

Radboud University



Generation Z and Employer Attractiveness Attributes

A study on characteristics of Generation Z and what organizational attributes

Generation Z finds attractive in an employer

Name

Willeke Wildeman

Student Number

S1083744

Abstract

Generation Z starts their working career in the time that the labour market is tight and industries face war of talent constantly. The supply of employees reduces and the demand for employees remain the same or increases at organizations, which gives Generation Z the chance to choose their employers. Employers have to differentiate to stand out, become competitive, and use employer branding effectively to attract this generation to their organizations. The purpose of this study is to find out what characteristics characterize Generation Z, what organizational attributes the population of the study finds attractive in an employer, and whether the population of this study in practice contains the characteristics as described in the literature of Generation Z. With a literature review, the several important characteristics and preferences of Generation Z are identified. Subsequently, a quantitative study was conducted at a Secondary Vocational Education school to identify the attractive employer attributes of a population of Generation Z. The data is collected via the Employer Attractiveness (EmpAt) Scale of Berthon et al. (2005) from fifty-five respondents enrolled in a catering education. The results show a significant importance in a fun and happy work environment. Attributes related to workplace relations are rated next the most important and show a significant difference compared to previous studies. Also job security and development opportunities are rated important and show significant differences. Characteristics related to innovative employers are considered least important by the study sample, but the results must be managed with caution.

Keywords: Generation Z, workplace characteristics, employer branding, employer attractiveness, attractiveness attributes, Employer Attractiveness (EmpAt) Scale

List of Tables

Table 1 Articles included for systematic review	11
Table 2 Workplace Characteristics and Preferences of Generation Z	13
Table 3 Employer attractiveness attributes importance based on the mean	25
Table 4 Employer attractiveness attributes importance based on the mode.....	27
Table 5 Employer attractiveness attributes with means and modes (high importance)	27
Table 6 Employer attractiveness attributes with means and modes (low importance)	27
Table 7 Overview comparison literature’s characteristics and attractiveness attributes	32

List of Abbreviations

Abbreviation	Meaning
EB	Employer Branding
EmpAt Scale	Employer Attractiveness Scale
MBO	Middelbaar Beroepsonderwijs (Secondary Vocational Education)

Tabel of Contents

List of Tables.....	3
List of Abbreviations.....	4
1 Introduction	6
2 Theoretical Framework	10
2.1 Workplace characteristics and preferences of Generation Z	10
2.2 Employer Branding.....	17
2.2.1 Employer Attractiveness	17
2.2.2 Employer Attractiveness Attributes	18
2.3 Theoretical Conclusion.....	18
3 Methodology	20
3.1 Data collection.....	20
3.2 Operationalization	21
3.3 Sample	22
4 Analysis & Findings.....	24
4.1 Statistical Properties of the EmpAt Scale.....	24
4.2 Comparison of employer attributes	27
5 Conclusion.....	33
6 Discussion	35
6.1 Findings & Implications	35
6.2 Contribution to knowledge	36
6.3 Limitations & Further Research	37
6.4 Practical Recommendations	38
7 References List.....	40
8 Appendices	46
Appendix I: Employer Attractiveness Scale.....	46
Appendix II: Dutch Employer Attractiveness Scale.....	48
Appendix III: Reliability Analysis Employer Attractiveness Scale	Fout! Bladwijzer niet gedefinieerd.
Appendix IV: Statistics Employer Attractiveness Scale.....	Fout! Bladwijzer niet gedefinieerd.
Appendix V: One Sample T-Test (I)	Fout! Bladwijzer niet gedefinieerd.
Appendix VI: One Sample T-Test (II)	Fout! Bladwijzer niet gedefinieerd.

1 Introduction

Several industries in the Netherlands, such as the health & welfare industry, the trading industry, and the catering industry, face a constant war for talent (CBS, 2023). The labour market is very tight, and employers compete against each other to recruit the best candidates (Heyday FM, n.d.). Attracting potential candidates is a prominent issue in the recruitment process, as it involves companies competing in the same pool of candidates in the labour market (Reis & Braga, 2016). The latest generation entering this pool of candidates is known as Generation Z. Due to the ageing population in Europe, Generation Z will start their careers in times when the supply of employees is decreasing (Sidorcuka & Chesnovicka, 2017), while the demand for employees remains the same. This means that organizations have the same demand for employees but must compete for a smaller number of candidates. To attract these candidates, organizations must improve and differentiate themselves to attract candidates.

Organizations differentiate themselves and become more competitive in attracting talent through employer branding initiatives (Reis & Braga, 2016). Employers in the hospitality sector face difficulties recruiting staff due to factors such as low wages (Dogru et al., 2024), a young transient workforce, unattractive working hours, and a negative industry image (Lin et al., 2018). The hospitality sector is often considered one of the least innovative industries, highlighting the need for creativity and innovation among companies (Styvén et al., 2022). Employer branding is crucial for this sector, as it is difficult to establish a positive image in the minds of potential employees and position the organization as a ‘great place to work’ (Uppal et al., 2017). Strong employer brands help organizations to both attract and retain potential employees (Styvén et al., 2022). Employer branding is a strategy that contribute to increasing employer attractiveness in the labour market (Reis & Braga, 2016). According to Backhaus and Tikoo (2004), employer branding is ‘grounded in the resource-based view and human resource theory and focuses on developing the image of organizations as potential employers’ (in Sivertzen et al., 2013, p. 473). By developing a positive image as potential employer and differentiating the organization from others, the employer attractiveness increases.

Employer attractiveness is defined as ‘the perceived level of both potential and current employees about the organization’s competitive advantages; in which the organization is seen as the best place to work’ (Nguyen et al., 2021, p. 98). This concept is operationalized through employer attractiveness attributes. Berthon et al. (2005) operationalized attractiveness attributes by the Employer Attractiveness (EmpAt) Scale. Attractiveness attributes represent the factors that potential candidates consider when selecting an employer (Berthon et al., 2005, in Reis & Braga, 2016). Applicants prioritize these factors based on their individual needs and expectations (Cable & Turban, 2001, in Reis & Braga, 2016). Given that each generation has unique priorities when it comes to selecting an employer, it is crucial to investigate the prioritized attributes of Generation Z. By investigating the prioritized attributes of a population belonging to Generation Z, organizations get insights in the characteristics and preferences of this generation. These preferences of Generation Z show organizations which attributes to focus on, in order to become attractive to Generation Z.

The workplace related characteristics and preferences of Generation Z have been extensively studied across various countries and continents. The study of Ganguli et al. (2022) reviews multi-geographical findings regarding the workplace related characteristics and preferences of Generation Z across countries on different continents. The review yielded the following preferences of Generation Z: workplace relationship, benefits, managerial relationship, and learning and development. All studies utilized in Ganguli et al.’s (2022) review were published between 2015 and 2020. Much of the existing literature on generations has been extensively explored, presenting findings that are often viewed as generic and stereotypical, including literature about Generation Z. There has been much criticism on generic and stereotyped findings in the generational literature. Over the years, the exploratory studies on the characteristics of Generation Z have shown different findings regarding these workplace related characteristics. For instance, it has been argued that the behaviours and values of people (cultural differences) can change or be influenced over time (Sakdiyakorn et al., 2021). Additionally, there is criticism on the tendency to view a generation as one-dimensional (Chaney et al., 2017) because preferences and values should align with the individual’s personal or interpersonal level (Sidorcuka & Chesnovicka, 2017). Moreover, less is known about how research findings about generations manifest in specific contexts. This criticism raises questions about the applicability of using a 'generation' as the basis for research. Still, the literature contains many insights into the work-related characteristics of Generation Z. The

aim is to gain a better understanding of the work related characteristics of Generation Z by performing a systematic literature review to answer the following research question:

‘What workplace characteristics characterize Generation Z?’

In this study, I identify the workplace related characteristics of a small population of Generation Z, which serves as the starting point of the empirical part of the study. By initially assessing and understanding the characteristics of Generation Z, employers can better target the preferences of Generation Z and attract them as potential candidates. Employers can respond to Generation Z’s demands by better clarifying organization’s benefits through effective use of employer branding.

Employer branding is growing in popularity within the field of human resources, and extensive research on employer branding has already been conducted (Moroko & Uncles, 2008; Biswas & Suar, 2014). Studies exploring the relationship between employer branding and employer attractiveness have investigated various aspects, including interactions with other generations (Reis & Braga, 2016), social media (Sivertzen et al., 2013; Kissel & Büttgen, 2015; Priyadarshini et al., 2017), and demographic factors such as age, gender, and employment status (Almaçık & Almaçık, 2012). However, there is a lack of academic research focussing on specific industries. The catering industry, which is part of the hospitality sector, is one of the industries that faces difficulties recruiting staff and has a constant war for talent. Organizations within the catering industry that utilize employer branding can gain competitive advantages like employer attractiveness to potential employees, making it easier to attract and retain talent. Employer attractiveness is the benefits of an organization perceived by potential candidates (Nguyen et al., 2021). To become an attractive employer, the organization differentiates itself from its competitors with its values, the organizational attributes. Organizational attributes are the well-considered qualities or features of an organization (De Kok et al., 2023) that are used to increase the employer attractiveness.

The catering organization experiences a demand for new potential candidates due to its growth and its high outflow of ageing employees within the next four years (... , personal communication, September 2023). The pool of potential candidates for ... primarily comprises students enrolled in Secondary Vocational Education (MBO) programs focused on

catering. The empirical part of the research is conducted at a MBO school specializing in catering and hospitality education. The objective is to explore what organizational attributes contribute to employer attractiveness and are deemed important for Generation Z. The second aim of the study is to assess which organizational attributes the study population finds attractive in an employer, by answering the research question:

‘What organizational attributes find the population of Generation Z attractive in ...?’

The Employer Attractiveness (EmpAt) Scale developed by Berthon et al. (2005) is used to measure employer attractiveness attributes for a population belonging to Generation Z. The EmpAt Scale has already identified important attractiveness attributes and has been utilized and validated in subsequent studies conducted in countries across the world over the years (Roy, 2008; Arachchige & Robertson, 2011; Alniaçik & Alniaçik, 2012; Sivertzen et al., 2013; Alniaçik et al., 2014; Reis & Braga, 2016; Eger et al., 2018; Babikova & Bucek, 2019; Gadibadi, 2020; Ha et al., 2021; Caputo et al., 2023). Additionally, the research findings contribute to the field of HR and recruitment. By examining the employer attractiveness attributes of a population belonging to Generation Z within the catering industry, the recruitment process can be better tailored to attract potential candidates in this sector. These findings assist ... in enhancing its attractiveness as an employer by identifying attractive organizational attributes. Consequently, ... can effectively attract and recruit potential candidates from the latest generation. Furthermore, the findings of this research question allow for a comparison between the identified attributes and the characteristics of Generation Z outlined in existing literature.

The research comprises a theoretical framework to understand the characteristics of Generation Z, reviewed from previous research. This theoretical framework also discusses the concepts of employer branding, employer attractiveness and employer attractiveness attributes, to understand the relationship between the concepts. The subsequent chapters present the methodological procedures, and the analysis and results of the study. The final chapters include the conclusion and the discussion, which discusses limitations of the research and suggests areas for future research, and the recommendations for ... on how to become an attractive employer for Generation Z.

2 Theoretical Framework

This chapter defines Generation Z and provides a systematical review, aimed to descriptively explore various workplace related characteristics and preferences of Generation Z as named in previous literature studies. Subsequently, this chapter explains the concepts of employer branding, employer attractiveness, and employer attractiveness attributes.

