EFFECT OF SOCIAL MEDIA INFORMATION ON RECRUITERS'
HIRING DECISION MAKING PROCESSES: A POLICY CAPTURING
APPROACH

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
OF
MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY

BY

SEREN BURAK ÖZKUM

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR
THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF SCIENCE
IN
THE DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY

JULY 2018

Approval of the Graduate School of Social Sciences

_____

Prof. Dr. Tülin Gençöz

Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science.

_____

Prof. Dr. H. Canan Sümer

Head of Department

This is to certify that we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science.

_____

Prof. Dr. H. Canan Sümer

Supervisor

Examining Committee Members

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Aslı Göncü Köse	(Çankaya Uni., PSY)	_____
Prof. Dr. H. Canan Sümer	(METU, PSY)	_____
Asst. Prof. Dr. Yonca Toker	(METU, PSY)	_____

I hereby declare that all information in this document has been obtained and presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that, as required by these rules and conduct, I have fully cited and referenced all material and results that are not original to this work.

Name, Last name: Seren Burak Özkum

Signature:

ABSTRACT

EFFECT OF SOCIAL MEDIA INFORMATION ON RECRUITERS' HIRING
DECISION MAKING PROCESSES: A POLICY CAPTURING APPROACH

Özkum, Seren Burak

M.S., Department of Psychology

Supervisor: Prof. Dr. H. Canan Sümer

July 2018, 89 pages

With the widespread use of social media in people's lives, the industry did not remain unresponsive and organizations started to use social media in a variety of different ways including for marketing, sales, recruitment, and selection purposes. This study aimed to investigate how social media information contained in candidate's profiles affect recruiter's hiring decisions and whether negative or positive information is more influential in this process of decision making by using policy capturing approach. Policy capturing is a regression-based technique which is used to assess how decision makers make evaluative judgements by using available information (Zedeck, 1977). In other words, it aims to identify the relative weight of factors contributing to decision outcomes. In the present study, initially, focus group were conducted with subject matter experts to determine what kinds information on candidate's social media profiles were important for recruiters, and then 82 participants who were actively engaged in recruitment and selection processes were shown summary social media reports of hypothetical candidates and asked to rate their likelihood of inviting each candidate for an interview. In each report, three negative and three positive information were manipulated by either stating that, that information can be inferred from candidate's social media profile or that information cannot be inferred from there.

Results showed that both positive and negative information shared by candidates in social media affected recruiters' hiring decisions significantly while the effect of negative information was more influential.

Keywords: Social media, employee selection, decision making, policy capturing

ÖZ

SOSYAL MEDYA BİLGİLERİNİN İŞE ALIM YETKİLİLERİNİN KARAR
VERME SÜREÇLERİNE ETKİSİ: BİR İLKE YAKALAMA YAKLAŞIMI

Özkum, Seren Burak

Yüksek Lisans, Psikoloji Bölümü

Tez Danışmanı: Prof. Dr. H. Canan Sümer

Temmuz 2018, 89 sayfa

Sosyal medyanın giderek artan kullanımı ile birlikte endüstri de bu gelişmeye kayıtsız kalmadı ve örgütler sosyal medyayı pazarlama, satış, seçme ve yerleştirme gibi fonksiyonlarda kullanmaya başladılar. Bu çalışmanın amacı adayların sosyal medya profillerindeki bilgilerin işe alım yetkililerinin işe alım kararlarını nasıl etkilediğini ve olumlu ya da olumsuz bilgilerden hangilerinin bu kararların çıktılarında daha etkili olduğunu ilke yakalama yaklaşımı tekniğini kullanarak anlamaktır. İlke yakalama karar vericilerin mevcut bilgileri kullanarak nasıl değerlendirici muhakemeler yaptığını ölçümleyen regresyon temelli bir tekniktir (Zedeck, 1977). Bu çalışmada öncelikle konu uzmanları ile yapılan odak grup çalışmaları ile sosyal medyadaki hangi bilgilerin işe alımcılar tarafından daha önemli olduğu belirlenmiş olup daha sonrasında işe alma ve yerleştirme süreçlerinde aktif olarak rol almakta bulunan 82 katılımcıya hipotetik olarak oluşturulmuş adaylara ait sosyal medya özet raporları gösterilmiş ve katılımcılardan her bir adayı mülakata davet etme olasılıklarını derecelendirmeleri istenmiştir. Her bir raporda, üç negatif ve üç pozitif bilgi bu bilginin adayın sosyal medya profilinden çıkartılması mümkündür ya da aday profilinde böyle bir çıkarım yapılamaz şeklinde manipüle edilmiştir. Sonuçlar hem pozitif hem negatif bilgilerin işe alımdan sorumlu uzmanların kararlarını anlamlı bir şekilde etkilediğini gösterirken, olumsuz bilgilerin bu kararlarda daha etkili olduğu görülmüştür.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Sosyal medya, çalışan seçimi, karar verme, ilke yakalama

To My Family

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Overview

With technological advancements and rapid changes in business world, human resource (HR) management departments needed to adapt to these changes (Davison, Maraist, Hamilton, & Bing, 2012). As the talent war between organizations heats up, organizations are investing to align their HR strategies with their businesses strategies to gain a competitive edge/advantage (Abraham, Kaliannan, Mohan & Thomas, 2015). Before making the hiring decision, recruiters collect information about the candidate from a variety of selection tools such as general mental ability tests, personality inventories, assessment centers, interviews, reference controls, and social media profiles now (Chamorro-Premuzic, Winsborough, Sherman, & Hogan, 2016).

Using social media information for selection purposes is a relatively new trend and being criticized by a number of scholars and practitioners (e.g., Clark & Roberts, 2010; Van Iddekinge, Lanivich, Roth, & Junco). On the other hand, this trend is being used in the field with an increasing popularity (Careerbuilder, 2016). Evidence suggests that organizations use social network sites such as Facebook, Twitter, LinkedIn and search engines to get more information about the candidates and make selection related decision such as recruitment, screening, promotion and hiring (Berkelaar, 2014; Clark & Roberts, 2010; Kluemper & Rosen, 2009). The purpose of the present study is to examine how social media information affects hiring decisions of recruiters and employers by using policy capturing method.

Policy capturing is a regression-based technique which is used to assess how decision makers make evaluative judgements by using the available information (Zedeck, 1977). Both within and between person differences can be analyzed by this methodology, thus it provides information about not only the individual decision-making patterns but also enables clustering individuals with similar decision-making strategies (Karren, Woodard, & Barringer, 2002). Policy capturing and similar regression-based techniques, such as conjoint analysis, are frequently used in research

1

in organizational behavior, human resources management, marketing, problem solving with computers and information systems, and environmental and social policy decision making (Aiman-Smith, Scullen, & Barr, 2002). More specifically, this study aims to analyze how social media information affects positive and negative hiring decisions by using a decision making oriented methodology.

Consistent with the purpose of the study, in the following sections, first, employee selection practices are briefly overviewed with an emphasis on the growing trend of social media use in employee recruitment and selection. In the second section, a review of the decision-making literature or more specifically policy capturing as a potential method to understand the role of social media usage in hiring decisions is presented. The purpose and the hypotheses of the present study are presented in the third section.

1.2 Employee Recruitment and Selection as Major HR Functions

Farr and Tippins (2010) define personnel selection as "the process employers use to make decisions concerning which individuals from a group to choose for particular jobs or roles within the organization" (p. 1). Acquiring and utilizing the human capital is essential for organizations to grow, be viable and survive (Jones & George, 2006 cited in Ekuma, 2012) thus, recruitment and selection are critical functions of human resources management. Companies are investing on recruiters, consultants, and employee screening/selection tests and techniques to get the most accurate information about the candidates and eventually hire the best one. According to a survey conducted by Careerbuilder (2012), over 40% of U.S. employers stated that a bad hiring decision costed them more than $25,000 without counting the intangible costs like reduced employee morale, production, and customer satisfaction. Thus, resources spent on increasing hiring decision quality is worth the associated costs. With the competitive talent market in today's business world it is likely that recruitment and selection will continue to be important as a strategic function for organizations.

1.2.1 Validity of Test, Techniques, and Methods Used in Employee Selection

Employee selection is and should be multi-dimensional as there are multiple factors accounted for to make a good hire. Personnel selection aims to assess candidates' knowledge, skills, abilities, and other characteristics to make a prediction about their future performance, fit or other related outcomes (Farr & Tippins, 2010). In compliance with this aim, instruments used in employee selection are as valuable as how accurate they are in their prediction (Buzea, 2007) which is largely determined by the psychometric quality indices of reliability and validity. Principles for the Validation and Use of Personnel Selection Procedure states that the most important aspect of developing, evaluating, and utilizing selection tests is the validity (SIOP, 2003). According to Hunter, Schmidt, and Judiesch (1990), selection methods with high predictive validity leads to increased employee performance, organizational outputs, and learning. Moreover, predictive validity of a test is associated with the economic utility of the test (Brogden, 1949; Schmidt & Hunter, 1998).

Prediction power of the selection methods varies notably indicating that some methods will yield more accurate predictions than others. Different studies show that general mental ability is the best predictor of the job performance (e.g. Hunter, 1986; Hunter & Schmidt, 1998; Ree, Earles & Teachout, 1994; Schmidt, Oh, & Schaffer, 2016). Meta-analysis of Schmidt et al. (2016) provides a detailed list of selection methods and reveals their operational validities together with incremental validity they add when combined with general mental ability tests (See Table 1).

The same study shows that other good predictors of job performance are interviews, biographical data, assessment centers, work sample tests and job knowledge tests. However, as different selection techniques assess the same constructs, prediction power does not increase as it does with methods measuring different constructs. For instance, the same meta-analysis shows that even though it has a low operational validity (.22), conscientiousness increases total validity by 8% when combined with cognitive ability as it measures a different construct. Considering this, to be able to make a better prediction, predictors tapping into different components of the performance construct should be used.

1.2.2 Most Widely Used Selection Methods across the Globe

Although many selection techniques are commonly used in companies from all around the world, there are sometimes significant differences in the frequency with which different selection tests and methods are used across countries. A good example is the relative popularity of graphology in Israel and France (Schmidt et al., 2016), which is not matched by the selection trends in other countries. On the other hand, cognitive ability tests, job knowledge tests, personality inventories, biographical data, integrity tests, interviews, physical fitness tests, situational judgment tests, work sample tests, assessment centers, physical ability tests, and letters of recommendations are the commonly used selection methods (SHRM, 2005; Chamorro-Premuzic, & Furnam, 2010; Schmidt et al., 2016). Employment interviews are the most commonly used selection method (Ryan & Ployhart, 2013). In terms of employment testing, according to the research of American Management Association (2001), 20% of the US companies use cognitive ability tests, 14% use managerial assessments, 13% use personality inventories, 10% use simulations and 8% use interest inventories.

1.2.3 Employee Selection Practices in Turkey

A master's thesis study conducted by Sözer (2004) showed that most commonly used selection methods in Turkey were interviews, references, personality tests, biographical data, occupational tests, assessment centers, foreign language tests and cognitive ability tests. However, usage of cognitive ability is relatively low - 19% for non-managerial jobs and 13% for managerial job. –especially when one considers that cognitive ability is the best predictor of future performance (Schmidt & Hunter, 1998). In a relatively more recent study Çiftçi and Öztürk (2013) reported that interviews, personality inventories, foreign language tests, assessment centers, general ability tests and technical ability tests are the most commonly used selection methods in Turkey. Even though there was an increased use of cognitive ability tests - 36 % - it is still being used less frequently compared to most European and North American countries. Another study about the selection processes in Turkish banking sector shows that general ability tests, foreign language tests, occupational knowledge tests, group

Table 1

Operational Validity for Overall Job Performance of General Mental Ability (GMA) Combined with a Second Supplementary Predictor Using Multiple Regression

Selection procedures/predictors	Operational validity (r)	Multiple R	Gain in validity (ΔR)	% gain in validity	Standardized regression weights	
					GMA	Supplement
1. GMA tests	.65					
2. Integrity tests	.46	.78	.130	20%	.63	.43
3. Employment interviews (structured)	.58	.76	.117	18%	.52	.43
4. Employment interviews (unstructured)	.58	.73	.087	13%	.49	.38
5. Interest	.31	.71	.062	10%	.64	.29
6. Phone-based interviews (structured)	.46	.70	.057	9%	.56	.29
7. Conscientiousness	.22	.70	.053	8%	.67	.27
8. Reference checks	.26	.70	.050	8%	.65	.26
9. Openness to Experience	.04	.69	.039	6%	.74	-.25
10. Biographical data	.35	.68	.036	6%	.90	-.34
11. Job experience (years)	.16	.68	.029	5%	.66	.21
12. Personality-based EI	.32	.68	.029	5%	.61	.20
13. Person-organization fit	.13	.67	.024	4%	.66	.18
14. SJT (knowledge)	.26	.66	.015	2%	.75	-.17
15. Person-job fit	.18	.66	.014	2%	.64	.13
16. Assessment centers	.36	.66	.013	2%	.78	-.18
17. T & E point method	.11	.66	.009	1%	.65	.11
18. Grade point average	.34	.66	.009	1%	.74	-.14
19. Years of education	.10	.65	.008	1%	.65	.10

Table 1 (Continued)

Selection procedures/predictors	Operational validity (r)	Multiple R	Gain in validity (ΔR)	% gain in validity	Standardized regression weights	
					GMA	Supplement
20. Extraversion	.09	.65	.006	1%	.65	.09
21. Peer ratings	.49	.65	.006	1%	.57	.12
22. Ability-based EI	.23	.65	.004	0%	.68	-.08
23. Agreeableness	.08	.65	.002	0%	.64	.05
24. Work sample tests	.33	.65	.002	0%	.68	-.06
25. SJT (behavioral tendency	.26	.65	.001	0%	.64	.02
26. Emotional Stability	.12	.65	.000	0%	.64	.02
27. Graphology	.02	.65	.000	0%	.65	.02
28. Job tryout procedure	.44	.65	.000	0%	.63	.02
29. Behavioral consistency method	.45	.65	.000	0%	.64	.02
30. Job knowledge tests	.48	.65	.000	0%	.65	-.01
31. Age	.00	.65	.000	0%	.65	.01

Note. EI = emotional intelligence; SJT = situational judgment tests; T & E = training and experience. Retrieved from Schmidt, Frank L. and Oh, In-Sue and Shaffer, Jonathan A., The Validity and Utility of Selection Methods in Personnel Psychology: Practical and Theoretical Implications of 100 Years of Research Findings (October 17, 2016). Fox School of Business Research Paper.

group discussions, personality inventories and interviews are being used by the bank HR departments (Sarılar, 2006). It can be seen that selection methods being used in Turkey are similar to global practices. HR departments follow new trends in the world to gain competitive advantage to attract talented employees, and it can be expected that companies in Turkey use social media information in their screening processes. Accordingly, study of Öz, Keklik, and Kılıç (2015) shows that Turkish companies uses social media as a screening tool, but this practice is not as common as global findings.

1.3 Social Media Usage in Employee Selection

Technological advancements in the last decade and emergence of social media networks created a new way of communication in people's life, especially for younger generation (Shapiro & Margolin, 2014). To be able to define a platform as a social media network, it must enable users to create a profile within an integrated system, show users other people whom they have common connections and view these connections within the system (Boyd & Ellison, 2007). A study shows that 90% of the people between 18–24 years old have a Facebook account (Withiam, 2011). According to the information provided by the companies, Facebook has 1.86 billion users, Twitter has 310 million users and LinkedIn has 433 million users by the end of fourth quarter of 2016.

Increasing popularity of social media networks and information they make readily available to prospective employers resulted in them being used for many companies as a pre-screening tool in their selection system in an increasing rate. Herriot (as cited in Black and Johnson, 2012) stated that: "The more economical it becomes to obtain information about a potential employee's private life, the greater the likelihood employers will use it." (p. 7). Younan defines social recruiting as: "Social Recruiting harnesses the evolution of Web 2.0 technologies and social media tools to communicate, engage, inform and recruit our future talent." (as cited in Jacobs, 2009, p. 2). Jacobs (2009) provided his own definition of social recruitment as: "Social Recruiting is delivering sound hiring decisions by actively using web-based technologies to build a shared understanding between employers / recruiters and passive and active job seekers" (p. 3).

According to a study by Shea and Wesley (2006), 45% of US companies are using social media networks in their screening phase and 11% of those who are not using it currently are planning to include it in the system in the near future. According to a more recent survey conducted by Society for Human Resources Management, 43% of the participants stated that they use social media profiles to screen job applicants showing an increasing trend in the use of social media for hiring/screening purposes. Moreover, 44% of the recruiters who participated in the survey believed that

information gained from social media profiles provide information about employee's job performance and potential (SHRM, 2016). Another survey showed that 73% of the HR professionals are using them in their selection process (Levinson, 2010). A recent CareerBuilder (2016) survey led to similar results demonstrating that social media screening rate reached to 60% showing an 8% increase in the previous year's results. LinkedIn Global Recruiting Trends Report (Schnidman, Hester, & Pluntke, 2016), shows that 40% of the participants stated that their top channel for quality hires is social professional networks.

