



**IMPACT OF CORPORATE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY
ON NEWLY GRADUATED JOB APPLICANTS**

İLAYDA ORBAY

Master's Thesis

Graduate School
Izmir University of Economics

İzmir

2022

**IMPACT OF CORPORATE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY
ON NEWLY GRADUATED JOB APPLICANTS**

İLAYDA ORBAY

A Thesis Submitted to
The Graduate School of Izmir University of Economics
Master's Program in Business Administration

İzmir
2022

ABSTRACT

IMPACT OF CORPORATE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY ON NEWLY GRADUATED JOB APPLICANTS

Orbay, İlayda

Master's Program in Business Administration

Advisor: Prof. Dr. Mehmet Gençer

July, 2022

Corporate social responsibility (CSR) is a broad concept that has received increased attention in the literature. In today's increasingly globalized world, social and environmental issues have become a growing concern for organizations, though few studies exist concerning job applicants' engagement with CSR. This study uses a scenario-based online survey to focus on this scarcity of attention. The analysis is based on a sample of 106 newly graduated job applicants from Turkey that provided usable data for the study. A modified snowball sampling approach is conducted for the survey. The respondents rated their perceptions of CSR, job pursuit intentions, and level of attraction towards the fictitious organization given in the scenario. Findings indicate that newly graduated job applicants acknowledge CSR positively and like the values represented by organizations that engage in CSR. The findings also revealed that newly graduated job applicants are significantly inclined to have a job interview with such an organization. Moreover, previous studies demonstrate that female job applicants find CSR more engaging than male applicants. Similarly, job applicants

who graduated from non-technical departments have responded more positively to CSR than applicants from technical departments. Finally, it is noticed that non-technical job applicants will make more effort than technical job applicants to work in a company that engages in CSR. This research provides an overview of newly graduated job applicants' opinions regarding CSR and contributes to the development of the literature.

Keywords: Corporate Social Responsibility, Job Applicant Perception, Job Pursuit Intentions, Organizational Attractiveness



ÖZET

KURUMSAL SOSYAL SORUMLULUĞUN YENİ MEZUN İŞ ADAYLARI ÜZERİNDEKİ ETKİSİ

Orbay, İlayda

İşletme Yüksek Lisans Programı

Tez Danışmanı: Prof. Dr. Mehmet Gençer

Temmuz, 2022

Kurumsal sosyal sorumluluk (KSS), literatürde artan ilgi gören geniş bir kavramdır. Günümüzün giderek globalleşen dünyasında sosyal ve çevresel konular kuruluşlar için artan bir endişe haline gelmesine rağmen, iş adaylarının KSS'ye bakış açısına ilişkin çok az sayıda çalışma yapılmıştır. Bu çalışmada, bahsedilen dikkat kıtlığına odaklanmak üzere senaryo tabanlı çevrimiçi anket kullanılmıştır. Analiz, Türkiye'den 106 yeni mezun iş adayının anket aracılığıyla sağladığı kullanılabilir veriler üzerinden yürütülmüştür. Araştırmada modifiye edilmiş kartopu örnekleme yaklaşımı uygulanmıştır. Katılımcılar, senaryoda verilen hayali organizasyona yönelik KSS algılarını, iş arama niyetlerini ve örgütsel çekicilik düzeylerini derecelendirmişlerdir. Bulgular, yeni mezun iş adaylarının KSS'yi olumlu bulduğunu ve KSS aktivitelerine önem veren kuruluşların temsil ettiği değerleri beğendiğini göstermektedir. Bulgular ayrıca, yeni mezun iş adaylarının böyle bir kuruluşla iş görüşmesi yapmak için oldukça istekli olduklarını ortaya koymuştur. Ayrıca, önceki çalışmaların da gösterdiği gibi, yeni mezun kadın iş adayları KSS'yi yeni mezun erkek iş adaylarından daha ilgi çekici

bulmaktadır. Benzer şekilde, teknik olmayan bölümlerden mezun olan adaylar, teknik departmanlardan mezun olanlara göre KSS'ye daha olumlu yanıt vermiştir. Son olarak, teknik olmayan iş adaylarının, KSS aktivitelerine önem veren bir şirkette çalışmak için teknik iş adaylarına göre daha fazla çaba gösterecekleri fark edilmiştir. Bu araştırma, yeni mezun iş adaylarının KSS ile ilgili görüşlerine genel bir bakış sağlamakta ve literatürün gelişmesine katkıda bulunmaktadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Kurumsal Sosyal Sorumluluk, İş Adayı Algısı, İş Arama Niyeti, Örgütsel Çekicilik



ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Firstly, I would like to express my deep appreciation and sincere gratitude to Prof. Dr. Mehmet Gençer, my advisor, for his guidance and professionalism throughout my research journey.

I owe the deepest gratitude to my mother for her efforts to raise me as a responsible individual. I also would like to thank my brother for his trust in me.

This study is dedicated to my dear husband, who never stopped believing in me during this journey, for his unconditional love and continuous support. And finally, many thanks to my cat, Lokum, for bringing me happiness and the unconditional love she gave.

Without these priceless people's assistance, trust, and patience, this study might not have materialized. I thank them with my entire heart for all of their support.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	iii
ÖZET	v
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	vii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	viii
LIST OF TABLES	x
LIST OF FIGURES.....	xi
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	xii
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Significance of the Study.....	3
1.2 Research Questions	4
1.3 Structure of the Study.....	4
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW	6
2.1 Development of CSR.....	6
2.1.1 Stakeholder Theory.....	14
2.1.2 CSR Perceptions of Employees	15
2.1.3 CSR Perceptions of Job Applicants.....	17
CHAPTER 3: DATA AND METHODOLOGY.....	19
3.1 Sample	19
3.2 Procedure.....	21
3.3 Demographic Variables	22
3.4 Measurement Instruments	22
3.4.1 CSR Perceptions Scale.....	23
3.4.2 Job Pursuit Intentions Scale.....	24
3.4.3 Organizational Attractiveness Scale	24
3.5 Methodology for Data Collection.....	25
3.6 Methodology for Data Analysis	26
3.6.1 Data Denoising	27
3.6.2 Refined Data	27
CHAPTER 4: FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION.....	30
4.1 Summary.....	30
4.2 Overall Findings and Discussion.....	31
4.3 Findings and Discussion for CSR Perceptions.....	38

4.4 Findings and Discussion for Job Pursuit Intentions	43
4.5 Findings and Discussions for Organizational Attractiveness.....	46
CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSION.....	50
5.1 Limitations.....	51
5.2 Implications for Management.....	52
5.3 Suggestions for Future Research	53
REFERENCES.....	54
APPENDICES.....	61
Appendix A: Survey Scenario in Turkish	61
Appendix B: Survey Scenario in English.....	62
Appendix C: Questions to Determine Demographic Variables in Turkish.....	63
Appendix D: Questions to Determine Demographic Variables in English.....	63
Appendix E: Survey Items in Turkish.....	63
Appendix F: Survey Items in English	64
Appendix G: Survey Answers	65

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. The Sample Characteristics	21
Table 2. Likert-Type Scale	22
Table 3. Standardized Educational Fields	29
Table 4. Answers per Survey Items.....	32
Table 5. Standard Deviation per Category, Gender and Educational Field Type	37
Table 6. Mean Values per Category, Gender and Educational Field Type	37
Table 7. SD and Mean Values per Item per Gender.....	38
Table 8. Respondents who Strongly Agree to all CSR Perceptions Items	40
Table 9. Respondents with Lowest Mean Value for CSR Perceptions	41
Table 10. SD and Mean Values per Gender for CSR Perceptions	43
Table 11. SD and Mean Values per Gender for Job Pursuit Intentions.....	46
Table 12. SD and Mean Values per Gender for Organizational Attractiveness.....	49

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1. Standard Deviation Formula for all Categories.....	39
Figure 2. Standard Deviation Formula for CSR Perceptions.....	43
Figure 3. Standard Deviation Formula for Job Pursuit Intentions.....	47
Figure 4. Standard Deviation Formula for Organizational Attractiveness.....	50



LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

CSR	: Corporate Social Responsibility
CSP	: Corporate Social Performance
DB	: Database
et al.	: et alia (and others)
GDPR	: General Data Protection Regulation
OC	: Organizational Commitment
OCB	: Organizational Citizenship Behavior
SD	: Standard Deviation



CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

As the markets have become global and more competitive in the past few decades, corporate social responsibility (CSR) has become an important topic that has received increasing attention in the literature. Likewise, corporate collapses and scandals have put increased pressure on organizations to involve activities and policies to enhance society and the environment (Evans and Davis, 2011).

Although there is no standard definition of CSR, it has been widely involved in academic studies since the 1950s. However, many studies in the literature have focused on CSR at the organizational level outcomes such as organizational performance (Cochran and Wood, 1984), organizational reputation (Brammer and Pavelin, 2006), and corporate image (Arendt and Brettel, 2010). Some other studies have focused on the CSR practices of organizations and their impact on various stakeholders, such as consumers (Groza et al., 2011), employees (Kim et al., 2010; Wang et al., 2013), managers (Du et al., 2012), and investors (Petersen and Vredenburg, 2009; Story et al., 2016). Few studies have examined job applicants' perceptions of organizations' CSR activities. The psychology of corporate social responsibility, which refers to the way individuals perceive and react to organizations' social activities and policies, has just begun to take its place in academic studies (Rupp et al., 2013).

It is widely accepted by scholars that the human workforce is the most significant and critical asset of any organization. For this reason, human resources optimize employee effectiveness and provide companies with the necessary knowledge, skills, competencies, and behavior to successfully pursue their organizational goals. The ability to attract skilled employees is undoubtedly a significant path toward productivity, effectiveness, overall organizational performance, and achieving goals (Duarte et al., 2014). Therefore, socially responsible organizations consider CSR as a source of competitive advantage by attracting a higher quality and quantity of job applicants interested in such activities to enhance society and the environment (Fombrun and Shanley, 1990; Story et al., 2016; Turban and Greening, 1997; Zhang and Gowan, 2011).

Previous studies demonstrate that an organization's engagement with CSR activities

offers advantages not only to an organization's financial performance but also to non-financial outcomes such as the organization's reputation in the eyes of its consumers and its attractiveness to investors by meeting the expectations of external stakeholders (Graves and Waddock, 1994; Kim et al., 2015; Orlitzky et al., 2003; Peloza, 2009; Shin et al., 2016). Furthermore, studies have emphasized the importance of ethical values for both organizations and individuals (Victor and Cullen, 1988).

The primary goal of this thesis is to contribute to the development of the field by investigating the impacts of CSR on newly graduated job applicants' perceptions. Additionally, this study investigates the following points:

- Whether CSR practices of an organization influence their perspective of organizational attractiveness,
- Whether CSR activities of an organization impact their job pursuit intentions,
- Whether there are any variations in their perceptions based on demographic variables.

The scope of this thesis is the impact of an organization's CSR activities and policies on newly graduated job seekers' perspectives. In this manner, an online survey is administered to newly graduated job applicants to achieve the study's goals, conducting a modified snowball sampling approach. Based on previous research, a scenario about a fictitious organization is generated and included in the survey within the scope of this research. The scenario initially informs about an organization's general aspects, such as its business sector, foundation year, mission, operations, and financials. Later, the scenario provides information about the fictitious organization's CSR activities and practices, including the partnership with non-profit organizations and donations to charities for the community and the environment.

Following that, items related to demographic variables are presented in the survey. Demographic items are included in the survey to uncover variations in applicants' perceptions based on demographic variables, such as age, gender, and educational level. The questions to assess demographic variables are provided in Appendix D. Ultimately, 17 items adapted from previous researchers are admitted to assess CSR perceptions, organizational attractiveness, and job pursuit intentions of the newly graduated job applicants. Those items are available in Appendix F.

Findings suggest that newly graduated job applicants acknowledge CSR positively and like the values represented by organizations that engage in CSR. The findings also indicated that newly graduated job applicants are significantly inclined to have a job interview with such an organization. Moreover, previous studies demonstrate that female job applicants find CSR more engaging than male applicants. Similarly, job applicants who graduated from non-technical departments have responded more positively to CSR than applicants from technical departments. Finally, it is noticed that non-technical job applicants will make more effort than technical job applicants to work in a company that engages in CSR. This research provides an overview of newly graduated job applicants' opinions regarding CSR and contributes to the development of the literature.

1.1 Significance of the Study

The study's main contribution is to provide a better understanding of the impacts of organizations' CSR activities on the perceptions of newly graduated job applicants. Many studies have concentrated on CSR at the organizational level outcomes such as organizational performance, organizational reputation, and corporate image. Other studies have focused on the CSR practices of organizations and their impacts on various stakeholders such as consumers, employees, managers, and investors. However, relatively few studies examine the CSR domain at the individual level. More specifically, little attention is paid to the impacts of CSR on the perceptions of job applicants. In addition, due to the belated implementation of CSR in Turkey, there is a paucity of attention on CSR-related topics among researchers. For that reason, this study aims to contribute to the literature by examining the impacts of CSR on the job applicants' perceptions and filling a part of the gap in the literature on the CSR approach in Turkey.

Though there are studies investigating the impact of CSR actions, practices, and other ethical and responsible activities of an organization on employees in Turkey, no study that specifically examines the impact of CSR on the perception of job applicants have not yet emerged. Therefore, this study provides insights into the specified relationship of CSR with newly graduated job applicants and contributes to the literature.

Although the results obtained from this study cannot be fully generalized, the fact that the sample is not limited to a single institute or university can be considered another significance of the study. A sample limited to a single institution or university may narrow the scope of the study. It may also affect the respondents' perceptions based on particular concerns.

Additionally, previous studies mainly use students as a sample instead of graduated job applicants (Evans and Davis, 2011; Greening and Turban, 2000; Smith et al., 2004; Zhang and Gowan, 2011). Lastly, when the scope of the literature review of this research is examined, no study has been found that examines job applicants in two separate categories as graduates of technical or non-technical departments. The study's uniqueness mainly emanates from two reasons; the sample consisting of newly graduated job applicants instead of students and the categorization of applicants as graduates of technical or non-technical departments.

1.2 Research Questions

The primary research question of this study is "How does corporate social responsibility impact the perceptions of the newly graduated job applicants who have graduated in the last three years?" The following research questions are asked based on the theoretical background:

1. Do CSR activities of an organization affect job applicants' perceptions?
2. Do CSR activities of an organization attract job applicants?
3. Do CSR activities of an organization affect job applicants' job pursuit intentions?

1.3 Structure of the Study

This study is organized into the following chapters. The first chapter examines the main concept with its background briefly. Furthermore, the study's aim and research questions are presented. The second chapter provides a comprehensive overview of CSR with the concept's historical development. The chapter further mentions stakeholder theory to acknowledge the CSR notion. Later, employees and job applicants as key stakeholder groups and their perceptions of CSR are discussed under separate headings.

In the third chapter, data and methodology are examined in detail. Sample, procedure, and demographic variables are provided. Then, measurement instruments used within the study are presented. Additionally, the third chapter covers the methodology for conducting data analysis. The fourth chapter examines the findings obtained from the survey analysis, and the discussions and interpretations based on these findings are provided. The fourth chapter includes a summary, overall findings & discussion, and findings & discussion for each measurement instrument. In the final chapter, the conclusion of this study is addressed. In addition, this chapter includes the limitations of this study, the implications for management, and suggestions for future research.



CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter of the study firstly provides a comprehensive overview of CSR with the historical development of the approach in order to identify related concepts, theories, methods, and gaps in the literature. The chapter also explores stakeholder theory briefly to understand the CSR notion. Following that, employees as a key stakeholder group and their perceptions of CSR activities of organizations are discussed. Finally, this chapter continues with a detailed examination of the impact of organizations' CSR activities and policies on job applicants.

The literature review is carried out systematically to acquire the relevant articles and provide transparency and reproducibility of the research. An initial search query is produced, and a literature scan is done through Scopus. The initial query contained "CSR," "Corporate Social Responsibility," "Perception," and "Candidate" keywords. All conjugations of verb keywords are also provided in the search query.