2.1 Workplace characteristics and preferences of Generation Z

Generation Z is the demographic cohort following the Millennials, which is currently graduating and leaving school, and entering the labour market. Literature defines different birth years for Generation Z. The studies of Kolnhofer-Derecskei et al. (2017) and Rickes (2016) describe Millennials as born between 1982 and 2004, indicating that Generation Z is born after the year 2004. According to the study of Posnick-Goodwin (2010), Generation Z is born between 1995 and the late 2000s. Other studies (Bencsik et al., 2016; Böhlich, 2020; Dutta & Mishra, 2021; Francis & Hoefel, 2018; Sakdiyakorn et al., 2021) also mention that Generation Z is born between 1995 and 2010. also mention that Generation Z was born between 1995 and 2010. Since more studies adopt these birth years, this study also assumes that Generation Z was born between 1995 and 2010.

Workplace characteristics and preferences - Literature Review

To answer the research question about which workplace characteristics characterize Generation Z, four European studies from the systematic review by Ganguli et al. (2022) were analyzed. Ganguli et al. (2022) examined the workplace characteristics and preferences of Generation Z and their implications for organizations worldwide. Since this study is focuses on the Netherlands, a European nation, only studies from Ganguli et al. (2022) that were conducted in European nations were considered. All the articles in Ganguli et al.'s (2022) study, which are analyzed, were conducted between 2016 and 2020. One European study from each year was analysed to investigate the workplace characteristics and preferences of Generation Z. By focusing exclusively on Europe, continental differences were minimized, enhancing the reliability of the findings regarding Generation Z's workplace characteristics in the Netherlands. The review of articles is presented below, in Table 1. Bencsik et al. (2016) investigated which HR activities needed to be adapted to meet the requirements of Generations Y and Z upon their entry into the workplace. Sidorcuka and Chesnovicka (2017)

analysed the existing methods for attracting and retaining Generation Z staff and identified which methods were perceived as most efficient. The study of Fratricova and Kirchmayer (2018) examined barriers to work motivation of Generation Z. Böhlich and Axmann (2020) conducted a comparative study of the expectations of Generation Z and the perceptions of employers regarding choosing an employer, work environment, and leadership.

Author / Year	Country
Bencsik et al. (2016)	Hungary
Sidorcuka and Chesnovicka (2017)	Latvia
Fratricova and Kirchmayer (2018)	Slovakia
Böhlich and Axmann (2020)	Germany

Table 1 Articles included for systematic review

The workplace characteristics and preferences in above mentioned studies are analysed and compared. Table 2 shows the authors of the articles along with the workplace characteristics and preferences of Generation Z. Because the four studies highlight different topics related to Generation Z and attrition of this generation not all workplace characteristics or preferences are mentioned in all articles. These boxes remained empty in the Table 2.

Author/Year	Ganguli et al. (2022)	Bencsik et al. (2016)	Sidorcuka and Chesnovicka (2017)	Fratricova and Kirchmayer (2018)	Böhlich and Axmann (2020)
Workplace Characteristics & Preferences					
Technological Savviness	<i>Technologically savvy</i>	<i>Important to be surrounded by a technological environment</i>	<i>Most connected generation who has adopted technological developments</i>	<i>Internet-savvy technologically literate generation</i>	
Job Security	<i>Stability and job security</i>	<i>Workplace stability</i>			<i>Security and predictability</i>
Entrepreneurial Orientation	<i>Interested in career paths</i>	<i>Careerist, professional ambitious generation</i>		<i>Need of career advancement</i>	
Learning and Development	<i>Seeks continuous good training</i>	<i>Continuously looking for new challenges and impulses</i>	<i>Willingness to gain work experience</i>	<i>Personal development</i>	
Relationships at the workplace	<i>Good relationships and team environment</i> <i>Committed</i>		<i>Engagement</i>	<i>Climate and performance need to be good</i> <i>Understanding and supportive</i>	

Innovative & Creative	<i>Innovative and creative</i>	<i>Performs better in innovative and creative activities</i>	<i>Considering creativity as important, important to have fresh ideas</i>		
Flexible Working Time	<i>Flexi work time</i>	<i>Allowance for flexible work schedules</i>	<i>Important to have flexibility</i>	<i>Deciding where and when to work</i>	<i>Flexibility</i>
Work-life Balance	<i>Work-life equilibrium</i>	<i>Work life balance</i>	<i>Separating work time and life, important to have a life/work balance</i>		<i>Work life balance</i>
Remuneration	<i>Generous pay, benefits and peripheral benefits</i>	<i>Immediate remuneration</i>	<i>More motivated by other benefits than remuneration</i>	<i>Fair payment</i>	<i>Valuing high salary more than fringe benefits</i>

Table 2 Workplace Characteristics and Preferences of Generation Z

Technological savviness

Ganguli et al. (2022) characterizes Generation Z as technologically savvy. Generation Z is born and raised into the world of technology and is the second wave of the digital generation born into the world of technology. Generation Z distinguishes itself from other generations through its connection to electronics and the digital world (Bencsik et al., 2016). Sidorcuka and Chesnovicka (2017) add that Generation Z is the most connected generation, heavily influenced by technological developments. When facing problems, rather than seeking advice or help, Generation Z tends to search for solutions online. Bencsik et al. (2016) highlighted that Generation Z is characterized by a preference for independently dealing with problems, which means they are not involving other people in it. Fratricova and Kirchmayer (2018) highlight Generation Z's internet-savvy and technological literacy, reinforcing the findings of the other reviewed studies. Bencsik et al. (2016) emphasize the importance of a technological environment for Generation Z, reporting that they mainly communicate in virtual spaces. In contrast, Ganguli et al. (2022) suggests that Generation Z prefers face-to-face interactions. The other analysed studies do not specify a preferred mode of communication for Generation Z. Given the significant role technology plays in their lives, *it is expected that the sample in this study will score items related to technology and electronics as important (5.00)*.

Job Security

The study of Ganguli et al. (2022) indicates that Generation Z values job security within an organization. Among the European studies analysed, Bencsik et al. (2016) and Böhlich and Axmann (2020) confirm that Generation Z seeks job security and workplace stability. However, the studies by Sidorcuka and Chesnovicka (2017) and Fratricova and Kirchmayer (2018) do not address this characteristic of Generation Z. Given the findings of Bencsik et al. (2016) and Böhlich and Axmann, and the lack of contradictory evidence, *it is expected that the sample in this study will score job security in an organization as very important (6.00)*.

Entrepreneurial Orientation and Learning & Development

Ganguli et al. (2022) show that Generation Z is interested in career paths and continuously seeks good training opportunities. Regarding career paths, Bencsik et al. (2016) mention that Generation Z is professionally ambitious and career oriented. Fratricova and Kirchmayer (2018) support this by noting that Generation Z has a strong need for career advancement.

Bencsik et al. (2016) describe that Generation Z is continuously looking for new challenges and impulses. Generation Z is interested in learning and development based on their interests and through informal learning. Sidorcuka and Chesnovicka (2017) cite Baumann (2014), who suggests that Generation Z plans to work for four companies during their lifetime, driven by a desire to gain diverse work experiences. Sidorcuka and Chesnovicka (2017) further explain that Generation Z values social connections, experiences, education, knowledge, and environmental sustainability within organizations. Fratricova and Kirchmayer (2018) add that Generation Z is keen on personal development. Böhlich and Axmann (2020) do not address entrepreneurial orientation or learning and development. Given the continuous pursuit of new challenges and their eagerness to gain work experience, *it is expected that the population of the study will express significant interest in attributes related to development opportunities within the organization.*

Relationships at the workplace

Ganguli et al. (2022) also describe that Generation Z values relationships with colleagues and managers. However, this characteristic is not confirmed by all four European studies. Only Fratricova and Kirchmayer (2018) support this characteristic, stating that a good organizational climate and employee performance are essential for fostering positive relationships with colleagues.

According to Ganguli et al. (2022), the kind of leadership Generation Z values having with the manager is that they are feeling committed to the organization. Sidorcuka and Chesnovicka (2017) complement this by noting that Generation Z wants to feel engaged with their work, team, and organization. Fratricova and Kirchmayer (2018) further highlight that Generation Z prefers managers who are understanding and supportive. Böhlich and Axmann (2020) mentioned that Generation Z is dependent on clear instructions of their managers. Based on these aspects, *it is expected that the study sample will express significant interest in attributes related to support and workplace relationships..*

Innovative and Creativity

Generation Z is characterized by its innovative and creative nature (Ganguli et al., 2022). Analysing the four European studies, Bencsik et al. (2016) describe Generation Z as innovative and creative due to their attitudes, perceptions and styles. Generation Z performs better in innovative and creative activities than its predecessors. Sidorcuka and Chesnovicka

(2017) add that Generation Z enjoys sharing their opinions and influences workplaces with their unique attitudes and styles. According to them, Generation Z values creativity and sharing fresh ideas to attract and retain their peers. Based on these findings, *it is expected that the sample will score attributes related to being innovative and the expression of opinions, attitudes, and styles through creativity as important (5.00).*

Flexibility, Work-Life Balance, and Remuneration

The study of Ganguli et al. (2022) shows that Generation Z favors generous pay, benefits, and peripheral benefits. However, the four European studies present varied results. Bencsik et al. (2016) state that Generation Z is interested in immediate remuneration, while Sidorcuka and Chesnovicka (2017) suggest that Generation Z is more motivated by other benefits than by pay. Fratricova and Kirchmayer (2018) note that Generation Z prefers fair payment, whereas Böhlich and Axmann (2020) report that Generation Z values a high salary more than fringe benefits. This finding by Böhlich and Axmann (2020) contradicts the earlier observation by Sidorcuka and Chesnovicka (2017).

Generation Z seeks enjoyment and pleasure in their work environment, which can be facilitated by flexibility. Ganguli et al. (2022) note that Generation Z prefers flexible work hours. All four analysed European studies confirm that Generation Z values flexibility and prefers flexible working schedules. Generation Z moves further away from the classic 9 to 5 office hours and prefers more flexible schedules (Sidorcuka & Chesnovicka, 2017). Fratricova and Kirchmayer (2018) add that Generation Z prefers to choose not only when but also where they work. Ganguli et al. (2022) describe work-life equilibrium as a significant motivating factor for Generation Z. Bencsik et al. (2016) also highlight work-life balance as a key work preference for this generation. Similarly, Sidorcuka and Chesnovicka (2017) note that Generation Z values the separation of work and personal life, underscoring the importance of work-life balance. Böhlich and Axmann (2020) further confirm that Generation Z considers maintaining a work-life balance crucial. Flexibility and a work-life are categorized under benefits in this study. Given these diverse preferences for remuneration and benefits, *it is expected that the sample in this study will show significant interest in pay and peripheral benefits.*

2.2 Employer Branding

When job seekers apply for a job, they often consider several organisations. In this process of consideration, job seekers emphasize the brand equity, image, awareness, and reputation of the organization (Berthon et al., 2005). Brand equity involves the impact of a brand rooted in the customer's knowledge (Davies, 2008), with image and awareness contributing to this knowledge. Organizational image and awareness relate the associations held in the customer's memory. The last consideration for job seekers when applying for a job is the reputation of the organization. As a contribution to improve the company's reputation and enhancing organization's attractiveness, employers seek to strengthen the company's name as a brand (Sivertzen et al., 2013, p. 473). This practice is known as employer branding.