According to a study conducted with recruitment and selection professionals in Belgium, 70% of the LinkedIn users and 43% of Facebook users use information gained from these sources to search more information about the candidates (Caers & Castelyns, 2011). Moreover, the same study showed that 26% of the LinkedIn users and 13.2% of the Facebook users select the candidates to be invited for the first interview by using social media information. Another study conducted in Cyprus found that 77% of the participants (i.e., HR professionals), who were actively involved in employee selection, used social network sites as a screening tool and as company size got bigger the rate of usage got higher as well (Melanthiou, Pavlou, & Constantinou, 2015).

Being used widely by most people, social media networks provide lots of information to recruiters about the candidates. Information contained in these networks can be work related (e.g. LinkedIn) or personal (e.g. Facebook, Twitter etc.). Companies visiting a candidate's profile can obtain information about interests, age, ethnicity, religion, sexual-orientation, marital status, job status, job history, behavior outside the work, life style, and political affiliations (Gross & Acquisti, 2005; Madera, 2012). According to Careerbuilder's report (2016), social media networks provides insights to employers outside the scope of cover letters and resumes. Moreover, social media information is being used to see the discrepancies between what is being presented in the formal application and social media postings (Davison, Marast, Hamilton, & Bing, 2012). Even though social media screening is framed as a

complementary tool to traditional methods, it has been claimed that it has the potential to displace them (Berkelaar, 2017).

1.4 Advantages of Using Social Network Sites as a Selection Tool

Social network sites are being preferred by the employers because they give inexpensive and quick background information about the candidate (Clark & Roberts, 2010). Some researchers mentioned about how social media networks can be used to get valuable information about a candidate. Some of the potential usage areas suggested by those scholars are as follows: information contained in the social media networks can be used for personality assessment, observing inconsistencies between applicant's application information, inappropriate online information may lead to inappropriate behavior at work and information provided can prevent negligent hiring therefore may reduce the number of related lawsuits (Elzweig & Peeples, 2009; Klumper & Rosen, 2009; Vazire & Gosling, 2004). In fact, a study supports the notion that social media network profiles measures personality (Vazarie & Gosling, 2004). Kleumper and Rosen's study (2009) also found that personality assessments by using social media information significantly differentiated high and low performers, showed adequate internal consistency and interrater agreement. Moreover, as it is not a self-report method and contains less socially desirable information, they suggested that it can predict over and above traditional personality assessments. A more recent study by Park et al. (2015) showed that the language used in social media correlates with personality and shows how language based social media assessments can validly and reliably predict personality. The authors state that social media is important for personality researchers because it does not only provide substantial sample sizes to work with but also enables researchers to study in an environment in which people express themselves naturally, access to data in a cheaper way and get high rate of information from the users.

Researchers indicate that social media profiles do not only give information about personality of the candidate but also provides accurate information about attitudes and cognitive abilities of the candidate (Chamorro-Premuzic et al., 2016).

Furthermore, according to Sackett (2007), traditional methods used in selection such as resumes, and interviews gives information mostly about the maximal performance of the candidates, rather than their typical performance. Social media network screening, however, can give information about the typical performance of the individual in his/her comfort zone (Black & Johnson, 2012) which is a more accurate picture of their true identity (Back et al., 2010). A famous statement commonly used in selection literature is: "Past behavior is the best predictor of future behavior." Hence, the information about person's daily life behavior may be more accurate than the methods traditionally used in selection (Black & Johnson, 2012).

1.5 Disadvantages of Using SNS as a Selection Tool

Despite the mentioned potential advantages, there are several disadvantages of using social media networks in selection process. Firstly, the United States Uniform Guideline of Equal Employment Opportunity Commission requires evidence about the criterion-related validity of a test if it is going to be used as a decision-making tool. There is very little information about the reliability and validity of social media network information (Madera, 2012). The information included shows great variance for both between and within candidates as some people prefer to post minimal information while others choose the opposite, and also people may prefer to share different information on various social media networks (Black & Johnson, 2012), all of which make comparison across candidates very challenging. Moreover, the information provided in the social media profiles does not necessarily reflect one's characteristics as people may try to look funnier, charismatic, or socially acceptable than they actually are (Smith & Kidder, 2010). As one study indicated, one potential problem in the use of social media is that people who see others as rivals for a job position can create fake profiles for them with uncomplimentary/unfavorable information (As cited in Chmiel, 2015).

Another problem associated with using social media networks as a selection tool is that the information provided in such platforms is being shared to be seen by friends and family members most of the time. As they are not meant to be seen by

potential hirers, it is debated that accessing information for hiring purposes may lead to invasion of privacy. With rapid developments in the technology, storing and accessing information about people is a lot easier and cheaper without people's notice (Miller & Weckert, 2000). Even though the users limit the access to their profile, it is not hard to access the information provided (Brandenburg, 2008). Some companies ask candidates to be added in their friend lists or even give their social media passwords to be able to access the information provided there. According to the Careerbuilder survey (2016), 41% of the participants stated that they are less likely to invite a candidate for an interview if they cannot access social media profile of that candidate.

Moreover, information contained in the social media profiles can be very personal such as ethnicity, age, sexual orientation, political affiliation etc., and making personnel selection decisions based on them can be against the law (Van Iddekinge et al., 2014). Even though it is being more and more widely used by the recruiters, many companies do not have policies concerning how to use social media information for selection purposes and does not plan to implement one (SHRM, 2016). Increasing usage of social media profiles for hiring has also been noticed by legal authorities and some countries started to make laws and regulations regarding the practice such as prohibiting companies to ask for candidates' social media usernames or passwords and penalizing them when they refuse to give such information or forcing regulations to comply with data protection laws (Morgan & Davis, 2013; Weihermann, 2016).

Candidate reactions to social media screening have been reported to be rather negative (e.g., Stroughton, Thompson, Meade, & Wilson, 2012). According to Madera's (2012) study, applicants perceived organizations using social media networks as a selection tool as less fair than those which did not include social media checking in their process, and these applicants' intention to purse a job offer was lowered.

Moreover, Budden, Anthony, Budden, and Jones (2007) found that students participants thought information provided in their social media profiles were private and should not be used without their consent. However, there are also other studies

with different results. For example, Vicknair et al. (2010) reported that many students from freshmen to graduate thought that employers and recruiters had the right to check social media profile for various reasons such as it is public information, it indicates personality and potential problems. However, 30% of the participants saw this process as invasion of privacy which is an important concern for the candidates (Harris, Van Hoye, & Lievens, 2003; Smith, Milberg, & Burke, 1996) and hence, did not approve it for being used for selection purposes.

One reason of having mostly non-favorable reactions is the low face validity of social media information in hiring. Job-relatedness and face validity of a selection tool affects how favorably it is perceived by the candidates (Ryan & Ployhart, 2000; Rynes & Cable, 2003).

Individuals who are looking for new job opportunities while continuing to work in their organizations want to keep their search confidential and control whether their references at their current job will be informed and when and how if it will be done so. Using social network sites in the screening process threatens the confidentiality of these candidates and they may direct their attention to other organizations to which may end up with lower quality and quantity of applicants (Smith & Kidder, 2010) which is against the fundamental purpose of recruitment and selection. In addition, Hausknecht et al.'s (2004) study proposes a model which indicates that negative attitudes towards selection methods are associated with selection procedure performance, self-perceptions, attitudes and behaviors toward organization, and work attitudes and behaviors. Thus, negative attitudes towards using social media in employee selection may lead candidates to be unable to show their true performance, make organization less attractive, and make candidates drop out from the process altogether. As this practice is perceived as less fair and attractive by people (Madera, 2012), organizations may suffer from the negative consequences for both current employees and candidates. Supporting this claim, a study on social networking suggested that, current employee's morale and motivation can also be affected by social media-based background checks as they would think that their postings can also have negative consequences (Broughton, Higgins, Hicks, & Cox, 2010). Despite all

the mentioned disadvantages of using social media information in the selection context, it is becoming a common practice among the recruiters with an increasing rate. As practitioners are going ahead of the science (Ployhart, Schmitt, & Tippins, 2017), many scholars (e.g., Brown and Vaughn, 2011) suggest approaching this practice with caution until scientific evidence and organizational policies advance further. While practitioners are excited about predicting (or hoping to predict) outcomes with such big data that social media provides, scientists seem largely skeptical about this data-mining approach lacking theoretical background (Chamorro-Premuzic et al., 2016).

1.6 Social Media Contents Affecting Recruiter's Decision Making

As Guion and Gibson (1988) stated, selection process is a decision-making process that involves deciding whom to hire and reject. Recruiters make future predictions about candidates with the limited information they have and make a decision based on high uncertainty (Highhouse, 2001). According to Born and Schlarios (2005), even though the methods used in selection have good predictive validities, problems may arise in the decision-making stage due to factors like time pressure and information overload. Moreover, they have also stated that cognitive and affective processes of decision makers influence the way they decide resulting with a more complicated decision-making process.

The information provided in the social media is likely to play a role in recruiter's decision making in two different ways. A candidate can gain a competitive advantage because of social media content or lose it for the same reason. CareerBuilder survey (2016) showed that 48% of the recruiters found information that caused them not to hire the candidate. Top five reasons for eliminating a candidate in social media screening phase were: provocative or inappropriate photographs, videos, or information (46%); information about candidate's drinking or using drugs (43%); discriminatory comments related to race, religion, gender, etc. (33%); candidate bad-mouthed previous company or fellow employee (31%); and poor communication skills (29%). The same survey stated that 32% of the participants found information

contained in the social media networks that led them to make a hiring decision. Most frequently expressed reasons for positive information leading to hiring were: candidate's background information supported job qualifications (44%); candidate's site conveyed a professional image (44%); candidate's personality came across as a good fit with company culture (43%); candidate was well-rounded, candidate showed a wide range of interests (40%); and candidate had great communication skills (36%). The survey results showed that information gained from social media was used more frequently for screening out the candidate than for hiring.

SHRM survey (2008) showed a similar result indicating that negative information's influence on hiring decisions was greater than that of positive one. Sprague (2011) states that "70% of hiring and recruiting professionals in the United States have rejected a candidate based on data found online" (p. 5). According to Rozin and Royzman (2001) weighting negative information more is a psychological phenomenon called negativity bias and they mentioned about four aspects of it: negative potency (negative is stronger), steeper negative gradients (negativity of negative events grows more rapidly), negativity dominance (in cases with both positive and negative entities exists negative ones dominate), and negative differentiation (negative events show more variety). According to Snyder and Tormala (2017), negativity bias affects human judgement and decision making. Research also shows that the tendency to give more weight to negative information applies to personnel selection as well (Rowe, 1984). Social media profiles may contain information (e.g., excessive sharing of personal life) that can be perceived negatively by recruiters, thus may give more reasons to screen out the candidate. The online evidence needs not to be direct though. For example, a law student was denied for position because he was affiliated with a website which consists of sexist comments about female law students even though the candidate did not make such statements himself in his profile (Samborn, 2007). Hence, it seems plausible to expect negative information on candidate's social media profiles to have more weight in the eyes of recruiters.

1.7 Cues Provided by Social Network Sites Which Affect Human Judgement

Another issue related to the use of social media in the recruitment process is how the information presented is processed consciously and subconsciously. Human judgement is prone to biases and selection procedures are not free from those biases. According to the SHRM survey (2016), social media networks are sometimes being used before the interview. That implies that the information contained in the social media profiles are the ones that create the first impression of candidate in the recruiter's eyes. An emerging trend to eliminate biases is "blind hiring" which is a hiring process without seeing the candidate physically and not requesting any information that may cause bias such as physical attractiveness, age, gender, and ethnicity (Maurer, 2016). That information can present both conscious and unconscious cues to the recruiter that may affect their judgements. Social media networks openly present all this potentially bias causing information to the recruiter. For instance, most of the social media profiles include a photograph of the candidate which may trigger biases concerning attractiveness/unattractiveness, gender, height, weight, age, and even gender-role congruency. In their research, Neuberg and Fiske (1987), stated that the first thing we see when a person contacts another is the physical appearance of that person and it may affect the subsequent relationships. According to the literature, the more attractive a candidate is, the higher the probability of he/she would be hired, evaluated more favorably, and get higher interview ratings (Hosoda, Stone-Romero, & Coats, 2003, Shahani-Denning, Dipboye, & Gehrlein, 1993; Watkins & Johnston, 2000).

On the other hand, there is contradicting evidence suggesting that physical attractiveness can also be a disadvantage. Especially for the positions which are hold by male employees traditionally, physical attractiveness reduces the favorability of female candidates (Shahani-Denning, 2003). Furthermore, there is empirical evidence suggesting that physical attractiveness creates an advantage for the candidate when the job position is a neutral or gender role congruent one, but its' effect is reversed for the jobs which are typically performed by the opposite sex (Cash, Gillen, & Burns, 1977; Heilman & Saruwatari, 1979). However, a recent study about the attractiveness bias

in social media context failed to find an effect (Paik, Shahani-Denning, & Griffeth, 2014). Hosoda et al.'s (2003) meta-analysis showed that attractiveness bias had been in a decreasing trend over the years. Even though with stricter legal sanctions and more educated recruitment professionals may reduce the biases up to a degree, there are many job non-related elements contained in social media which can affect decisions of hiring authorities by creating implicit or explicit biases such as race, ethnicity, religion, and sexual orientation and basing hiring decisions on that information may lead to discriminative hiring which may cause legal problems (Black & Johnson, 2012). According to Shafir (1993) recruiters follow different strategies (selecting the best candidate vs. rejecting the worst candidates) and these strategies shape their decisions and influence how they process available cues in the same candidate's social media profile.

As stated above, because of idiosyncratic preferences of recruitment authorities, information provided in the social media profiles of the candidates may be weighted/evaluated quite differently. The purpose of the present study is to understand how cues gathered from social media profiles of the candidates affect recruiter's hiring decisions by using policy capturing methodology. Hence in the following section of this introduction a brief overview of policy capturing approach and how it is used in the decision-making literature are presented.

1.8 Policy Capturing as a Statistical Approach to Recruitment Related Decisions

According to Aiman-Smith et al. (2002), "Policy-capturing is a regression-based decision-capturing methodology in which participants are asked to make decisions in response to a series of decision or problem-solving scenarios presented by the researcher. The researcher regresses the decision outcomes on the values of one or more cues embedded in the scenarios and then uses the resulting regression weights to make inferences about the respondents' judgment policies" (p. 390). Policy capturing is used to understand a number of different job-related constructs/behaviors such as job search, compensation, job analysis, and interviews (Karren & Barringer, 2002) and other regression-based methods (e.g., conjoint analysis) are widely used in a variety of

16

areas such as marketing, computer and information systems, environmental and social policy research (Aiman-Smith et al., 2002).

According to Zedeck (1977), the purpose of this methodology is to capture individual judges' decision-making policies, that is, how they "weight, combine, or integrate information" (p. 51). To elaborate, participants are given realistic scenarios including cues that could affect how they decide, and in the light of the presented information, they are asked to make a decision as they would do in real life. Then, the outcome decision is regressed on the values of cue variables to evaluate the relative worth of these cues on the given decision.

To exemplify, the study conducted by Williamson, Cope, Thompson, and Wuensch (2002), used policy capturing technique to understand how their cue variables (image of the job, relocation requirements, starting salary, retirement plan, and advancement opportunities) affect candidate's decision to apply for the job and accept it. Participants were given hypothetical job advertisements with different levels of the cue variables and asked whether they would apply for that job, and if they were offered the job, would they accept the offer.

A recent study by Zacher, Dirkers, Korek, and Hughes (2017) used policy capturing to examine how four job characteristics (i.e., job autonomy, task variety, task significance, and feedback from the job) affect job attraction and whether this effect differs with participant's age. By experimentally manipulating job characteristics in their scenarios these authors were able to identify that task variety, task significance, and feedback from the job affect job attraction more for younger employees whereas the effect of job autonomy did not vary by age.

Policy capturing has many advantages over traditional methods used to identify relative contributions of different variables in decision making. For example, it is superior to self-report measures asking participants to rate or rank order the relevant attributes/factors, which are criticized for having low validity (Hitt & Middlemist, 1979; Stumpf & London, 1981), being subject to socially desirable responds (Arnold & Feldman, 1981; Judge & Bretz, 1992) and being less realistic (Rynes, Schwab & Heneman, 1983). In fact, Tomassetti, Dalal, and Kaplan (2016) empirically tested

whether policy capturing actually solves the social desirability problem and their results showed that policy capturing studies were superior in terms of reducing social desirability compared to traditional self-report techniques; namely, Likert type, forced choice, ranking and points distribution-based methods. Moreover, policy capturing lets researcher systematically sample the stimuli and provides control over confounding variables in addition to providing precise measurements and generalizable results (Carroll & Johnson, 1990). It also lets researcher experimentally manipulate cue variables, which helps reducing multicollinearity problem to provide a more accurate picture of how each cue affect decisions individually. Moreover, policy capturing can be used to understand how given cues influence an individual's decision and combination of these individual analysis provides a deeper understanding of between participant differences, how these decision makers use those cues as a group, and whether there are specific clusters of decision makers with similar decision-making tendencies (Aiman-Smith et al., 2002; Karren & Barringer, 2002).