Considering that a study may have been published on the same subject with different keywords not included in the initial query, the second version of the search query is created. The keywords "Recruitment," "Recruiter," "Recruit," "Interviewer," "Interviewee," "Interview," "Prospect," "Prospective," and "Applicant" and their verb conjugations have also been added to the query. Later, the job-related keywords "Job Attractiveness," "Job Application," "Job Selection," "Job Choice," and "Job Pursuit" are added to the search query. From the search results, only scientific articles published in the "Business, Management & Accounting" field have been included in the literature scan. After performing a literature scan with the final version of the search query, the contents of the obtained articles are examined, and irrelevant articles are excluded.

2.1 Development of CSR

Beginning in the 1950s, corporate social responsibility (CSR) has been the focus of academic studies (Carroll, 1999). Carroll (1999) points out that the first definition of CSR, as we know, was made by Howard R. Bowen in 1953 and refers to CSR as an obligation that businessmen must fulfill in line with the values and expectations of society. Bowen's (1953) book *Social Responsibilities of the Businessman* and

description represented the most critical work of the 1950s (Carroll, 1999). This definition could serve as a guide for companies in the future, but it was not sufficient to meet all the social issues. However, according to Carroll (1999), Bowen should be called the “Father of Corporate Social Responsibility” because of his early and good definition. Since then, according to the literature, CSR has been defined in many forms. Following this pioneering definition of Bowen, another definition of social responsibility was made by Keith Davis in 1960, stating that “businessmen’s decisions and actions taken for reasons at least partially beyond the firm’s direct economic or technical interest” (p. 70). Thus, another contribution of Davis to the literature on the social responsibility concept is his view on the relationship between social responsibility and business power.

Later, Joseph W. McGuire (1963) put another point of view in his book *Business and Society*. He stated that “the idea of social responsibilities supposes that the corporation has not only economic and legal obligations but also certain responsibilities to society which extend beyond these obligations” (p. 144). Because McGuire (1963) stated that an organization’s obligations to society are beyond its economic and legal obligations, his definition of social responsibility is sharper than the previous ones. Later, McGuire emphasized that an organization must strive for the welfare of society, education, politics, employees’ happiness, and the entire social world.

As more researchers became interested in the subject, the scope of the CSR concept gradually expanded. In 1966, Keith Davis and Robert Blomstrom defined social responsibility in their book *Business and its Environment* as “social responsibility, therefore, refers to a person’s obligation to consider the effects of his decisions and actions on the whole social system. Businessmen apply social responsibility when they consider the needs and interests of others who may be affected by business actions. They look beyond their firm’s narrow economic and technical interests” (p. 12). Thus, it was discussed that social responsibility is an obligation for an organization to act toward the interests and needs of the society beyond making a profit.

Keith Davis later took social responsibility one step further in 1967, stating that social responsibility enlarges an individual’s view of the entire social system (p. 46). According to this statement, Davis suggested that the social responsibility activities of

an organization can affect the general social system and expand the perspective of an individual to the whole system. Later, Clarence C. Walton, in *Corporate Social Responsibilities* (1967), stated that “In short, the new concept of social responsibility recognizes the intimacy of the relationships between the corporation and society and realizes that such relationships must be kept in mind by top managers as the corporation and the related groups pursue their respective goals” (Walton, 1967, p. 18).

In the 1970s, Morrell Heald (1970) did not come up with a definition of social responsibility. However, Heald’s idea was similar to the definitions performed in the 1960s. In Heald’s book *The Social Responsibilities of Business*, he stated, “meaning of the concept of social responsibility for businessmen must finally be sought in the actual policies with which they were associated” (p. xi). Harold Johnson (1971), in his book *Business in Contemporary Society: Framework and Issues*, provided many definitions of social responsibility. He first stated that “a socially responsible firm is one whose managerial staff balances multiple interests. Instead of striving only for larger profits for its stockholders, a responsible enterprise also considers employees, suppliers, dealers, local communities, and the nation” (p. 50).

It should be noted that along with this definition, Johnson gave a clue about the stakeholder approach and even named some of these interest groups. Moreover, Johnson came up with another view of social responsibility: “social responsibility states that businesses carry out social programs to add profits to their organization” (p. 54). In this view, social responsibility is considered as a policy to increase profitability for organizations. Johnson’s third view of social responsibility: “The third approach of social responsibility assumes that the prime motivation of the business firm is utility maximization; the enterprise seeks multiple goals rather than only maximum profits” (p. 59). Finally, Johnson’s fourth view of social responsibility suggests that highly profit-oriented firms may focus on social responsibility activities. Once those organizations hit their target, they would act like society’s needs and values are important to them.

In addition to Johnson’s views, another contribution to the concept came from the Committee for Economic Development (CED) in 1971. The CED declared that

organizations are expected to take broader responsibilities toward the society under humanitarian values. George Steiner made another critical point of view regarding CSR in the 1970s in his book *Business and Society* (1971), stating that businesses have and should primarily have economic goals. However, they also have responsibilities to society and must fulfill them. Moreover, according to Steiner, the larger the company, the greater its responsibilities to society (Steiner, 1971, p. 164). Rather than dwelling on the definition of CSR, Steiner examined areas in which CSR can be applied. He provided models for specifying the social responsibilities of business.

In 1973, Keith Davis joined the debate regarding the CSR approach again with his landmark article. In this article, Davis first mentioned Milton Friedman, a well-known economist. Friedman (1962) stated that “Few trends could so thoroughly undermine the very foundations of our free society as the acceptance by corporate officials of a social responsibility other than to make as much money for their stockholders as possible” (p. 133). However, Davis opposed the idea with a quote by Paul Samuelson, who was also an economist, discussing that “a large corporation these days not only may engage in social responsibility, it had damn well better try to do so” (Samuelson, 1970). After all these perspectives, Davis (1973) defined CSR as “CSR refers to the firm’s consideration of, and response to, issues beyond the narrow economic, technical, and legal requirements of the firm” (p. 312), stating the importance of matters beyond the financial, profit-related, technical responsibilities of organizations. Then in 1973, Davis refers to the obligation of an organization to consider the impacts of its decisions on the social environment. Davis specified his view as “it is the firm’s obligation to evaluate in its decision-making process the effects of its decisions on the external social system in a manner that will accomplish social benefits along with the traditional economic gains which the firm seeks” (p. 313). Davis later added that an organization fails to fulfill its social responsibilities only if it meets the minimum requirements of the law.

According to Henry Eilbert and I. Robert Parket (1973), CSR is about “good neighborliness.” The concept consists of two stages. One is avoiding things that would disrupt the neighborhood. The other is the voluntary assumption of the obligation to help solve neighborhood problems. Later in 1974, Richard Eells and Clarence Walton addressed the CSR approach, similar to Davis’s (1973) CSR perspective but with some

differences, stating that CSR is not merely an economic concern but a concern that includes the needs and goals of the society. “Insofar as the business system as it exists today can only survive in an effectively functioning free society, the corporate social responsibility movement represents a broad concern with business’s role in supporting and improving that social order” (Eells and Walton, 1974, p. 247). According to Jules Backman (1975), social responsibility is a set of goals that a business should concentrate on in addition to its economic performance (p. 2).

In these decades, CSR was generally defined as organizations taking responsibility for the needs and values of the society beyond carrying out their economic objectives. In the 1970s, besides CSR, it is seen that the concept of corporate social performance (CSP) was also mentioned (Carroll, 1977). One of the authors who mentioned the CSP approach is S. Prakash Sethi (1975). Sethi, in an article, made the distinction between CSP and social responsibility. According to the author, social obligation is corporate behavior “in response to market forces or legal constraints” (p. 70).

On the other hand, social responsibility is a concept beyond the social obligation. In addition, social responsibility means taking corporate behavior to a higher level (p. 62). Sethi (1975) also mentioned that social responsibility is prescriptive, whereas social obligation is proscriptive. Finally, in Sethi’s model, social responsiveness means adapting corporate behavior to social needs. In a book titled *Private Management and Public Policy: The Principle of Public Responsibility*, Lee Preston and James Post (1975) mentioned “public” responsibility instead of CSR. Preston and Post stated that they prefer the word “public” rather than “social” “to stress the importance of the public policy process, rather than individual opinion and conscience, as the source of goals and appraisal criteria” (p. 102). In 1976, H. Gordon Fitch defined CSR as an attempt to solve social problems caused by an organization (Fitch, 1976, p. 38).

In 1979, Archie B. Carroll proposed a four-stage definition of CSR within the framework of the CSP conceptual model (Carroll, 1979). Carroll suggested that “the social responsibility of business encompasses the economic, legal, ethical, and discretionary expectations that society has of organizations at a given point in time” (Carroll, 1979, p. 500). Moreover, the economic part of the definition refers to society’s expectations for businesses to produce goods and services and sell them at a

profit. Law represents the set of basic rules that society expects businesses to follow. Thus, legal responsibility is the second part of the definition (Carroll, 1979, p. 500). The other two responsibilities are types of responsibilities that go beyond obeying the law. Ethical responsibility refers to the ethical norms society expects businesses to abide by. Those cover behavior and practices beyond what is required by law. The last one, discretionary responsibilities, represents voluntary practices for society's benefit, which society does not exactly expect from businesses. Although these are responsibilities left to the discretion of businesses and managers, society's expectation still exists. In addition, while economic and legal responsibilities are for businesses themselves, ethical and discretionary responsibilities are done for others (Turker, 2009; Carroll, 1999). Moreover, these four classes of CSR by Carroll (1979) are the most common study used to describe CSR in the literature.

Concentrating on the CSR concept in the 1960s and 1970s also led to focusing on concepts such as business ethics, corporate social responsiveness, CSP, public policy, and stakeholder theory/management in the 1980s. However, this does not mean that the interest in CSR is over. It may mean that CSR has evolved into alternative concepts and models. Those concepts are related to CSR and can be considered similar up to a point.

In 1980, Thomas M. Jones joined the discussions regarding the CSR concept in this decade, defining CSR as "Corporate social responsibility is the notion that corporations have an obligation to constituent groups in society other than stockholders and beyond that prescribed by law and union contract. Two facets of this definition are critical. First, the obligation must be voluntarily adopted; behavior influenced by the coercive forces of law or union contract is not voluntary. Second, the obligation is broad, extending beyond the traditional duty to shareholders to other social groups such as customers, employees, suppliers, and neighboring communities" (Jones, 1980, pp. 59-60). Jones identified CSR as the obligation of businesses to be responsible towards society beyond the rules of law. Jones added that two crucial things should be highlighted. First, the obligation must be carried out voluntarily. Secondly, the obligation mentioned is broader than the traditional obligation of shareholders to other social groups such as employees, customers, and suppliers (Jones, 1980, pp. 59-60). In addition, Jones stated that CSR should be considered as a

process instead of an outcome (p. 65). Later on, Frank Tuzzolino and Barry Armandi (1981) did not define the CSR concept. However, the authors suggested that organizations, like individuals, have specific criteria that need to be fulfilled or met, as shown in Maslow's hierarchy of needs.

Later, Carroll (1983) extended his four-stage definition of CSR: "In my view, CSR involves the conduct of a business so that it is economically profitable, law-abiding, ethical and socially supportive. To be socially responsible... then means that profitability and obedience to the law are the foremost conditions for discussing the firm's ethics and the extent to which it supports the society in which it exists with contributions of money, time, and talent. Thus, CSR is composed of four parts: economic, legal, ethical and voluntary or philanthropic" (Carroll, 1983, p. 604). With this elaborated four-stage definition, Carroll highlighted that profitability and complying with the rules are the foremost goals of a business. Since Carroll suggested that voluntarism and/or philanthropy was a better basis for the social responsibility field, he modified the word "discretionary" in the previous definition into "voluntary or philanthropic."

Moreover, Peter Drucker (1984) and Philip Cochran and Robert Wood (1984) contributed to the CSR domain with their arguments. Drucker (1984) stated that businesses should turn social responsibility practices into economic opportunity and benefit, productive capacity, human competence, -paid jobs, and h (Drucker, 1984, p. 62). Cochran and Wood (1984) sought to answer whether a business that focuses on social responsibility practices can also be profitable.

In 1987, Edwin M. Epstein published a definition of CSR explaining its relationship with the concepts of social responsibility, responsiveness, and business ethics. He proposed that "corporate social responsibility relates primarily to achieving outcomes from organizational decisions concerning specific issues or problems which (by some normative standard) have beneficial rather than adverse effects on pertinent corporate stakeholders. The normative correctness of the products of corporate action has been the main focus of corporate social responsibility" (Epstein, 1987, p. 104). In addition to defining the CSR, Epstein (1987) introduced corporate social responsiveness and business ethics concepts and brought these together and gave its name as "corporate

social policy process.”

In general, no unique contribution was made to the CSR concept in the 1990s (Carroll, 1999). CSP, stakeholder theory, business ethics theory, and corporate citizenship were the most popular topics in the 1990s. In 1991, Carroll revised his four-part definition of CSR. Carroll, with this definition, suggested a pyramid model for the more specific classification of CSR. Carroll’s pyramid presents economic, legal, ethical, and philanthropic responsibilities. The economic category formed the basis of Carroll’s pyramid, followed by the legal, ethical, and philanthropic categories (Carroll, 1991, p. 42). Carroll summarized the pyramid as “The CSR firm should strive to make a profit, obey the law, be ethical, and be a good corporate citizen” (p. 43).

Moreover, in 1994, Carroll surveyed academic leaders on the social issues in the management field and obtained exciting data. Analysis of the answer to “What topics do you see as most important for research in the social issues in the management field in the balance of the 1990s?” was essential to Carroll. First, it should be noted that CSR is categorized under the “corporate social performance” (CSP) concept. According to the study, the concepts that attracted the most attention regarding CSR in the 1990s were CSP, business ethics, and stakeholder theory. However, these concepts cannot be considered entirely separate from CSR.

Alongside the development of CSR that began in the 1950s, CSR has become more supported by many organizations such as governments and non-governmental organizations since the 1990s (Moura-Leite and Padgett, 2011). In this period, no significant contributions were made to CSR in terms of definition. However, concepts such as stakeholder theory and business ethics took place on the stage. At the same time, in this decade, the integration of CSR policies into corporate systems and business processes has accelerated, and partnerships between companies, NGOs, and non-government organizations have increased (Carroll, 2008).

To conclude the topic, the World Business Council for Sustainable Development (1999) defines corporate social responsibility as “the commitment of business to contribute to sustainable economic development, working with employees, their families, the local community and society to improve their quality of life.” Finally, the

European Commission (2005) defines CSR as “a concept whereby companies integrate social and environmental concerns in their business operations and interactions with their stakeholders on a voluntary basis.”

2.1.1 Stakeholder Theory

The stakeholder approach is a CSR-related elaborative concept introduced in the mid-1980s (Freeman, 1984). Since both concepts focus on the interests of the main actors in a company’s immediate environment, the stakeholder theory is directly related to the CSR point of view (Johansson and Larsson, 2000). In other words, Carroll (1991) suggested a natural fit between CSR and the organization’s stakeholders.

According to Freeman (1984), who is mentioned as the father of stakeholder theory, a stakeholder is “any group or individual who can affect or is affected by the achievement of the firm’s objectives” (p. 25). The word “stakeholder” originally derives from “shareholder.” However, stakeholders are often tied to a company, usually on a long-term basis. It can also be called a kind of vested interest. On the other hand, the shareholder has a financial interest, can sell a stock, buy new stock, and is not affiliated with the company for a long time. The stakeholder term includes shareholders, employees, customers, suppliers, governments, the local community, competitors, creditors, and the public.