EB is a critical tool for talent acquisition, development, and retention (Leekha Chhabra & Sharma, 2014), to maintain a healthy talent pool (Backhaus & Tikoo, 2004; Barrow & Mosley, 2005; Gaddam, 2008; Mandhanya & Shah, 2010; Martin et al., 2011). Organizations use effective EB to achieve certain competitive advantages, such as increased employer attractiveness, which makes it easier for them to attract and retain employees (Backhaus & Tikoo, 2004). EB in service firms, e.g. in the hospitality sector, is crucial because contact personnel in service settings play an essential role for value creation and customer satisfaction (Styvén et al., 2022). EB focuses on employment and characterizes the organisation's identity for both internal and external audiences. This study specifically focuses on EB towards an external audience, examining how an organisation presents itself and what attributes make an employer attractive. Contrary to the external branding process, the internal branding process deals with employer's creation of the organization's image, the communication of this image to the internal audience, and how the internal audience perceives it (Martin et al., 2005). An employer stands out when the organization presents itself differently in comparison to its competitors. The employer differentiates itself from its competitors with 'offers', which have different forms of values for their employees. These values are related to the employer attractiveness (Styvén et al., 2022). Because employer attractiveness is an important topic within employer branding, the following section delves deeper into employer attractiveness and employer attractiveness attributes.

2.2.1 Employer Attractiveness

The value of an employer brand reflects in its ability to attract potential applicants: the employer's attractiveness for job seekers (Kissel & Büttgen, 2015). Berthon et al. (2005)

define employer attractiveness as ‘the envisioned benefits that a potential employee sees in working for a specific organization’ (p. 156). The benefits that a potential employee sees are the comparisons between the organization’s image and their own needs, personality, and values (Backhaus & Tikoo, 2004). The comparisons make an organization more or less attractive for potential employees. The comparisons are also called a ‘fit’ that emphasizes the extent to which a person and the organization match with similar characteristics and meet each other’s needs (Kristof, 1996). The fit increases the identification of the employee with the organization and the organizational attractiveness (Carless, 2005; Turban & Keon, 1993). The study of Diener et al. (1984) align with Berthon et al.’s (2005) and Backhaus and Tikoo’s (2004) definitions of employer attractiveness, by stating that individuals are attracted to organizations that provide a work environment in which they can fulfil their needs. The misfit and missing the attractiveness between the potential candidate’s needs and the organization’s attributes may be an explanation for the labour shortage that companies experience. Organizational attributes represent the values of an organization (Umphress et al., 2007). It is important that the organization creates the best possible fit between Generation Z and the organizational attributes, to enhance the attractiveness to Generation Z.

2.2.2 Employer Attractiveness Attributes

To investigate the organizational attributes that attract the potential candidates, previous studies (Alniaçik & Alniaçik, 2012; Arachchige & Robertson, 2011; Roy, 2008; Sivertzen et al., 2013) utilized the Employer Attractiveness (EmpAt) Scale developed by Berthon et al. (2005). The EmpAt Scale consists of five dimensions of value: interest value, social value, economic value, development value, and application value. The EmpAt Scale is developed to measure external employer attractiveness (Styvén et al., 2022), and prioritizes employer attractiveness attributes. This EmpAt Scale measures the importance of organizational attributes to the particular target group and is used to give insights into what attributes are important and make the employer attractive.

2.3 Theoretical Conclusion

The literature review provides a comprehensive overview of the characteristics of Generation Z, addressing the research question about what characterizes this generation. Previous European studies have thoroughly examined these characteristics. Generation Z, characterized by its technological savviness, places significant value on the role of technology in their lives, reflecting a strong preference for digital solutions and virtual communication. They exhibit a

clear inclination towards job security and stable workplace environments, as corroborated by multiple European studies. Their entrepreneurial orientation is underscored by a continuous pursuit of new challenges, career advancement, and personal development opportunities. Positive workplace relationships are crucial for Generation Z, indicating their need for a nurturing and engaging organizational climate. Additionally, their innovative and creative nature drives them to value environments that foster creativity and the expression of fresh ideas. Flexibility in work schedules and a strong work-life balance are highly prized by this generation, although there are varied preferences regarding remuneration and benefits, which means that there is no clear consensus on whether Generation Z particularly prefers specific benefits.

To examine whether the expectations are supported, employer attractiveness attributes need to be assessed. The organizational attributes that are important for the population of the study will be assessed with the EmpAt Scale of Berthon et al. (2005). This approach will help assess the extent to which the study's population aligns with the characteristics of Generation Z as described in the literature. The findings will identify which organizational attributes the population of the study belonging to Generation Z finds appealing, enabling employers in the catering industry to tailor their branding more effectively to this generation.

3 Methodology

This chapter presents the methodology and methodological choices employed in the research. It delineates the necessary information required to address the research question and the methods used to obtain this information. The chapter discusses the process of data collection and operationalization for assessing attractive employer attributes, as well as the comparison between the characteristics of Generation Z outlined in the literature and the identified attractive employer attributes. Additionally, it specifies the sources from which this information is obtained and outlines the considered ethical considerations.

3.1 Data collection

To address the research question regarding the organizational attributes that are attractive to the study population, respondents were asked to complete the survey with Berthon et al.'s (2005) Employer Attractiveness Scale. This EmpAt Scale is employed to identify the workplace related characteristics of a population belonging to Generation Z. It is used as methodology because this scale has been utilized in previous studies concerning attractiveness attributes (Alniaçik & Alniaçik, 2012; Arachchige & Robertson, 2011; Caputo et al., 2023; Roy, 2008; Sivertzen et al., 2013), which increases the reliability of this study. Data is collected from individuals belonging to Generation Z who are interested in the catering industry and are enrolled in catering educational programs. The respondent's preferences for organization attributes were assessed based on the importance they assigned to each attribute.

The EmpAt Scale consists of five dimensions of value: interest value, social value, economic value, development value, and application value. Every value has five underlying questions, which is an organizational attribute. Interest value encompasses a challenging and stimulating job, with a focus on innovation and interest in product and services (Sivertzen et al., 2013; Reis & Braga, 2016). Social value relates to a pleasant and positive work environment, including social and interpersonal aspects such as relations to other employees (Sivertzen et al., 2013; Reis & Braga, 2016). Economic value pertains to economic benefits (Sivertzen et al., 2013), such as above-average wages, compensation packages, job security, and promotion opportunities (Reis & Braga, 2016). Development value points to the possibility for future job opportunities (Sivertzen et al., 2013), encompassing recognition, self-worth and confidence, skill development and career enhancing experiences (Reis & Braga, 2016). Lastly, application

value refers to the opportunity to use and apply the knowledge acquired earlier in a custom-oriented workplace (Sivertzen et al., 2013; Reis & Braga, 2016).

Subsequently, after identifying the workplace related characteristics of Generation Z and the attractive employer attributes, I compared the workplace characteristics of Generation Z to the attractive employer attributes the population of the study finds attractive. This comparison aimed to determine whether the study population exhibits the characteristics outlined in the theoretical framework. By analysing the disparities and similarities between the literature and the findings from the EmpAt Scale, the research question regarding the organizational attributes that are attractive to the population of the study can be effectively addressed.

3.2 Operationalization

To examine the attributes that the population of the study finds attractive in an employer, this study employs a quantitative approach in the form of a survey: the Employer Attractiveness (EmpAt) Scale developed by Berton et al. (2005). The EmpAt Scale is available in Appendix I. The respondents rate the survey questions using a rating scale: the Likert Scale. The Likert Scale in this study has a series of seven answer statements that measures the importance of the organizational attributes for the population of the study. The rating scale contains the answer statements 1 = not important at all, to 4 = neutral, to 7 = extremely important. I selected the EmpAt Scale as the research methodology due to its established use in global studies and its proven high reliability.

While this EmpAt Scale is originally in English, I translated the survey into Dutch, given the involvement of a Dutch population in the research, ensuring clarity for all participants. The clarity of the EmpAt Scale's questions is crucial for obtaining reliable responses. I took several steps to achieve this. Firstly, I searched for Dutch translations of Berthon et al.'s (2005) EmpAt Scale and found a translation in the master's thesis of Krommendijk (2020), which served as the basis for the Dutch survey. Subsequently, the translated scale underwent a pre-test with a representative from the target group, incorporating feedback to improve the scale's understandability. The university supervisor then reviewed the modified scale, and after further modifications (marked with '*'), it was returned to the representative from the target group for final confirmation. This iterative process aimed at enhancing the scale's reliability and content validity. The translated scale is available in Appendix II. The EmpAt Scale's reliability is evaluated by the Cronbach's alpha before using the survey. The reliability

analysis is available in Appendix III. The reliability of the complete EmpAt Scale is supported with a Cronbach's alpha of .952, which is characterized by high reliability.

Previous literature has identified several workplace related characteristics associated with Generation Z. The EmpAt Scale is employed to gauge attractive employer attributes. Subsequently, the characteristics identified, and the results obtained from the EmpAt Scale are compared to identify any similarities or discrepancies. The expectations involve identifying significant interests or differences within the sample. Significant interest is measured by comparing means (M). To determine whether the differences between groups are statistically significant, hypothesis testing is conducted with the following null hypothesis regarding the expected significant differences:

H₀ = There is no difference between the sample values and the tested values.

H₁ = There is a difference between the sample values and the tested values.

3.3 Sample

..., the organization in the catering industry, is seeking potential candidates from the Secondary Vocational Education (MBO) level. The target population for this research consists of MBO students who are currently enrolled in or have nearly completed a catering and hospitality-oriented program. I assume that these graduating MBO students fall within the age range of sixteen to twenty years. These ages show that the students are born between the 1995 and 2010, a question about age in the survey would not contribute to the research. The sample for this study comprises students from MBO school ..., which is specialized in food-related education programs. All participants are enrolled in food education but attend classes at different educational levels across the regions North Brabant and North Limburg. Conducting the method at students related to the relevant industry, increases the validity of the research. In total $N=55$ students completed the online survey. To facilitate easier access for the students, the questionnaire was shared as a QR code instead of using a weblink. The students completed the questionnaire individually, but collectively with their class and teacher during one of the educational courses (Tilborghs, personal communication, February 20, 2024). In total, four classes, consisting of ten to fifteen students each from ..., participated in the research.

Accessibility

The accessibility to ... was facilitated by ..., which has had an ongoing relationship with the school for several years. Through a ... employee, I connected with a teacher from ..., I decided to share the survey directly with the school, instead of utilizing social media, to ensure the inclusion of the right population in the sample - students with a background in catering and hospitality education. This personalized approach reduced the likelihood of participation by students without the relevant background, thereby improving the content validity of the responses received. In collaboration with my manager at ..., I sent an introductory email explaining the purpose of the research and inviting ... to participate.

After multiple communication with ... regarding the research approach, I ensured alignment and approval for the approach with the director of ... and the teacher from Subsequently, plans were made to reach out to the students. By reaching the students and conducting the survey, I have addressed various ethical considerations. Firstly, participation in the research and completion of the survey were voluntary. The population has been told about the purpose, duration, and value of the survey and study, prior to completion. The participants had the right to decline participation or withdraw from the research at any point (American Psychological Association, 2003). Secondly, respondents' privacy was ensured, as no personal information was requested. It was communicated to the teacher that adherence to these ethical considerations was expected, and it is assumed that the teacher conveyed this information to the students.

4 Analysis & Findings

This chapter describes the analysis and shows the findings of the study. The first paragraph shows the analysis and findings of the attractive employer attributes that attract the population of Generation Z to the organization, measured by the Employer Attractiveness (EmpAt) Scale of Berton et al. (2005). The second shows a comparison of the measurements of the sample's employer attractiveness attributes compared to measurements in other studies. This part evaluates the expectations regarding workplace related characteristics of Generation Z. The analysis is conducted using IBM SPSS Statistics 27. The findings presented in this chapter are the basis for the conclusion.