Despite its established advantages, there are criticisms pointed towards policy capturing as decision makers do not base their decisions on a fixed number of cues and their decisions may vary according to the context and the situation (Aiman-Smith et al., 2002). Moreover, making decisions about hypothetical people is different and scenarios are likely to lack the richness of real situations (Gorman, Clover, & Doherty, 1978; Hobson & Gibson, 1983).

Study designs in policy capturing involves a three-step approach: deciding whether to focus on individual or aggregate decision outcomes, selecting the target participant group and designing scenarios, and experimental design of the study (Aiman-Smith et al., 2002). Policy capturing studies can be designed to seek answer to idiographic (individual) or nomothetic (aggregate) outcomes. Idiographic designs analyze how an individual processes information and makes a decision based on this information while nomothetic designs focus on the decision-making process of overall tendencies among the sample (Aiman-Smith et al., 2002). For example, if the purpose is to understand how employment rates, national economic status, supply of competent employees and competitor's demand for them affect hiring decision of a human

resources director of a specific company, then the researcher needs to focus on individual outcomes. However, if the purpose is to understand how all human resources directors in a market makes this decision, then the focus would be on aggregate outcomes. Even though some authors claim that the policy capturing method, by definition, should focus on individual outcomes (e.g., Hobson & Gibson, 1983), there are many studies in the literature seeking answer to general outcomes (Karren & Barringer, 2002). Since the goal of the present study is to understand how hiring authorities make hiring or not hiring decision based on the social media information, the focus is on the aggregate outcomes of the participants.

Representativeness of the sample is important for all research designs, but it is even more critical for policy capturing studies. As this technique aims to understand how decision makers use available information and decide accordingly, high fidelity setups including a representative sample and realistic scenarios are needed to assure external validity. An important issue in policy capturing studies is the decision concerning which/what cues to include. Researchers can use a number of different sources, such as literature reviews, focus groups, subject matter experts' judgements, and media information, in identifying the critical cues to include while creating the scenarios. (Aiman-Smith et al., 2002). Moreover, in compliance with the nature of policy capturing, sample should be composed of people who are actually in a position to make similar decisions in their real-life jobs.

Representativeness and statistical power of the policy capturing studies depend on the number of the scenarios to be created in addition to the sampling. As the number of scenarios to be created is a function of number of the cue variables and how many levels each cue variable consists, these values must be balanced as higher values provide higher levels of realism (Aiman-Smith et al., 2002) but at the same time causes boredom and fatigue for the participants, especially when all participants rate all scenarios (Graham & Cable, 2001).

According to Cohen and Cohen (1983), policy capturing designs are s*ubject X conditions* designs. Hence, and in calculating the statistical power of such studies, within-subject variance accounted for the conditions rather than total variance should

be taken into consideration, meaning that these designs would show adequate power with relatively smaller sample sizes. Review of the published policy capturing studies showed sample size varying from 3 to 197 (Karren & Barringer, 2002). Smaller number of participants are enough for idiographic designs (in which individual decision-making processes are analyzed) while higher sample sizes are needed for nomothetic designs, which investigates aggregate decision-making processes of the participants (Aiman-Smith et al., 2002).

1.9 The Present Study

The proposed study herein aims to understand how cues from social media affect hiring decisions of hiring authorities by using policy capturing approach. As discussed above, screening candidates through their social media profiles is becoming a widespread practice. Even if it is not a part of official recruitment and selection process of the organization, hiring decision makers check social media networks for various reasons. With the aforementioned advantages of policy capturing method, this study seeks to answer 1) whether cues concerning candidates gathered over social media affect hiring professional's positive (hiring) or negative (screening out) decisions and 2) whether positive or negative information is more influential while they are making a selection related decision. Thus, in the light of the relevant literature, following hypothesis are proposed:

Hypothesis 1: Positive information from social media is significantly associated with hiring decision.

Hypothesis 2: Negative information from social media is significantly associated with not - hiring decision.

Hypothesis 3: Proportion of variance in hiring decision explained by positive social media information is smaller than proportion of variance in not–hiring decision explained by negative information.

CHAPTER 2

METHOD

2.1 Participants

Snowball sampling methodology was used in this study as the target group of participants consisted of active recruiters, and snowball sampling made it easier to reach such professionals. Initially, 167 professionals with recruitment and selection expertise participated in the study. Of these 167 professionals, 78 participants fully completed the study and 4 participants (who were treated as missing data) completed the package except for the demographic information part, resulting in a sample size of 82. Remaining participants did not provide enough data and excluded from the analysis.

Out of 78 participants who provided demographic information, 46 were female and 32 were male. Mean age for the participants was 35.51 years (SD = 8.68). Mean tenure of the participants on their current organization was 8.70 years (SD = 10.49) and mean tenure throughout their careers was 13.61 years (SD = 11.83).

The participants held various levels in their organizational hierarchy including assistant specialist (n = 4), specialist (n = 18), consultant (n = 7), lower level manager (n = 7), mid-level manager (n = 11), top-level manager (n = 13), member of the board (n = 6), and other positions (n = 12). Although all participants were actively engaged in recruitment and selection processes, 56 of them defined it as their primary HR function. Fourteen participants were working in public organizations, 62 were working in private organizations and two of them were in other type of organizations. The organizations were operating in various sectors which are shown in Table 2.

2.2 Procedure

The study was conducted in two steps. The first step was a preliminary study conducted to determine the factors that are likely to play a role in the decision to invite

a candidate for interview (e.g., physical attractiveness, gender, alcohol consumption, sociability, political view). The second step was the main study in which participants

Table 2

Sectors in Which Organizations of Participants Are Operating

Sector	N
Banking	1
Information Technology	5
Consultancy	7
Durable Consumer Goods	1
Iron and Steel	1
Auditing	1
Education	3
Energy	5
Financial Services	1
Real Estate	1
Food	7
Security	1
Chemical Products	1
Logistic	4
Retail	2
Engineering Services	3
Automotive	2
Trade	1
Advertising	2
Health Services	2
Defense Industry	1
Textile	1
Telecommunication	4
Tourism	1
Manufacturing	4
Construction	4
Agriculture and Stock Raising	1
Other/Do not want to indicate	11

was provided social media summary reports of hypothetical candidates and asked to rate the extent to which they were likely to invite each candidate for an interview.

2.2.1 The Preliminary Studies

Two focus group studies were conducted with subject matter experts (SME) who were working as human resources professionals in various organizations. In the first one, SMEs met face-to-face with the researcher and the second focus group took place in the virtual environment allowing participants from different organizations and cities to be included. In these two focus groups, a total of eight human resources professionals were asked about which information that can be seen in social media were most likely to affect their hiring decisions either negatively or positively. To elaborate, they were asked the following four questions: "What kinds of information, situations or factors affect your impression positively about the candidate when you inspect their social media profiles?", "What kinds of information, situations or factors affect your impression negatively about the candidate when you inspect their social media profiles?", "What kinds of information, situations or factors in candidate's social media profiles would definitely affect your hiring decisions positively?", and "What kinds of information, situations or factors in candidate's social media profiles would definitely affect your hiring decisions negatively?" . Each question was discussed by the SMEs thoroughly. Since using social media information in employee selection is a controversial topic, some SMEs were reluctant to express an opinion. In order to get over this issue, SMEs were asked to act in a way that their organization accepted this policy as part of their formal recruitment process and their supervisors asked them from which information they would make inferences about the candidate.

Factors expressed by the SMEs were combined with factors gathered from questionnaires about this topic and an initial list of 36 possible factors which would influence hiring authorities' decisions were formed (see Appendix A for these 36 factors).

The list was given to another group which consists 10 human resources professionals to rate their perceived importance. They were given the name of the position, information stating that social media screening is the formal policy of their organization and candidates already had necessary knowledge, skills, abilities and other attributes to perform that job. Then they were asked to rate these factors in terms

of their likelihood to influence their decision to invite the candidate for an interview on a 5-point Likert type scale (1 = It does not affect at all; 5 = It would most likely affect).

Factors rated by SMEs were ordered from highest to lowest (see Appendix A for descriptive statistics of importance ratings for the 36 factors). Factors which were similar in their nature were combined as a single factor. As one of the aims of this study was to analyze whether negative or positive information is more influential in hiring decisions, three positive and three negative factors rated as highest were chosen and decided to be used in the main study. Each factor was decided to have two levels: one indicating that that information was available in the candidate's profile and a neutral one indicating that no inferences could be made from the social media profile of the candidate. Thus, a neutral level of each factor was prepared and added as the second level. Table 3 shows six factors included in the study.

Table 3

Final List of Social Media Factors Included in the Study
Sharing confidential information about former organization
Conflicting information between social media profile and application form/resume
Disturbing and offensive sharings about minorities (based on gender, sexual orientation, political view, etc.)
Sharing job related content on social media and getting positive comments about them from professional network
Creating an impression which is congruent with organizational culture
Actively participating in hobbies, sports activities, and social responsibility projects

2.2.2 Main Study

Following the preliminary studies, six factors (three negative and three positive) which were rated highest in terms of their importance for hiring decisions were chosen to be included in the summary social media reports. These six factors with two levels led to a 64 (2^6) unique profiles to be created. Summary social media

reports of these 64 profiles were created in a way that all possible combinations of the six factors are represented. As Graham and Cable (2001) stated, rating so many candidates would cause boredom, fatigue and careless responding. Thus, an incomplete blocks approach suggested by Aiman-Smith et al. (2002) was applied and four blocks each consists 16 candidates were formed.

In each block, profiles were distributed in a way that levels of each factor are represented equally. To control age and gender, information about these characteristics were also equally integrated into the profiles. Name of the hypothetical candidates were created by random name and surname generators to prevent possible biases. All social media summary reports were uploaded to an online platform in a way that participants can see the profiles of the candidates on their block and rate their likelihood to invite them for an interview using a 101-point scale. At each profile, warning messages were included encouraging participants to carefully examine each profile and then rate that candidate. Inclusion of warning instructions reduces careless responding and increase the quality of data (Clifford & Jerit, 2015). The online platform was instructed to assign each participant to one of the four blocks and randomize the order of the candidate reports they see.

At the start of the main study, the participants were provided an instruction which included the title of the job and the role they should assume. The job position to be filled was "Retail and Commercial Banking Assistant Specialist" as entry level banking jobs have an equal distribution in terms of gender in Turkey according to İstanbul University Banking Research Center's study (2005). The participants were asked to assume the role of an HR executive who is responsible for selection to that position. They were informed that the bank's human resources management policy requires a social media screening before inviting candidates for an interview and their subordinates, who are recruitment specialists, created reports about social media profiles of candidates which meet minimum criteria for application and successfully passed preselection phases (e.g. resume screening, application form screening, online selection tests). This statement was added to make sure that participants assumed all candidates were more or less similar to each other in terms of basic qualifications

required and social media information gives additional information about the respective candidate. Furthermore, it was emphasized that social media screening was a part of formal organizational recruitment policy. To warm them up for the task and get into the role deeper, they were given the job advertisement, which was created by combining various advertisements for a similar position, of that position which included summary job description and summary job specifications (see Appendix B). Neither job specifications nor job description included information relating to the manipulated cue variables to prevent participants from making connections between them.

As aforementioned, four different blocks were formed, and profiles were embedded into them in a way that both levels of each factor were represented equally in each block. Each participant was assigned into a random block while keeping the number of participant in each block the same. The order of the candidates in each block was also randomized to prevent order effect. A sample practice task was provided to participants to warm them up and to prevent start-up effect as suggested by Aiman-Smith et al. (2002). Candidates were provided summary social media reports of candidates and asked to adjust the slider in which each end of the slider corresponds to very likely to invite for an interview and very unlikely to invite for an interview. The reason for using the continuous line technique (adjusting the slider on a continuous line) is that common methods such as Likert scales used in psychology are not sensitive enough to analyze the interaction effects between the factors in policy capturing methodology (Aiman-Smith et al., 2002). On the other hand, as suggested by Russell, Pinto, and Bobko (1991), marking the spot on a continuous line corresponding to one's evaluation creates continuous variables and let researchers analyze the interaction effects. Participants were allowed to see all reports in one page as the nature of selection is comparative and they could change their decision after seeing other candidates' reports. After rating all 16 candidates in the corresponding block, demographic information about the participants were collected.

2.3 Measures

After focus groups and preliminary studies were conducted, six factors (three negative: sharing confidential information about former organization, having information conflicting with application form and resume, and disturbing and offensive sharings about minorities and three positive: sharing job related content on social media and getting positive comments about them from professional network, creating an impression which is congruent with organizational culture, and actively participating in hobbies, sports activities, social responsibility projects) were chosen to be included in the summary social media reports. These six factors with two levels (whether this information can be inferred from respective participant's social media profile or not) led to a 64 (2^6) unique profiles to be created. Summary social media reports of these 64 profiles were created in a way that all possible combinations of the six factors are represented (see Appendix C for factors' distribution to the profiles).

Two sample profiles are provided below for demonstration purposes. It can be seen that, although in the first candidate's profile all three negative factors can be inferred, none of the positive factors is present, the opposite pattern can be observed for the second one (see Appendix D for other sample profiles in study's original language).

Likelihood to call the candidate for an interview was included as the dependent variable in this study. After reading the summary social media reports, participants were asked to rate the likelihood to call that candidate for an interview from 0 to 100 by using the slider provided in the online platform.

For demographic information, candidates were asked to report their gender, age, tenure in the current organization, total tenure, their status in the organizational hierarchy, department, human resources functions they perform mostly on their jobs, whether their organizations is a public or private one, and the sector which their organization is in business (see Appendix E).

Summary Social Media Report
Name Surname: Yeliz Yalçın
Gender: Female
Age: 27

- Candidate shared confidential information about former organization.

- Some of the information in candidate's profile conflicts with the information in the application form and resume.

- Disturbing and offensive sharings towards minorities were observed in candidate's profile.

- Candidate made sharings about professional topics seldomly.

- There are no contents in candidate's profile that can be related with our organizational culture.

- Candidate profile gives no information about extracurricular activities such as hobbies, sports activities, aid events and social responsibility projects.

Summary Social Media Report
Name Surname: Halil Öztürk
Gender: Male
Age: 30

- No sharings were found about former organizations in candidate's profile.

- There was no information in candidate's profile conflicting with application form and resume.

- No contents regarding to candidate' attitude towards minorities were found in the profile.

- There were many up-to-date and informative sharings about banking and finance sector in the candidate's sharings and these sharings got positive comments from his/her professional network.

- Candidate's profile creates an impression that is congruent with our organizational culture.

- Candidate's profile consists sharings about actively participated extracurricular activities such as hobbies, sports activities, aid events and social responsibility projects.

Figure 1. Sample social media summary reports (translated)

CHAPTER 3

RESULTS

3.1 Overview

Descriptive statistics, results of hypothesis testing and exploratory analysis are presented in this chapter. In the first section descriptive statistics are summarized. Then, results of the multilevel analysis testing the hypotheses of the study are presented. Finally, results of the exploratory analysis, aiming to understand how participant characteristics affected hiring decisions of recruiters are presented.

As mentioned in the Method section, the online platform used to collect data was designed in such a way that each candidate was randomly assigned to one of the four blocks while keeping the number of participants in each block equal. However, since some participants who started responding did not complete it, participants who were included in the final analyses were not distributed into the blocks equally (see Table 4 for distribution of participants into the blocks).

Table 4

Distribution of Participants into Blocks

	Block 1	Block 2	Block 3	Block 4
Number of participants	18	22	24	18

3.2 Hypothesis Testing

Hypotheses 1 and 2 proposed that there would be a significant relationship between positive information inferred from social media and hiring decision; and negative information inferred from social media and not – hiring decision.

In order to test these hypothesis, a multilevel analysis by using HLM 7.03 software (Raudenbush, Bryk, & Congdon, 2017) was conducted. In policy capturing studies, participants rate different scenarios, thus there is both within and between variance components (decisions nested in participants) and multilevel analysis handles

such nested data appropriately. In this study, 1312 hiring decision was nested in 82 participants.

