 MONTHS...

Scale: 5-point, A very great extent – To no extent

2. To what extent do you have any particular health problems?
3. To what extent do you feel healthy enough to carry out things that you would like to do?

Instructions: In the PAST 2 MONTHS...

Scale: 5-point, All of the time – Never

4. How much of the time has your health kept you from doing the kind of things other people your age do?

Wellness-salient identity

(Adapted from Lobel & St. Clair, 1992; $\alpha = .76$).

1. Please indicate “which best describes you and your day-to-day priorities.”
 - a. I live a healthy lifestyle.
 - b. I primarily live a healthy lifestyle but sometimes participate in unhealthy activities.
 - c. I live a healthy lifestyle about half of the time.
 - d. I sometimes participate in healthy activities but primarily do not live a healthy lifestyle.
 - e. I do not live a healthy lifestyle.

Instructions: Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements.

Scale: 5-point, strongly disagree – strongly agree

2. My health is important to me.
3. My health is not a priority.
4. I am proud of living a healthy lifestyle.
5. Living a healthy lifestyle is not important to me.