Freeman et al. (2001) stated as “a stakeholder approach to strategic management suggests that managers must formulate and implement processes which satisfy all and only those groups who have a stake in the business.” As the opposite of shareholder theory, the basic idea of stakeholder theory is that businesses should serve the interests of everyone who has a “stake” in the firm, not just shareholders. In other words, according to Freeman et al. (2001), “a stakeholder approach rejects the very idea of maximizing a single objective function as a useful way of thinking about management strategy. Rather, stakeholder management is a never-ending task of balancing and integrating multiple relationships and objectives.” Freeman et al. (2001) argue that in order to achieve a perfect business strategy, it is appropriate to focus on multiple targets rather than a single target. Briefly, stakeholder management tries to involve the groups that have a stake in the company in the managerial decision-making process (Garriga and Melé, 2004).

To conclude, the primary purpose of the stakeholder theory is to ensure maximum cooperation between the interests of stakeholder groups and the business's goals. Basically, this concept concentrates on boosting financial performance and other steps that will take the organization one step further with the assistance of socially responsible policies that primarily include the stakeholders' values and perspectives.

2.1.2 CSR Perceptions of Employees

Since the subject of this study is the perceptions of newly graduated job applicants on CSR activities of organizations, the employees' perspectives are also covered.

Although there is no consensus on CSR definition, it has been widely involved in academic studies since the 1950s, as mentioned earlier in this chapter. However, over the last few decades, researchers have examined CSR at the organizational level outcomes such as organizational performance, organizational reputation, and corporate image and their impact on various stakeholders: most commonly, consumers (Groza et al., 2011), employees (Kim et al., 2010; Wang et al., 2013), managers (Du et al., 2012) and investors (Petersen and Vredenburg, 2009; Story et al., 2016). It is also worth mentioning that relatively little attention is paid to employee engagement with CSR. Rodrigo and Arenas (2008, p. 266) stated that "relatively little attention has been given to employees in the CSR literature... surprising because the attraction of talent, loyalty to a firm, and motivation have all been used to explain why CSR can be a source of competitive advantage." Moreover, Dhanesh (2012) also suggested that employees have hardly received attention in the CSR literature.

The workforce should be considered one of the essential stakeholders, and its human capital is one of the most critical factors for an organization to achieve competitive success (Bae et al., 2011; Pfeffer, 1996). It should be highlighted that employees are one of the most critical stakeholders of organizations as they are highly involved with the organization. Collier and Esteban (2007, p. 20) emphasized the importance of employee engagement with CSR, stating that employees carry the main burden of ethical corporate behavior in organizations. Therefore, they should be a key stakeholder group in CSR practices. Collier and Esteban (2007) also propose that the degree of motivation and commitment play a role in determining how employees

respond to CSR practices of organizations. Thus, it should be noted that the employee's motivation and commitment to the organization are significant in determining the reactions of that employee to the CSR activities of the organization.

However, this does not imply that all employees will be equally interested in the CSR activities of organizations (Rodrigo and Arenas, 2008). Individuals react differently to CSR-related issues in line with their values and education related to CSR (Evans and Davis, 2011). Although this stakeholder group's perspectives on CSR are considered homogenous, it cannot be assumed that all the employees will have the same degree of engagement with CSR. At this point, Rodrigo and Arenas (2008) analyzed employees in three basic classes. The first type is the "Committed Employee," who are motivated by their values and tend to be more sensitive to social welfare, social concerns, and CSR activities of the organizations they work for. These employees positively perceive their organizations' steps regarding society and the environment. Employees with common goals and values align with their organization's CSR activities and practices, which are closest to the committed employees class of Rodrigo and Arenas (2008), perceive their firms' CSR engagements to show affiliation and commitment to their organizations. The second type is classified as the "Indifferent Employee." These employees are focused on their personal development, not social issues-oriented. Along with this, they are not against community-oriented steps taken by their organizations. It would not be wrong to say that CSR-related activities implemented by their organizations do not increase their commitment. Finally, the third type is the "Dissident Employee," who questions why the CSR-related expenses are made instead of raising employee salaries and offering incentives to employees. The fact that the organization they work for implements CSR programs or does such expenses for society's benefit does not usually satisfy them. On the contrary, it may lead them to rebel against the company.

Considering the importance of addressing society-oriented issues, organizations' implementation of CSR programs will benefit not only society but it will also benefit the organization itself. In addition, the inclusion of employees in the CSR programs of the organizations will also further result in various positive organizational contributions. Thus, creating a corporate culture that encourages employees to engage in citizenship behaviors is essential. Additionally, since the employees are considered

the primary stakeholders in an organization due to their role in the organization, their expectations regarding CSR programs must be met by the organization they work for (Lee et al., 2013).

2.1.3 CSR Perceptions of Job Applicants

The psychology of corporate social responsibility, which refers to how individuals perceive and react to organizations' social activities and policies, has just begun to take its place in academic studies (Rupp et al., 2013). As mentioned previously, the majority of the academic studies regarding CSR have examined CSR at the organizational or institutional level (Aguinis and Glavas, 2012; Rupp et al., 2013). On the other hand, previous studies have emphasized the importance of ethical values for both organizations and individuals (Victor and Cullen, 1988). Therefore, the engagement of individuals with CSR-related activities also needs to be investigated.

Researchers have begun to examine whether individuals' perspective on corporate citizenship increases organizational attractiveness among job applicants and whether this perspective impacts an individual's job responsibilities (Evans and Davis, 2011). Additionally, many studies demonstrate that organizations concentrating on CSR activities may affect recruitment (Backhaus, Stone and Heiner, 2002; Turban and Greening, 1997; Greening and Turban, 2000). However, a scant amount of study has examined whether CSR activities and policies of organizations affect job applicants' attraction to an organization (Aguilera et al. 2007; Evans and Davis, 2011; Greening and Turban, 2000). Moreover, many of these studies are location-oriented studies that examine the impact of CSR on job applicants on a country basis.

Early studies demonstrate that an organization's engagement with CSR activities not only offers advantages to the financial performance of an organization at the organizational level but also to non-financial outcomes such as the organization's reputation in the eyes of its consumers and its attractiveness to investors by satisfying external stakeholders' expectations (Shin et al., 2016). On the other hand, applicants seeking a job in the industry of a specific organization can also be involved in external stakeholders of this organization. According to Mitchell et al. (1997) framework, job applicants or, in other words, potential employees have power, legitimacy, and urgency. They are called "salient" stakeholders (Greening and Turban, 2000). The link

between CSR and job applicants is significant because CSR activities and policies of organizations often give those organizations a positive image, which provides a competitive advantage and attracts a higher qualified human workforce (Davis, 1973; Fombrun and Shanley, 1990; Zhang and Gowan, 2011). Thus, applying CSR activities by the organizations can also be advantageous in attracting job applicants interested in such activities to enhance society and the environment.

Moreover, since human resources optimize the effectiveness of its employees and provide companies with the necessary knowledge, skills, competencies, and behavior to successfully pursue organizational goals, it is accepted by scholars that it is the most significant and critical asset of any organization. The capability to attract skilled employees is undoubtedly a significant path toward productivity, effectiveness, the overall performance of an organization, and achieving goals (Duarte et al., 2014). Therefore, CSR practices enhance organizational competitiveness by attracting highly skilled job applicants and talent to the organization (Story et al., 2016).

CSR at the individual level is integrated theories from areas such as motivation, organizational justice, social change, and behavioral ethics (Rupp, 2011; Rupp, Ganapathi, Aguilera and Williams, 2006; Rupp et al., 2011; Rupp et al., 2013; Snell, 2000). Previous studies demonstrate that CSR perceptions of employees are directly and positively associated with their organizational identification, trust in their employer, organizational commitment (OC), organizational citizenship behavior (OCB), and intention to stay (Brammer, Millington and Rayton, 2007; Hansen, Dunford, Boss, Boss and Angermeier, 2011; Jones, 2011; Kim, Lee, Lee and Kim, 2010; Peterson, 2004; Rodrigo and Arenas, 2008; Rupp et al., 2013).

The job applicants' engagement with CSR activities of organizations has been linked with several variables. There is empirical evidence that CSR perceptions of job applicants are directly and positively related to perceived organizational attractiveness and job pursuit intentions (Albinger and Freeman, 2000; Evans and Davis, 2011; Greening and Turban, 2000; Jones, Willness and MacNeil, 2009; Rupp et al., 2013; Turban and Greening, 1997). Based on previous research, this study focuses on perceived organizational attractiveness and job pursuit intentions. Those variables are assessed using five-point Likert-type scales.

CHAPTER 3: DATA AND METHODOLOGY

In this chapter, information regarding the methods and the procedures used within this study are presented. Information about the sampling method of the study is firstly provided. Following that, the data collection procedure is discussed. Details about the scenario are also given in the procedure section. In addition, brief information regarding the demographic variables is presented. Later on, measurement instruments are discussed. Finally, methodology details and the analytical tools used are described in this chapter. This chapter consists of the sample, procedure, demographic variables, measurement instruments, methodology for data collection, and methodology for data analysis.

3.1 Sample

As the title of this study suggests, newly graduated job applicants are the target sample for this research. Newly graduated job applicants include job seekers who have graduated in the last three years. Since students are used as the sample in most previous studies (Evans and Davis, 2011; Greening and Turban, 2000; Smith et al., 2004; Zhang and Gowan, 2011), the distinctiveness of this study is that graduated job applicants are taken as the sample to contribute to the development of the literature.

The snowball sampling approach (Kolb, 2008) is conducted to find respondents who have graduated in the last three years and are actively seeking a job in Turkey. Several respondents are identified as primary data willing to participate in the current research. Afterward, these job applicants seeking a job provided the details of other people who may participate in this study. The snowball sampling process continued until enough data was reached for the study. The snowball sampling approach is applied because it enables the researcher to reach the targeted sample population.

Due to the nature of the online survey method administered in this study, the response rate could not be provided since the number of people reached by the questionnaire cannot be monitored. A total of 106 responses are obtained. As seen in Table 1, while 46 (43.4%) of the respondents are female, 60 (56.6%) are male. The average age of the female respondents is 24.3 (SD = 0.9985), and the average age of the male respondents is 24.7 (SD = 1.8214). It is observed that 105 of the 106 respondents are

university graduates, corresponding to 99.1% of the sample.

On the other hand, only one of the respondents is a postgraduate. The fact that all respondents participating in the survey have a university level or higher level of education proves that the respondents participating in the survey match the target population of the research. Although the target audience of the research is consistent with the respondents' educational level, there was not enough data on postgraduate responses to use educational level as a demographic variable for the analysis conducted.

Table 1. The Sample Characteristics

Characteristics	Category	Frequency	Percentage
<i>Age</i>	22	3	2.8
	23	17	16
	24	36	34
	25	37	34.9
	26	8	7.5
	27	1	0.9
	28	3	2.8
	35	1	0.9
<i>Gender</i>	Male	60	56.6
	Female	46	43.4
<i>Education</i>	Bachelor's Degree	105	99.1
	Master's Degree	1	0.9
<i>Educational Field Type</i>	Non-technical Department	62	58.5
	Technical Department	44	41.5

3.2 Procedure

As previously mentioned in this thesis, data is collected through a scenario-based individual-level online survey administered to newly graduated applicants, conducting a modified snowball sampling strategy. The survey is administered from February to March 2022. Participation in the survey was voluntary. In order to make respondents participate comfortably, the respondents are assured that their data will be kept confidential, and the researcher provided a commitment regarding confidentiality. In addition, due to the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR), questions and items irrelevant to the research are avoided in the survey.

The survey administered for this study involved different items in measuring newly graduated job applicants' perceptions of corporate social responsibility, their job choice intentions, and the influence of CSR on organizational attractiveness. For all the measures on the survey, respondents are asked to respond to a five-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 = "strongly disagree" to 5 = "strongly agree" as presented in Table 2. In addition, demographic variables such as age, gender, and educational background are also requested from the respondents to figure out whether there are any variations in their perceptions based on demographics and achieve better data classification.

Table 2. Likert-Type Scale

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)

Respondents are informed of the study's nature initially. Then they are asked to read the scenario about a fictitious organization called "MarketBee." Following that, the respondents are asked to consider themselves as potential job applicants for the described organization. After reading the provided scenario, they are asked to indicate their perceptions regarding CSR, the company's organizational attractiveness, and their likelihood of seeking a job with this company.

The scenario describes a company's external corporate social responsibility activities and practices based on previous research. The scenario is written in the same format

as a company's about page; general information about the company is provided initially (e.g., its history, operations, and business condition). The following part of the scenario included the organization's charitable activities towards the community and environment, such as partnering with non-profit organizations, donating to charities for the community and environment, and encouraging employee volunteering.

Finally, to analyze the job pursuit intentions of the respondents participating in the study in a more reliable way, the fictitious company in the scenario is chosen as a marketing company. It is also considered that respondents have been educated in different fields and may have diverse intentions to pursue jobs in different sectors. The original English version of the scenario is provided in Appendix B.

3.3 Demographic Variables

To be controlled, the respondents are asked to provide demographic information within the survey. Due to the nature of the study, gender, age, and educational level are measured as control variables. Gender is collected on purpose because it has been demonstrated in the previous studies that women often have better attention to CSR-related topics than men (e.g., Greening and Turban, 2000; Peterson, 2004). It must be emphasized that the demographic information regarding age is open-ended. However, other demographic variables, including gender and educational background, had particularized answers. As in the measurement instruments, demographic questions are also asked in Turkish to remove the language barrier. The Turkish version of the demographic questions is shown in Appendix C.

Finally, all demographic information (e.g., age, gender, educational background) is gathered to analyze whether there are any variations in job applicants' perceptions based on demographics and achieve better data classification. The English version of the questions asked to assess demographic information is provided in Appendix D.

3.4 Measurement Instruments

An online survey is conducted in order to measure job applicants' CSR perceptions. The survey used within this study contained a scenario about a fictitious organization and 17 carefully selected items in three categories to be answered based on the given

scenario. Independent variables included the CSR perceptions scale, organizational attractiveness scale, and job pursuit intentions scale. All of the independent variables are measured using items derived from various studies that were previously conducted. The scales included in the survey are also selected by examining the previously conducted research on the effects of CSR activities on organizations. Each independent variable included in the survey depends on a theoretical background to ensure the reliability of the survey. Demographic information (e.g., age, gender, educational background) is also requested from the respondents to determine whether there are any variations in their perceptions based on demographics and achieve better data classification.

Independent variables are measured using a five-point Likert-type response scale, with 1 = “strongly disagree” and 5 = “strongly agree” as shown in Table 2. Since the audience of the questionnaire consists of native Turkish speakers, the survey scenario and items are translated to Turkish to remove the language barrier for the respondents. The Turkish version of the scenario is available in Appendix A, and the Turkish version of the 17 items is provided in Appendix E. The survey included the following independent variables:

3.4.1 CSR Perceptions Scale

The impacts of CSR on the perceptions of newly graduated job applicants are measured using items derived from several researchers. The original English version of the seven items used to assess CSR perceptions are provided in Appendix F. Sample items to assess CSR perceptions include “MarketBee behaves responsibly regarding the environment,” “MarketBee is aware of environmental issues,” “MarketBee fulfills its social responsibilities,” “MarketBee gives back to society,” and “MarketBee acts in a socially responsible way” are derived from Currás-Pérez et al. (2009). Additionally, the following sample items are developed by Lin et al. (2011) to assess CSR perceptions of newly graduated job applicants: “This firm gives adequate contributions to charities” and “This firm is concerned about improving the public well-being of society.”

The CSR perceptions scale measures whether newly graduated job applicants attach importance to organizations’ CSR activities and practices when seeking a job. As

mentioned previously, respondents are asked to evaluate the items on a five-point Likert-type scale based on the scenario given in the survey about the fictitious organization MarketBee. The five-point Likert-type scale is created as 1 = “strongly disagree” and 5 = “strongly agree” as shown in Table 2. Since the survey was conducted in Turkey, the items had to be translated into Turkish from English to avoid language barriers. Moreover, various methods are used to translate the items from the English version to the Turkish version, ensuring no translation-related word difference between the English and Turkish versions. The Turkish version of the survey items is provided in Appendix E.