In multilevel analysis, an index called intra class correlation (ICC) is calculated to analyze the proportion of variance caused by within part. Thus, a null model was formed and by running this model a level – 1 variance of 677.8 and a level – 2 variance of 312.18 was found which led to an ICC of .315. It indicates that 31.5% of the variance depends on the participants. Some scholars (e.g. Lee, 2000) interpret ICC as lower values indicate that a single level regression would suffice for that data while some others like Roberts (as cited in Anderson, 2012) warn that it would give hints, but further analyses are necessary. For this study, calculated ICC is interpreted to be good enough to continue with a multilevel approach.

If there are control variables in multilevel analysis, Anderson (2012) suggests following a stepwise approach in which control variables are entered after null model and analysis is conducted, and then variables of interest are entered, and analysis is run again. Thus, control variables of candidate age and gender were entered into the equation below and analysis was run again. Results of the second step are demonstrated in Table 5.

$$Interview = \gamma_{00} + \gamma_{10} * Age + \gamma_{20} * Gender + u_0 + r$$

Table 5

HLM Results: Control Variables

Fixed Effect	Coefficient	Standard Error	t – ratio
Intercept	37.10	2.15	17.28*
Candidate Age	2.10	.38	5.51*
Candidate Gender	-.37	1.07	-.35

Note. * p < .001

These results indicated that average likelihood to invite candidate for an interview was 37.10 and as the age of the candidate increased, the likelihood of to be called for an interview increased by 2.10 units. Effect of candidate's gender on hiring decisions was not significant.

For the final steps, six cue variables of interest were entered into the equation below and analysis was run again. Results of the third step of the analysis are presented in Table 6.

$$Interview = \gamma_{00} + \gamma_{10} * Factor1 + \gamma_{20} * Factor2 + \gamma_{30} * Factor3 + \gamma_{40}$$
$$* Factor4 + \gamma_{50} * Factor5 + \gamma_{60} * Factor6 + \gamma_{70}$$
$$* CandidateAge + \gamma_{80} * CandidateGender + u_0 + r$$

Results of the analysis showed that, all cue variables proposed were significantly associated with likelihood to call respective candidate for an interview after controlling for age and gender of the candidate. All three positive information were significantly and positively related with outcome variable and all three negative information were significantly and negatively associated with outcome variable, thus Hypothesis 1 and 2 are fully supported. After inclusion of the cue/predictor variables, effect of control variables of age and gender were no longer significant.

To elaborate, the average likelihood to be called for an interview for a male candidate who was 28.5 years old (gender of the candidates were coded as 0 = male, 1 = female and age of the candidates were grand mean centered) with zero information in his profile (neither positive nor negative information can be inferred from that candidate's profile) was 60.18 on the 101-point scale (0 = I would not invite at all; 100 = I would definitely invite). For candidates who shared confidential information about former organization, this likelihood was reduced by 24.09 units, for candidates who had conflicting information between their social media profiles and application forms/resume it was reduced by 8.05 and, for those who had offensive and disturbing sharings about minorities it was reduced by 24.34.

On positive information side, the likelihood to be called for an interview increased by 4.49 units for candidates who have job related, newsworthy, and educational sharings on their profiles and got positive comments from their

professional networks for these sharings, 3.52 units for candidates whose profiles creates an impression to be congruent with organizational culture, and 2.21 units for those who are actively engaged in extracurricular activities such as hobbies, sports activities, aid events, and social responsibility projects.

Hypothesis 3 proposed that explained variance by negative information in the outcome variable will be higher than the variance explained by positive information. To test this hypothesis, effect size of each predictor was calculated. As Anderson (2012) discussed, there is no direct estimation of accounted variance in HLM and he suggests using pseudo R^2 statistics which compares variance components of null model and conditional model. Pseudo R^2 is calculated using the formula presented below:

$$\text{Pseudo } R^2 = \frac{(\sigma^2_{\text{unconditional}} - \sigma^2_{\text{conditional}})}{\sigma^2_{\text{unconditional}}}$$

To compare the variance explained by positive and negative information on likelihood to be invited for an interview, two models were created; one with negative information only and the other with positive information only. Results showed that negative information only model reduced the unexplained variance 48.2% while positive information only model reduces unexplained variance by 1.2%, yielding full support for Hypothesis 3.

To further investigate the effects of negative vs positive information, two new variables were created by using the number of positive and negative cues in a given profile, respectively. These two variables (total positive and total negative) were entered into the equation below together with their interaction term after the control variables.

$$
\begin{aligned}
Interview = {} & \gamma_{00} + \gamma_{10} * CandidateAge + \gamma_{20} * CandidateGender + \gamma_{30} \\
& * Negative + \gamma_{40} * Positive + \gamma_{50} * Positive * Negative + u_0 \\
& + r
\end{aligned}
$$

Table 6

HLM Results: Full Model: Social Media Factors Predicting Likelihood to Invite Respective Candidate for an Interview

Fixed Effect	Coefficient	Standard Error	t – ratio
Intercept	60.18	3.45	17.419***
Sharing confidential information about former organization	-24.09	2.57	-9.36***
Social media profile consists information conflicting with application form/resume	-8.05	2.66	-3.03**
Candidate made offensive and disturbing sharings about minorities	-24.34	2.65	-9.19***
Candidate made sharings about job related topics which are newsworthy and educational and got positive comments from his/her professional network	4.49	1.07	4.19***
Candidate's profile creates an impression to be congruent with organizational culture	3.52	1.22	2.90**
Candidate is actively engaged in extracurricular activities such as hobbies, sports activities, aid events, and social responsibility projects	2.21	.86	2.56*
Candidate Age	.14	.48	.30
Candidate Gender	-.28	1.00	-.28

Note. * p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001

33

Results of this analysis are detailed in Table 7. According to the HLM results, on average, as the amount of negative information in their social media increased, candidate's likelihood to be invited for an interview reduced by 17.46 units and as the amount of positive information increased, candidate's likelihood of being invited for an interview increased by 4.93 units, supporting Hypothesis 3. Interaction term was not significant, indicating that positive and negative information in the candidates' profiles predicts interview invitation separately, but their coexistence in the profile do not neutralize their effects in predicting the outcome.

Table 7

HLM Results: Number of Positive and Negative Cues and Their Interaction

Fixed Effect	Coefficient	Standard Error	t – ratio
Intercept	58.46	3.96	14.771*
Candidate Age	.38	.49	.78
Candidate Gender	-.29	1.00	-.29
Number of Negative Information	-17.46	1.99	-8.79*
Number of Positive Information	4.93	1.35	3.66*
Number of Negative Information * Number of Positive Information	-1.16	.74	-1.57

Note: * $p < .001$

3.3 Exploratory Analysis

Although not hypothesized, it would make a further contribution to analyze how higher levels variables such as participant demographics influences likelihood to call the respective candidate for an interview. Four demographic variables; participant age, gender, and tenure were asked during data collection and they were further analyzed to investigate whether participant characteristics affected hiring decision.

For that purpose, those four variables were entered into the equation below as level – 2 variables. As mentioned before, four participants did not complete demographics section of the study, thus they were coded as missing data. Results of the analysis is provided in the Table 8.

$$Interview = \gamma_{00} + \gamma_{01} * ParticipantAge + \gamma_{02} * CurrentTenure + \gamma_{03}$$
$$* TotalTenure + \gamma_{04} * ParticipantGender + \gamma_{10} * Factor1 + \gamma_{20}$$
$$* Factor2 + \gamma_{30} * Factor3 + \gamma_{40} * Factor4 + \gamma_{50} * Factor5 + \gamma_{60}$$
$$* Factor6 + \gamma_{70} * CandidateAge + \gamma_{80} * CandidateGender + u_0$$
$$+ r$$

Results showed that none of the level – 2 variables (participant age, gender, tenure in current organization, and total tenure) was associated with the outcome variable statistically. Six cue variables included in the study was still significantly associated with the outcome variable even after level – 2 variables were included in the equation.

Table 8

HLM Results: Model with Level – 2 Variables

Fixed Effect	Coefficient	Standard Error	t – ratio
Intercept	58.93	4.53	13***
Level 1 Effects			
Sharing confidential information about former organization	-24.09	2.57	-9.36***
Social media profile consists information conflicting with application form/resume	-8.05	2.66	-3.03**
Candidate made offensive and disturbing sharings about minorities	-24.34	2.65	-9.19***
Candidate's profile creates an impression to be congruent with organizational culture	3.52	1.21	2.90**
Candidate is actively engaged in extracurricular activities such as hobbies, sports activities, aid events, and social responsibility projects	2.21	.86	2.56*

Table 8 (Continued)

Fixed Effect	Coefficient	Standard Error	t – ratio
Candidate made sharings about job related topics which are newsworthy and educational and got positive comments from his/her professional network	4.49	1.07	4.19***
Candidate Age	.15	.48	.30
Candidate Gender	-.28	1.00	-.28
Level 2 Effects			
Participant Age	.07	.32	.23
Participant Gender	2.11	5.04	.42
Tenure in current organization	.11	.32	.35
Total tenure	.05	.28	.18

Note. * p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001

CHAPTER 4

DISCUSSION

4.1 Overview

The aim of this study was to analyze how information available in social media profiles of the candidates affect recruitment authorities' hiring decisions and whether positive or negative information were more influential on the decision-making process. Results of the study showed that both positive and negative information in candidate's social media profiles predicted their likelihood to be called for an interview significantly and that the effect of negative information was much greater than that of positive information.

To my knowledge, research to date on social media in employee selection context was lacking studies concerning how specific social media information affects hiring decisions. Along with the current studies on social media in selection context which focus largely on psychometric properties, legal aspects and ethical issues, this study contributes to the literature by providing insight from a different perspective for a procedure which is being commonly used in practice yet was not given enough attention in academia.

With all three study hypotheses supported, and additional information gained by the exploratory analysis, this study provides valuable insights for all related parties of employee recruitment and selection. In this section first, findings of the study and their implications are discussed. Then limitations of study are presented followed by possible improvements and suggestions for future research.

4.2 Discussion and Implications

Hypothesis 1 states that, positive information on social media would predict recruiter's likelihood to invite respective candidate for an interview. Supporting this hypothesis, analyses indicated that positive information significantly predicts hiring decisions. Hypothesis 2 predicted that negative information on candidate's social

media profiles will affect likelihood to be invited for an interview. Analyses showed that there is a significant relationship between negative information and hiring decisions, thus this hypothesis was also supported. Lastly, Hypothesis 3 proposed that negative information would be weighted more on hiring decisions compared to positive information. Results of the study also confirmed this hypothesis, as it was found that negative information reduced unexplained variance in hiring decisions more than did positive information.

Full support for Hypothesis 1 and 2 indicates that social media information in candidate's social media profiles affect recruitment and selection authorities' hiring decisions. Coefficients of the predictors indicated that both sharing confidential information about former organization and making offensive and disturbing sharings about minorities had higher coefficients followed by conflicting information between application form/ resume. For predictors related to positive information, coefficients were in general smaller. In their rankings in terms of coefficients, sharing job-related contents and getting positive comments from professional networks about those sharings had the greatest one, followed by giving an impression to be congruent with organizational culture and being actively involved in extracurricular activities. It can be argued that using unstandardized B coefficients is not the ideal way for determining the relative importance of predictors. To calculate standardized coefficients of the analysis the formula presented below is used.

$$\beta = B \ coefficient \ of \ predictor * \left(\frac{SD \ of \ predictor}{SD \ of \ outcome}\right)$$

In this study, all predictors were dichotomous categorical variables and shown to participants in equal numbers which means that they had same frequencies. Thus, their rank ordering after standardization did not change hence they were used in the present study. Furthermore, using beta coefficients would especially be problematic when there is multicollinearity between variables (Johnson & Lebreton, 2004). Since policy capturing methodology lets researcher to manipulate their predictors in an orthogonal way (all possible combinations were included, and all predictors were dichotomous), B values seem to be a good indicator of relative importance of each

factor/cue. Furthermore, other proposed relative importance analysis methods for multilevel models, such as Pratt index (Liu, Zumbo, & Wu, 2014), which requires analysis to be conducted in structural equation modelling framework, or dominance analysis (Luo & Azen, 2013), which is feasible with lesser number of predictors, could not be applied in the present study.

Findings of the present study are consistent with the previous research (e.g., Slovensky & Ross, 2012) stating that employers are using social media to make hiring decisions. This is a valuable information for candidates, human resources professionals, and researchers since social media is being used in screening process more and more (Brown & Vaughn, 2011; Davison, Maraist, & Bing, 2011).

Present findings indicated that sharing confidential information about former organization and making offensive and disturbing sharings about minorities were the most influential factors affecting hiring decisions. However, the third negative cue, having conflicting information between social media profile and application form/resume had a lower coefficient. The common theme underlying the first two negative factors is that they both suggest potential harm to third parties (former organization and minorities) while the third one is most probably being a product of candidate's impression management effort by either hiding negative information or exaggerating -even making up- positive ones. It could be argued that these different natures (harming others vs. impression management) may be one of the reasons the recruiters evaluated them differently. Moreover, harming others can also be perceived as potential counterproductive work behavior which refers to behaviors of employees that intentionally harms organization (Robinson & Bennett, 1995). Fine (2012) stated that counterproductive work behaviors may target an organization itself which is the case in sharing confidential information or its' members such as making offending and disturbing sharings about minorities, especially if these minorities are members of the organization. Thus, recruiters may not want to take the risk of hiring individuals who are prone to such acts.

On the positive information side, coefficients were lower, and the differences were not as much as in the case of negatives. Yet, when one looks at the rank ordering

of positive information in terms of their coefficients, it can be seen that sharing job related information comes first. This may be interpreted as having a certain level of job knowledge or an investigative personality. The second one has still an organizational component; fit with organizational culture, but it can be perceived as a broader one as it is not specific to the position but to the organization. The factor with the lowest coefficient is being actively involved in extracurricular activities. Participating in such events is not directly job related and participants may have though that it is not a necessity but a nice-to-have bonus. Pattern of positive information shows that the higher and the more specific to a particular position a factor is, the more important it is for hiring decision.

It seems that it would be a good strategy for candidates to include information that can be perceived as positively in the eyes of recruiters. To clarify, positive information which can be related to the applied position is more likely to have a desirable effect compared to the ones with lower job relatedness. However, the findings show that in selection context it is more important to avoid sharing contents that can be perceived negatively, as the results showed that negative information reduced unexplained variance more than positive information indicating that they are more influential. Especially, if sharings by the candidate in social media accounts harms someone in a way, they seem to affect hiring decision negatively and strongly.

Practitioners should be aware that both positive and negative information affect their decisions even though reliability, validity, legal, and ethical concerns are still on the table. In the focus groups conducted prior to the main study, most of the HR professionals had stated that they did not give credit to social media information while evaluating the candidates, yet with all cues being significant predictors of the final decision to invite a candidate for an interview, it may indicate that their decisions are affected even if not at the conscious level which was also discussed by Lam (2016). Results of this study is consistent with the findings of Bohnert and Ross (2010) which shows that candidates with professional and family oriented social media profiles are more likely to be called for an interview, perceived as more qualified, more likely to get an offer, thought to deserve higher starting salaries, and rated as more

conscientious than control group while this trend is reversed for alcohol-oriented group, which shows that both positive and negative information are influential on hiring related decisions.

Hypothesis 3 stated that negative information would be weighted more than did positive information by hiring authorities to make a hiring decision. This hypothesis was also fully supported which showed that negative information affects hiring decision of HR professionals more than does positive information. This finding is a very critical one especially when one thinks about the business world where competition for job positions are highly competitive and candidates are screened out based on minor differences. It is also important to note that the finding that negative information appears to have more weight than does positive information is consistent with previous research. For example, Kanar, Collins, and Bell (2010) discussed that negative information was given more weight for various contexts including the personnel selection. In their comprehensive study, Baumeister, Bratslavsky, Finekenauer, and Vohs (2001) provided evidence that bad things are stronger than good in close and social relations, emotions, learning, neurological processes, child development, social support, information processing, memory, stereotypes, forming impressions, self-concepts, feedback, and health. Especially in impression formation section, they mentioned about "positive-negative asymmetry" which refers to giving more weight to negative information while forming impressions, which is consistent with the findings given that social media screening in personnel selection is also an impression formation. As mentioned in the Introduction section, negativity bias is a phenomenon which suggests that negative information is weighted more heavily than positive ones. As mentioned in the Introduction section, in their taxonomy of negativity bias, Rozin and Royzman (2001), proposed four aspects of it: negative potency (negative is stronger), steeper negative gradients (negativity of negative events grows more rapidly), negativity dominance (in cases with both positive and negative entities exists negative ones dominate), and negative differentiation (negative events show more variety) The findings of this study fits with these aspects except steeper negative gradients. According to the results, negative information was

particularly stronger, existence of both positive and negative information yield to domination of negative ones, and even though negative information was weighted more, more variance was observed in negative ones compared to positives in terms of their weighting. Apart from negativity bias, one other reason would be the differential treatment towards stigmatized individuals. In his taxonomy of stigmas, Goffman (1963) discusses blemishes of character (e.g. aberrant personality and radical views), which can be inferred from social media profiles of the candidates. According to the literature about stigmatization, these people get negative reactions from other people as these stigmas affect their social identity negatively (Black & Johnson, 2012). Negative information provided in this study would have created an image that is deviant from the expectations of the recruiters which creates a stigma and led to devaluation of the stigmatized individual as discussed by Kleck (1969).