4.1 Statistical Properties of the EmpAt Scale

The statistical analysis of responses to the EmpAt Scale is shown in Appendix IV. The appendix shows a mean from a minimum of 5.33 and a maximum of 6.51 (*SD* from 0.92 to 1.37). The missing data in the study is ignorable as it is inherent to the data collection process, where respondents were not required to answer all questions. The missing data occurs randomly at the item level and accounts for less than 10% of the dataset, thus deemed acceptable.

Upon examining the mean scores of the questions, all employer attractiveness attributes were rated as important (ranging from 5 to 7). Table 3 presents the employer attributes and their means scores from high to low, providing a measure of importance for each attribute. From Table 3, it is evident that attributes such as a fun ($M = 6.51$ $SD = .920$) and happy work environment ($M = 6.39$ $SD = 1.054$), as well as a sense of acceptance and belonging ($M = 6.13$ $SD = 1.218$) are deemed very important. Attributes related to being a humanitarian organization ($M = 5.33$ $SD = 1.218$), the employer offering innovative products and service ($M = 5.43$ $SD = 0.971$), an above-averaged salary ($M = 5.56$ $SD = 1.244$), and innovative work practices ($M = 5.57$ $SD = 1.002$) are perceived as less important, but not unimportant by the study's sample.

Employer Attractiveness Attribute	Mean
A fun working environment	6.51
Happy work environment	6.39
Acceptance and belonging	6.13
Supportive and encouraging colleagues	6.05
Having a good relationship with your colleagues	6.05
Recognition/appreciation from management	6.05
Good promotion opportunities within the organization	6.04
Job security within the organization	6.02
Gaining career-enhancing experiences	5.98
The organization is customer-oriented	5.95
A springboard for future employment	5.93
Having a good relationship with your supervisors	5.89
Feeling good about yourself as a result of working for a particular organization	5.85
An attractive overall compensation package	5.82
Hands-on inter-departmental experience	5.73
The organization both values and makes use of your creativity	5.73
The organization produces high-quality products and services	5.65
Opportunity to apply what was learned at a tertiary institution	5.65
Working in an exciting environment	5.64
Feeling more self-confident as a result of working for a particular organization	5.62
Opportunity to teach others what you have learned	5.60
Innovative employer – novel work practices/forward-thinking	5.57
An above-averaged salary	5.56
The organization produces innovative products and services	5.43
Humanitarian organization – gives back to society	5.33

Table 3 Employer attractiveness attributes importance based on the mean

The importance of the employer attributes can also be analyzed based on the modes rather than the means. The mode indicates the most frequently chosen answer for each attribute

Table 4 presents the employer attributes and their modes. Upon comparing the analysis based on the means (Table 3) with that based on the modes (Table 4), it is observed that the employer attractiveness attributes ranked as most important, remain the same in both analyses. Similarly, the least important employer attractiveness attributes are also ranked the same in both analyses. Analysis based on the modes of the attributes reveals that these five attributes are rated higher in importance compared to when the results are analyzed based on the means. The five attributes, along with their mean and mode are shown in Table 5. With modes of 7.00 and means lower than 6.00, it suggests that quite a few individuals in the population have rated the attribute as a 5.00 or lower. This implies that a portion of the population perceives the employer attractiveness attribute as merely important (5.00), holds a neutral opinion (4.00), or deems it unimportant (1.00 - 3.00).

Employer Attractiveness Attribute	Mode
A fun working environment	7.00
Happy work environment	7.00
Acceptance and belonging	7.00
Supportive and encouraging colleagues	7.00
Having a good relationship with your colleagues	7.00
Recognition/appreciation from management	7.00
Good promotion opportunities within the organization	7.00
Job security within the organization	7.00
The organization is customer-oriented	7.00
A springboard for future employment	7.00
Having a good relationship with your supervisors	7.00
The organization both values and makes use of your creativity	7.00
Working in an exciting environment	7.00
Gaining career-enhancing experiences	6.00
Feeling good about yourself as a result of working for a particular organization	6.00
Hands-on inter-departmental experience	6.00
Opportunity to apply what was learned at a tertiary institution	6.00
Feeling more self-confident as a result of working for a particular organization	6.00

Opportunity to teach others what you have learned	6.00
An attractive overall compensation package	5.00
The organization produces high-quality products and services	5.00
Innovative employer – novel work practices/forward-thinking	5.00
An above-averaged salary	5.00
The organization produces innovative products and services	5.00
Humanitarian organization – gives back to society	5.00

Table 4 Employer attractiveness attributes importance based on the mode

Employer Attractiveness Attribute	Mean	Mode
The organization is customer-oriented	5.95	7.00
A springboard for future employment	5.93	7.00
Having a good relationship with your supervisors	5.89	7.00
The organization both values and makes use of your creativity	5.73	7.00
Working in an exciting environment	5.64	7.00

Table 5 Employer attractiveness attributes with means and modes (high importance)

Analysis based on the modes of the attributes also reveals that two attributes are ranked lower in importance, compared to when the results are analyzed based on the means. These two attributes are presented in Table 6. Both attributes are rated most often as important (5.00), yet the averages are higher ($M = 5.82$, $M = 5.65$) meaning that several respondents also rated these attributes as very important (6.00) or extremely important (7.00). This shows that the opinions among the sample differ.

Employer Attractiveness Attribute	Mean	Mode
An attractive overall compensation package	5.82	5.00
The organization produces high-quality products and services	5.65	5.00

Table 6 Employer attractiveness attributes with means and modes (low importance)

4.2 Comparison of employer attributes

To determine whether the sample is significantly different from a given value in previous literature studies, the mean of the organizational attributes in the EmpAt Scale is compared to

known values. This is investigated using the one sample t-test for the studies of Gadibadi (2020) in Appendix V, and Caputo et al. (2023) in Appendix VI. The elaboration of the one sample t-test, where the sample's means are compared, is shown in Appendix VII. These studies are conducted with a 7-point Likert Scale in different European countries. The study of Gadibadi (2020) was performed in a Swedish startup, indicating that the organization wants to attract young people, specifically Generation Z. The study of Caputo et al. (2023) was conducted at the University of Turin, indicating that this is also a population of Generation Z. The studies differ in the sample size and population which the information is collected. Comparing the mean of this study's attributes to mean of other studies' attributes, expectations regarding the characteristics of Generation Z may or may not lead to significant differences and shows whether the attributes are rated more or less important than the two previous studies. This overview is shown in Table 7.

One Sample T-test

Nineteen means in Gadibadi (2020) significantly differ from the test value (sig. < .05), indicating that the probability that the observed differences are due to random variations is very small. These are highlighted in green in Appendix VII. A few outcomes stand out: the means of the attributes one ($M_1 = 5.43$, $M_2 = 5.44$), three ($M_1 = 5.73$, $M_2 = 5.92$), and four ($M_1 = 5.65$, $M_2 = 5.95$) in this study are lower than those in Gadibadi (2020), suggesting that these attributes are considered less important by the current sample compared to Gadibadi's (2020) sample. These significant differences are highlighted in red in the appendix. Attributes two and ten do not significantly differ from the test value, indicating that the observed differences could be due to random variation. These non-significant differences are not highlighted in the appendix.

Comparing the study's means to the outcomes of Caputo et al. (2023), the sample ranked all attributes higher than those Caputo et al. (2023) study, suggesting that the participants value these attributes more than the benchmark value. Attributes four ($M = 5.65$, $p = .122$), five ($M = 5.64$, $p = .052$), and twenty-three ($M = 5.95$, $p = .109$) show no significant difference from the test value, indicating insufficient evidence that the means are different, and are not highlighted in the table. The other twenty-two attributes show a significant difference (sig. < .05) and are highlighted in green, indicating sufficient evidence to believe that the differences in means are not due to random variation. Overall, the majority of attribute means are ranked higher compared to those in Gadibadi (2020) and Caputo et al. (2023).

One Sample T-test - Expectations

The means for attributes ‘producing innovative products and services’, ‘being an innovative employer’, and ‘producing high-quality products and services’ are above 5.00 (M = 5.43, M = 5.57, M = 5.65), indicating that these are considered important by the sample. Significant differences were found between this study and Caputo et al. (2023) for these attributes, with lower means in the Caputo study, suggesting a higher importance placed on these attributes by the current study sample. No significant differences were found between this study and Gadibadi (2020) for these attributes, which fails to reject the null hypothesis ($H_0 = H_1$).

The attribute ‘job security’ scored M = 6.02, indicating it is highly important and supporting the expectation of scoring ‘job security’ as very important (M = 6.02). This score is significantly higher compared to Gadibadi (2020) (M = 4.59, $p < .001$) and Caputo et al. (2023) (M = 5.64, $p = .009$). The result of the statistical test rejects the null hypothesis ($H_0 \neq H_1$), indicating that significant difference was found.

The attributes ‘gaining career-enhancing experience’ (M = 5.98) and ‘a springboard for future employment’ (M = 5.93) show that the sample considers the possibility to be entrepreneurial almost highly important. Both attributes show significant differences compared to previous studies, emphasizing their importance. The same outcomes have been noticed for the attributes related to learning and development. While both attributes are ranked as important, the importance on ‘hands-on-departmental experiences’ is lower (M = 5.73, $p < .001$) than getting the ‘possibility of good promotion opportunities within the organization’ (M = 6.04, $p < .001$). Based on these outcomes, significant difference ($H_0 \neq H_1$) is noted in comparisons with both Gadibadi (2020) and Caputo et al. (2023), indicating these attributes are more important to the current sample.

The attributes ‘supportive and encouraging colleagues’ (M = 6.05, $p < .001$) and ‘having a good relationship with colleagues’ (M = 6.05, $p < .001$) are rated as highly important by the sample. ‘Having a good relationship with managers’ (M = 5.89) is ranked as less important, but still important (> 5.00). Significant differences were found between this study and Caputo et al. (2023) (M = 5.89, $p < .001$), but no significant differences were found between this study and Gadibadi (2020) (M = 5.89, $p = .315$). ‘Recognition and appreciation from management’ (M = 6.05) showed significant differences compared to the other studies, indicating it is a crucial factor for the sample. The importance of ‘acceptance and belonging’

($M = 6.13$, $p = < .05$) also reflects significant differences ($H_0 \neq H_1$) and highlights their value to the sample. Overall, the sample shows significant interest in attributes related to support and workplace relationships.

The attribute 'the organization values and makes use of your creativity' ($M = 5.73$) is rated as highly important by the sample. No significant difference is found between this study and Gadibadi (2020) ($p = .259$), while a significant difference is found between this study and Caputo et al. (2023) ($p = < .001$). 'Opportunity to apply learning' ($M = 5.65$) and 'opportunity to teach others what is learned' ($M = 5.60$) are also rated highly. The results of the statistical test reject H_0 and support H_1 , indicating significant differences compared to previous studies and suggesting these attributes are important.

The attributes 'an attractive overall compensation package' ($M = 5.82$, $p = < .001$) and 'an above-average basic salary' ($M = 5.56$, $p = < .001$) are rated as important, but less so compared to other attributes. H_0 is rejected, indicating that a significant differences (H_1) was found in comparisons with both Gadibadi (2020) and Caputo et al. (2023). These means show that the exception of the sample showing significant interest in pay and peripheral benefits, which is not fully supported compared to the other attributes of the EmpAt scale.