3.4.2 Job Pursuit Intentions Scale

Job pursuit intentions of newly graduated job applicants are measured using items derived from Highhouse et al. (2003) and Greening and Turban (2000). The original English version of these six items used to assess job pursuit intentions of newly graduated applicants are given in Appendix F. Sample items to measure job pursuit intentions including “I would accept a job offer from this company,” “If this company invited me for a job interview, I would go,” “I would make this company one of my first choices as my employer,” and “I would recommend this company to a friend looking for a job” are developed by Highhouse et al. (2003). In addition, sample items including “I would exert a great deal of effort to work for this company” and “I would be interested in pursuing a job application with this company” are obtained from Greening and Turban (2000). The five-point Likert-type scale is created as 1 = “strongly disagree” and 5 = “strongly agree” as shown in Table 2. Since the survey was conducted in Turkey, the items had to be translated into Turkish from English to avoid language barriers. Various methods are used to translate the items from the English version to the Turkish version to ensure there is no translation-related word difference between the English and Turkish versions. The translated Turkish version of the items used to assess job pursuit intentions is provided in Appendix E.

3.4.3 Organizational Attractiveness Scale

The items that are developed by Bauer and Aiman-Smith (1996), Highhouse et al. (2003), and Lin et al. (2011) are used to assess newly graduated job applicants’ attractiveness to an organization that engages CSR-related activities. The original English version of the four items used to measure the organizational attractiveness of

newly graduated applicants is provided in Appendix F. Since the survey is administered in Turkey, the items had to be translated into Turkish from English to avoid language barriers.

The reliability of the translation from the English version to the Turkish version is ensured by using various methods. Sample items to measure the organizational attractiveness of newly graduated job applicants, including the item “I find MarketBee as a very attractive company” are derived from Bauer and Aiman-Smith (1996). In addition, sample items including “For me, this company would be a good place to work,” “I am interested in learning more about this company,” and “A job at this company is very appealing to me” are developed by Highhouse et al. (2003).

Finally, the sample item “I like what this firm stands for” is derived from Lin et al. (2011). Respondents are requested to rate the items on a five-point Likert-type scale. The Likert-type scale is created as 1 = “strongly disagree” and 5 = “strongly agree” as shown in Table 2. Since the survey was conducted in Turkey, the items had to be translated into Turkish from English to avoid language barriers. Various methods are used to translate the items from the English version to the Turkish version. The Turkish version of the survey items is provided in Appendix E.

3.5 Methodology for Data Collection

In order to conduct data analysis, first, the data collection is handled via creating a survey. The survey to collect data is created on Google Forms for easier distribution through online platforms and to reach more people in a shorter time. The survey contained 17 carefully selected items in three categories: CSR perceptions, job pursuit intentions, and organizational attractiveness. The items included in the survey are selected by examining the previously conducted research on the effects of organizations’ CSR activities and policies. Each item on the survey depends on a theoretical background to ensure the reliability of the survey.

Additionally, respondents are asked to answer these items based on a scenario involving a fictitious company. This scenario is also created using the previous research as a basis. A company conducting different external CSR activity levels is provided in this scenario. Details regarding the internal CSR activities of the fictitious company in the scenario are not included explicitly so that the respondents’ answers

should not be affected. The scenario is written in the same format as a company's about page; general information about the company is provided initially (e.g., its history, operations, and business condition). The following part of the scenario included the organization's charitable activities towards the community and environment, such as partnering with non-profit organizations, donating to charities for the community and environment, and encouraging employee volunteering.

Moreover, this scenario is given on the first page of the questionnaire for respondents to read carefully. The rest of the questionnaire is divided into three pages. A separate page is provided for each category of items. Since the audience of the questionnaire consists of native Turkish speakers, the survey scenario and items are translated to Turkish to remove the language barrier for the respondents. The Google Forms questionnaire is shared with the professional and personal contacts of the researcher through online platforms. A brief explanation regarding the questionnaire is given to each respondent to ensure they understood the research context. The survey is administered from February to March 2022. Participation in the survey was voluntary. A total of 106 respondents have filled in the questionnaire thoroughly.

After the number of respondents reaches a saturation point, the questionnaire is closed for answers. Certain data such as educational field is denoised to standardize manually entered values. Later, its results are exported as a CSV file from Google Forms and imported into an Oracle Database. Oracle Database is chosen for the analysis due to being a robust relational database where answers per respondent could be queried over different aspects such as age, gender, and educational field. This tool enabled the calculation of mean and standard deviation values provided in the findings section. The information gathered regarding the questionnaire answers is placed in various tables and included in this study using SQL queries.

3.6 Methodology for Data Analysis

The data analysis process of the study consists of data denoising and quantitative data analysis. Before starting the analysis, data denoising is applied to standardize the data. Then, data analysis is performed using an external DB to handle various queries to uncover values such as the standard deviation and mean values.

3.6.1 Data Denoising

Since the last graduated department information of the respondents was entered manually, different strings occurred related to the same field. The same departments are entered in different ways such as “Computer Engineering” or “Comp. Eng.,” “Materials Engineering” or “Metallurgy and Materials Engineering” as shown in Table 3. For this reason, in order to analyze the department information of the respondents correctly, data denoising is performed before the data analysis. During data denoising, manipulation methods such as lengthening of abbreviations, correcting the capitalization of letters, and correcting spelling errors are applied. Since the survey is conducted in Turkey, the department information studied at the university is recorded in Turkish. In addition to these mentioned above, the last step of data denoising is to translate the recorded department information from Turkish to English, the main language in which this study is conducted.

3.6.2 Refined Data

In this section, the refined data obtained after data denoising is provided. In addition to the standardization of educational fields, each educational field is flagged as a technical or non-technical field. The respondents who graduated from technical fields are referred to as technical respondents, while those who graduated from non-technical fields are referred to as non-technical respondents.

In general, engineering faculties and fields such as programming are considered technical fields, whereas fields such as law, business administration, and sociology are considered non-technical. Furthermore, the Likert-type scale answers that range from “strongly disagree” to “strongly agree” are given points between 1 and 5 for data analysis.

Using the points attached to each answer, a numerical analysis of the variables and statistics are generated regarding the respondents’ gender and educational fields. This numerical analysis analyzes the mean and standard deviation values of the whole questionnaire, each category, and each item to make as many inferences as possible.

A clear presentation of the obtained data is extremely important for the transparency of the research. For this reason, the data analyzed in this study is provided in its raw

form. The items asked in this survey study can be examined under three categories. These categories are “CSR perceptions,” “job pursuit intentions,” and “organizational attractiveness.”

Table 3. Standardized Educational Fields

Field Before Data Denoising	Field After Data Denoising	Translated as
Bilgi İşlem	Bilgi Yönetimi	Information Management
Bilgisayar Mühendisliği	Bilgisayar Mühendisliği	Computer Engineering
Bilgisayar Müh.	Bilgisayar Mühendisliği	Computer Engineering
Bilişim Sistemleri Mühendisliği	Bilişim Sistemleri Mühendisliği	Information Systems Engineering
Çalışma Ekonomisi	Çalışma Ekonomisi	Labour Economics
Çevre Mühendisliği	Çevre Mühendisliği	Environmental Engineering
Denizcilik işletmeleri yönetimi	Denizcilik İşletmeleri Yönetimi	Maritime Business Management
Diş Hekimliği	Diş Hekimliği	Dentistry
Elektrik Elektronik Mühendisliği	Elektrik Elektronik Mühendisliği	Electrical and Electronics Engineering
Endüstri Mühendislik	Endüstri Mühendisliği	Industrial Engineering
Endüstri Mühendisliği	Endüstri Mühendisliği	Industrial Engineering
Endüstri Müh.	Endüstri Mühendisliği	Industrial Engineering
Hukuk	Hukuk	Law
Hukuk Fakültesi	Hukuk	Law
İngilizce Öğretmenliği	İngilizce Öğretmenliği	English Language Teaching
İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı	İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı	English Language and Literature
İnşaat Mühendisliği	İnşaat Mühendisliği	Civil Engineering

Table 3 (continued). Standardized Educational Fields

İşletme	İşletme	Business Administration
Kimya Öğretmenliği	Kimya Öğretmenliği	Chemistry Teaching
Lojistik	Lojistik Yönetimi	Logistics Management
Makine Mühendisliği	Makine Mühendisliği	Mechanical Engineering
Malzeme Mühendisliği	Metaller ve Malzeme Mühendisliği	Metallurgy and Materials Engineering
Metaller ve malzeme mühendisliği	Metaller ve Malzeme Mühendisliği	Metallurgy and Materials Engineering
mühendislik	Mühendislik	Engineering
programlama	Web Tasarım ve Programlama	Web Design and Programming
Siyaset Bilimi ve Uluslararası İlişkiler	Siyaset Bilimi ve Uluslararası İlişkiler	Political Science and International Relations
Siyaset Bilimi ve Uluslararası İlişkiler	Siyaset Bilimi ve Uluslararası İlişkiler	Political Science and International Relations
Sosyoloji	Sosyoloji	Sociology
Türk dili ve edebiyatı	Türk Dili ve Edebiyatı	Turkish Language and Literature
Uluslararası İlişkiler	Uluslararası İlişkiler	International Relations
Veteriner Fakültesi	Veterinerlik	Veterinary Medicine
Web tasarım ve kodlama	Web Tasarım ve Programlama	Web Design and Programming
Yazılım Mühendisliği	Yazılım Mühendisliği	Software Engineering

CHAPTER 4: FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

This section of the study provides the findings obtained from the survey analysis, explanations, and interpretations based on these findings. The first part of this chapter includes a summary, overall findings, statistics, and implications regarding the whole survey. Answers to the items given are analyzed according to the demographic variables of the respondents, such as age, gender, and educational background. The items grouped under three main categories are analyzed separately for further insights. These groups included CSR perceptions, job pursuit intentions, and organizational attractiveness. Survey variables are also considered under these categories, and observations and implications are provided.

4.1 Summary

When the survey results are examined, the following findings are obtained. A total of 106 responses are acquired. The average age of respondents who completed this questionnaire is 24.53. The distribution of the respondents by gender is 60 males and 46 females. On a percentage basis, it is observed that 56.6% of the respondents are male, and 43.4% are female. The distribution of the respondents by their educational field is 62 graduates from non-technical departments and 44 from technical departments. Graduates from non-technical departments constitute 58.5% of respondents, while those who graduated from technical departments constitute 41.5%.

Respondents participating in this study are divided into two groups regarding education level: university graduate level and postgraduate level. It is observed that 105 of the 106 respondents are university graduates. One of the respondents is a postgraduate. The fact that all respondents participating in the survey have a university level or higher level of education proves that the respondents participating in the survey match the target population of the research. Although the target audience of the research is in line with the respondents' educational level, there was not enough data on postgraduate responses to use educational level as a demographic variable for the analysis conducted.

Moreover, a five-point Likert-type scale is used to answer given statements in the questionnaire. This five-point Likert scale is developed as 1 = "strongly disagree" and

5 = “strongly agree” based on the original scale. These points are used in calculating the mean and standard deviation values of the answers given to the complete survey and each category. The mean and standard deviation values of the answers per category, gender, and educational field type are shown in Table 5 and 6. The mean and standard deviation values of the answers per item per gender are also available in Table 7. The data and methodology section provides details of the scale used for answers.

Table 4. Answers per Survey Items

	# of 1 points	# of 2 points	# of 3 points	# of 4 points	# of 5 points
Item 1	0	0	5	69	32
Item 2	0	0	9	61	36
Item 3	0	2	12	55	37
Item 4	1	3	27	67	8
Item 5	0	0	4	68	34
Item 6	0	1	28	54	23
Item 7	2	4	26	50	24
Item 8	0	2	38	56	10
Item 9	0	2	1	62	41
Item 10	0	4	52	46	4
Item 11	0	5	12	58	31
Item 12	2	17	43	38	6
Item 13	0	3	9	58	36
Item 14	0	6	32	59	9
Item 15	0	2	25	67	12
Item 16	0	2	9	52	43
Item 17	0	2	1	46	57

4.2 Overall Findings and Discussion

The number of respondents that answered the survey is 106. Each of the 106 respondents answered 17 items evaluated in three different categories. The total

number of items answered is 1802. The distribution of the answers by given points by the respondents is as follows: “5 strongly disagree,” “55 disagree,” “333 undecided,” “966 agree,” and “443 strongly agree” as provided in Table 4. The mean value of all answers combined is 3.9917, very close to the fourth option in the Likert-type scale, “agree.”

The items with the highest number of “strongly disagree” answers are item 7 and item 12. The “strongly disagree” answer is given two times to those items. Item 7 is “MarketBee is concerned with improving social welfare.” The fact that this item is one of the two items that have the most strongly disagreed statement may imply that, even though the company donates for the services such as clean water, education, and stray animals, the respondents may have thought the company might not be inherently concerned with social welfare. Item 12 is “I would exert a great deal of effort to work for this company.” The reason for this item to be one of the two items with the highest number of “strongly disagree” answers could be due to being a bold statement. Even though the company engages in CSR activities, those activities alone may not have been sufficient for some respondents to put “a lot of” effort into working there.

Moreover, the top three items with the highest number of “strongly agree” answers are item 17 with 57, item 16 with 43, and item 9 with 41 “strongly agree” answers. It may imply that overall, newly graduated job applicants acknowledge CSR activities and like the values the company represents. Although some of the respondents stated that they would not put a lot of effort into working for this company, they generally consider it a good place to work. Similarly, almost half of the respondents stated that they would strongly agree to have a job interview if the company had offered them. Additionally, 103 respondents out of 106 have declared they would “agree” or “strongly agree” to go to the job interview with this company. Only two respondents disagreed, and only one of them was undecided.

The top three items with the least “strongly agree” answers are item 10 with 4, item 12 with 6, and item 4 with 8 “strongly agree” answers. Item 12 and 10 are also the items with the lowest mean values of 3.27 and 3.47, respectively. The fact that both items 12 and 10 are in the job pursuit intentions category could imply that, on average, respondents view CSR activities positively. However, they do not see CSR activities

as the main reason for their job pursuit intentions. Besides, item 4 with the 8 “strongly agree” answer is also the lowest scored item in the CSR perception category. The statement in item 4, “MarketBee gives back to the community,” can be perceived in many different ways. Although the statement is positive, respondents are not fully informed about the company’s activities other than CSR. It may not be apparent for them to compare the exchange between MarketBee and the society.

The average of the answers given by 106 respondents to all items is 3.9917. It could be deduced that newly graduated job applicants positively acknowledge CSR activities. In addition, when the distribution of the answers by gender is examined, the mean value of the answers given by the female respondents is 4.0742, while the mean value of the answers given by male respondents is 3.9284. Overall, females seem to respond to CSR activities more positively than males. Their opinions about CSR are 3.71% more affirmative than males. It has been demonstrated in the previous studies that women often have better attention to CSR-related topics than men (e.g., Greening and Turban, 2000; Peterson, 2004).

The following results emerged when the answers’ distribution by the type of educational field is examined. Forty-four respondents graduated from technical departments, while 62 graduated from non-technical departments. Hereinafter will be referred to as technical and non-technical respondents. The mean value of the answers to the whole survey from technical respondents is 3.8583, while the mean value of answers by non-technical respondents is 4.0863. It may imply that non-technical job applicants are more susceptible to CSR activities.

While the mean value of answers from technical male respondents is 3.8578, the mean value of answers from technical female respondents is 3.8603. It could imply that there is little to no difference in sensitivity to CSR between males and females that have graduated from technical departments. Unlike technical respondents, the mean values of answers given by male and female non-technical respondents differ. The mean answer from non-technical male respondents is 4.0343, and the mean answer from non-technical female respondents is 4.1192. It implies that there is a slight difference in terms of sensitivity to CSR between males and females who graduated from non-technical departments. When four groups are compared as “technical males,” “non-

technical males,” “technical females,” and “non-technical females,” it can be seen that the group with the highest CSR sensitivity is non-technical females. In contrast, the group with the lowest CSR sensitivity is technical males.