Another explanation for negative information being weighted more would be that negative factors included in this study, especially sharing confidential information and making disturbing sharings about minority groups, may cause serious problems for the organizations. On the other hand, positive ones are desirable to have in a work place but absence of them would not affect the organization as critical as negative ones. Thus, this nature of the positive and negative information in this study may have played an important role on recruiter's decisions.

Initial analysis with only control variables of candidate age and gender showed that candidate age was positively associated with hiring decision. This is an interesting finding since the ages of candidates provided in the profiles were rather in a narrow range (27-30 years) as this range is believed to represents the ages of possible candidates for the position studied in this study. Moreover, former studies showed an opposite trend and the found either no association (e.g., Raza & Carpenter, 1987) or a negative association (e.g., Gordon & Arvey, 2004; Haefner, 1977) between candidate age and employability. One explanation for this contradicting finding is that since the range is very narrow, candidates at this age were not seen so different to observe age bias. Yet being older in this narrow range may be perceived as having more experience thus may have resulted in a positive effect on hiring decision. Other control variable,

candidate gender, was not significantly associated with hiring decision. It could be argued that manipulation of job-position in this study as a gender-neutral occupation (banking specialist) created a fit between candidate and job position which neglected a possible gender bias.

Exploratory analyses investigated whether participant characteristics of age, gender, tenure in current position, and total tenure affected hiring decision. None of the participant characteristics were significantly related with hiring decision. This is an interesting finding since initial analysis with a null model showed that 31.5% of the variance was dependent on within-participant variance. A potential explanation for this finding would be that interpretation of social media information is different for each individual as they have different schemas and expectations, thus a considerable proportion of variance comes from participants but there are no systematic relationships in terms of their age, gender, current and total tenure. Previous studies about recruiter demographics and hiring decision making (i.e., Goldberg, 2005; Graves & Powell, 1995; Raza & Carpenter, 1987) showed that age and gender of the recruiter did not have a significant effect on hiring decisions consistent with the findings of this study.

4.3 Limitations and Suggestions for Future Research

This study herein has some limitations that need to be acknowledged. The first limitation concerns that the participants of this study (recruitment authorities) was a specific group to reach out to invite for this study. Even though the snowball sampling approach used in this study made it easier to reach the recruitment professionals, it is not known to what extend the final sample was represented the population of HR professionals. However, the final sample size of the study was acceptable according to the criteria in the literature like at least 50 participants suggested by (Shepherd & Zacharakis, 1997). Moreover, according to Oliphant and Alexander (1982) as policy capturing studies provide more data points to be analyzed and have repeated measures portion, they have adequate levels of statistical power with lower sample sizes than traditional studies. Still, a higher number of participants would add more power to the

study and sample size is an acceptable limitation of this study. Future studies with larger and more representative samples are definitely suggested.

Another limitation of this study is the number of social media factors included. Given that social media provides so extensive information and cues about the candidates, inclusion of only six of them gives a partial picture only. Even though SMEs ratings indicated that the included cues were the most important ones, importance of social media factors for screening purposes is idiosyncratic and a different set of SMEs would probably provide some other factors which are not included in this study. In policy capturing studies it is recommended to use around seven cue variables which is the number at which participants reach their cognitive limits (Brehmer & Brehmer, 1988; Miller, 1956), thus this second limitation does not only apply to this study, but to all policy capturing studies. This is a criticism directed towards the methodology itself as mentioned in the Introduction section. Critics state that decision makers do not base their decisions on a fixed number of cues and their judgments may vary depending on the situation and context (Aiman-Smith et al., 2002). Even though, some information is missed due to the nature of such studies, inclusion of the critical factors as identified by the SMEs is believed to improve the capturing of how social media information is used (by decision makers) in the process of recruitment/selection. Using different sets of factors/cues in future research would give information about the most effective factors in decision making.

Another limitation concerns the nature of the design used. Using incomplete design has handicaps compared to the full factorial designs. One of the advantages policy capturing methodology provides is that number of scenarios rated by the participants increases the power of the study and lets researchers get adequate power with smaller sample sizes (Cooksey, 1996). However, confounded designs such as fractional designs or incomplete blocks designs reduce the number of the scenarios rated by each participant in exchange for reduced fatigue, boredom and negative reactions from participants (Graham & Cable, 2001). Karren and Barringer (2002) suggested that if a full factorial design is not feasible for a particular study, one must prioritize incomplete blocks design as it does not exclude some of the scenarios as

44

fractional designs do and all combinations of cue variables are still present within the study. In this study, four blocks representing each level of cue variables equally were created and all scenarios were rated by participants following the aforementioned suggestion. Both factorial designs and confounded designs have their advantages and disadvantages and future studies should design their studies in a way to optimize power and participant issues mentioned above.

Finally, with six cue variables there were 15 possible interaction effects that can be analyzed even if one tries to analyze only two-way interactions. However, a decision was made not to analyze all possible interactions mainly because of sample size limitations. Nevertheless, interaction of different information, especially positive and negative information in social media profiles of candidates could give valuable information. As a partial solution to the dilemma between need to explore interactions and not having the required sample size for it, I've decided to analyze the interaction of overall amount of positive and negative information. With this approach, consistent with the expectations, I found that both number of the positive information and number of negative information was significantly associated with likelihood to be invited for an interview. However, the interaction of overall positive and negative information was not significant. Future studies with larges sample sizes may benefit from examining interaction of specific positive and negative cue variables in the final decision making.

In this study, negative information showed noticeable variance in terms of its' effect on hiring decisions. For future research, it is advisable to further categorize negative information (such as harming others, impression management, and oversharing private life) and investigate the differential effects of different negatives. Moreover, in future studies, actual social media platforms can be used and look whether the media presenting the information creates any difference for recruiter's decisions. It may be interesting to compare the reports in which all information is summarized with original written posts of the candidates or visual sharings. And lastly, in this study participants were told that all participants were more or less equal in terms of their qualifications for the job and passed preselection phases. It is worth to

investigate whether social media information changes the rank ordering of candidates when they are not equal. For instance, does negative social media information have a detrimental effect for a very qualified and a potential star employee? Or does positive information boosts rank order of an average candidate and puts him/her above others? With social media getting more in our lives including employee selection, there are still many areas to investigate further.

REFERENCES

Abraham, M., Kaliannan, M., Mohan, A. V., & Thomas, S. (2015). A review of SMEs recruitment and selection dilemma: Finding a 'fit'. *Journal of Developing Areas, 49*(5), 335-342.

Aiman-Smith, L., Scullen, S., & Barr, S. H. (2002). Conducting studies of decision making in organizational contexts: A tutorial for policy-capturing and other regression-based techniques. *Organizational Research Methods, 5*(4), 388-414.

American Management Association. (2001). *How many U.S. companies use employment tests?* Retrieved from http://www.siop.org/workplace/employment%20testing/usingoftests.aspx

Anderson, D. (2012). *Hierarchical Linear Modeling (HLM): An Introduction to Key Concepts Within Cross-Sectional and Growth Modeling Frameworks.* Oregon: Behavioral Research and Teaching.

Arnold, H. J., & Feldman, D. C. (1981). Social desirability response bias in self-report choice. *Academy of Management Journal, 24*, 377-385.

Back, M., Stopfer, J., Vazire, S., Gaddis, S., Schmukle, S., Egloff, B., & Gosling, S. (2010). Facebook Profiles Reflect Actual Personality, Not Self-Idealization. *Psychological Science, 21*(3), 372-374.

Baumeister, R. F., Bratslavsky, E., Finkenauer, C., & Vohs, K. D. (2001). Bad Is Stronger Than Good. *Review of General Psychology, 5*(4), 323-370.

Berkelaar, B. (2017). Different ways new information technologies influence conventional organizational practices and employment relationships: The case of cybervetting for personnel selection. *Human Relations, 70*(9), 1115-1140.

Berkelaar, B. L. (2014). Cybervetting, Online Information, and Personnel Selection: New Transparency Expectations and the Emergence of a Digital Social Contract. *Management Communication Quarterly, 28*(4), 479-506.

Black, S., & Johnson, A. F. (2012). Employers use of social networking in the selection process. *The Journal of Social Media in Society, 1*(1), 7-28.

Bohnert, D., & Ross, W. H. (2010). The Influence of Social Networking Web Sites on the Evaluation of Job Candidates. *CyberPsychology, Behavior & Social Networking, 13*(3), 341-347.

Born, M., & Scholarios, D. (2005). Decision Making in Selection. In A. Evers , N. Anderson, & O. Voskuijl, *The Blackwell Handbook of Personnel Selection* (pp. 267-290). The Blackwell.

Boyd, D. M., & Ellison, N. B. (2007). Social network sites: Definition, history, and scholarship. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication, 13*(1), 210-230.

Brandenburg, C. (2008). The newest way to screen job applicants: A social networker's nightmare. *Federal Communications Law Journal, 60*(3), 598-626.

Brehmer, A., & Brehmer, B. (1988). What have we learned about human judgement from thirty years of policy-capturing? *Advances in Psychology, 54*(C), 75-114.

Brogden, H. E. (1949). When testing pays off. *Personnel Psychology, 2*(2), 171-183.

Broughton, A., Higgins , T., Hicks, B., & Cox, A. (2009). *Workplaces and social networking the implications for employment relations.* ACAS.

Brown, V. R., & Vaughn, E. D. (2011). The writing on the (Facebook) wall: The use of social networking sites in hiring decisions. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 26*(2), 219-225.

Budden, C. B., Anthony, J. F., Budden, M. C., & Jones , M. A. (2007). Managing the evolution of a revolution: Marketing implications of internet media usage among college students. *College Teaching Journal, 3*(3), 5-10.

Buzea, C. (2007). The predictive validity of selection methods in staffing activities. *Bulletin of the Transilvania University of Braşov, 14*(49), 635-638.

Caers, R., & Castelyns, V. (2011). LinkedIn and Facebook in Belgium the influences and biases of social network sites in recruitment and selection procedures. *Social Science Computer Review, 29*(4), 437-448.

Careerbuilder. (2012, April 18). *Thirty-seven percent of companies use social networks to research potential job candidates, according to new CareerBuilder Survey.*

Careerbuilder. (2016). *Number of employers using social media to screen candidates has increased 500 percent over the last decade.* Retrieved from http://www.careerbuilder.com/share/aboutus/pressreleasesdetail.aspx?ed=12%2F31%2F2016&id=pr945&sd=4%2F28%2F2016

Caroll, J. S., & Johnson, E. J. (1990). *Decision research: A field guide.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Carsten, J. M. (1987). Unemployment, job satisfaction, and employee turnover: A meta-analytic test of the Muchinsky model. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 374-381.

Cash, T. F., Gillen, B., & Burns, D. S. (1977). Sexism and "beautyism" in personnel consultant decision making. *Journal o Applied Psychology, 62*, 301-310.

Chamorro-Premuzic, T., & Furnham, A. (2010). *The psychology of personnel selection.* Cambridge University Press.

Chamorro-Premuzic, T., Winsborough, D., Sherman, R., & Hogan, R. (2016). New Talent Signals: Shiny New Objects or a Brave New World? *Industrial and Organizational Psychology, 9*(3), 621-640.

Chmiel, M. (2015). Agency and communion in LinkedIn professional candidates' profiles. Bias in recruitment process? *Jagiellonian Journal of Management, 1*(4), 291-304.

Çiftçi, M., & Öztürk, U. C. (2013). Yetkinlik bazlı personel seçme faaliyetleri ve Türkiye'deki büyük ölçekli işletmelerin işgören seçme modeli tercihindeki eğilimler. *Sosyo Ekonomik Araştırmalar Dergisi, 13*(25), 145-172.

Clark, L. A., & Roberts, S. J. (2010). Employer's use of social networking sites: A socially irresponsible practice. *Journal of Business Ethics, 95*(4), 507-525.

Clifford, S., & Jerit , J. (2015). Do Attempts to Improve Respondent Attention Increase Social Desirability Bias? *Public Opinion Quarterly, 79*(3), 790-802.

Cohen, J., & Cohen, P. (1983). *Applied multiple regression-correlation analysis for the behavioral sciences.* Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Cooksey, R. W. (1996). *Judgment analysis: Theory, methods, and applications.* San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Davison, H. K., Maraist, C. C., Hamilton, R. H., & Bing, M. N. (2012). To screen or not to screen? Using the internet for selection decisions. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal, 24*(1), 1-21.

Dougherty, T. W., Ebert, R. J., & Callender, J. C. (1986). Policy capturing in the employment interview. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 71*, 9-15.

Ekuma, K. (2012). The Importance of predictive and face validity in employee selection and ways of maximizing them: An assessment of three selection methods. *International Journal of Business and Management, 7*(22), 115-122.

Elzweig, B., & Peeples, D. K. (2009). Using social networking web sites in hiring and retention decisions. *SAM Advanced Management Journal, 74*, 27-35.

Farr, J. L., & Tippins, N. T. (2010). *Handbook of employee selection.* Routledge.

Fine, S. (2012). Estimating the economic impact of personnel selection tools on counterproductive work behaviors. *Economics and Business Letters, 1*(4), 1-9.

Gilliland, S. W. (1993). The perceived fairness of selection systems: An organizational justice perspective. *Academy of Management Review, 18*(4), 694-734.

Goffman, E. (1963). *Stigma.* London: Penguin.

Goldberg, C. B. (2005). Relational demography and similarity-attraction in interview assessments and subsequent offer decisions: Are we missing something? *Group & Organization Management, 30*(6), 597-624.

Gordon, R. A., & Arvey, R. D. (2004). Age Bias in Laboratory and Field Settings: A Meta-Analytic Investigation. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 34*(3), 468-492.

Gorman, C., Clover, W., & Doherty, M. (1978). Can we learn anything about interviewing real people from "interviews" of paper people? Two studies of the external validity of a paradigm. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 22*, 165-192.

Graham, M., & Cable, D. (2001). A comparison of full versus fractional factorial designs in policy-capturing studies. *Organizational Research Methods, 4*, 26-45.

Graves, L. M., & Powell, G. N. (1995). The effect of sex similarity on recruiters' evaluations of actual applicants: A test of the similarity-attraction paradigm. *Personnel Psychology, 48*(1), 85-98.

Griffeth, R. H. (2000). 'A meta-analysis of antecedents and correlates of employee turnover, update, moderator tests, and research implications for the next millennium. *Journal of Management*, 463-488.

Gross, R., & Acquisti, A. (2005). Information revelation and privacy in online social networks. *WPES '05 Proceedings of the 2005 ACM workshop on Privacy in the Electronic Society*, 71-80.

Guion, R. M., & Gibson, W. (1988). Personnel selection and placement. *Annual Review of Psychology, 39*, 349-374.

Haefner, J. E. (1977). Race, age, sex, and competence as factors in employee selection of the disadvantaged. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 62*, 199-202.

Harris, M. M., Lievens, F., & Van Hoye, G. (2004). "I think they discriminated against me": Using prototype theory and organizational justice theory for understanding perceived discrimination in selection and promotion situations. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 12*(1/2), 54-65.

Hausknecht, J. P., Day, D. V., & Thomas, S. C. (2004). Applicant reactions to selection procedures: An updated model and meta-analysis. *Personel Psychology, 57*, 639-683.

Heilman, M. E., & Saruwatari, L. R. (1979). When beauty is beastly: The effects of appearance and sex on evaluations of job applicants for managerial and nonmanagerial jobs. *Organizational Behavior & Human Performance, 23*(3), 360-372.

Heriot, G. L. (1993). New feudalism: The unintended destination of contemporary trends in employment law. *Georgia Law Review, 28*.

Highhouse, S. (2001). Judgement and Decision-Making Research: Relevence to Industrial and Organizational Psychology. In N. Anderson, D. Ones, H. Sinangil, & C. Viswesvaran, *Handbook of Industrial, Work and Organizational Psychology Volume 2 Organizational Psychology* (pp. 314-331). London: Sage.

Hitt, M. A., & Middlemist, R. D. (1979). A methodology to develop the criteria and criteria weightings for assessing subunit effectiveness in organizations. *Academy of Management Journal, 22*, 356-374.

Hobson, C., & Gibson, F. (1983). Policy-capturing as an approach to understanding and improving performance appraisal: A review of the literature. *Academy of Management Review, 10*, 640-649.

Hosoda, M., Stone-Romero, E. F., & Coats, G. (2003). The effects of physical attractiveness on job-related outcomes: A meta-analysis of experimental studies. *Personnel Psychology, 56*(2), 431-462.