Characteristic Generation Z	Employer Attractiveness Attributes	Mean (M)	Significant Difference ($p < .05$)	
			Gadibadi (2020)	Caputo et al. (2023)
Technologically Savvy & Communication	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The organization produces innovative products and services 	5.43	($p = .964$)	($p = <.001$)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Innovative employer – novel work practices/forward-thinking 	5.57	($p = .804$)	($p = .007$)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The organization produces high quality products and services 	5.65	($p = .085$)	($p = .122$)
Job Security	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Job security within organizations 	6.02	($p = <.001$)	($p = .009$)
Entrepreneurial Orientation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Gaining career enhancing experiences 	5.98	($p = <.001$)	($p = <.001$)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A springboard for future employment 	5.93	($p = <.001$)	($p = <.001$)
Learning & Development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Good promotion opportunities within the organization 	6.04	($p = <.001$)	($p = <.001$)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hands-on-departmental experience 	5.73	($p = <.001$)	($p = <.001$)
Relationship colleague/manager	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supportive and encouraging colleagues 	6.05		($p = <.001$)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Having a good relationship with your colleagues 	6.05	($p = <.001$)	($p = <.001$)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Having a good relationship with your superiors 	5.89	($p = .315$)	($p = <.001$)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recognition/Appreciation from management 	6.05	($p = .013$)	($p = <.001$)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Acceptance and belonging 	6.13		($p = <.001$)
Innovation & Creativity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The organization values and makes use of your creativity 	5.73	($p = .259$)	($p = <.001$)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opportunity to each others what you have learned 	5.60	($p = <.001$)	($p = <.001$)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opportunity to apply what was learned at tertiary institution 	5.65	($p = <.001$)	($p = <.001$)
Remuneration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An attractive overall compensation package 	5.82	($p = <.001$)	($p = <.001$)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An above average basic salary 	5.56	($p = <.001$)	($p = <.001$)

Table 7 Overview comparison literature's characteristics and attractiveness attributes

5 Conclusion

The study provides valuable insights into the characteristics and preferences of Generation Z in the workplace. By reviewing four European studies, several notable workplace characteristics and preferences emerged, including technological savviness, job security, entrepreneurial orientation, and learning and development. Other important characteristics include receiving feedback, relationships with colleagues and managers, leadership, innovation and creativity, and remuneration.

The empirical findings suggest that Generation Z is a dynamic demographic with diverse workplace characteristics and preferences that evolve over time. Compared to earlier studies, the sample scores higher on all attributes, except a few related to innovative, customer-oriented employers. The sample places significant importance on promotion opportunities and job security within organizations. They highly value opportunities for career-enhancing experiences, emphasizing their proactive approach towards personal and professional growth. The sample rates relationships with colleagues and managers, and recognition and appreciation from management, as highly important organizational attributes. They also desire to share their opinions, attitudes, and styles in the workplace, highlighting the importance of creativity, practical application of knowledge, and a sense of acceptance and belonging within the organization. Interestingly, the sample does not show a significant interest in salary and overall compensation packages compared to previous studies. However, these attributes still play a role in motivating them, indicating that salary and attractive benefits remain important. Additionally, the sample demonstrates a significant interest in the organizational attributes ‘fun and happy work environment’, which were measured as most important attributes, but are not compared to other studies.

Although the results of this study should be viewed with caution due to limitations, particularly regarding the sample size, the findings highlight the attributes important to this population belong to Generation Z. By leveraging employer branding and developing an ‘employer value proposition’ – which encompasses defining organizational values and communicating the mission and vision – ... can effectively respond to Generation Z’s characteristics and preferences. ... needs to adjust its organizational attributes to better align

with Generation Z's expectations. Increasing its attractiveness will enhance its ability to attract employees from this demographic.

6 Discussion

This chapter discusses the interpretation of the results, the contribution to the knowledge, and practical and managerial implications. Subsequently, the chapter describes a critical reflection on limitations of the research and directions for further research. In the last paragraph, the recommendations are given.

6.1 Findings & Implications

The results have shown that all attributes discussed in Berthon et al.'s (2005) Employer Attractiveness Scale are important to the study's population of Generation Z, and these attributes are rated as more important compared to previous studies. The survey responses indicated that more than half of the sample do not find any of the organization attributes unattractive. While the study examines the attractiveness of employer attributes, the Employer Attractiveness Scale does not allow respondents to rank the attributes to determine which are considered more important. The lack of ranking may explain why the sample rates all attributes as important.

In this study, the importance of attributes is measured on a scale where 5.00 signifies "moderately important," 6.00 signifies "very important," and 7.00 signifies "extremely important." To provide a clearer and more concise overview of attractive organizational attributes, importance could be considered from 6.00 to 7.00. This would highlight fewer attributes as important for the sample, giving organizations a clearer picture of where to focus their efforts and which attributes require less attention.

Furthermore, the analysis shows that none of the attributes have the same mean, mode and median when calculated using the EmpAt Scale, and the study's outcomes differ from those of previous studies. This supports the findings of Chaney et al. (2017) and Sidorcuka and Chesnovicka (2017), suggesting that respondents have their own interpretations of what employer attributes are important, and these cannot be generalized or seen as one-dimensional. Additionally, a comparison of the means of previous studies, shows that values change over time, supporting the findings of Sakdiyakorn et al. (2021). The study results that the importance of organizational attributes was evaluated separately by attribute rather than by dimension. Previous studies do not adhere to the original dimensions making comparison

of dimensions less reliable. For this reason, the choice was made to measure the importance of each attribute individually. This provides more detailed and specific insights into which attributes are considered important. Consequently, organizations now have more targeted information on which specific attributes to improve or emphasize to become more attractive to potential employees.

6.2 Contribution to knowledge

The study has contributed to the theory of employer attractiveness attributes concerning Generation Z. As outlined in the theoretical framework, employer branding serves as a critical tool for talent acquisition (Leekha Chhabra & Sharma, 2014). By defining its identity, the employer distinguishes itself from competitors (Reis & Brage, 2016), highlighting values associated with employer attractiveness (Styvén et al., 2022), referred to as employer attractiveness attributes. This study empirically investigates the attractive employer attributes for a population of Generation Z, comparing them to characteristics of Generation Z outlined in the literature. The characteristics of Generation Z identified in the literature are evaluated using the results of the EmpAt Scale and compared to the outcomes to two previous European studies of Gadibadi (2020) and Caputo et al. (2023).

Focusing on European studies allows organizations in Europe, in this case catering organizations in the Netherlands, to better target attributes such as job security and development opportunities. The sample shows significant interest in these attributes, supporting previous findings by Bencsik et al. (2016) and Böhlich and Axmann (2020) regarding job security, entrepreneurial orientation, and learning and development. The sample also rated 'having a relationship with colleagues' and 'supportive and encouraging colleagues' as highly important, which aligns with Fratricova and Kirchmayer's (2018) finding that a good workplace climate and performance are essential, while the relationship with managers is considered slightly less important. The importance of sharing ideas (Bencsik et al., 2016) and perceptions (Sidorcuka & Chesnovicka, 2017) is also supported by the sample, indicating significant differences and high ratings. The attribute 'the organization values and makes use of your creativity' is rated as highly important by the sample. There is no significant difference in this attribute when compared to Gadibadi (2020), but it is rated significantly higher compared to Caputo et al. (2023).

Although compensation and salary are important attributes, they are less emphasized compared to other attributes. As a contribution to previous research, the sample rates an attractive compensation package higher than an above-averaged salary, indicating a greater interest in compensation packages than in salary, which supports the findings of Sidorcuka and Chesnovicka (2017). The study indicates that attributes such as producing innovative and high-quality products and services, as well as being an innovative employer, are considered important by the sample. These attributes are rated higher compared to the study by Caputo et al. (2023), suggesting a greater emphasis on them by the current sample. However, no significant differences were found in comparison to Gadibadi (2020).

6.3 Limitations & Further Research

The study has several limitations. First, the measurement method employed, the Employer Attractiveness (EmpAt) Scale by Berthon et al. (2005), poses a constraint. In this research, attractive organizational characteristics were assessed to provide the catering organization ... insights into which employer attributes Generation Z finds appealing. However, the findings revealed that the students perceive all employer attractiveness attributes as important, with none standing out. This measurement method lacks the capability to rank these attributes or discern which ones are preferred over others by the study population. To offer organizations better insights into which employer attractiveness attributes resonate most with the population, further research is advised to rate or rank attributes from high to low or to use alternative methods to gauge employer attractiveness attributes. Such research could delve into which attributes are deemed most important by Generation Z, enabling comparisons between the attributes offered by different organizations.

Secondly, the sample size poses a limitation. The study is based on a small population belonging to Generation Z, all of whom are enrolled in catering or hospitality education programs. A total of three MBO schools were contacted for this study. However, the survey collection did not take place at two of the three schools due to lack of respondents and the unavailability of the opportunity. The third MBO school, ... , agreed to collaborate and distribute the survey to its students. However, due to time constraints, the survey was not widely circulated within the school. This sample size of $N=55$ is not representative of the total population enrolled in catering or hospitality education programs. If the study were repeated, the results might differ, potentially invalidating the findings of this study. The study's results would be better supported by conducting research among a larger group of

students enrolled in catering or hospitality education programs. However, this sample size is acceptable because the main goal of the study is to assess characteristics and attributes, not to establish connections between them.

Finally, the findings reveal varying interpretations among the population for each attribute, which concerns generalization. Despite efforts to avoid generalizing the entire Generation Z population, this study focused on a subset of Generation Z enrolled in catering or hospitality education programs. To mitigate the risk of complete generalization, future research on attractive employer attributes should be conducted at the individual level. This approach would enable employers to better align with individual preferences. In-depth interviews could provide valuable insights into individual preferences and are advised when looking at how to retain employees. Employee retention was not considered in this study.

6.4 Practical Recommendations

The study has showed what employer attractiveness attributes are important to a population of Generation Z and thus how to enhance ... ability to attract talent from Generation Z more effectively. By aligning its attributes with the values of Generation Z, ... can distinguish itself from competitors in the catering and hospitality industry. ... should thoroughly analyze and adapt its organizational attributes to better resonate with the preferences of Generation Z. This may involve emphasizing certain attributes such as career opportunities, fostering a culture that values creativity, nurturing a strong a sense of acceptance and belonging. The population of this study belonging to Generation Z values working in environments that are both exciting and enjoyable. ... should focus on creating a positive work environment that fosters satisfaction and engagement among its employees. This can be achieved through initiatives like organizing team-building activities, providing opportunities for skill development and growth, and fostering a supportive and inclusive workplace culture, both among colleagues and with management. While salary and overall compensation packages are motivating attributes, they may not be the most important attributes. However, ... should still ensure that its remuneration and benefits packages are attractive to this demographic. Offering additional benefits such as flexible work arrangements and career opportunities can further enhance the organization's attractiveness.

... can bolster its attractiveness to Generation Z by leveraging effective employer branding strategies. This includes clearly communicating ... values, culture, and organizational

attributes that align with the preferences of Generation Z. Highlighting aspects such as exciting work environments, opportunities for personal and professional growth, and remuneration packages can significantly enhance ... attractiveness to potential candidates from this demographic.

7 References List

Alniaçık, E., & Alniaçık, 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.

Alniaçık, E., Alniaçık, Ü., Erat, S., & Akcin, K. (2014). Attracting talented employees to the company: do we need different employer branding strategies in different cultures? *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 150, 336-334. <https://doi/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.09.074>

Ambler, T., and Barrow, S. (1996). “The employer brand”. *The Journal of Brand Management*, Vol. 4 No. 3, pp. 185-206.