Considering the answers given to the entire questionnaire, the highest score is 4.7647, and the lowest is 2.4118. The demographic data showed that the respondent who gave the highest score to the questionnaire is a non-technical female, and the respondent who gave the lowest score is a technical male. It could also support the deduction that non-technical females are more sensitive to CSR than technical males.

The highest and lowest scores given to the entire questionnaire by female respondents are 4.7647 and 3.1765, whereas the highest and lowest scores given to the entire questionnaire by male respondents are 4.6471 and 2.4118. Considering the difference between the lowest and highest scores given by the respondents, there is a 50% difference between the highest and lowest scores among female respondents. On the other hand, there is a 92.7% difference between male respondents’ highest and lowest scores. For the entire survey, the standard deviation value for male respondents is 0.4325, and the standard deviation value for female respondents is 0.3201. Using these metrics, it can be deduced that males are more diversified in their opinions towards CSR.

The standard deviation for the whole survey is 0.3928. While the standard deviation of the answers given by female respondents is 0.3201, the same metric for male respondents is 0.4325. The item with the lowest standard deviation is item 5 with 0.5301, and the item with the highest standard deviation is item 7 with 0.8815. The mean values for these items are 4.28 and 3.85, respectively. No respondents strongly disagreed or disagreed with the statement that MarketBee is socially responsible, and only four were undecided. It could imply that most respondents agree that MarketBee is socially responsible, while they have diversified views on MarketBee being concerned with improving social welfare.

When only the male respondents’ answers are examined, it is found that the item with the lowest standard deviation is item 5 with 0.5164, and the item with the highest standard deviation is item 12 with 0.9649. It could be deduced that male respondents

agree that MarketBee is socially responsible by contributing to these non-profit organizations. However, they have diversified views if they would like to put in a lot of effort for working there. When only the female respondents' answers are examined, it is observed that the item with the lowest standard deviation is item 17 with 0.488, and the item with the highest standard deviation is item 7 with 0.8936. For females, the mean values of these items are 4.63 and 3.85, respectively. It implies that the female respondents like the values represented by MarketBee through CSR activities, and their opinions are homogenous. Although females generally seem more sensitive to CSR activities, their opinion on MarketBee improving social welfare is diversified. It could be deduced that an organization should put more effort than the organization in this study to reflect as an entity that improves social welfare in the eyes of newly graduated job applicants.

When the survey results are examined, the item with the lowest mean score is item 12 with 3.2736, and the item with the highest mean score is item 17 with 4.4906. The lowest scored item for male respondents is item 12 with 3.13, and the highest scored item is item 17 with a 4.383 mean score. For female respondents, the lowest score is given to item 12 with a 3.457 mean score. On the other hand, the highest score is given to item 17, with a 4.63 mean score. Gender-wise, the male and female respondents' lowest and highest scored items are the same; items 12 and 17, respectively. Item 12 states, "I would exert a great deal of effort to work for this company." The respondents who hesitated to agree might have seen this statement as too powerful. Item 17 states, "I like the values this company represents." It could imply that the newly graduated job applicants are not easily impressed with CSR activities in terms of their job pursuit intentions. However, they acknowledge the CSR activities and seem to sympathize with companies that engage in CSR activities.

Respondents who graduated from technical fields gave the highest score to CSR perceptions, while those educated in non-technical fields gave the highest score in organizational attractiveness. Considering the effect of CSR activities on organizational attractiveness, it could be said that this effect is higher in job applicants who have been trained in non-technical fields. Both groups gave the lowest score to job pursuit intentions. It could imply that both technical and non-technical respondents' opinions of an organization regarding CSR perception and organizational

attractiveness are more optimistic than their opinions of job pursuit intentions. For the complete survey, the standard deviation of the answers given by non-technical respondents is 0.3094, and the standard deviation of the answers given by technical respondents is 0.4582. When the perspectives on CSR are evaluated, it could be deduced that job applicants in non-technical fields have more homogenous opinions on CSR than those educated in technical fields.

In terms of gender and educational field, it is found that the group with the lowest standard deviation is non-technical females with 0.2992, and the group with the highest standard deviation is technical males with 0.4831. It could be implied that non-technical females have the most homogenous and positive perceptions while technical males have the most discrete and negative perceptions of CSR. When CSR perceptions, job pursuit intentions, and organizational attractiveness are examined separately, the demographic group with the lowest standard deviation in all categories is non-technical females. In contrast, the group with the highest standard deviation is technical males. The category job pursuit intentions are the only category in which technical females have lower mean scores than technical males

Table 5. Standard Deviation per Category, Gender and Educational Field Type

Technical Field?	Male			Female			Total		
	Yes	No	Total	Yes	No	Total	Yes	No	Total
All items	0.4831	0.3245	0.4325	0.3500	0.2992	0.3201	0.4582	0.3094	0.3928
CSR Perceptions	0.4712	0.3882	0.4370	0.4546	0.3637	0.3764	0.4630	0.3711	0.4127
Job Pursuit Intentions	0.6153	0.4714	0.5709	0.4693	0.4349	0.4598	0.5868	0.4478	0.5302
Organizational Attractiveness	0.5991	0.4701	0.5664	0.4581	0.3739	0.4002	0.5718	0.4112	0.5080

Table 6. Mean Values per Category, Gender and Educational Field Type

Technical Field?	Male			Female			Total		
	Yes	No	Total	Yes	No	Total	Yes	No	Total
All items	3.8578	4.0343	3.9284	3.8603	4.1192	4.0742	3.8583	4.0863	3.9917

Table 6 (continued). Mean Values per Category, Gender and Educational Field Type

CSR Perceptions	4.0119	4.0595	4.0310	4.0179	4.1504	4.1273	4.013	4.1152	4.0728
Job Pursuit Intentions	3.6713	3.9167	3.7694	3.625	4.0088	3.9420	3.6629	3.9731	3.8443
Organizational Attractiveness	3.8681	4.1667	3.9875	3.9375	4.2303	4.1793	3.8807	4.2056	4.0708

Table 7. SD and Mean Values per Item per Gender

		Male		Female		Total	
		Mean (\bar{x})	SD (σ)	Mean (\bar{x})	SD (σ)	Mean (\bar{x})	SD (σ)
CSR Perceptions	Q1	4.2167	0.5237	4.3043	0.5526	4.2547	0.5356
	Q2	4.2	0.6325	4.3261	0.5599	4.2547	0.6026
	Q3	4.1833	0.7477	4.2174	0.6638	4.1981	0.7094
	Q4	3.5833	0.7656	3.9348	0.49	3.7358	0.6804
	Q5	4.2667	0.5164	4.3043	0.5526	4.2830	0.5301
	Q6	3.9167	0.7656	3.9565	0.6652	3.934	0.7207
	Q7	3.85	0.8796	3.8478	0.8936	3.8491	0.8815
Job Pursuit Intentions	Q8	3.5833	0.6712	3.8478	0.6313	3.6981	0.6643
	Q9	4.35	0.6594	4.3261	0.5187	4.3396	0.5998
	Q10	3.4167	0.6712	3.5435	0.5852	3.4717	0.6356
	Q11	4.00	0.8025	4.1957	0.7186	4.0849	0.7699
	Q12	3.1333	0.9649	3.4565	0.6898	3.2736	0.8678
	Q13	4.1333	0.7241	4.2846	0.6884	4.1981	0.7094

Table 7 (continued). SD and Mean Values per Item per Gender

Organizational Attractiveness	Q14	3.6	0.7855	3.7609	0.6031	3.6698	0.7134
	Q15	3.7167	0.6662	4.00	0.6678	3.8396	0.6345
	Q16	4.25	0.7041	4.3261	0.7009	4.283	0.7004
	Q17	4.3833	0.6911	4.6304	0.488	4.4906	0.621

Standard deviation formula for all answers without any demographic variables is given below.

Standard Deviation, s : **0.39283739**
 Count, N : 106
 Mean, \bar{x} : 3.9916759
 Variance, s^2 : 0.15432122

Solution

- 1)
$$s = \sqrt{\frac{\sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - \bar{x})^2}{n - 1}}$$
- 2)
$$s = \sqrt{\frac{SS}{n - 1}}$$
- 3)
$$s = \sqrt{\frac{16.203728}{106 - 1}}$$
- 4)
$$s = \sqrt{\frac{16.203728}{105}}$$
- 5)
$$s = \sqrt{0.15432122}$$
- 6)
$$s = 0.39283739$$

Figure 1. Standard Deviation Formula for all Categories

4.3 Findings and Discussion for CSR Perceptions

This section presents the analysis details for the items in the CSR perceptions scale. In the CSR perceptions category, the mean value of all respondents' answers is 4.0728. The mean and standard deviation values of the answers per item per gender for CSR

perceptions are shown in Table 10. When the answers are examined regarding gender distribution, it is found that the mean value of the answers given by female respondents is 4.1273, and the mean value of the answers given by male respondents is 4.031. The fact that the average of the answers given by female respondents in the CSR perceptions category is higher than that of males may indicate that females attach more importance to CSR activities of organizations. In this category, female respondents' perceptions about CSR are 2.39% more positive than the opinions of male respondents. Compared to other categories, the opinions of male and female respondents differ the least in the CSR Perceptions category.

When the mean value of seven items in this category is taken, the highest and lowest scores given to this category by both male and female respondents are 5 and 3 points, respectively. The difference between respondents' highest and lowest answers for this category is 66.6% for both male and female respondents. Once the average of the answers given to the items in this category is considered, it can be concluded that the CSR perceptions of the respondents are positive, regardless of the demographic group. A total of three respondents have answered all the items as "strongly agree" in this category. While two of the respondents who answered "strongly agree" to all items in this category are male, one is female as shown in Table 8 below. While two of them are non-technical, the educational field of one is technical.

Table 8. Respondents who Strongly Agree to all CSR Perceptions Items

Age	Gender	Education Level	Department	Educational Field Type
28	Male	University	Political Science and International Relations	Non-technical
25	Female	University	English Language Teaching	Non-technical
25	Male	University	Environmental Engineering	Technical

Respondents who gave the lowest average score to the items in this category are given

in Table 9 below. Two of these respondents are male, and one is female. While two of them are technical, one is non-technical.

Table 9. Respondents with Lowest Mean Value for CSR Perceptions

Age	Gender	Education Level	Department	Educational Field Type
25	Male	University	Metallurgy and Materials Engineering	Technical
26	Male	University	Industrial Engineering	Technical
24	Female	University	Law	Non-technical

When the demographic data of the respondents who gave the lowest and highest scores to the items in this category are examined, it is found that two of the three respondents who gave the highest average score graduated from non-technical departments. On the other hand, two out of three respondents who gave the lowest average score graduated from technical departments. This fact further supports the idea that non-technical respondents are more sensitive to CSR acts regarding CSR perceptions.

The standard deviation of the answers given to this category is 0.4127. Compared to the other categories, the standard deviation of CSR perceptions is 28.5% lesser than the standard deviation of job pursuit intentions and 23.1% lesser than the standard deviation of the organizational attractiveness category. It could be deduced that this category is the category with which respondents have the most consensus. The standard deviation of the answers given by female respondents in this category is 0.3764, while the standard deviation of the male respondents is 0.437. The CSR perceptions category has less standard deviation than the other two categories for both

male and female respondents. The standard deviations of both male and female respondents are the lowest in this category, while the mean values for this category are high. It could be implied that the CSR perceptions of both male and female newly graduated job applicants are positive.

In this category, the item with the lowest standard deviation is item 5 with 0.5301, and the item with the highest standard deviation is item 7 with 0.8815. When the answers of only male respondents are examined, it is found that the item with the lowest standard deviation is item 5 with 0.5164, and the item with the highest standard deviation is item 7 with 0.8796. For the female respondents, it is found that the item with the lowest standard deviation is item 4 with 0.49, and the item with the highest standard deviation is item 7 with 0.8936. Items 4, 5, and 7 are given as the following:

- “MarketBee gives back to the community.”
- “MarketBee acts within the framework of social responsibility.”
- “MarketBee is concerned with improving social welfare.”

When these data are examined, it can be said that respondents acknowledge that an organization engaged in CSR activities acts within the framework of social responsibility and gives back to society. Concurrently, it can be said that respondents’ views on this issue are pretty homogeneous and consistent with each other. On the other hand, it can be said that respondents have very diversified ideas about this fictitious organization being concerned with improving social welfare.

When the mean values in this category are examined, it is found that the lowest mean value belongs to item 4 with 3.7358, and the item with the highest mean value is item 5 with 4.283. From this, it can be deduced that the newly graduated job applicants approve that the organizations that carry out CSR activities act within the framework of social responsibility. However, they are not sure whether these organizations are giving back to society, and, in general, they are skeptical about the issue. When the answers of male respondents are examined, it is found that the item with the lowest mean score is item 4 with 3.5833, and the item with the highest mean score is item 5 with 4.2667. When the answers of female respondents are evaluated, it is found that the lowest mean score belongs to item 7 with 3.8478, and the item with the highest mean score is item 2 with 4.3261. Based on this, it can be concluded that male

respondents think that this fictitious organization acts within the framework of high social responsibility but does not give back enough to society. Additionally, it can be inferred that females think that this organization is conscious of environmental problems, although it is not concerned enough about improving social welfare.

Standard Deviation, s : **0.41274415**
 Count, N : 106
 Mean, \bar{x} : 4.0727763
 Variance, s^2 : 0.17035774

Solution

- 1)
$$s = \sqrt{\frac{\sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - \bar{x})^2}{n - 1}}$$
- 2)
$$s = \sqrt{\frac{SS}{n - 1}}$$
- 3)
$$s = \sqrt{\frac{17.887562}{106 - 1}}$$
- 4)
$$s = \sqrt{\frac{17.887562}{105}}$$
- 5)
$$s = \sqrt{0.17035773}$$
- 6)
$$s = 0.41274415$$

Figure 2. Standard Deviation Formula for CSR Perceptions

Table 10. SD and Mean Values per gender for CSR Perceptions

	Male		Female		Total	
	Mean (\bar{x})	SD (σ)	Mean (\bar{x})	SD (σ)	Mean (\bar{x})	SD (σ)
Q1	4.2167	0.5237	4.3043	0.5526	4.2547	0.5356
Q2	4.2	0.6325	4.3261	0.5599	4.2547	0.6026
Q3	4.1833	0.7477	4.2174	0.6638	4.1981	0.7094

Table 10 (continued). SD and Mean Values per gender for CSR Perceptions

Q4	3.5833	0.7656	3.9348	0.49	3.7358	0.6804
Q5	4.2667	0.5164	4.3043	0.5526	4.283	0.5301
Q6	3.9167	0.7656	3.9565	0.6652	3.934	0.7207
Q7	3.85	0.8796	3.8478	0.8936	3.8491	0.8815

4.4 Findings and Discussion for Job Pursuit Intentions

The average mean value of the answers given by 106 respondents to this category is 3.8443. The mean and standard deviation values of the answers per item per gender for job pursuit intentions are shown in Table 11. This category is the category with the lowest mean score in terms of all 106 respondents' answers. When the distribution of answers to this category is examined, it is found that the mean value of answers given by female respondents is 3.942, while the mean value of male respondents' answers is 3.7694. The female respondents' opinions are 4.58% more positive than the opinions of male respondents. Similar to other categories, it can be said that CSR activities are more effective in women's job pursuit intentions. Considering individual answers given to this category, the highest mean value is 4.833, and the lowest mean value is 2. For the female respondents, the highest mean value is 4.833, and the lowest mean value is 2.833. For the male respondents, the highest mean value is 4.667, and the lowest mean value is 2. While the two respondents who disagree most with the items in this category are technical males, the respondent who agrees most is a non-technical female. The difference between the answers with the highest and lowest scores in this category is 133.3% for male and 70.6% for female respondents. The standard deviation of all respondents' answers to this category is 0.5302. The standard deviation of female respondents' answers in this category is 0.4598, while the standard deviation of male respondents' answers is 0.5709. The standard deviation for both male and female respondents' answers in this category is higher than in the other two categories. As in other categories, it is observed that the standard deviation of the answers given by male respondents is higher than that of females in this category. Similar to other categories, it could be said that the female respondents' job pursuit intentions regarding an organization that engages in CSR activities are more homogenous than those of male respondents.