Hunter , J. E. (1986). Cognitive ability, cognitive aptitude, job knowledge, and job performance. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 29*(3), 340-362.

Hunter, J. E., Schmidt, F. L., & Judiesch, M. K. (1990). Individual differences in output variability as a function of job complexity. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 75*, 28-42.

İstanbul Üniversitesi Bankacılık Araştırma Merkezi. (2005). *Bankalarda Kadınlar Çalışıyor Erkekler Yönetiyor.*

Jacobs, P. (2009). What is social recruiting. *Human Resources Magazine, 14*(5), pp. 2-3.

Johnson, J. W., & Lebreton, J. M. (2004). History and Use of Relative Importance Indices in Organizational Research. *Organizational Research Methods, 7*(3), 238-257.

Jones, G. R., & George, J. M. (2006). *Contemporary management.* New York: McGraw- Hill Irwin.

Judge, T. A., & Bretz, R. D. (1992). Effects of work values on job choice decisions. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 77*, 261-271.

Kanar, A. M., Collins, C. J., & Bell, B. S. (2010). A comparison of the effects of positive and negative information on job seekers' organizational attraction and attribute recall. *Human Performance, 23*(3), 193-212.

Karren, R. J., & Woodard Barringer, M. (2002). A review and analysis of the policy-capturing methodology in organizational research. *Organizational Research Methods, 5*(4), 337-361.

Kleck, R. (19696). Physical stigma and task oriented interactions. *Human Relations, 22*(1), 53-60.

Kluemper, D. H., & Rosen, P. A. (2009). Future employment selection methods: evaluating social networking web sites. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 24*(6), 567-580.

Lam, H. (2016). Social media dilemmas in the employment context. *Employee Relations, 38*(3), 420-437.

Lee, V. E. (2000). Using hierarchical linear modeling to study social contexts: The case of school effects. *Educational Psychologist, 35*, 125-141.

Levinson, M. (2010). *Social networking ever more critical to job search success*. Retrieved from https://www.cio.com/article/2417135/careers-staffing/social-networking-ever-more-critical-to-job-search-success.html

Liu, Y., Zumbo, B. D., & Wu, A. D. (2014). Relative Importance of Predictors in Multilevel Modeling. *Journal of Modern Applied Statistical Methods, 13*(1), 2-22.

Luo, W., & Azen, R. (2013). Determining Predictor Importance in Hierarchical Linear Models Using Dominance Analysis. *Journal of Educational and Behavioral Statistics, 38*(1), 3-31.

Madera, J. M. (2012). Using social networking websites as a selection tool: The role of selection process fairness and job pursuit intentions. *International Journal of Hospitality Management, 31*(4), 1276-1282.

Maurer, R. (2016). *Blind hiring may be missing the point*. Retrieved from https://www.shrm.org/resourcesandtools/hr-topics/talent-acquisition/pages/blind-hiring-practices.aspx

Mazen, A. M. (1990). The moderating role of social desirability, age, and experience in human judgment: Just how indirect is policy capturing? *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 90*, 19-40.

Melanthiou, Y., Pavlou, F., & Constantinou, E. (2015). The use of social network sites as an e-recruitment tool. *Journal of Transnational Management, 20*, 31-49.

Miller, G. (1956). The magical number seven, plus or minus two: Some limits on our capacity for processing information. *Psychological Review, 63*(2), 81-97.

Miller, S., & Weckert, J. (2000). Privacy, the workplace and the internet. *Journal of Business Ethics, 28*(3), 255-265.

Morgan, H. A., & Davis, F. A. (2013). *Social media and employment law summary of key cases and legal issues.* Paul Hastings LLP.

Motowidlo, S. J., & Burnett, J. R. (1995). Aural and visual sources of validity in structured employment interviews. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 61*(3), 239-249.

Neuberg, S. L., & Fiske, S. T. (1987). Motivational influences on impression formation: Outcome dependency, accuracy-driven attention, and individuating processes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 53*(3), 431-444.

Oliphant, V. N., & Alexander, E. R. (1982). Reations to resumes as a function of resume determinants, applicant characteristics, and sex of raters. *Personnel Psychology, 35*(4), 829-842.

Öz, M. K., Keklik, B., & Kılıç, R. (2015). İnsan kaynakları tedarikinde sosyal medyanın rolü üzerine bir araştırma. *23.Ulusal Yönetim ve Organizasyon Kongresi.* Bodrum-Muğla.

Paik, L. S., Shahani-Denning, C., & Griffeth, R. W. (2014). An examination of attractiveness biases in the context of hiring through social networking sites. *Journal of Organizational Psychology, 14*(1), 52-66.

Park , G., Schwartz, H., Eichstaedt, J., Kern, M., Kosinski, M., Stillwell, D., . . . Seligman, M. (2015). Automatic Personality Assessment Through Social Media Language. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 108*(6), 934–952.

Ployhart, R. E., Schmitt, N., & Tippins, N. T. (2017). Solving the supreme problem: 100 years of selection and recruitment at the Journal of Applied Psychology. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 102*(3), 291-304.

Raudenbush, S. W., Bryk, A. S., & Congdon, R. (2017). HLM 7.03 for Windows [Computer software]. Skokie, IL: Scientific Software International, Inc.

Raza, S. M., & Carpenter, B. N. (1987). A Model of Hiring Decisions in Real Employment Interviews. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 72*(4), 596-603.

Ree, M. J., Earles, J. A., & Teachout, M. S. (1994). Predicting job performance: Not much more than g. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 79*(4), 518-524.

Robinson, S. L., & Bennett, R. J. (1995). A typology of deviant workplace behaviors: a multidimensional scaling study. *Academy of Management Journal, 38*(2), 555-572.

Rowe, P. M. (1984). Decision processes in personnel selection. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science, 16*(4), 326-337.

Rozin, P., & Royzman, E. B. (2001). Negativity Bias, Negativity Dominance, and Contagion. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 5*(4), 296-320.

Russell, C. J., & Bobko, P. (1991). Appropriate moderated regression an inappropriate research strategy: A demonstration of information loss due to scale coarseness. *Applied Psychological Measurement, 15*, 257-266.

Ryan, A. M., & Ployhart, R. E. (2000). Applicants' perceptions of selection procedures and decisions: A critical review and agenda for the future. *Journal of Management, 26*(3), 565-606.

Ryan, A. M., & Ployhart, R. E. (2013). A century of selection. *Annual Review of Psychology, 65*(1), 693-717.

Rynes, S. L., & Cable, D. M. (2003). Recruitment research in the twenty-first century. In *Handbook of Psychology* (pp. 55-76).

Rynes, S. L., Schwab, D. P., & Heneman, H. G. (1983). The role of pay and market pay variability in job applicant decisions. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 31*, 353-364.

Sackett, P. R. (2007). Revisiting the origins of the typical-maximum performance distinction. *Human Performance, 20*(3), 179-185.

Samborn, H. V. (2007). Go Google yourself! *ABA Journal, 93*(8), 56-57.

Sarılar, Ö. (2006). *Bankalarda Uygulanan İşe Alım Süreçleri: Türkiye Cumhuriyeti Merkez Bankası Örneği.* Ankara: Türkiye Cumhuriyeti Merkez Bankası İnsan Kaynakları Genel Müdürlüğü.

Schmidt, F. L., & Hunter, J. E. (1998). The validity and utility of selection methods in personnel psychology: Practical and theoretical implications of 85 years of research findings. *Psychological Bulletin, 124*(2), 262-274.

Schmidt, F. L., Oh, I.-S., & Shaffer, J. A. (2016). The validity and utility of selection methods in personnel psychology: Practical and theoretical implications of 100 years of research findings. *Fox School of Business Research Paper*.

Schnidman, A., Hester, L., & Pluntke, P. (2016). *Global recruiting trends 2017.* Linkedin Talent Solutions. Retrieved from https://business.linkedin.com/content/dam/me/business/en-us/talent-solutions/resources/pdfs/linkedin-global-recruiting-trends-report.pdf

Shahani, C., Dipboye, R. L., & Gehrlein, T. M. (1993). Attractiveness bias in the interview: Exploring the boundaries of an effect. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology, 14*(3), 317-328.

Shahani-Denning, C. (2003). Physical attractiveness bias in hiring: What is beautiful is good. *Hofstra Horizon*, 14-17.

Shapiro, L. A., & Margolin, G. (2014). Growing up wired: Social networking sites and adolescent psychosocial development. *Clinical Child and Family Psychology Review, 17*(1), 1-18.

Shea, K., & Wesley, J. (2006). How social networking sites affect students, career services, and employers. *National Association of Colleges and Employers Journal, 66*(3), 26-32.

Shepherd, D. A., & Zacharakis, A. (1997). Conjoint analysis: A window of opportunity for entrepreneurship research. In J. A. Kaltz, *Advances in Entrepreneurship, Firm Emergence and Growth, Volume 3* (pp. 203-248). Amsterdam: JAI Ppress.

SHRM. (2005). *Selection assessment methods.* SHRM Foundation.

SHRM. (2008). *Online technologies and their impact on recruitment strategies.*

SHRM. (2016). *Using social media for talent acquisition - recruitment and screening.*

Slovensky, R., & Ross, W. H. (2012). Should human resource managers use social media to screen job applicants? Managerial and legal issues in the USA. *Digital Policy, Regulation and Governance, 14*(1), 55-69.

Smith , H., Milberg, S., & Burke, S. (1996). Information privacy: Measuring individuals' concerns about organizational practices. *Management Information Systems Quarterly, 20*(2), 167-196.

Smith, W. P., & Kidder, D. (2010). You've been tagged! (Then again, maybe not): Employers and Facebook. *Business Horizons, 53*(5), 491-499.

Snyder, A. I., & Tormala, Z. L. (2017). Valence Asymmetries in Attitude Ambivalence. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 112*(4), 555-576.

Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Inc. (2003). *Principles for the validation and use of personnel selection procedures.* Ohio: Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Inc.

Sözer, S. (2004). *An evaluation of current human resource management practices in the Turkish private sector (Master's Thesis).* Ankara: Middle East Technical University.

Sprague, R. (2011). Invasion of the social networks: Blurring the line between personal life and the employment relationship. *University of Louisville Law Review, 50*(1), 1-34.

Stoughton, J. W., Thompson, L. F., Meade, A. W., & Wilson, M. A. (2012). Reactions to using social networking websites in pre-employment screening. *27th Annual Meeting of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology.*

Stumpf, S. A., & London, M. (1981). Capturing rater policies in evaluating candidates for promotion. *Academy of Management Journal, 24*, 752-766.

Tomassetti, A. J., Dalal, R. S., & Kaplan, S. A. (2016). Is policy capturing really more resistant than traditional self-report techniques to socially desirable responding? *Organizational Research Methods, 19*(2), 255-285.

Van Iddekinge, C. H., Lanivich, S. E., Roth, P. L., & Junco, E. (2016). Social media for selection? Validity and adverse impact potential of a Facebook-based assessment. *Journal of Management, 42*(7), 1811-1835.

Vazire, S., & Gosling, S. D. (2004). E-perceptions: Personality impressions based on personal websites. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 87*(1), 123-132.

Vicknair, J., Elkersh, D., Yancey, K., & Budden, M. (2010). The use of social networking websites as a recruiting tool for employers. *American Journal of Business Education, 3*(11), 7-12.

Watkins, L. M., & Johnston, L. (2000). Screening job applicants: The impact of physical attractiveness and application quality. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 8*(2), 76-84.

Weihermann, R. (2016). *Social media in the employment context and the new EU General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR)*. Retrieved from http://blogs.dlapiper.com/employmentgermany/2016/06/27/social-media-in-the-employment-context-and-the-new-eu-general-data-protection-regulation-gdpr/

Williamson, C. L., Cope, J., Thompson, L. F., & Wuensch, K. (2002). Policy capturing as a tool to enhance recruiting. *Career Development International, 7*(3), 159-166.

Withiam, G. (2011). Social media and the hospitality industry: Holding the tiger by the tail. *Cornell Hospitality Roundtable Proceedings, 3*(3), 6-15.

Zacher, H., Dirkers, B. T., Korek, S., & Hughes, B. (2017). Age-differential effects of job characteristics on job attraction: A policy-capturing study. *Frontiers in Pscyhology, 8*, 1-11.

Zedeck, S. (1977). An information processing model and approach to the study of motivation. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 18*(1), 47-77.

APPENDICES

A. FACTORS EMERGED FROM FOCUS GROUPS AND DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS

#	Factor	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std Deviation	Variance
1	Paylaşımlarının içeriğinin olumlu olması	1.00	4.00	2.80	0.87	0.76
2	Kendini etkin bir şekilde ifade etmesi	1.00	5.00	3.70	1.10	1.21
3	Pozisyon ile uyumlu, profesyonel paylaşımlar yapması	3.00	5.00	4.00	0.63	0.40
4	Paylaşımlarının başkalarının gönderileri yerine kendine ait, özgün fikirleri içermesi	1.00	5.00	3.20	1.25	1.56
5	Takipçi sayısının takip edilenden çok daha fazla olması	1.00	3.00	1.80	0.87	0.76
6	Giyim tarzının kurum kültürüne uygun olması	1.00	4.00	2.50	0.81	0.65
7	Adayın çok yönlü olduğunu gösteren hobileri, spor aktiviteleri, yardım etkinlikleri ve sosyal sorumluluk projelerine dair paylaşımlar yapması	2.00	4.00	3.50	0.67	0.45

Appendix A (Continued)

8	Güncel olayları takip etmesi ve bu olaylara dair nitelikli yorumlar yapması	2.00	5.00	3.30	0.78	0.61
9	Kendi uzmanlık alanı ile ilgili öğretici paylaşımlar yapması	3.00	5.00	4.10	0.54	0.29
10	Başkalarına ait paylaştığı yazıların kaynağının uzman ve güvenilir olması	1.00	4.00	3.40	0.92	0.84
11	Alanıyla ilgili gündemi takip etmesi ve güncel paylaşımlar yapması	3.00	5.00	4.30	0.64	0.41
12	Paylaşımlarının profesyonel niteliklerini destekler nitelikte olması	2.00	5.00	3.90	0.83	0.69
13	Profilin profesyonel bir imaj çizmesi	1.00	5.00	3.20	1.25	1.56
14	Profilin adayın yaratıcılık seviyesini göstermesi	1.00	5.00	2.90	1.04	1.09
15	Profilin kurum kültürü ile uyumlu bir izlenim vermesi	1.00	5.00	3.80	0.98	0.96
16	Kişilik özelliklerine dair olumlu izlenim vermesi	1.00	5.00	3.50	1.02	1.05
17	Kazanılan ödüllerin görülmesi ve adayın profesyonel çevresinin yaptığı yorumların olumlu olması	3.00	4.00	3.80	0.40	0.16

Appendix A (Continued)

18	Takipçi sayısının takip edilenden çok daha az olması	1.00	4.00	2.20	1.17	1.36
19	Sürekli olarak şikâyet eden, olumsuz içerikler paylaşması	2.00	4.00	2.90	0.83	0.69
20	Paylaştığı fotoğrafların hep tek başına olması, benmerkezci izlenim yaratan profil içerikleri	1.00	4.00	2.60	0.92	0.84
21	Kurum kültürü ile uyumlu olmayan siyasi görüşleri destekleyen paylaşımlar yapması	2.00	5.00	3.60	1.11	1.24
22	Profesyonel olmayan kullanıcı/hesap ismi	1.00	5.00	2.90	1.22	1.49
23	Yazım hataları ve dili düzgün kullanmaması	1.00	5.00	3.30	1.35	1.81
24	Herhangi bir görüşte (din, siyaset vb.) radikal paylaşımlar yapması	2.00	5.00	3.60	0.92	0.84
25	Görüşlerini ifade ederken ya da savunurken agresif bir tutum göstermesi	3.00	5.00	4.00	0.63	0.40
26	Özgeçmişindeki bilgilerle çelişen bilgilerin bulunması	4.00	5.00	4.60	0.49	0.24
27	Başkalarını incitici, rahatsız edici, belirli bir gruba yönelik (cinsiyet, cinsel yönelim, politik grup vb.) saldırgan, tehdit içeren paylaşımlar yapması	3.00	5.00	4.30	0.78	0.61

63

Appendix A (Continued)

28	Giyim tarzının kurum kültürüne uygun olmaması	1.00	4.00	2.50	1.20	1.45
29	Provakatif ya da uygunsuz fotoğraf, video ya da bilgi paylaşması	2.00	5.00	3.70	0.78	0.61
30	Alkol ya da uyuşturucu kullandığını gösteren paylaşımlarının olması	1.00	4.00	2.80	0.98	0.96
31	Önceki çalıştığı yeri, yöneticisini ya da iş arkadaşlarını kötülemesi	2.00	5.00	3.80	0.87	0.76
32	Suç içeren davranışların bulunması	3.00	5.00	4.30	0.78	0.61
33	Önceki iş yeri ile ilgili gizli bilgileri paylaşması	4.00	5.00	4.70	0.46	0.21
34	Çok sık paylaşımda bulunması	1.00	4.00	1.80	0.87	0.76
35	İçeriklerinde argo/küfür kullanması	1.00	5.00	3.50	1.12	1.25
36	Cinsel içerikli paylaşımlarda bulunması	1.00	5.00	3.70	1.35	1.81

B. SUMMARY JOB DESCRIPTION AND JOB SPECIFICATION

Bireysel ve Ticari Bankacılık Uzmanı

Özet İş Tanımı

•Mevcut müşteri ilişkilerinin devamlılığını sağlamak ve geliştirmek,

•Belirlenen sektörler içinde mevcut ürünlerinin satışının gerçekleştirilebileceği potansiyel müşterileri belirlemek,

•Potansiyel müşterilere ziyarette bulunarak ürünleri pazarlamak ve yeni müşteriler kazanmak,

•Belirlenen standartlar dahilinde müşterilere teklif sunmak, sunulan teklifleri takip etmek ve satışları gerçekleştirmek,

•Gerçekleştirilen satış sonuçlarına ilişkin raporlama yapmak,

•Sektördeki eğilim, değişim ve gelişmeleri takip ederek ürün sürecine katkıda bulunmak.