American Psychological Association. (2003). *Five principles for research ethics*. <https://www.apa.org/monitor/jan03/principles>

Arachchige, B. J. H., and Robertson, A. (2011). “Business student perceptions of a preferred employer: a study identifying determinants of employer branding”. *The IUP Journal of Brand Management*, Vol. 8 No. 3, pp. 25-46.

Babikova, K., & Bucek, J. (2019). A model replication with an extension of students’ perception of prospective employer attractiveness. *Journal of Competitiveness*, 11(2), 5.

Backhaus, K. and Tikoo, S. (2004). “Conceptualizing and researching employer branding”. *Career Development International*, Vol. 9 No. 5, pp. 501-517.

Barrow, S., & Mosley, R. (2005). *The employer brand: Bringing the best of brand management to people at work*. New York: Wiley.

Bencsik, A., Horváth-Csikós, G., & Juhász, T. (2016). Y and Z Generations at Workplaces. *Journal of competitiveness*, Vol. 8, No. 3, pp. 90 - 106.

Berthon, P., Ewing, M. & Hah, L. L. (2005). "Captivating company: dimensions of attractiveness in employer branding". *International Journal of Advertising*, Vol. 24 No. 2, pp. 151-172.

Biswas, M. K., & Suar, D. (2016). Antecedents and consequences of employer branding. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 136, 57-72.

Böhlich, S., and Axmann, R. (2020). "Generation Z: A Comparative Study of the Expectations of Gen Z and the Perception of Employers". *IUBH Discussion Papers-Human Resources*, Vol. 1, No. 1, pp. 1-16.

Cable, D. M., & Turban, D. (2001). Establishing the dimensions, sources and value of job seekers' employer knowledge during recruitment. *Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management*, 20, 115-163

Caputo, A., Molino, M., Cerato, B., & Cortese, C. G. (2023). Employer Attractiveness: Two Instruments to Measure Employer Branding and Reputation. *SAGE Open*, 13(3), 21582440231192188.

Carless, S. A. (2005). Person-job fit versus person- organization fit as predictors of organizational attraction and job acceptance intentions: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 78(3), pp. 411-429.
<https://doi.org/10.1348/096317905X25995>

Centraal Bureau voor Statistiek (CBS). (August 16, 2023). Vacatures; *seizoen gecorrigeerd*. Dataset. <https://opendata.cbs.nl/statline/#/CBS/nl/dataset/80474ned/table?ts=1695719485174>

Chaney, D., Touzani, M., & Slimane, K. B. (2017). Marketing to the (new) generations: summary and perspectives. *Journal of Strategic Marketing*, 25(3), 179-189.

Davies, G. (2008). Employer branding and its influence on managers. *European journal of Marketing*, 42(5/6), 667-681.

- Diener, E., Larsen, R. J., & Emmons, R. A. (1984). Person X Situation interactions: Choice of situations and congruence response models. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 47(3), 580–592. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.47.3.580>
- Dogru, T., McGinley, S., & Self, T. (2024). Hospitality industry attraction: The effect of job openings and employee wages in the United States. *Tourism Management*, 103, 104888.
- Dutta, D., & Mishra, S. K. (2021). Predictors of applicant attraction among Gen-X and millennials: evidence from an emerging economy. *International Journal of Manpower*, 42(8), 1479-1499.
- Eger, L., Mičík, M., & Řehoř, P. (2018). Employer branding on social media and recruitment websites: Symbolic traits of an ideal employer. *E+M. Ekonomie a Management*, 21(1), 224-237. <https://doi.org/10.15240/tul/001/2018-1-015>
- Francis, T., & Hoefel, H. (2018). “True Gen”: Generation Z and Its Implications for Companies”. Retrieved from <https://www.mckinsey.com/industries/consumer-packaged-goods/our-insights/true-gen-generation-z-and-its-implications-for-companies>
- Fratrièová, J. & Kirchmayer, Z. (2018). Barriers to Work Motivation of Generation Z. *Journal of Human Resource Management*, Vol. 21, No. 2, pp. 28-39
- Gaddam, S. (2008). Modelling employer branding communication: The softer aspect of HR marketing management. *The ICFAI Journal of Soft Skills*, 2(1), 45–55.
- Gadibadi, C. (2020). Identifying Dimensions of Employer Attractiveness in Startups: The Case of Swedish Tech Startups.
- Ganguli, R., Padhy, S. C., & Saxena, T. (2022). The Characteristics and Preferences of Gen Z: A Review of Multi-Geography Findings. *IUP Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 21(2), 79-98.

Ha, N. M., Luan, N. V., & Trung, N. M. (2021). Employer attractiveness: Measurement scale development and validation. *Ho Chi Minh City Open University Journal Of Science-Economics And Business Administration*, 11(1), 3-18.

Heyday FM. (N.d.). *Hoe ziet de toekomst van hospitality eruit?*
<https://www.heydayfm.nl/hospitality/hospitality/hospitality-branche>

Kissel, P., & Büttgen, M. (2015). Using social media to communicate employer brand identity: The impact on corporate image and employer attractiveness. *Journal of Brand Management*, 22, 755-777.

De Kok, K., Van Der Scheer, W., Ketelaars, C., & Leistikow, I. (2023). Organizational attributes that contribute to the learning & improvement capabilities of healthcare organizations: a scoping review. *BMC Health Services Research*, 23(1), 585.

Kolnhofer-Derecskei, A., Reicher, R. Z., & Szeghegyi, A. (2017). The X and Y generations' characteristics comparison. *Acta Polytechnica Hungarica*, 14(8), 107-125.

Kristof, A. L. (1996). Person–organization fit: An integrative review of its conceptualizations, measurement, and implications. *Personnel Psychology*, 49(1), 1–49.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.1996.tb01790.x>.

Krommendijk, K. (2020). *Generational Differences in Employer Preferences: Using the Employer Attractiveness Scale in The Netherlands* [Master's Thesis, Utrecht University]. UU Theses Repository. Retrieved on November 6, 2023, from
<https://studenttheses.uu.nl/handle/20.500.12932/37437>

Leekha Chhabra, N., & Sharma, S. (2014). Employer branding: strategy for improving employer attractiveness. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, 22(1), 48-60.

Lin, M. Y., Chiang, C. F., & Wu, K. P. (2018). How Hospitality and Tourism Students Choose Careers: Influences of Employer Branding and Applicants' Customer Orientation. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Education*, 30(4), 229–240.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/10963758.2018.1480377>

- Mandhanya, Y., & Shah, M. (2010). Employer branding: a tool for talent management. *Global Management Review*, 4(2), 43–48
- Martin, G., Beaumont, P., Doig, R., & Pate, J. (2005). Branding: New performance discourse for HR? *European Management Journal*, 23(1), 76–88
- Martin, G., Gollan, P. J., & Grigg, K. (2011). Is there a bigger and better future for employer branding? Facing up to innovation, corporate reputations, and wicked problems in SHRM. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 22(17/11), 3618–3637
- Nguyen, M. H., Luan, N. V., & Khoa, B. T. (2021). Employer attractiveness and employee performance: An Exploratory study. *Journal of System and Management Sciences*, 11(1), 97-123.
- Posnick-Goodwin, S. (2010). Meet Generation Z. *California Educator*, 14, 8–18.
- Priyadarshini, C., Kumar, Y. L. N., & Jha, R. R. (2017). Employer attractiveness through social media: A phenomenological study. *The Qualitative Report*, 22(4), 969-983.
- Puri, D. (2018). Developing the Scale to Measure Employer Attractiveness. *Annals of the University Dunarea de Jos of Galati: Fascicle: I, Economics & Applied Informatics*, 24(3).
- Reis, G. G., & Braga, B. M. (2016). Employer attractiveness from a generational perspective: Implications for employer branding. *Revista de Administração (São Paulo)*, 51, 103-116.
- Rickes, P. C. (2016). Generations in flux. *Planning for Higher Education*, 44(4), 21-45.
- Roy, S. K. (2008). “Identifying the dimensions of attractiveness of an employer brand in the Indian context”. *South Asian Journal of Management*, Vol. 15, No. 4, pp. 110-130.
- Sakdiyakorn, M., Golubovskaya, M., & Solnet, D. (2021). Understanding Generation Z through collective consciousness: Impacts for hospitality work and employment. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 94, 102822.

Sidorcuka, I., & Chesnovicka, A. (2017, September). Methods of attraction and retention of Generation Z staff. In *CBU International Conference Proceedings*, Vol. 5, pp. 807-814.

Singh, A. P., & Dangmei, J. (2016). Understanding the Generation Z: the future workforce. *South-Asian journal of multidisciplinary studies*, 3(3), 1-5.

Sivertzen, A. M., Nilsen, E. R., & Olafsen, A. H. (2013). Employer branding: employer attractiveness and the use of social media. *Journal of Product & Brand Management*, 22(7), 473-483.

Styvén, M. E., Näppä, A., Mariani, M., & Nataraajan, R. (2022). Employee perceptions of employers' creativity and innovation: Implications for employer attractiveness and branding in tourism and hospitality. *Journal of Business Research*, 141, 290-298.

Turban D. B., & Keon T. L. (1993). Organizational attractiveness: An interactionist perspective. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78(2), pp. 184-193. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.78.2.184>

Umphress, E. E., Smith-Crowe, K., Brief, A. P., Dietz, J., & Watkins, M. B. (2007). When birds of a feather flock together and when they do not: Status composition, social dominance orientation, and organizational attractiveness. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(2), 396–409. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.92.2.396>

Uppal, A., Wadhwa, B., & Vashisht, A. (2017). Magnitudes of attractiveness in employer branding: Generation Z. *International Journal of Applied Business and Economic Research*, 15(23-2), 1-7.

8 Appendices

Appendix I: Employer Attractiveness Scale

Value Question: How important are the following to you when considering potential employers?

Interest Value

1. The organization produces innovative products and services
 2. Innovative employer – novel work practices/forward-thinking
 3. The organization both values and makes use of your creativity
 4. The organization produces high-quality products and services
 5. Working in an exciting environment
-

Social Value

6. A fun working environment
 7. Happy work environment
 8. Supportive and encouraging colleagues
 9. Having a good relationship with your colleagues
 10. Having a good relationship with your superiors
-

Economic Value

11. An attractive overall compensation package
 12. An above average basic salary
 13. Job security within the organization
 14. Good promotion opportunities within the organization
 15. Hands-on inter-departmental experience
-

Development Value

16. Feeling good about yourself as a result of working for a particular organisation
 17. Feeling more self-confident as a result of working for a particular organisation
 18. Gaining career-enhancing experience
 19. A springboard for future employment
 20. Recognition/appreciation from management
-

Application Value

21. Opportunity to teach others what you have learned
22. Opportunity to apply what was learned at a tertiary institution
23. The organization is customer-oriented
24. Humanitarian organization – gives back to society
25. Acceptance and belonging

(Berthon et al., 2005, in Puri, 2018)

Appendix II: Dutch Employer Attractiveness Scale

Value Vraag: Hoe belangrijk zijn de volgende onderdelen voor jou wanneer je overweegt voor een werkgever te gaan werken?