In this category, the item with the lowest standard deviation is item 9 with 0.5998, and the item with the highest standard deviation is item 12 with 0.8678. When only the answers of male respondents are examined, it is found that the item with the lowest standard deviation is again item 9 with 0.6594, and the item with the highest standard deviation is item 12 with 0.9649. For the female respondents, the item with the lowest standard deviation is again item 9 with 0.5187, and the item with the highest standard deviation is item 11 with 0.7186. In line with these findings, item 12 has the lowest mean score with 3.2736 points, and item 9 has the highest mean score with 4.3396 points in this category. For the job pursuit intentions category, the highest and lowest scored items are the same for both male and female respondents. The item with the highest mean score for male respondents is item 9 with 4.35 points, while the item with the lowest mean score is item 12 with 3.13. For female respondents, the item with the highest mean score is again item 9 with 4.3261 points, and the item with the lowest mean score is item 12 with 3.4565 points.

When the answers of female and male respondents about job pursuit intentions are examined, it is observed that the items with the highest and lowest mean scores in both groups are the same. While the item with which both groups agree the most is item 9, the item with which they disagree the most is item 12. Moreover, the standard deviation of the answers to item 12 is high for both groups, while the standard deviation of the answers to item 9 is the lowest for both groups. The following can be inferred from here: Newly graduated job applicants are very willing to have a job interview with a company that engages in CSR activities. However, they will not make much effort to work in this company by considering only the CSR activities of a company. This deduction applies to both male and female respondents. Similar results are seen when respondents are evaluated into two groups as technical and non-technical. While the standard deviation of the answers given by the non-technical respondents to item 12 is 0.783, the standard deviation of the answers given by the technical respondents is 0.841.

Similarly, while the mean value of the answers given by the non-technical respondents for item 12 is 3.548, the mean value of the answers given by the technical respondents for the same item is 2.886. It can be deduced from this that most technical respondents

will make less effort to work in a company that engages in CSR activities than non-technical respondents. However, due to the high standard deviation of the answers given to this item, it can be said that some of both technical and non-technical respondents will make a lot of effort to work in this company. It is found that while 5 out of 6 respondents who “strongly agree” with this item are non-technical respondents, only one of them is a technical respondent. Similarly, only 9 out of 38 respondents who answered “agree” to this item are technical respondents, while 29 are non-technical. Considering that 62 respondents are non-technical and 44 are technical respondents, it is found that while 77.3% of non-technical respondents answered “agree” or “strongly agree” to item 12, only 16.1% of technical respondents answered “agree” or “strongly agree.”

Considering that 62 respondents are non-technical and 44 are technical respondents, 77.3% of non-technical respondents answered “agree” or “strongly agree” to item 12. In contrast, only 16.1% of technical respondents gave the answer “agree” or “strongly agree.” Based on that, it can be said that job pursuit intentions of newly graduated job applicants from non-technical departments are directly proportional to their CSR activities and are quite positive. However, it could be concluded that CSR activities do not play a major role in the job pursuit intentions of job applicants who have newly graduated from technical departments.

Table 11. SD and Mean Values per Gender for Job Pursuit Intentions

	Male		Female		Total	
	Mean (\bar{x})	SD (σ)	Mean (\bar{x})	SD (σ)	Mean (\bar{x})	SD (σ)
Q8	3.5833	0.6712	3.8478	0.6313	3.6981	0.6643
Q9	4.35	0.6594	4.3261	0.5187	4.3396	0.5998
Q10	3.4167	0.6712	3.5435	0.5852	3.4717	0.6356
Q11	4.00	0.8025	4.1957	0.7186	4.0849	0.7699
Q12	3.1333	0.9649	3.4565	0.6898	3.2736	0.8678
Q13	4.1333	0.7241	4.2846	0.6884	4.1981	0.7094

Standard Deviation, s:	0.5301836
Count, N:	106
Mean, \bar{x} :	3.8443396
Variance, s^2 :	0.28109465

Solution

$$\begin{aligned}
 1) \quad s &= \sqrt{\frac{\sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - \bar{x})^2}{n - 1}} \\
 2) \quad s &= \sqrt{\frac{SS}{n - 1}} \\
 3) \quad s &= \sqrt{\frac{29.514938}{106 - 1}} \\
 4) \quad s &= \sqrt{\frac{29.514938}{105}} \\
 5) \quad s &= \sqrt{0.28109465} \\
 6) \quad s &= 0.5301836
 \end{aligned}$$

Figure 3. Standard Deviation Formula for Job Pursuit Intentions

4.5 Findings and Discussions for Organizational Attractiveness

The mean value of all respondents' answers to the organizational attractiveness category is 4.0708. The mean and standard deviation values of the answers per item per gender for organizational attractiveness are shown in Table 12. Compared to other categories, this score is almost the same as CSR perceptions but higher than job pursuit intentions. When the distribution of the answers given to this category is examined by gender, it is found that the mean value of the answers given by female respondents is 4.1793, while the same metric is 3.9875 for male respondents. Based on the given scenario, female job applicants found the organization 4.81% more attractive than male job applicants. From this, it can be deduced that female newly graduated job applicants find an organization that engages in CSR activities more attractive than male job applicants. Taking the average of the answers given to all four items in this category, the highest score given to this category is "strongly agree" (5), and the lowest score is "disagree" (2). The highest average answer given by female respondents is

“strongly agree” (5), and the lowest is “undecided” (3). The male respondents’ highest average answer is “strongly agree” (5), and the lowest is “disagree.” The difference between the highest and lowest average answers given to this category is 150% for male and 66.6% for female respondents. The standard deviation of the answers given to this category is 0.508. Compared to other categories, the standard deviation of this category is lower than job pursuit intentions but higher than CSR perceptions. The standard deviation of the answers given by female respondents for organizational attractiveness is 0.4002, while the same metric for male respondents is 0.5664. As in other categories, it can be deduced that female job applicants find CSR more attractive than male job applicants and have more homogeneous ideas on this subject regarding organizational attractiveness.

When the respondents’ educational field type is considered, while the mean score given to this category by technical respondents is 3.8807, it is 4.2056 for the non-technical respondents. It could be deduced that the non-technical job applicants are more attracted to an organization that engages in CSR activities. A similar situation exists for the standard deviation difference between the technical and non-technical respondents. While non-technical respondents’ standard deviation for this category is 0.4112, technical respondents’ standard deviation is 0.5718. Furthermore, the respondent group with the highest mean score given to this category is non-technical females with 4.2303 points, while the group with the lowest mean score is technical males with 3.8681 points for the organizational attractiveness. This result shows that female job applicants find CSR more attractive than male applicants and non-technical applicants find it more attractive than technical applicants.

When the answers in this category are examined, the item with the lowest standard deviation is item 17 with 0.621, and the item with the highest standard deviation is item 14 with 0.7134. For male respondents, the item with the lowest standard deviation is item 15 with 0.6662, and the item with the highest standard deviation is item 14 with 0.7855. For female respondents, the item with the lowest standard deviation is item 17 with 0.488, and the item with the highest standard deviation is item 16 with 0.7009. While the item with the highest mean score is item 17 with 4.2491, the item with the lowest mean score is item 14 with 3.6698 points. For male respondents, the item with the highest mean score is again item 17 with 4.3833, and the item with the lowest mean

score is item 14 with 3.6.

Similarly, for female respondents, the item with the highest mean score is item 17 with 4.6304, and the item with the lowest mean score is item 14 with 3.7609 points. The items answered by male and female respondents with the highest and lowest mean scores are the same. Item 14, the lowest-rated item by both male and female respondents, is “I find MarketBee as a very attractive company.” Item 17, the highest score by both male and female respondents, is “I like what this firm stands for.” In the light of all these data, it can be said that both male and female job applicants find a company that engages in CSR activities organizationally attractive. However, due to the relatively low number of respondents who state that they find this organization very attractive and the high standard deviation of the answers given to this item, it can be inferred that respondents’ opinions differ on this issue.

When respondents are examined into four groups as “technical males,” “non-technical males,” “technical females,” and “non-technical females,” it can be said that all groups highly appreciate the values represented by a company that engages in CSR activities. In general, respondents from all these groups have diverse opinions about wanting to learn more about this company. While some respondents are very willing, others simply are not interested in learning more about this company. The scenario about the fictitious company in this study is kept fairly short in order not to decrease the response rate of the survey. Because they may have thought that they did not have enough information about the company, many respondents may not have been able to make a clear assessment about putting a lot of effort into working in this company or thinking that this company is a good place to work.

Table 12. SD and Mean Values per Gender for Organizational Attractiveness

	Male		Female		Total	
	Mean (\bar{x})	SD (σ)	Mean (\bar{x})	SD (σ)	Mean (\bar{x})	SD (σ)
Q14	3.6	0.7855	3.7609	0.6031	3.6698	0.7134
Q15	3.7167	0.6662	4.00	0.6678	3.8396	0.6345

Table 12 (continued). SD and Mean Values per Gender for Organizational Attractiveness

Q16	4.25	0.7041	4.3261	0.7009	4.283	0.7004
Q17	4.3833	0.6911	4.6304	0.488	4.4906	0.621

Standard Deviation, s : **0.50797769**

Count, N : 106

Mean, \bar{x} : 4.0707547

Variance, s^2 : 0.25804133

Solution

$$1) \quad s = \sqrt{\frac{\sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - \bar{x})^2}{n - 1}}$$

$$2) \quad s = \sqrt{\frac{SS}{n - 1}}$$

$$3) \quad s = \sqrt{\frac{27.09434}{106 - 1}}$$

$$4) \quad s = \sqrt{\frac{27.09434}{105}}$$

$$5) \quad s = \sqrt{0.25804133}$$

$$6) \quad s = 0.50797769$$

Figure 4. Standard Deviation Formula for Organizational Attractiveness

CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSION

CSR has been widely involved in academic studies since the 1950s. Many studies have focused on CSR at the organizational level outcomes such as organizational performance, organizational reputation, and corporate image. However, a few studies investigated the CSR domain at the individual level. More specifically, little attention is paid to the impacts of CSR on the perceptions of job applicants. In addition, due to the belated implementation of CSR in Turkey, there was a paucity of attention on CSR-related topics among researchers.

The main objective of this study was to contribute to the development of the field by investigating the impacts of CSR on newly graduated job applicants' perceptions. Additionally, this study investigated whether CSR activities and policies of an organization affect job applicants' perspectives of organizational attractiveness and their job pursuit intentions. This study further aimed to fill a part of the gap in the literature on the CSR approach in Turkey.

This study used an online survey to collect data regarding the different aspects of CSR impressions of newly graduated job applicants. The items included in the survey are classified under three categories: CSR perceptions, job pursuit intentions, and organizational attractiveness. In addition, demographic variables such as age, gender, educational level, and education field are collected to be used in the analysis. The snowball sampling approach (Kolb, 2008) is conducted to find respondents who have graduated in the last three years and are actively seeking a job in Turkey. Survey data is migrated into an external DB to query various values such as mean and standard deviation. Since educational fields could not be directly used in the analysis, all respondents are flagged as technical or non-technical, according to the fields they graduated from. This aspect is referred to as the educational field type throughout this study. After that, respondents are divided into four groups according to their genders and educational field types. CSR perceptions, job pursuit Intentions, and organizational attractiveness are examined for each group.

Overall, 106 job applicants have responded to the survey: 60 (56.6%) males and 46 (43.4%) females. While 44 (41.5%) of the respondents graduated from technical

departments, 62 (58.5%) graduated from non-technical departments. The average age of respondents is 24.5. It is found that newly graduated job applicants acknowledge CSR positively and like the values represented by companies that engage in CSR. Female job applicants find CSR acts more attractive than male applicants. They have responded 3.71% more positively to CSR acts than males.

Similarly, job applicants who graduated from non-technical departments have responded 6% more positively to CSR than applicants from technical departments. Newly graduated job applicants are very willing to have a job interview with a company that engages in CSR. Given the opportunity, 103 out of 106 respondents agreed or strongly agreed to have a job interview with the fictitious company provided in this research. However, newly graduated job applicants also stated that they need more information than just CSR acts of a company to consider it an excellent place to work. It is noticed that non-technical job applicants will make more effort than technical job applicants to work in a company that engages in CSR. CSR acts do not play a significant role in the job pursuit intentions of job applicants who graduated from technical departments. It is determined that the group with the highest CSR sensitivity is non-technical females. In contrast, the group with the lowest CSR sensitivity is technical males. There is little difference in sensitivity to CSR between male and female job applicants who have graduated from technical departments.

5.1 Limitations

Although this research provides an overview of the opinions of newly graduated job applicants regarding CSR, it has several limitations. The first limitation is that the sample size is relatively small, with only 106 respondents. Likewise, the respondents are primarily around İzmir province in Turkey, limiting the study geographically and excluding other parts of the world. Moreover, the fact that 105 of the 106 respondents have university-level education prevents this study from using educational level as a control variable, limiting the possible inferences. Furthermore, the respondents in this study are all newly graduated job applicants. Another limitation is that only one scenario is used in the study and that scenario is limited to external CSR activities of the fictitious organization. Lastly, the questionnaire is kept relatively short in terms of the number of items to increase the number of responses.

5.2 Implications for Management

Overall, newly graduated job applicants acknowledge the CSR activities of organizations and like the values they represent. In addition, many job applicants find companies engaging in CSR activities socially responsible. However, newly graduated job applicants do not believe a company is inherently concerned with social welfare, considering only its CSR activities. Besides, newly graduated job applicants do not embrace CSR activities as the main reason for their job pursuit intentions. Provided only the CSR acts, job applicants cannot assess whether this exchange between companies and society benefits the latter. Although some job applicants stated that they would not put much effort into working for a company that engages in CSR, they generally consider this company a good place to work.

Similarly, 97% of the newly graduated applicants agree to have a job interview with a company that engages in CSR. Female job applicants attach more importance to CSR activities of organizations than males. Moreover, in terms of job pursuit intentions, female job applicants are more positively affected than males.

Furthermore, male respondents' job pursuit intentions regarding an organization that engages in CSR activities are more diversified than those of female respondents. Regarding sensitivity to CSR, there is little to no difference between male and female job applicants who have graduated from technical departments. While female job applicants that have graduated from non-technical departments are the most sensitive, male job applicants that have graduated from technical departments are the least sensitive to CSR.

Job applicants who have graduated from non-technical departments are more attracted to organizations that engage in CSR than those who have graduated from technical departments. All things considered, newly graduated job applicants are not easily impressed with only CSR activities in terms of their job pursuit intentions. Though, they acknowledge CSR activities and seem to sympathize with companies that engage in CSR.

5.3 Suggestions for Future Research

Conducting a study with a more extensive sample size would enable future research to be more objective and provide a broader overview. In addition, reaching respondents from different geographical parts would increase the variety, and countries or provinces could be used as variables. Further research could be beneficial to include respondents currently working full-time jobs, unemployed for a significant amount of time, or students. Additionally, another scenario including internal CSR activities could be beneficial to add to the survey. Ultimately, since the questionnaire is relatively short, adding more items would help better understand the impacts.