Özet İş Gerekleri

•Üniversitelerin 4 yıllık örgün eğitim veren fakültelerinin ilgili bölümlerinden mezun (İktisat, işletme, ekonomi vb.) olmak,

•Bankacılık alanında en az 3 yıl tecrübe,

•Gelişmeye ve öğrenmeye açık olma,

•Müşteri ve başarı odaklı olma,

•Takım çalışmasına yatkınlık,

•Planlama ve organizasyon becerisi,

•Analitik düşünme yeteneği

C. PRESENTATION OF FACTORS' DISTRIBUTION IN THE APPLICANT PROFILES

Candidate No	Name Surname	Age	Gender	F1	F2	F3	F4	F5	F6
		Block 1							
64	Zehra Ünal	27	F	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	Mustafa Özer	27	M	0	0	0	0	0	1
2	Sezen Aktaş	28	F	0	0	0	0	1	0
3	Merve Ateş	29	F	0	0	0	0	1	1
4	Gamze Kılıç	30	F	0	0	0	1	0	0
5	Şükrü Korkmaz	28	M	0	0	0	1	0	1
6	Serkan Bozkurt	29	M	0	0	0	1	1	0
7	Halil Öztürk	30	M	0	0	0	1	1	1
56	Yeliz Yalçın	27	F	1	1	1	0	0	0
57	Meltem Avcı	28	F	1	1	1	0	0	1
58	Ebru Aslan	29	F	1	1	1	0	1	0
59	Ayten Polat	30	F	1	1	1	0	1	1
60	Uğur Kurt	27	M	1	1	1	1	0	0
61	Yılmaz Çiftçi	28	M	1	1	1	1	0	1
62	Yaşar Özcan	29	M	1	1	1	1	1	0
63	Süleyman Yıldırım	30	M	1	1	1	1	1	1

Candidate No	Name Surname	Age	Gender	F1	F2	F3	F4	F5	F6
		Block 2							
8	Yasin Aydın	27	M	0	0	1	0	0	0
9	Deniz Yıldırım	27	F	0	0	1	0	0	1
10	Ömer Çakır	28	M	0	0	1	0	1	0
11	Orhan Güler	29	M	0	0	1	0	1	1
12	Furkan Kaya	30	M	0	0	1	1	0	0
13	Yağmur Yüksel	28	F	0	0	1	1	0	1
14	Müge Özdemir	29	F	0	0	1	1	1	0
15	Sezen Yılmaz	30	F	0	0	1	1	1	1
48	Salih Yıldız	27	M	1	1	0	0	0	0
49	Burak Şen	28	M	1	1	0	0	0	1
50	Yunus Gül	29	M	1	1	0	0	1	0
51	Bayram Doğan	30	M	1	1	0	0	1	1
52	Zeynep Çelik	27	F	1	1	0	1	0	0
53	Melis Aksoy	28	F	1	1	0	1	0	1
54	Sena Kara	29	F	1	1	0	1	1	0
55	Gülşah Acar	30	F	1	1	0	1	1	1

Block 3									
Candidate No	Name Surname	Age	Gender	F1	F2	F3	F4	F5	F6
16	Filiz Özer	27	F	0	1	0	0	0	0
17	Ali Güneş	27	M	0	1	0	0	0	1
18	Selma Can	28	F	0	1	0	0	1	0
19	Sude Özkan	29	F	0	1	0	0	1	1
20	Hilal Bulut	30	F	0	1	0	1	0	0
21	Ramazan Ünal	28	M	0	1	0	1	0	1
22	Yılmaz Işık	29	M	0	1	0	1	1	0
23	Adem Kaplan	30	M	0	1	0	1	1	1
40	Canan Şahin	27	F	1	0	1	0	0	0
41	İlayda Sarı	28	F	1	0	1	0	0	1
42	Sevilay Demir	29	F	1	0	1	0	1	0
43	Didem Çetin	30	F	1	0	1	0	1	1
44	Abdullah Keskin	27	M	1	0	1	1	0	0
45	Musa Tekin	28	M	1	0	1	1	0	1
46	Fatih Turan	29	M	1	0	1	1	1	0
47	Kadir Taş	30	M	1	0	1	1	1	1

Block 4									
Candidate No	Name Surname	Age	Gender	F1	F2	F3	F4	F5	F6
32	Doruk Sözeri	27	M	1	0	0	0	0	0
33	Çiğdem Şimşek	27	F	1	0	0	0	0	1
34	Erdoğan Nalbant	28	M	1	0	0	0	1	0
35	Necati İşgören	29	M	1	0	0	0	1	1
36	Tarık Güven	30	M	1	0	0	1	0	0
37	Büşra Zeybek	28	F	1	0	0	1	0	1
38	Nihan Yalçıntaş	29	F	1	0	0	1	1	0
39	Ece Tokgöz	30	F	1	0	0	1	1	1
24	Anıl Fındıkçı	27	M	0	1	1	0	0	0
25	Ziya Doğramacı	28	M	0	1	1	0	0	1
26	Erhan Çınar	29	M	0	1	1	0	1	0
27	Taylan Boztepe	30	M	0	1	1	0	1	1
28	Aysu Parlak	27	F	0	1	1	1	0	0
29	Ayşe Kürkçü	28	F	0	1	1	1	0	1
30	Dilan Hancı	29	F	0	1	1	1	1	0
31	Elif Eroğlu	30	F	0	1	1	1	1	1

Note. F1: Sharing secret information about previous companies, F2: Conflicting information about candidate's resume and professional background, F3: Disturbing sharing about minorities, women, homosexual people etc., F4: Sharing about job-

related topics which are newsworthy and educational, F5: Creating an impression to be congruent with organizational culture, F6: Being actively involved in sport activities, social responsibility projects etc., 1: This information can be found on the social media profile of the candidate, 0: This information cannot be inferred from social media profile of the candidate.

D. SAMPLE CANDIDATE SOCIAL MEDIA REPORTS AND RATING SCALE

LÜTFEN ÖZET RAPORU DİKKATLİCE OKUDUKTAN SONRA DEĞERLENDİRMENİZİ YAPINIZ!

Sosyal Medya Özet Raporu

Ad Soyad: Zehra Ünal

Cinsiyet: Kadın Yaş: 27

- Adayın, daha önce çalıştığı kurumlarla ilgili herhangi bir paylaşıma rastlanmamıştır.
- Adayın profilinde, başvuru formunda ve özgeçmişinde verdiği bilgilerle çelişen ya da onları destekleyen bir bilgi bulunmamaktadır.
- Adayın paylaşımlarında farklı gruplara karşı tutumunu belli eden içerikler görülmemiştir.
- Adayın sosyal medyada mesleki konularla ilgili nadiren bazı paylaşımlarda bulunduğu görülmektedir.
- Aday profilinde kurumumuz kültürü ile ilişkilendirilebilecek bir içerik bulunmamaktadır.
- Aday profili adayın iş dışında aktif rol aldığı hobileri, spor aktiviteleri, yardım etkinlikleri ve sosyal sorumluluk projeleri olup olmadığına dair herhangi bir bilgi vermemektedir.

ŞİMDİ BU ADAY İÇİN DEĞERLENDİRMENİZİ YAPINIZ

Kesinlikle davet etmem	Kesinlikle davet ederim

0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100

()	

LÜTFEN ÖZET RAPORU DİKKATLİCE OKUDUKTAN SONRA DEĞERLENDİRMENİZİ YAPINIZ!

Sosyal Medya Özet Raporu

Ad Soyad: Süleyman Yıldırım

Cinsiyet: Erkek

Yaş: 30

- Adayın, daha önce çalıştığı kurumlarla ilgili gizlilik mahiyeti taşıyan bazı bilgileri paylaştığı görülmüştür.
- Adayın profilinde, yer alan bazı bilgiler başvuru formu ve özgeçmişinde verdiği bilgilerle çelişmektedir.
- Adayın profilinde farklı gruplara yönelik incitici, rahatsız edici, saldırgan ve tehdit içeren paylaşımlar görülmüştür.
- Adayın paylaşımları arasında bankacılık ve finans sektörü ile ilgili güncel ve öğretici paylaşımlara çok sıklıkla rastlanmakta olup bu paylaşımlara profesyonel çevresinden olumlu yorumlar almıştır.
- Adayın profiline bakıldığında kurumumuzun kültürü ile uyumlu bir şekilde çalışabileceğini gösteren bir izlenimi uyanmaktadır.
- Adayın profilinde aktif olarak ilgilendiği hobileri, spor aktiviteleri, yardım etkinlikleri ve sosyal sorumluluk projeleri ile ilgili paylaşımlar bulunmaktadır.

ŞİMDİ BU ADAY İÇİN DEĞERLENDİRMENİZİ YAPINIZ

	Kesinlikle davet etmem	Kesinlikle davet ederim
	0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100	
()		

E. DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION FORM

Cinsiyetiniz

o   Kadın (1)

o   Erkek (2)

Yaşınız

_____

Şu an çalışmakta olduğunuz kurumda kaç yıldır çalışıyorsunuz?

_____

Kariyeriniz boyunca toplamda kaç yıldır çalışıyorsunuz?

_____

Çalışmakta olduğunuz kurumdaki pozisyonunuzu en iyi ifade eden seçeneği işaretleyiniz.

o   Uzman Yardımcısı (1)

o   Uzman (2)

o   Danışman (3)

o   Alt Kademe Yönetici (4)

o   Orta Kademe Yönetici (5)

o   Üst Kademe Yönetici (6)

o   Yönetim Kurulu Üyesi (7)

o   Diğer (8)

_____

Aşağıdaki seçeneklerden çalıştığınız birimi en iyi tanımlayanı lütfen seçiniz.

O   İnsan Kaynakları (1)

o   Danışmanlık (2)

o   Diğer (4)

_____

İnsan Kaynakları alanında görev ve sorumluluklarınızın en büyük kısmını oluşturan fonksiyon hangisidir? (Birden fazla seçeneği işaretleyebilirsiniz.)

☐   İşe Alım/ Seçme ve Yerleştirme (1)

☐   Performans Yönetimi (2)

☐   Eğitim ve Geliştirme (3)

☐   Özlük ve Bordro İşlemleri (4)

☐   Organizasyonel Gelişim (5)

☐   Endüstriyel İlişkiler (6)

☐   İş Değerleme ve Ücretlendirme (7)

☐   İş Güvenliği ve Çalışan Sağlığı (8)

☐   İş Analizi ve İş Dizaynı (9)

☐   Diğer (10)

_____

Çalıştığınız kurumu en iyi tanımlayan seçeneği işaretleyiniz.

O   Kamu (1)

o   Özel sektör (2)

o   Diğer (3)

_____

Şu an çalıştığınız kurumun faaliyet gösterdiği sektörü seçiniz.

Ajans-Fuar-Organizasyon

Akademi-Yüksek Öğretim

Araştırma

Bankacılık

Basın-Yayın/Matbaa

Bilişim

Cam ve Seramik

Çağrı Merkezi

Danışmanlık

Dayanıklı Tüketim

Demir-Çelik

Denetim

Denizcilik ile ilgili Üretim& Hizmetler

Eğitim

Eğlence-Sanat

Elektrik-Elektronik

Enerji

Finansal Hizmet

Gayrimenkul

Gıda

Güvenlik/Koruma Hizmetleri

Kimya/Kimyasal Ürünler

Kozmetik

Lojistik/Taşımacılık

Madencilik

Mağazacılık

Medya/Televizyon/Radyo/Film

Mimarlık/Dizayn

Mobilya

Mühendislik Hizmetleri

Otomasyon

Otomotiv

Perakendecilik/Toptancılık

Petrol ve Ürünleri

Reklam ve Tanıtım

Sağlık/Hastane

Savunma Sanayii

Sigorta

Silahlı Kuvvetler

Sivil Toplum Kuruluşları

Spor

Tekstil

Telekomünikasyon

Tıbbi Malzeme

Turizm/Otelcilik

Üretim/İmalat

Yapı/İnşaat

Ziraat/Hayvancılık

Diğer/Belirtmek istemiyor

F. INFORMED CONSENT FORM

ARAŞTIRMAYA GÖNÜLLÜ KATILIM FORMU

Bu çalışma ODTÜ Psikoloji Bölümü yüksek lisans öğrencisi Seren Burak Özkum tarafından ODTÜ Psikoloji Bölümü öğretim üyesi Prof. Hayriye Canan Sümer danışmanlığında yürütülmektedir. Bu form sizi araştırma koşulları hakkında bilgilendirmek için hazırlanmıştır.

Çalışmanın Amacı Nedir?

Bu çalışmanın temel amacı adayların sosyal medya profillerinden edinilen bilgilerin işe alım yetkililerinin kararlarını ne kadar etkilediğinin incelenmesidir.

Bize Nasıl Yardımcı Olmanızı İsteyeceğiz?

Çalışmanın başında size verilen yönergede belirtildiği üzere belirli bir pozisyonun işe alımından sorumlu olan bir işe alım yöneticisi olduğunuz ve adayların sosyal medya profillerindeki bilgileri inceleyerek bir değerlendirme yapmanız istenecektir. Çalışma süreci boyunca size, söz konusu pozisyona başvuran adayların işe alım uzmanları tarafından hazırlanmış sosyal medya özet raporları sunulacaktır. Sizden istenen her adayı inceledikten sonra, karşınıza çıkacak kaydırma butonunu kullanarak, adayı mülakata çağırma olasılığınızı işaretlemenizdir.

Katılımınızla ilgili bilmeniz gerekenler:

Bu çalışmaya katılmak tamamen gönüllülük esasına dayalıdır. Herhangi bir yaptırıma veya cezaya maruz kalmadan çalışmaya katılmayı reddedebilir veya çalışmayı bırakabilirsiniz. Katılımcıların sağladığı veriler tamamen gizli tutulacak, sadece araştırmacılar tarafından ulaşabilecektir. Bu araştırmanın sonuçları bilimsel ve profesyonel yayın ve/veya eğitim amaçlı kullanılabilir, fakat katılımcıların kimliği hiçbir koşulda paylaşılmayacaktır.

Riskler:

Çalışma, katılımcıların fiziksel ya da psikolojik sağlığını etkileyecek herhangi bir risk barındırmamaktadır.

Araştırmayla ilgili daha fazla bilgi almak isterseniz:

Çalışmayla ilgili soru ve yorumlarınızı araştırmacıya ozkum.burak@metu.edu.tr adresinden iletebilirsiniz.

Yukarıdaki bilgileri okudum ve bu çalışmaya tamamen gönüllü olarak katılıyorum.

Evet   Hayır

G. TURKISH SUMMARY/TÜRKÇE ÖZET

GİRİŞ

Teknolojideki gelişmeler ve iş dünyasındaki sürekli değişimler sonucunda insan kaynakları (İK) departmanlarının da bu değişimlere ayak uydurmaları gerekti (Davison, Maraist, Hamilton, & Bing, 2012). İşe alımcılar işe alım kararı vermeden önce aday hakkında genel yetenek testleri, kişilik envanterleri, değerlendirme merkezleri uygulamaları, mülakatlar, referans kontrolleri ve şimdi de sosyal medya profillerini kullanarak bilgi toplamaktadırlar (Chamorro-Premuzic, Winsborough, Sherman, & Hogan, 2016).