Interesse Waarde

1. De organisatie maakt innovatieve producten en diensten
 2. De organisatie gebruikt nieuwe, innovatieve manieren van werken*
 3. De organisatie waardeert en maakt gebruik van je creativiteit
 4. De organisatie produceert producten en diensten van hoge kwaliteit
 5. Werken in een boeiende omgeving
-

Sociale Waarde

6. Een werkomgeving waar je plezier ervaart
 7. Een werkomgeving waar je je gelukkig voelt
 8. Steun en aanmoediging van je collega's
 9. Een goede relatie met je collega's
 10. Een goede relatie met je leidinggevende
-

Economische Waarde

11. Een aantrekkelijk arbeidsvoorwaardenpakket
 12. Een bovengemiddeld salaris*
 13. Baanzekerheid bij de organisatie
 14. Goede doorgroeimogelijkheden binnen de organisatie
 15. Een goede samenwerking tussen afdelingen*
-

Ontwikkelingswaarde

16. Je goed voelen over jezelf door te werken voor een bepaalde organisatie*
 17. Je zelfverzekerder voelen over jezelf door te werken voor een bepaalde organisatie*
 18. Werkervaringen opdoen die je loopbaankansen vergroten
 19. De mogelijkheid om hoger op te komen voor toekomstig werk*
 20. Erkenning en waardering van je leidinggevendenden
-

Toepassingswaarde

21. De mogelijkheid anderen te leren wat je hebt geleerd
 22. De mogelijkheid om in de praktijk te brengen wat je tijdens je opleiding of elders hebt geleerd
 23. De organisatie is klantgericht
 24. Een humanitaire (=menslievende) organisatie die bijdraagt aan de samenleving en het maatschappelijk belang*
 25. Het gevoel van geaccepteerd worden en erbij horen
-

Appendix III: SPSS Output – Reliability Analysis Employer Attractiveness Scale

➔ Reliability

Scale: ALL VARIABLES

Case Processing Summary

		N	%
Cases	Valid	51	92,7
	Excluded ^a	4	7,3
	Total	55	100,0

a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
,952	25

Appendix IV: SPSS Output – Statistics Employer Attractiveness Scale

Statistics

N	Statistics																										
	Valid	Missing	Maakt innovatieve producten en diensten	Gebruikt innovatieve manieren van werken	Waardeert en gebruikt creativiteit	Produceert producten en diensten van hoge kwaliteit	Werken in een boeiende omgeving	Werkomgeving waar je plezier ervaart	Werkomgeving waar je je gelukkig voelt	Steun en aanmoediging van je collega's	Een goede relatie met je collega's	Een goede relatie met je leidinggevende	Aantrekkelijk arbeidsvoorwaardenpakket	Een bovengemiddeld salaris	Baanzekerheid bij de organisatie	Goede doorgroei-mogelijkheden binnen de organisatie											
	53	2	54	1	55	0	55	0	55	0	55	0	55	0	54	1	55	0									
Mean	5,4340		5,5741		5,7273		5,6545		5,6364		6,5091		6,3889		6,0545		6,0545		5,8909		5,8182		5,5636		6,0185		6,0364
Median	5,0000		5,0000		6,0000		6,0000		6,0000		7,0000		7,0000		6,0000		6,0000		6,0000		6,0000		6,0000		6,0000		6,0000
Mode	5,00		5,00		7,00		5,00 ^a		7,00		7,00		7,00		7,00		7,00		7,00		5,00		5,00		7,00		7,00
Std. Deviation	,97091		1,00192		1,25395		1,25045		1,36577		,92040		1,05360		,93131		1,02593		1,03051		,94459		1,24370		1,01852		,94209
Variance	,943		1,004		1,572		1,564		1,865		,847		1,110		,867		1,053		1,062		,892		1,547		1,037		,888
Skewness	,193		,139		-1,154		-1,191		-,931		-1,802		-2,158		-,539		-1,287		-,617		-,168		-,960		-,706		-,350
Std. Error of Skewness	,327		,325		,322		,322		,322		,322		,325		,322		,322		,322		,322		,322		,325		,322
Kurtosis	-,306		-1,091		2,096		2,364		,344		2,077		5,204		-,778		2,874		-,264		-1,016		1,885		-,160		-1,234
Std. Error of Kurtosis	,644		,639		,634		,634		,634		,634		,634		,634		,634		,634		,634		,634		,634		,634

a. Multiple modes exist. The smallest value is shown

N	Statistics																				
	Valid	Missing	Een goede samenwerking tussen afdelingen	Je goed voelen over jezelf door te werken voor een bepaalde organisatie	Je zelfverzekerder voelen over jezelf door te werken voor een bepaalde organisatie	Werkervaringen opdoen die je loopbaankansen vergroten	De mogelijkheid om hoger op te komen voor toekomstig werk	Erkenning en waardering van je leidinggevend	De mogelijkheid om anderen te leren wat je hebt geleerd	De mogelijkheid om in de praktijk te brengen wat je tijdens je opleiding of elders hebt geleerd	De organisatie is klantgericht	Een humanitaire organisatie die bijdraagt aan de samenleving en het maatschappelijk belang	Het gevoel van geaccepteerd worden en erbij horen								
	55	0	55	0	55	0	55	0	55	0	55	0	55								
Mean	5,7273		5,8545		5,6182		5,9818		5,9273		6,0545		5,6000		5,6545		5,9455		5,3273		6,1273
Median	6,0000		6,0000		6,0000		6,0000		6,0000		6,0000		6,0000		6,0000		6,0000		5,0000		7,0000
Mode	6,00		6,00		6,00		6,00 ^a		7,00		7,00		6,00		6,00		7,00		5,00		7,00
Std. Deviation	1,02658		1,00771		1,09698		1,00905		1,06900		1,19285		1,22626		1,09237		1,16139		1,21799		1,21799
Variance	1,054		1,015		1,203		1,018		1,143		1,423		1,504		1,193		1,349		1,484		1,484
Skewness	-,485		-,599		-,575		-,860		-,606		-1,671		-1,116		-,324		-1,142		-,347		-1,720
Std. Error of Skewness	,322		,322		,322		,322		,322		,322		,322		,322		,322		,322		,322
Kurtosis	-,389		-,155		-,392		,250		-,499		4,429		2,275		-,823		1,096		-,310		3,141
Std. Error of Kurtosis	,634		,634		,634		,634		,634		,634		,634		,634		,634		,634		,634

Appendix V: One Sample T-Test (I)

Question 1

One-Sample Statistics

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Maakt innovatieve producten en diensten	53	5,4340	,97091	,13337

One-Sample Test

Test Value = 5.44						
	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
					Lower	Upper
Maakt innovatieve producten en diensten	-,045	52	,964	-,00604	-,2737	,2616

Question 2

One-Sample Statistics

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Gebruikt innovatieve manieren van werken	54	5,5741	1,00192	,13634

One-Sample Test

Test Value = 5.54						
	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
					Lower	Upper
Gebruikt innovatieve manieren van werken	,250	53	,804	,03407	-,2394	,3075

Question 3

One-Sample Statistics

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Waardeert en gebruikt creativiteit	55	5,7273	1,25395	,16908

One-Sample Test

Test Value = 5.92						
	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
					Lower	Upper
Waardeert en gebruikt creativiteit	-1,140	54	,259	-,19273	-,5317	,1463

Question 4

One-Sample Statistics

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Produceert producten en diensten van hoge kwaliteit	55	5,6545	1,25045	,16861

One-Sample Test

Test Value = 5.95

	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
					Lower	Upper
Produceert producten en diensten van hoge kwaliteit	-1,752	54	,085	-,29545	-,6335	,0426

Question 5

One-Sample Statistics

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Werken in een boeiende omgeving	55	5,6364	1,36577	,18416

One-Sample Test

Test Value = 5.56

	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
					Lower	Upper
Werken in een boeiende omgeving	,415	54	,680	,07636	-,2929	,4456

Question 6

One-Sample Statistics

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Werkomgeving waar je plezier ervaart	55	6,5091	,92040	,12411

One-Sample Test

Test Value = 5.57

	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
					Lower	Upper
Werkomgeving waar je plezier ervaart	7,567	54	<,001	,93909	,6903	1,1879

Question 9

One-Sample Statistics

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Een goede relatie met je collega's	55	6,0545	1,02593	,13834

One-Sample Test

Test Value = 5.53

	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
					Lower	Upper
Een goede relatie met je collega's	3,792	54	<,001	,52455	,2472	,8019

Question 10

One-Sample Statistics

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Een goede relatie met je leidinggevende	55	5,8909	1,03051	,13895

One-Sample Test

Test Value = 5.75

	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
					Lower	Upper
Een goede relatie met je leidinggevende	1,014	54	,315	,14091	-,1377	,4195

Question 11

One-Sample Statistics

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Aantrekkelijk Arbeidsvoorwaardenpakket	55	5,8182	,94459	,12737

One-Sample Test

Test Value = 5.10

	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
					Lower	Upper
Aantrekkelijk Arbeidsvoorwaardenpakket	5,639	54	<,001	,71818	,4628	,9735

Question 12

One-Sample Statistics

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Een bovengemiddeld salaris	55	5,5636	1,24370	,16770

One-Sample Test

Test Value = 4.93

	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
					Lower	Upper
Een bovengemiddeld salaris	3,778	54	<,001	,63364	,2974	,9699

Question 13

One-Sample Statistics

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Baanzekerheid bij de organisatie	54	6,0185	1,01852	,13860

One-Sample Test

Test Value = 4.59

	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
					Lower	Upper
Baanzekerheid bij de organisatie	10,307	53	<,001	1,42852	1,1505	1,7065

Question 14

One-Sample Statistics

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Goede doorgroeimogelijkheden binnen de organisatie	55	6,0364	,94209	,12703

One-Sample Test

Test Value = 4.99

	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
					Lower	Upper
Goede doorgroeimogelijkheden binnen de organisatie	8,237	54	<,001	1,04636	,7917	1,3010

Question 15

One-Sample Statistics

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Een goede samenwerking tussen afdelingen	55	5,7273	1,02658	,13842

One-Sample Test

Test Value = 5.01

	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
					Lower	Upper
Een goede samenwerking tussen afdelingen	5,182	54	<,001	,71727	,4397	,9948

Question 16

One-Sample Statistics

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Je goed voelen over jezelf door te werken voor een bepaalde organisatie	55	5,8545	1,00771	,13588

One-Sample Test

Test Value = 5.49

	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
					Lower	Upper
Je goed voelen over jezelf door te werken voor een bepaalde organisatie	2,683	54	,010	,36455	,0921	,6370

Question 17

One-Sample Statistics

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Je zekerder voelen over jezelf door te werken voor een bepaalde organisatie	55	5,6182	1,09698	,14792

One-Sample Test

Test Value = 4.86

	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
					Lower	Upper
Je zekerder voelen over jezelf door te werken voor een bepaalde organisatie	5,126	54	<,001	,75818	,4616	1,0547

Question 18

One-Sample Statistics

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Werkervaringe opdoen die je loopbaankansen vergroten	55	5,9818	1,00905	,13606

One-Sample Test

Test Value = 4.53

	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
					Lower	Upper
Werkervaringe opdoen die je loopbaankansen vergroten	10,670	54	<,001	1,45182	1,1790	1,7246

Question 19

One-Sample Statistics

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
De mogelijkheid om hoger op te komen voor toekomstig werk	55	5,9273	1,06900	,14414

One-Sample Test

Test Value = 4.94

	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
					Lower	Upper
De mogelijkheid om hoger op te komen voor toekomstig werk	6,849	54	<,001	,98727	,6983	1,2763

Question 20

One-Sample Statistics

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Erkenning en waardering van je leidinggevers	55	6,0545	1,19285	,16084

One-Sample Test

Test Value = 5.64

	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
					Lower	Upper
Erkenning en waardering van je leidinggevers	2,577	54	,013	,41455	,0921	,7370

Question 21

One-Sample Statistics

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
De mogelijkheid om anderen te leren wat je hebt geleerd	55	5,6000	1,22626	,16535