REFERENCES

- Aguilera, R. V., Rupp, D. E., Williams, C. A. and Ganapathi, J. (2007). *Putting the S back in corporate social responsibility: A multilevel theory of social change in organizations*. *Academy of Management Review*, Vol.32, pp.836-863.
- Aguinis, H. and Glavas, A. (2012). *What we know and don't know about corporate social responsibility: A review and research agenda*. *Journal of Management*, Vol.38, pp.932– 968.
- Arendt, S. and Brettel, M. (2010). *Understanding the influence of CSR on corporate identity, image, and firm performance*. *Management Decision*, Vol. 48 No. 10, pp. 1469-1492.
- Backhaus, K. B., Stone, B. and Heiner, K. (2002). *Exploring the relationship between corporate social performance and employer attractiveness*. *Business & Society*, Vol.41, pp.292-318.
- Backman, J. (1975). *Social responsibility and accountability*. 1st Edition. New York: New York University Press.
- Bae, K.-H., Kang, J.-K. and Wang, J. (2011). *Employee treatment and firm leverage: A test of the stakeholder theory of capital structure*. *Journal of Financial Economics*, Vol.100(1), pp.130–153.
- Bauer, T. N. and Aiman-Smith, L. (1996). *Green career choices: The influence of ecological stance on recruiting*. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, Vol.10(4), pp.445–458.
- Bowen, H. R. (1953). *Social responsibilities of the businessman*. 1st Edition. New York: Harper & Row.
- Bowman, E. H., & Haire, M. (1975). *A strategic posture toward corporate social responsibility*. *California Management Review*, Vol.18(2), pp.49-58.
- Brammer, S., Millington, A., Rayton, B. (2007). *The contribution of corporate social responsibility to organizational commitment*. *Journal of Human Resource Management*, Vol.18, pp.1701–1719.
- Brammer, S. and Pavelin, S. (2006). *Corporate reputation and corporate social performance: the importance of fit*. *Journal of Management Studies*, Vol. 43(3), pp. 35-55.
- Carroll, A. B. (Ed.). (1977). *Managing corporate social responsibility*. 1st Edition. Boston: Little, Brown.

- Carroll, A. B. (1979). *A three-dimensional conceptual model of social performance*. *Academy of Management Review*, Vol.4(4), pp.497-505.
- Carroll, A. B. (1983). *Corporate social responsibility: Will industry respond to cutbacks in social program funding?* *Vital Speeches of the Day*, Vol.49(19), pp.604-608.
- Carroll, A. B. (1991). *The pyramid of corporate social responsibility: Toward the moral management of organizational stakeholders*. *Business Horizons*, Vol.34(4), pp.39-48.
- Carroll, A. B. (1999). *Corporate social responsibility: Evolution of a definitional construct*. *Business and Society*, Vol.38(3), pp.268–295.
- Carroll, A. B. (2008). *A history of corporate social responsibility: Concepts and practices*. In A. Crane, A. McWilliams, D. Matten, J. Moon, & D. Siegel (Eds.), *The oxford handbook of corporate social responsibility* (pp. 19-46). Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
- Cochran, P. L. and Wood, R. A. (1984). *Corporate social responsibility and financial performance*. *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 27(1), pp.42-56.
- Committee for Economic Development. (1971). *Social responsibilities of business corporations*. 1st Edition. New York: Author.
- Davis, K. (1960). *Can business afford to ignore social responsibilities?* *California Management Review*, Vol.2, pp.70-76.
- Davis, K. (1967). *Understanding the social responsibility puzzle: What does the businessman owe to society?* *Business Horizons*, Vol.10, pp.45-50.
- Davis, K. (1973). *The case for and against business assumption of social responsibilities*. *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol.16, pp.312-322.
- Davis, K. and Blomstrom, R. L. (1966). *Business and its environment*. 1st Edition. New York: McGrawHill.
- Dhanesh, G. S. (2012). *The view from within: Internal publics and CSR*. *Journal of Communication Management*, Vol.16(1), pp.39–58.
- Drucker, P. F. (1984). *The new meaning of corporate social responsibility*. *California Management Review*, Vol.26, pp.53-63.
- Du, S., Swaen, V., Lindgreen, A. and Sen, S. (2012). *The roles of leadership style in corporate social responsibility*. *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol.114(1)
- Duarte, A. P., Gomes, D. R. and Gonçalves das Neves, J. (2014). *Finding the jigsaw piece for our jigsaw puzzle with corporate social responsibility*. *Management*

- Research: The Journal of the Iberoamerican Academy of Management, Vol.12(3), pp.240–258.
- Eells, R. and Walton, C. (1974). *Conceptual foundations of business*. 3rd Edition. Burr Ridge, IL: Irwin.
- Eilbert, H. and Parket, I. R. (1973). *The current status of corporate social responsibility*. 1st Edition. Business Horizons, Vol.16, pp.5-14.
- El Akremi, A., Gond, J.-P., Swaen, V., De Roeck, K. and Igalens, J. (2015). *How do employees perceive corporate responsibility? development and validation of a multidimensional corporate stakeholder responsibility scale*. Journal of Management, Vol.44(2), pp.619–657.
- Epstein, E. M. (1987). *The corporate social policy process: Beyond business ethics, corporate social responsibility, and corporate social responsiveness*. California Management Review, Vol.29, pp.99-114.
- Evans, W. R., Davis, W. D. (2011). *An examination of perceived corporate citizenship, job application attraction, and CSR work role definition*. Business & Society, Vol.50, pp.456-480.
- Fitch, H. G. (1976). *Achieving corporate social responsibility*. Academy of Management Review, Vol.1, pp.38-46.
- Fombrun, C. and Shanley, M. (1990). *What's in a name? Reputation building and corporate strategy*. Academy of Management Journal, Vol.33, pp.233–258.
- Freeman, R., E. (1984). *Strategic management: A stakeholder approach*. 1st Edition. Boston, MA: Pitman.
- Freeman, R. E. and McVea, J. (2001). *A stakeholder approach to strategic management*. [Online] SSRN Electronic Journal. Available from: https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=263511. (Accessed: 16 March 2022)
- Friedman, M. (1962). *Capitalism and freedom*. 1st Edition. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Garriga, E. and Melé, D. (2004). *Corporate Social Responsibility Theories: Mapping the Territory*, Journal of Business Ethics, Vol.53, pp.51-71.
- Graves, S. B. and Waddock, S. A. (1994). *Institutional Owners and Corporate Social Performance*. Academy of Management Journal, Vol.37(4), pp.1034–1046.
- Greening, D. W. and Turban, D. B. (2000). *Corporate Social Performance as a Competitive Advantage in Attracting a Quality Work Force*. Business & Society,

Vol.39, pp.254-280.

Groza, M. D., Pronschinske, M.R. and Walker, M. (2011). *Perceived organizational motives and consumer responses to proactive and reactive CSR*. Journal of Business Ethics, Vol.102(4), pp.639-652.

Hameed, I., Riaz, Z., Arain, G. A. and Farooq, O. (2016). *How do internal and external CSR affect employees' organizational identification? A perspective from the group engagement model*. Frontiers in Psychology, Vol.7.

Hansen S. D., Dunford BB, Boss AD, Boss RW, Angermeier I. (2011). *Corporate social responsibility and the benefits of employee trust: A cross-disciplinary perspective*. Journal of Business Ethics, Vol.102, pp.29–45.

Heald, M. (1970). *The social responsibilities of business: Company and community, 1900-1960*. 1st Edition. Cleveland, OH: Case Western Reserve University Press.

Highhouse, S., Lievens, F. and Sinar, E. F. (2003). *Measuring attraction to organizations*. Educational and Psychological Measurement, Vol.63(6), pp.986–1001.

Johansson, E. and Larsson, P. (2000). *Pole position with corporate social responsibility: The case of SKF in Malaysia*. Unpublished Master's Thesis. Göteborg University, Sweden.

Johnson, H. L. (1971). *Business in contemporary society: Framework and issues*. 1st Edition. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Jones, D. A., Willness CR, MacNeil S. (2009). Corporate social responsibility and recruitment: Testing person-organization fit and signaling mechanisms. In Solomon GT (Ed.), Best paper proceedings of the 69th annual meeting of the Academy of Management, Chicago, IL.

Jones, K. S. (2011). *"I'm too good to be bad": The moderating role of honesty-humility in aggressive and prosocial reactions to first and third party unfairness*. PhD dissertation, University of Illinois.

Jones, T. M. (1980). *Corporate social responsibility revisited, redefined*. California Management Review, Vol.22(3), pp.59-67.

Kim, H., Hur, W.-M. and Yeo, J. (2015). *Corporate Brand Trust as a mediator in the relationship between consumer perception of CSR, corporate hypocrisy, and corporate reputation*. Sustainability, Vol.7(4), pp.3683–3694.

Kim, H., Lee, M., Lee, H. and Kim, N. (2010). *Corporate social responsibility and employee- company identification*. Journal of Business Ethics, Vol.95(4), pp.557-569.

Kolb, B. (2008). *Marketing Research: A Practical Approach*. 1st Edition. Sage

Publications Ltd, London.

Lee, E. M., Park, S. and Lee, H. J. (2013). *Employee perception of CSR activities: Its antecedents and consequences*. Journal of Business Research, Vol.66(10), pp.1716-1724.

Lin, C.-P., Tsai, Y.-H., Joe, S.-W. and Chiu, C.-K. (2011). *Modeling the relationship among perceived corporate citizenship, firms' attractiveness, and career success expectation*. Journal of Business Ethics, Vol.105(1), pp.83–93.

McGuire, J. W. (1963). *Business and society*. 1st Edition. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Moura-Leite, R. C. and Padgett, R. C. (2011). *Historical background of corporate social responsibility*. Social Responsibility Journal, Vol.7(4), pp.528-539.

Orlitzky, M., Schmidt, F. L. and Rynes, S. L. (2003). *Corporate Social and financial performance: A meta-analysis*. Organization Studies, Vol.24(3), pp.403–441.

Peloza, J. (2009). *The challenge of measuring financial impacts from investments in corporate social performance*. Journal of Management, Vol.35(6), pp.1518–1541.

Petersen, H. L. and Vredenburg, H. (2009). *Moral or economics? Institutional investor preference for corporate social responsibility*. Journal of Business Ethics, Vol.90(1), pp.1-14.

Peterson, D. K. (2004). *The relationship between perceptions of corporate citizenship and organizational commitment*. Business & Society, Vol.43, pp.296-319.

Pfeffer, J. (1996). *Competitive advantage through people: unleashing the power of the work force*. 1st Edition. Harvard Business School Press, Cambridge, MA.

Preston, L. E. and Post, J. E. (1975). *Private management and public policy: The principle of public responsibility*. 1st Edition. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Rodrigo, P. and Arenas, D. (2008). *Do employees care about CSR programs? A typology of employees according to their attitudes*. Journal of Business Ethics, Vol.83(2), pp.265–283.

Rupp, D. E. (2011). *An employee-centered model of organizational justice and social responsibility*. Organizational Psychology Review, Vol.1, pp.72–94.

Rupp, D. E., Ganapathi J, Aguilera RV, Williams CA. (2006). *Employee reactions to corporate social responsibility: An organizational justice framework*. Journal of Organizational Behavior, Vol.27, pp.537–543.

Rupp, D. E., Shao, R., Thornton, M. A. and Skarlicki, D. P. (2013). *Applicants' and employees' reactions to corporate social responsibility: The moderating effects of first-party justice perceptions and moral identity*. Personnel Psychology, Vol.66(4),

pp.895–933.

Rupp, D. E., Williams CA, Aguilera RV. (2011). *Increasing corporate social responsibility through stakeholder value internalization (and the catalyzing effect of new governance): An application of organizational justice, self-determination, and social influence theories*. In Schminke M (Ed.), *Managerial ethics: Managing the psychology of morality* (pp. 71–90). New York, NY: Taylor and Francis.

Samuelson, P. A. (1970) 'Love that corporation', *Mountain Bell Magazine*, 26 December 1970, p.17.

Sethi, S. P. (1975). *Dimensions of corporate social performance: An analytic framework*. *California Management Review*, Vol.17, pp.58-64.

Shin, I., Hur, W.-M. and Kang, S. (2016). *Employees' perceptions of corporate social responsibility and job performance: A sequential mediation model*. *Sustainability*, Vol.8(5), pp.493.

Snell R. S. (2000). *Studying moral ethos using an adapted Kohlbergien model*. *Organization Studies*, Vol.21, pp.267–295.

Steiner, G. A. (1971). *Business and society*. 1st Edition. New York: Random House.

Story, J., Castanheira, F. and Hartig, S. (2016). *Corporate Social Responsibility and organizational attractiveness: Implications for talent management*. *Social Responsibility Journal*, Vol.12(3), pp.484–505.

Turban, D. B. and Greening, D. W. (1997). *Corporate social performance and organizational attractiveness to prospective employees*. *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol.40, pp.658-672.

Turker, D. (2009). *Measuring corporate social responsibility: a scale development study*. *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol.85(4), pp.411-427.

Tuzzolino, F. Armandi, B. R. (1981). *A need-hierarchy framework for assessing corporate social responsibility*. *Academy of Management Review*, Vol.6, pp.21-28.

Verdeyen, V., Put, J. and Van Buggenhout, B. (2004). *A social stakeholder model*. *International Journal of Social Welfare*, Vol.13, pp.325–331.

Walton, C. C. (1967). *Corporate social responsibilities*. 1st Edition. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Wang, Y. J., Tsai, Y. H. and Lin, C. P. (2013). *Modeling the relationship between perceived corporate citizenship and organizational commitment considering organizational trust as a moderator*. *Business Ethics: A European Review*, Vol.22(2), pp.218-233.

Werther, W. B. and Chandler, D. (2010). *Strategic Corporate Social Responsibility: Stakeholders in a Global Environment*. 1st Edition. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage

Zhang, L. and Gowan, M. A. (2011). *Corporate Social Responsibility, applicants' individual traits, and organizational attraction: A person–organization Fit Perspective*. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, Vol.27(3), pp.345–362.



APPENDICES

Appendix A: Survey Scenario in Turkish

MarketBee dijital reklamcılık ve pazarlama sektöründe faaliyet göstermek üzere 2003 yılında kurulmuştur. MarketBee'nin misyonu, partnerlerinin dijital dünyada tanınırlığını artırmak ve mevcut müşteri kitlesi ile bağlantılarını güçlendirirken yeni kitleler ile tanışmasını sağlamaktır. MarketBee, dijital reklamcılık ve pazarlama sektöründe lider şirketler arasında yer almaktadır. Bugün 11 ülkede 2000'i aşkın çalışanı ile dünya çapında tanınır bir konumdadır. Yıllık gelir ve kârlılığı son 4 yıldır istikrarlı şekilde artmaktadır. Ancak MarketBee, bir işletmenin yalnızca para kazanmaktan fazlası olduğunu savunmaktadır.

Topluma ve çevreye karşı hayırsever aktiviteler

MarketBee operasyonları gereği topluma ve çevreye etkilerini kendi sorumluluğu kabul eder ve bu etkileri sürekli değerlendirmektedir. MarketBee kuruluşundan bu yana toplumu destekleyici ve çevreyi koruyucu aksiyonları desteklemektedir. MarketBee kendi sektöründe kâr amacı gütmeyen organizasyonlara en çok bağış yapan şirketlerden biridir.

Kar amacı gütmeyen organizasyonlar ile ortaklık

MarketBee Afrika'daki dezavantajlı çocukların eğitimlerine katkıda bulunabilmek amacıyla görev yapan EduAfrica ile ortak oldu. MarketBee vergi öncesi elde ettiği gelirin %3'ünü direkt olarak EduAfrica'ya bağışlıyor.

Toplum ve Çevre için bağışlar

MarketBee son 4 yıldır yıllık toplam vergi öncesi gelirinin %6.3'ünü temiz içme suyu, sokak hayvanları için barınaklar, sahillerin temizliği ve ormanların korunması için bağışlamaktadır.

Çalışan Gönüllülüğü Teşviği

MarketBee, çalışanlarını kâr amacı gütmeyen organizasyonlara gönüllü olarak destek vermeye teşvik etmektedir. MarketBee çalışanları, her yıl en az 10 saat gönüllü olarak görev almalıdır. Yıllık 10 saatten fazla gönüllü olan çalışanlar MarketBee tarafından çeşitli şekillerde ödüllendirilir.

Appendix B: Survey Scenario in English

MarketBee was established in 2003 to operate in the digital advertising and marketing industry. MarketBee's mission is to increase the recognition of its partners in the digital world and to meet new audiences while strengthening their connections with the existing customer base. MarketBee is among the leading companies in the digital advertising and marketing industry. Today, it is in a world-renowned position with more than 2000 employees in 11 countries. Its annual income and profitability have been increasing steadily for the last 4 years. However, MarketBee believes that business should mean a lot more than just making money.

Charitable activities towards the community and environment

MarketBee believes it is their responsibility to consider their impact on the community and the environment in all the decisions they make. Since it was established, MarketBee supports activities for the community and environmental protection. It has been known as one of the top companies that donate to non-profit organizations in its industry.

Partnering with non-profit organizations

MarketBee partnered with EduAfrica, a charity to improve the education environment for disadvantaged children in Africa. MarketBee donates 3% of its pre-tax revenue directly to EduAfrica.

Donating to charities for the community and environment

For the last 4 years, MarketBee has donated 6.3% of its total annual pre-tax income to clean drinking water, stray animal shelters, cleaning beaches and protecting forests.

Encouraging employee volunteering

MarketBee encourages its employees to volunteer in non-profit communities and rewards these efforts. MarketBee employees must volunteer at least 10 hours each year. Employees who volunteer more than 10 hours per year are rewarded in various ways by MarketBee.

Appendix C: Questions to Determine Demographic Variables in Turkish

1. Yaşınız
2. Cinsiyetiniz
3. En son bitirdiğiniz okul derecesi
 - a. Lise
 - b. Üniversite
 - c. Yüksek Lisans
 - d. Doktora
4. Bölümünüz

Appendix D: Questions to Determine Demographic Variables in English

1. Age
2. Gender
3. Educational level
 - a. Highschool
 - b. University
 - c. Master's Degree
 - d. Doctorate
4. Educational field

Appendix E: Survey Items in Turkish

Soru Numarası	Soru	Kategori
1	MarketBee çevreye karşı sorumlu davranır.	KSS Algısı
2	MarketBee çevre sorunlarının farkındadır.	KSS Algısı
3	MarketBee sosyal sorumluluklarını yerine getiriyor.	KSS Algısı
4	MarketBee kazandığını topluma geri verir.	KSS Algısı
5	MarketBee sosyal sorumluluk çerçevesinde hareket eder.	KSS Algısı
6	MarketBee hayır kurumlarına yeterli katkı sağlar.	KSS Algısı

7	MarketBee toplumsal refahın iyileştirilmesiyle ilgilenmektedir.	KSS Algısı
8	Bu şirketten bir iş teklifini kabul ederim.	İş Arama Niyeti
9	Bu şirket beni bir iş görüşmesine davet etseydi, giderdim.	İş Arama Niyeti
10	Bu şirketi işverenim olarak ilk tercihlerimden biri yapardım.	İş Arama Niyeti
11	İş arayan bir arkadaşıma bu şirketi tavsiye ederim.	İş Arama Niyeti
12	Bu şirkette çalışmak için çok çaba harcardım.	İş Arama Niyeti
13	Bu şirkete bir iş başvurusu yapmakla ilgilenirim.	İş Arama Niyeti
14	MarketBee'yi çok çekici bir şirket olarak görüyorum.	Örgütsel Çekicilik
15	Benim için bu şirket çalışmak için iyi bir yer olurdu.	Örgütsel Çekicilik
16	Bu şirket hakkında daha fazla şey öğrenmek istiyorum.	Örgütsel Çekicilik
17	Bu şirketin temsil ettiği değerler hoşuma gitti.	Örgütsel Çekicilik

Appendix F: Survey Items in English

Item Number	Item	Category
1	MarketBee behaves responsibly regarding the environment.	CSR Perceptions
2	MarketBee is aware of environmental issues.	CSR Perceptions
3	MarketBee fulfills its social responsibilities.	CSR Perceptions
4	MarketBee gives back to society.	CSR Perceptions
5	MarketBee acts in a socially responsible way.	CSR Perceptions
6	MarketBee gives adequate contributions to charities.	CSR Perceptions
7	MarketBee is concerned about the improvement of the public well-being of the society.	CSR Perceptions
8	I would accept a job offer from this company.	Job Pursuit Intentions
9	If this company invited me to a job interview, I would go.	Job Pursuit Intentions
10	I would make this company one of my first choices as my employer.	Job Pursuit Intentions
11	I would recommend this company to a friend looking	Job Pursuit Intentions

	for a job.	
12	I would exert a great deal of effort to work for this company.	Job Pursuit Intentions
13	I would be interested in pursuing a job application with this company.	Job Pursuit Intentions
14	I find MarketBee as a very attractive company.	Organizational Attractiveness
15	For me, this company would be a good place to work.	Organizational Attractiveness
16	I am interested in learning more about this company.	Organizational Attractiveness
17	I like what this firm stands for.	Organizational Attractiveness

Appendix G: Survey Answers

Age	Gender	Education	Field	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10	Q11	Q12	Q13	Q14	Q15	Q16	Q17	
24	F	University	Computer Engineering	5	4	5	4	5	5	4	4	5	4	3	3	5	4	3	5	5	
22	M	University	Electrical and Electronics Engineering	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	3	4	3	4	4	4	4	5	4
23	M	University	Computer Engineering	4	5	5	4	5	4	3	3	4	2	3	2	4	3	3	4	4	
24	M	University	Mechanical Engineering	4	4	3	3	5	4	4	4	5	4	5	3	5	4	4	5	5	
24	M	University	Civil Engineering	5	5	5	4	5	5	5	3	4	3	3	3	4	3	3	4	4	
23	F	University	Business Administration	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	5	4	5	4	5	4	4	5	5	
24	M	University	Business Administration	4	4	4	3	4	3	3	3	4	3	4	2	3	3	3	4	5	
23	F	University	Business Administration	5	5	5	4	5	5	4	4	5	4	4	4	5	4	5	5	5	
24	M	University	Civil Engineering	5	4	5	4	5	5	4	4	4	4	5	3	4	4	4	5	5	
24	M	University	Computer Engineering	4	4	4	3	4	4	3	3	5	4	4	3	4	4	3	4	4	
24	M	University	Metallurgy and Materials Engineering	5	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	5	3	4	4	4	5	5	

23	M	University	Industrial Engineering	4	5	5	4	5	4	4	3	4	3	4	3	4	3	3	4	4
24	M	University	Software Engineering	4	5	5	4	4	5	5	4	5	4	4	4	5	4	4	5	4
23	M	University	Computer Engineering	4	5	5	4	5	5	5	4	5	4	4	3	4	4	4	5	4
22	F	University	Business Administration	5	5	5	5	5	4	4	5	5	4	5	4	5	5	5	5	5
24	M	University	Computer Engineering	4	5	5	4	5	5	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	4
24	M	University	Law	4	3	3	3	4	3	4	3	4	3	3	3	3	3	3	4	4
25	F	University	Law	4	5	4	4	4	5	4	5	4	3	4	3	4	4	4	4	5
23	F	University	Business Administration	5	4	3	4	4	3	3	4	4	3	4	3	4	3	4	4	4
25	F	University	Business Administration	5	5	4	4	5	4	3	3	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	5	5
23	M	University	Political Science and International Relations	5	3	4	4	4	3	4	5	5	4	4	4	4	4	5	4	5
25	M	University	Computer Engineering	4	4	3	3	4	4	4	4	5	4	4	4	5	4	4	5	5
25	F	University	Law	4	4	4	5	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	4	5	5	4	4	4
23	M	University	Computer Engineering	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	5	4	5	3	5	3	4	4	4
24	F	University	Computer Engineering	4	4	4	4	4	3	3	4	4	3	4	4	5	4	4	4	5
25	M	University	Law	4	4	5	4	4	3	3	4	4	5	5	5	5	4	4	4	5
25	M	University	Web Design and Programming	4	4	4	4	5	4	4	4	5	4	5	4	5	4	4	4	4
23	F	University	Business Administration	4	4	5	4	5	5	5	3	5	3	4	3	5	3	3	4	4
25	F	University	Dentistry	4	5	4	4	5	4	4	4	5	3	5	3	4	4	4	5	4
25	M	University	Logistics Management	4	4	5	4	4	4	3	3	4	3	4	3	4	4	3	4	4
24	F	University	Business Administration	4	4	5	4	4	4	4	4	5	3	5	4	4	3	4	5	5

26	F	University	Sociology	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	5	5	5	5	4	5	4	5	5	5
26	F	University	Civil Engineering	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	3	3	2	4	4	3	4	4	4
25	F	University	Law	5	4	4	4	5	3	3	4	5	4	5	4	5	4	5	5	5
24	F	University	Business Administration	4	5	4	4	4	5	4	4	4	4	5	3	4	3	4	4	5
25	F	University	Law	4	4	4	4	5	5	5	4	5	4	5	4	5	4	5	5	4
25	M	University	Law	4	4	3	4	4	5	5	3	4	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
25	F	University	Political Science and International Relations	5	5	4	4	5	5	5	5	5	4	5	4	5	4	4	5	5
24	M	University	Law	5	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	5	3	4	4	4	4	4	5
25	F	University	Law	5	4	5	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	3	5	5	5	5	5	5
25	M	University	Labor Economics	4	5	4	4	5	5	3	4	5	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	5
25	F	University	Industrial Engineering	4	4	5	4	4	4	5	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	4	3	4
25	M	University	Law	5	4	5	4	5	5	4	4	4	3	5	4	4	3	4	4	4
26	F	University	Law	5	5	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	5	3	4	3	4	4	5
25	F	University	Law	4	4	3	4	4	4	5	4	5	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	5
24	F	University	Law	5	5	4	4	4	3	3	4	4	3	5	4	4	4	4	5	4
25	F	University	Law	4	4	4	4	5	4	3	4	4	4	5	4	4	3	4	4	4
25	M	University	Law	4	4	4	3	4	4	5	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	4	5	5
25	F	University	Law	4	4	5	4	4	4	5	4	4	3	4	4	5	4	4	5	5
24	F	University	Sociology	4	4	5	4	4	4	5	4	5	4	5	3	4	4	4	5	5
23	M	University	Computer Engineering	4	4	4	3	4	3	4	4	5	3	4	3	4	3	3	4	4
25	M	University	Law	4	4	4	3	4	3	5	4	4	4	5	4	5	4	4	5	5
25	M	University	Law	4	5	5	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	5	4	4	3	4	4	5
24	M	University	Software Engineering	4	4	5	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	4	5	4	5	4	5	5
25	M	University	Law	5	4	4	3	5	3	4	4	4	3	4	5	5	3	4	4	5
25	M	University	Business Administration	4	4	4	4	4	4	5	5	5	4	5	4	5	4	4	5	5
25	M	University	Law	3	3	4	3	4	3	3	4	4	3	4	3	4	3	4	4	4
25	M	University	Law	5	5	4	4	5	4	5	4	4	5	4	5	5	5	5	5	5

25	F	University	Law	4	4	5	4	4	4	5	4	4	3	5	4	5	4	4	5	5
23	M	University	Political Science and International Relations	4	4	4	4	4	4	5	4	4	3	5	4	5	5	4	5	4
25	M	University	Business Administration	4	5	4	4	4	4	4	4	5	3	3	3	4	5	5	5	5
26	M	University	Industrial Engineering	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	5	5	4	5	4	5	4	4	5	5
25	M	University	Computer Engineering	4	4	5	3	4	4	3	4	5	3	4	3	4	4	4	4	4
28	M	University	Computer Engineering	5	4	5	4	4	3	4	4	5	3	3	2	4	4	3	5	4
28	M	University	Political Science and International Relations	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	3	5	3	3	3	5	4	4	5	5
28	M	University	Political Science and International Relations	4	4	4	3	4	5	5	3	5	3	4	3	4	3	3	5	5
35	M	Masters Degree	Information Management	4	3	3	3	4	3	4	3	4	3	4	3	4	3	4	4	4
25	M	University	Software Engineering	4	3	4	4	4	3	4	3	4	3	3	2	3	2	3	4	4
24	M	University	Computer Engineering	4	3	5	5	5	5	4	4	5	4	4	2	5	4	5	5	5
24	M	University	Software Engineering	4	5	4	4	4	4	3	3	4	3	4	2	4	3	4	4	4
24	M	University	Computer Engineering	4	4	5	3	4	3	3	4	5	4	4	4	4	5	4	4	4
26	M	University	Software Engineering	4	5	4	3	4	4	3	3	4	3	4	2	3	3	3	4	5
24	F	University	Law	4	5	4	4	4	4	3	5	5	4	4	3	4	4	4	5	5
24	F	University	Maritime Business Management	5	5	4	3	4	3	4	3	4	3	3	2	4	3	4	3	5
25	F	University	Law	4	5	4	3	4	4	4	5	5	4	5	4	5	4	4	4	5
24	M	University	Law	5	5	5	3	4	4	5	4	5	4	4	2	3	3	4	3	4

24	F	University	Veterinary Medicine	3	4	3	3	3	4	4	3	4	3	4	3	4	3	4	3	5
24	M	University	Information Systems Engineering	5	5	5	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
23	M	University	English Language and Literature	4	4	5	5	5	4	2	3	4	3	2	1	4	2	2	5	5
27	M	University	Engineering	3	4	3	2	3	3	4	3	4	2	2	1	3	2	3	3	3
26	F	University	Web Design and Programming	4	4	3	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	5	4	4	4	4
25	M	University	Metallurgy and Materials Engineering	4	4	4	1	4	3	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
24	F	University	Law	4	5	4	4	5	3	3	4	4	5	4	4	5	4	4	5	5
24	F	University	Political Science and International Relations	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	3	4	3	4	3	4	5	5
26	M	University	Engineering	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	3	4	3	4	4	4	4	4
25	F	University	English Language Teaching	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	3	4	3	4	4	2	4	3	3	5
26	M	University	Industrial Engineering	4	5	2	2	4	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	4	2	2
25	F	University	Law	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	3	4	3	4	3	3	3	4	3	5
24	F	University	Dentistry	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
24	M	University	Software Engineering	4	3	4	3	4	4	3	3	5	3	4	2	5	3	3	4	5
25	M	University	Maritime Business Management	3	4	4	2	3	4	4	5	5	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
24	F	University	Law	4	4	4	4	4	4	5	4	4	3	3	3	4	3	3	5	4
25	M	University	Law	5	5	2	4	5	3	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	3	3	4	5
24	F	University	Chemistry Teaching	4	5	5	4	5	4	4	4	4	4	5	4	4	4	4	4	4
24	F	University	Turkish Language and Literature	5	3	5	4	5	3	3	4	4	4	4	5	5	3	4	5	5
23	F	University	Computer Engineering	4	4	5	3	4	3	2	3	4	3	4	2	4	4	5	4	5

24	M	University	Software Engineering	5	5	4	3	4	3	3	3	3	5	3	4	2	5	3	3	4	4	
24	F	University	Law	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	4	4	4	4	
23	F	University	International Relations	5	4	5	3	5	4	5	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	4	
23	M	University	Software Engineering	4	4	4	4	4	5	2	3	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	3	5	
22	F	University	Computer Engineering	4	5	4	4	4	3	1	3	4	3	2	2	3	2	3	3	3	4	
24	M	University	Computer Engineering	4	4	4	3	4	5	4	3	4	3	4	3	4	3	4	3	3	4	4
23	F	University	Labor Economics	5	4	3	5	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	
24	M	University	Computer Engineering	5	4	4	4	5	4	4	4	5	3	4	2	4	4	4	3	4	4	
23	F	University	Software Engineering	5	5	5	4	5	5	4	3	5	3	4	3	4	4	4	3	4	5	
25	M	University	Environmental Engineering	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	3	5	4	5	3	5	4	4	5	5	5	