One-Sample Test

Test Value = 4.38

	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
					Lower	Upper
De mogelijkheid om anderen te leren wat je hebt geleerd	7,378	54	<,001	1,22000	,8885	1,5515

Question 22

One-Sample Statistics

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
De mogelijkheid om in de praktijk te brengen wat je tijdens je opleiding of elders hebt geleerd	55	5,6545	1,09237	,14729

One-Sample Test

Test Value = 3.93

	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
					Lower	Upper
De mogelijkheid om in de praktijk te brengen wat je tijdens je opleiding of elders hebt geleerd	11,708	54	<,001	1,72455	1,4292	2,0199

Question 23

One-Sample Statistics

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
De organisatie is klantgericht	55	5,9455	1,16139	,15660

One-Sample Test

Test Value = 4.95

	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
					Lower	Upper
De organisatie is klantgericht	6,357	54	<,001	,99545	,6815	1,3094

Question 24

One-Sample Statistics

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Een humanitaire organisatie die bijdraagt aan de samenleving en het maatschappelijk belang	55	5,3273	1,21799	,16423

One-Sample Test

Test Value = 4.57

	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
					Lower	Upper
Een humanitaire organisatie die bijdraagt aan de samenleving en het maatschappelijk belang	4,611	54	<,001	,75727	,4280	1,0865

Appendix VI: One Sample T-Test (II)

Question 1

One-Sample Statistics

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Maakt innovatieve producten en diensten	53	5,4340	,97091	,13337

One-Sample Test

Test Value = 4.56

	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
					Lower	Upper
Maakt innovatieve producten en diensten	6,553	52	<,001	,87396	,6063	1,1416

Question 2

One-Sample Statistics

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Gebruikt innovatieve manieren van werken	54	5,5741	1,00192	,13634

One-Sample Test

Test Value = 5.19

	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
					Lower	Upper
Gebruikt innovatieve manieren van werken	2,817	53	,007	,38407	,1106	,6575

Question 3

One-Sample Statistics

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Waardeert en gebruikt creativiteit	55	5,7273	1,25395	,16908

One-Sample Test

Test Value = 4.80

	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
					Lower	Upper
Waardeert en gebruikt creativiteit	5,484	54	<,001	,92727	,5883	1,2663

Question 4

One-Sample Statistics

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Produceert producten en diensten van hoge kwaliteit	55	5,6545	1,25045	,16861

One-Sample Test

Test Value = 5.39

	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
					Lower	Upper
Produceert producten en diensten van hoge kwaliteit	1,569	54	,122	,26455	-,0735	,6026

Question 5

One-Sample Statistics

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Werken in een boeiende omgeving	55	5,6364	1,36577	,18416

One-Sample Test

Test Value = 5.27

	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
					Lower	Upper
Werken in een boeiende omgeving	1,989	54	,052	,36636	-,0029	,7356

Question 6

One-Sample Statistics

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Werkomgeving waar je plezier ervaart	55	6,5091	,92040	,12411

One-Sample Test

Test Value = 5.28

	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
					Lower	Upper
Werkomgeving waar je plezier ervaart	9,903	54	<,001	1,22909	,9803	1,4779

Question 7

One-Sample Statistics

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Werkomgeving waar je je gelukkig voelt	54	6,3889	1,05360	,14338

One-Sample Test

Test Value = 5.26

	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
					Lower	Upper
Werkomgeving waar je je gelukkig voelt	7,874	53	<,001	1,12889	,8413	1,4165

Question 8

One-Sample Statistics

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Steun en Aanmoediging van je collega's	55	6,0545	,93131	,12558

One-Sample Test

Test Value = 5.13

	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
					Lower	Upper
Steun en Aanmoediging van je collega's	7,362	54	<,001	,92455	,6728	1,1763

Question 9

One-Sample Statistics

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Een goede relatie met je collega's	55	6,0545	1,02593	,13834

One-Sample Test

Test Value = 4.86

	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
					Lower	Upper
Een goede relatie met je collega's	8,635	54	<,001	1,19455	,9172	1,4719

Question 10

One-Sample Statistics

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Een goede relatie met je leidinggevende	55	5,8909	1,03051	,13895

One-Sample Test

Test Value = 5.36

	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
					Lower	Upper
Een goede relatie met je leidinggevende	3,821	54	<,001	,53091	,2523	,8095

Question 11

One-Sample Statistics

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Aantrekkelijk Arbeidsvoorwaardenpakket	55	5,8182	,94459	,12737

One-Sample Test

Test Value = 5.34

	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
					Lower	Upper
Aantrekkelijk Arbeidsvoorwaardenpakket	3,754	54	<,001	,47818	,2228	,7335

Question 12

One-Sample Statistics

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Een bovengemiddeld salaris	55	5,5636	1,24370	,16770

One-Sample Test

Test Value = 4.97

	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
					Lower	Upper
Een bovengemiddeld salaris	3,540	54	<,001	,59364	,2574	,9299

Question 13

One-Sample Statistics

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Baanzekerheid bij de organisatie	54	6,0185	1,01852	,13860

One-Sample Test

Test Value = 5.64

	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
					Lower	Upper
Baanzekerheid bij de organisatie	2,731	53	,009	,37852	,1005	,6565

Question 14

One-Sample Statistics

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Goede doorgroeimogelijkheden binnen de organisatie	55	6,0364	,94209	,12703

One-Sample Test

Test Value = 5.28

	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
					Lower	Upper
Goede doorgroeimogelijkheden binnen de organisatie	5,954	54	<,001	,75636	,5017	1,0110

Question 15

One-Sample Statistics

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Een goede samenwerking tussen afdelingen	55	5,7273	1,02658	,13842

One-Sample Test

Test Value = 4.98

	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
					Lower	Upper
Een goede samenwerking tussen afdelingen	5,398	54	<,001	,74727	,4697	1,0248

Question 16

One-Sample Statistics

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Je goed voelen over jezelf door te werken voor een bepaalde organisatie	55	5,8545	1,00771	,13588

One-Sample Test

Test Value = 5.03

	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
					Lower	Upper
Je goed voelen over jezelf door te werken voor een bepaalde organisatie	6,068	54	<,001	,82455	,5521	1,0970

Question 17

One-Sample Statistics

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Je zekerzekerder voelen over jezelf door te werken voor een bepaalde organisatie	55	5,6182	1,09698	,14792

One-Sample Test

Test Value = 5.15

	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
					Lower	Upper
Je zekerzekerder voelen over jezelf door te werken voor een bepaalde organisatie	3,165	54	,003	,46818	,1716	,7647

Question 18

One-Sample Statistics

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Werkervaringen opdoen die je loopbaankansen vergroten	55	5,9818	1,00905	,13606

One-Sample Test

Test Value = 5.44

	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
					Lower	Upper
Werkervaringen opdoen die je loopbaankansen vergroten	3,982	54	<,001	,54182	,2690	,8146

Question 19

One-Sample Statistics

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
De mogelijkheid om hoger op te komen voor toekomstig werk	55	5,9273	1,06900	,14414

One-Sample Test

Test Value = 5.29

	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
					Lower	Upper
De mogelijkheid om hoger op te komen voor toekomstig werk	4,421	54	<,001	,63727	,3483	,9263

Question 20

One-Sample Statistics

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Erkenning en waardering van je leidinggevend	55	6,0545	1,19285	,16084

One-Sample Test

Test Value = 5.12

	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
					Lower	Upper
Erkenning en waardering van je leidinggevend	5,810	54	<,001	,93455	,6121	1,2570

Question 21

One-Sample Statistics

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
De mogelijkheid om anderen te leren wat je hebt geleerd	55	5,6000	1,22626	,16535

One-Sample Test

Test Value = 4.64

	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
					Lower	Upper
De mogelijkheid om anderen te leren wat je hebt geleerd	5,806	54	<,001	,96000	,6285	1,2915

Question 22

One-Sample Statistics

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
De mogelijkheid om in de praktijk te brengen wat je tijdens je opleiding of elders hebt geleerd	55	5,6545	1,09237	,14729

One-Sample Test

	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
					Lower	Upper
Test Value = 4.88						
De mogelijkheid om in de praktijk te brengen wat je tijdens je opleiding of elders hebt geleerd	5,258	54	<,001	,77455	,4792	1,0699

Question 23

One-Sample Statistics

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
De organisatie is klantgericht	55	5,9455	1,16139	,15660

One-Sample Test

	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
					Lower	Upper
Test Value = 5.69						
De organisatie is klantgericht	1,631	54	,109	,25545	-,0585	,5694

Question 24

One-Sample Statistics

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Een humanitaire organisatie die bijdraagt aan de samenleving en het maatschappelijk belang	55	5,3273	1,21799	,16423

One-Sample Test

	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
					Lower	Upper
Test Value = 4.52						
Een humanitaire organisatie die bijdraagt aan de samenleving en het maatschappelijk belang	4,915	54	<,001	,80727	,4780	1,1365

Question 25

One-Sample Statistics

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Het gevoel van geaccepteerd worden en erbij horen	55	6,1273	1,21799	,16423

One-Sample Test

Test Value = 5.23

	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
					Lower	Upper
Het gevoel van geaccepteerd worden en erbij horen	5,463	54	<,001	,89727	,5680	1,2265

Appendix VIII: Comparison of One Sample T-Tests – Table

Question Number	Attribute	Master Thesis	Gadibadi (2020)	Sig. a < .05	Caputo et al. (2023)	Sig. a < .05
<u>Interest Value</u>						
1	The organization produces innovative products and services	5.43	5.44	.964	4.56	<.001
2	Innovative employer – novel work practices/forward thinking	5.57	5.54	.804	5.19	.007
3	The organization both values and makes use of your creativity	5.73	5.92	.259	4.90	<.001
4	The organization produces high quality products and services	5.65	5.95	.085	5.39	.122
5	Working in an exciting environment	5.64	5.56	.680	5.27	.052
<u>Social Value</u>						
6	A fun working environment	6.51	5.57	<.001	5.28	<.001
7	Happy work environment	6.39	-	-	5.26	<.001
8	Supportive and encouraging colleagues	6.05	-	-	5.13	<.001
9	Having a good relationship with your colleagues	6.05	5.53	<.001	4.86	<.001
10	Having a good relationship with your supervisors	5.89	5.75	.315	5.36	<.001
<u>Economic Value</u>						
11	An attractive overall compensation package	5.82	5.10	<.001	5.34	<.001
12	An above average basic salary	5.56	4.93	<.001	4.97	<.001

13	Job security within the organization	6.02	4.59	<.001	5.64	.009
14	Good promotion opportunities within the organization	6.04	4.99	<.001	5.28	<.001
15	Hands-on-departmental experience	5.73	5.01	<.001	4.98	<.001
<u>Development Value</u>						
16	Feeling good about yourself as a result of working for a particular organization	5.85	5.49	.010	5.03	<.001
17	Feeling more self-confident as a result of working for a particular organization	5.62	4.86	<.001	5.15	.003
18	Gaining career-enhancing experience	5.98	4.53	<.001	5.44	<.001
19	A springboard for future employees	5.93	4.94	<.001	5.29	<.001
20	Recognition/appreciation from management	6.05	5.64	.013	5.12	<.001
<u>Application Value</u>						
21	Opportunity tot each others what you have learned	5.60	4.38	<.001	4.64	<.001
22	Oppportunity to apply what was learned at a tertiary institution	5.65	3.93	<.001	4.88	<.001
23	The organization is customer-oriented	5.95	4.95	<.001	5.69	.109
24	Humanitarian organization – gives back to society	5.33	4.57	<.001	4.52	<.001
25	Acceptance and belonging	6.13	-	-	5.23	<.001