Sosyal medyadaki bilgilerin personel seçme ve yerleştirme amacı ile kullanılması görece yeni bir trend olup birçok akademisyen ve uygulayıcı tarafından (ör. Clark & Roberts, 2010) eleştirilmektedir. Öte yandan bu trend sahada artan bir popülarite ile kullanılmaktadır (Careerbuilder, 2016). Bulgular organizasyonların Facebook, Twitter, LinkedIn gibi sosyal medya sitelerini ve arama motorlarını kullanarak adaylar hakkında bilgi topladıklarını ve çalışan cezbetme, aday tarama, terfi ve işe alım gibi kararları vermekte kullandığını göstermektedir (Berkelaar, 2014; Clark & Roberts, 2010; Kluemper & Rosen, 2009). Bu çalışmanın amacı sosyal medyadaki bilgilerin işe alımcıların ve işverenlerin işe alım kararlarını nasıl etkilediğini ilke yakalama ('*policy capturing*') yöntemi ile incelemektir. İlke yakalama, karar vericilerin mevcut bilgilere dayanarak nasıl muhakemeler yaptığını, karara ulaşırken mevcut bilgilere nasıl ve ne kadar önem/ağırlık verdiklerini değerlendirmek için kullanılan regresyon temelli bir tekniktir (Zedeck, 1977).

Temel İK Fonksiyonları Olarak Çalışan Seçme ve Yerleştirme

Farr ve Tippins (2010), çalışan seçimini "işverenlerin organizasyon içerisindeki belirli bir iş ya da rol için hangi bireyleri seçecekleri dair karar vermek için kullandıkları süreçler" (sf. 1) olarak tanımlamaktadır. Kurumlar adaylarla ilgili en doğru bilgileri almak ve nihayetinde en iyi adayı işe almak için yatırımlar yapmaktadır.

Careerbuilder (2012) tarafından yapılan bir ankete göre ankete katılan işverenlerin %40'ından fazlası kötü bir işe alım kararının kendilerine 25.000 dolardan fazla maliyet yarattığını ifade etmiştir. Dolayısı ile işe alım kalitesini arttırmak için harcanan kaynaklar ilgili maliyetlere değmektedir.

Çalışan Seçiminde Kullanılan Test, Teknik ve Yöntemlerin Geçerlilikleri

Çalışan ya da personel seçmenin amacı, adayların bilgi, beceri, yetenek ve diğer özelliklerini ölçerek gelecek iş performansı, uyum ve diğer ilgili çıktılarla ilgili tahmin yapabilmektir (Farr & Tippins, 2010). Bu amaca uygun olarak da çalışan seçiminde kullanılan enstrümanlar bu tahminleri yapmakta ne kadar doğrularsa, kurum için o kadar değerlidirler (Buzea, 2007) ve bu da büyük ölçüde psikometrik kalite indeksleri olan güvenilirlik ve geçerlilik ile belirlenmektedir. Hunter, Schmidt ve Judiesch (2010) yordama geçerliliği yüksek olan seçme yöntemlerinin artan çalışan performansı, örgütsel çıktılar ve öğrenme ile ilişkili olduğunu ifade etmektedir. Ayrıca, testlerin yordama geçerliliği ile ekonomik faydası arasında da bir ilişki bulunmaktadır (Brogden, 1949; Schmidt & Hunter, 1998).

Çalışan seçme yöntemlerinin tahmin gücü gözlemlenebilir şekilde farklılıklar göstermektedir. Farklı çalışmalar genel bilişsel yeteneğin iş performansını en iyi tahmin eden özellik olarak göstermektedir (ör. Hunter, 1986; Ree, Earles & Teachout, 1994). Scmidt ve diğerleri (2016) meta analiz çalışmalarında çalışan seçme yöntemlerinin detaylı bir listesini vermiş olup bu yöntemlerin geçerliliklerini de ortaya koymuştur (bkz. Tablo 1).

Küresel Olarak En Sıklıkla Kullanılan Çalışan Seçme Yöntemleri

Birçok çalışan seçme yöntemi dünyanın dört bir tarafındaki şirketlerce sıklıkla kullanılmakta olsa da bazı yöntemlerin kullanımında ülkelere bağlı olarak farklılık gözlemlenmektedir. Bu farklılıkların dışında genel yetenek testleri, iş bilgisi testleri, kişilik envanterleri, biyografik veriler, dürüstlük testleri, mülakatlar, fiziksel form testleri, durumsal muhakeme testleri, iş örneklemleri, değerlendirme merkezleri ve

tavsiye mektupları en sık kullanılan çalışan seçme yöntemleridir (SHRM, 2005; Chamorro-Premuzic & Furnam, 2010; Schmidt ve diğerleri, 2016).

Türkiye'deki Çalışan Seçme Uygulamaları

Sözer (2004) tarafından yapılmış olan yüksek lisans tez çalışmasında Türkiye'de en çok kullanılan seçme yöntemleri olarak mülakatlar, referanslar, kişilik envanterleri, biyografik veriler, mesleki testler, değerlendirme merkezleri, yabancı dil testleri ve genel yetenek testleri gösterilmektedir. Diğer çalışmalarda Çiftçi ve Öztürk (2013) ile Sarılar (2006) benzer bulgulara işaret etmektedir. Bu bulgular Türkiye'de kullanılan seçme yöntemlerinin küresel uygulamalara yakın olduğunu göstermektedir. Öz, Keklik ve Kılıç (2015) Türk şirketlerinin sosyal medyayı bir tarama aracı olarak kullandıklarını ama bu uygulanmanın küresel çaptaki kadar yaygın olmadığını göstermiştir.

Çalışan Seçiminde Sosyal Medya Kullanımı

Son on yıldaki teknolojik gelişmeler ve sosyal medya ağlarının ortaya çıkması insanların hayatlarında yeni bir iletişim yöntemi yaratmıştır (Shapiro & Margolin, 2014). Sosyal medya ağlarının giderek artan popülaritesi ve adaylarla ilgili sağladıkları bilgiler birçok şirketin sosyal medyayı artan bir şekilde işe alım sistemlerinde kullanmalarına yol açmıştır. Farklı çalışmalar (ör. Careerbuilder, 2016; Levinson, 2010; Shea ve Wesley, 2006; SHRM, 2016) katılımcıların %40 ile %73 arasındaki oranlarda sosyal medya profillerini işe alım süreçlerinde kullandıklarını ve bu oranın giderek artma eğiliminde olduğunu göstermektedir. Avrupa'da yapılan çalışmalar da (ör. Caers & Castelyns, 2011; Melanthiou, Pavlou, & Constantinou, 2015) benzer sonuçlar göstermektedir.

Sosyal medya ağlarının birçok kişi tarafından kullanılması sebebi ile işe alımcılar adaylarla ilgili iş ile alakalı ya da kişisel birçok bilgiye ulaşabilmektedir. Adayların profillerini ziyaret eden şirketler adayın ilgileri, yaşı, etnik kökeni, inançları, cinsel yönelimi, medeni hali, iş durumu, iş geçmişi, iş dışındaki davranışları ve siyasi görüşleri gibi bilgilere erişebilmektedir (Gross & Acquisti, 2005; Madera,

2012). Günümüzde sosyal medya taramaları geleneksel yöntemleri tamamlar nitelikte görülse de gelecekte onların yerini alabilecek potansiyelleri olduğu iddia edilmektedir (Berkelaar, 2017).

Sosyal Medya Sitelerinin Çalışan Seçmede Kullanılmasının Avantajları

Sosyal medya siteleri işverenlerce ucuz ve hızlı bir şekilde adaya dair bilgi sağladıkları için tercih edilmektedir (Clark & Roberts, 2010). Bazı bilim insanları sosyal medya bilgilerinin kişilik özelliklerinin ölçümünde kullanılabileceği, adayın verdiği çelişkili bilgileri gözlemlemekte kullanılabileceği, daha sonra adayla ilgili eksik bilgiden kaynaklanan sorunları önceden gösterebileceği gibi avantajları olduğunu ifade etmiştir (Elzweig & Peeples, 2009). Farklı çalışmalar (ör. Kleumper & Rosen, 2009; Park ve diğerleri, 2015; Vazarie & Gosling, 2004) sosyal medya profillerinin kişilik özellikleri ile ilişkilerini gösteren bulgular sunmaktadır. Kişilik özellikleri dışında sosyal medyadaki bilgilerin adayların tutum ve bilişsel yetenekleri ile ilgili doğru bilgi verdiği de ifade edilmiştir (Chamorro-Premuzic ve diğerleri, 2016). Ayrıca, çalışan seçmede kullanılan özgeçmiş ve mülakat gibi geleneksel yöntemler adayın maksimal performansı ile ilgili bilgi verirken (Sackett, 2007) sosyal medya taramaları adayın konfor alanındaki tipik performansı ile ilgili bilgiler verebilir (Black & Johnson, 2012).

Sosyal Medya Sitelerinin Çalışan Seçmede Kullanılmasının Dezavantajları

Sosyal medyanın çalışan seçiminde kullanılmasına dair bahsedilen avantajlarının yanı sıra birçok da dezavantajı bulunmaktadır. İlk olarak bu uygulamanın geçerlilik ve güvenilirliğine dair çok az bilgi bulunmaktadır (Madera, 2012). Ayrıca adayların sosyal medya kullanım stillerinin farklı olmasından kaynaklı olarak elde edilen bilgi seviyeleri farklılık göstermektedir (Black & Johnson, 2012). Dahası, bireyler sosyal medya profillerinde olduklarından daha komik, karizmatik ya da sosyal olarak kabul edilebilir izlenimler yarattığından gerçek özelliklerini sergilemeyebilirler (Smith & Kidder, 2010). Bazı sosyal medya platformları arkadaş ve aile üyeleri ile paylaşım yapmak amacıyla kullanıldığı için buradan edinilen

78

bilgilerin işe alım amacıyla kullanılmasının gizlilik ihlaline sebep olabileceği tartışılmaktadır. Ek olarak, sosyal medya profilindeki etnik köken, cinsel yönelim, politik görüş gibi bilgilerin bu amaçla kullanılması ayrımcılığa sebep olup hukuksal problemler yaratabilir (Van Iddekinge ve diğerleri, 2014). Gittikçe artan kullanımına rağmen, çoğu firmanın sosyal medyanın işe alım süreçlerinde nasıl kullanılacağına dair resmi bir politikası bulunmamaktadır. Bu uygulamaya karşı olan aday tepkileri genelde negatif olarak rapor edilmiştir (Stroughton, Thompson, Meade, & Wilson, 2012).

İşe Alımcıların Kararlarını Etkileyen Sosyal Medya İçerikleri

Sosyal medyada bulunan bilgiler adayın diğer adaylara karşı avantajlı ya da dezavantajlı konuma geçmesine sebep olabilmektedir. Careerbuilder (2016) anketine göre işe alımcıların %48'i sosyal medya taramalarında adayı elemelerine sebep olan bilgiler bulmuştur. Aynı ankete katılan profesyonellerin %32'si adayların profillerinde işe alım kararına katkıda bulunan içerikler bulduklarını söylemiştir. Özetle çalışmalar, sosyal medya bilgilerinin daha çok, eleme amaçlı kullanıldığını göstermektedir. Olumsuz bilgilere daha fazla ağırlık verilmesi olumsuzluk önyargısı olarak tanımlanmıştır (Rozin & Royzman, 2001). Araştırmalar bu önyargının çalışan seçimi bağlamında da geçerli olduğunu göstermiştir (Rowe, 1984).

Sosyal Medya Sitelerindeki İnsan Yargısını Etkileyen İpuçları

Sosyal medyanın işe alım süreçlerinde kullanılması ile ilgili bir başka konu da mevcut bilginin bilinçli ya da bilinçaltı düzeyde nasıl işlendiğidir. Muhakeme süreçleri önyargılara maruzdur ve işe alım süreçleri de bu önyargılardan bağımsız değildir. Sosyal medya ağları işe alımcılara potansiyel olarak önyargı yaratabilecek bilgileri açıkça sunmaktadır. Örneğin, sosyal medya profillerinde bulunan fotoğraflar çekicilik, cinsiyet, fiziksel özellikler, yaş ve cinsiyet-rol uyumu gibi önyargıları tetikleyecek bilgiler verebilir. Bu tarz iş ile ilgisiz bilgilerin yaratacağı önyargılar ve bunlara bağlı işe alım kararları ise ayrımcılık yaratarak yasal sorunlara yol açabilir (Black & Johnson, 2012).

İşe Alımla İlgili Kararlara İstatistiksel Bir Yaklaşım Olarak İlke Yakalama

"İlke yakalama, katılımcılara araştırmacı tarafından sunulan karar verme ya da problem çözme senaryolarına karşılık kararlar vermeleri istenen regresyon temelli bir yöntemdir. Araştırmacı senaryolara yerleştirilmiş bir ya da daha fazla ipucu ile bağımlı değişkeni regresyona dahil edip regresyon ağırlıkları doğrultusunda katılımcıların muhakeme ilkeleri ile ilgili çıkarımlar yapar" (Aiman-Smith ve diğerleri, 2002, sf. 390). Zedeck (1977) bu yöntemin amacının bireylerin bilgileri nasıl ağırlandırdıklarını, birleştirdiklerini ve entegre ettiklerini anlamak olduğunu belirtmiştir.

İlke yakalama yönteminin geleneksel yöntemlere karşı oldukça fazla avantajı bulunmaktadır. Özbildirime dayalı yöntemler düşük geçerlilik düzeyleri (Hitt & Middlemist, 1979; Stumpf & London, 1981) ve sosyal istenirlik problemleri (Arnold & Feldman, 1981; Judge & sebebiyle eleştirilmektedir. Ayrıca ilke yakalama araştırmacıya uyarıcıları sistematik olarak örnekleme, kirletici değişkenler üzerinde kontrol sağlama, titiz ölçümleme yapma ve genelleştirilebilir sonuçlar elde etme imkanı tanımaktadır (Carroll & Johnson, 1990). Bunların yanında, ilke yakalama, araştırmacının ipucu değişkenlerini (ya da potansiyel olarak karar vermede kullanılan faktörleri) deneysel olarak manipüle etmesine olanak sağlar. Son olarak, ilke yakalama yöntemi, hangi ipucu değişkenlerinin bireylerin kararını etkilediğini anlamak ve bu bireysel analizlerin kombine edilmesi ile bireysel farkları inceleyebilmek için ve de karar vericilerin farklı ipuçlarını nasıl grupladıklarını ve benzer karar verme eğiliminde olan spesifik karar verici gruplarının varlıklarını görmek için kullanılabilir. İlke yakalama yönteminin doğası gereği hem katılımcılar içi hem de katılımcılar arası farkları gözettiği için bu tip dizaynların görece düşük örneklem büyüklükleri ile yeterli istatistiksel güç sağladıkları da ifade edilmiştir (Cohen & Cohen, 1983).

Bu avantajlarının yanı sıra bu yaklaşıma karşı yapılan eleştiriler arasında, karar vericilerin kararlarını sabit sayıdaki ipuçlarına göre vermedikleri, bu kararların duruma ve şartlara göre değişebileceği, hipotetik insanlarla ilgili verilen kararların gerçekten farklı olabileceği ve bu durumda gerçek durumların zenginliğinden mahrum

olacağı sıralanmaktadır (Aiman-Smith ve diğerleri, 2002; Gorman, Clover, & Doherty, 1978; Hobson & Gibson, 1983).

Mevcut Çalışma

Bu çalışma sosyal medyadaki ipuçlarının işe alım kararlarını nasıl etkilediğini anlamayı amaçlamaktadır. Belirtildiği üzere adayların sosyal medya profilleri üzerinden taranması giderek artan bir uygulamadır. İlke yaklaşımı yönteminin bahsedilen avantajları ile birlikte bu çalışma sosyal medyadan elde edilen ipuçlarının olumlu ya da olumsuz karar verme süreçlerini etkileyip etkilemediğini ve pozitif ve negatif bilgilerden hangisinin işe alım kararlarında daha etkili olduğunu araştırmaktadır. Dolayısı ile ilgili yazın ışığında aşağıdaki hipotezler önerilmiştir:

Hipotez 1: Sosyal medyadaki pozitif bilgiler işe alma kararı ile anlamlı bir şekilde ilgili olacaktır.

Hipotez 2: Sosyal medyadaki negatif bilgiler işe almama kararı ile anlamlı bir şekilde ilgili olacaktır.

Hipotez 3: Olumlu sosyal medya bilgilerinin işe alım kararı üzerinde açıkladığı değişkenlik oranı, negatif sosyal medya bilgilerinin işe alım kararı üzerinde açıkladığı değişkenlik oranından daha düşük olacaktır.

YÖNTEM

Katılımcılar

Kartopu örneklemi stratejisinin kullanıldığı bu çalışmanın katılımcıları aktif işe alımcılardan oluşmaktadır. Bu kapsamda 46 kadın 32 erkek olmak üzere 82 katılımcıdan bilgi toplanırken dört katılımcı demografik bilgi sağlamamıştır. Katılımcıların ortalama yaşı 35,51'dir (SS = 8,68). Katılımcılar mevcut kurumlarında ortalama 8,70 yıl (SS = 10,49) yıldır çalışırken, toplam çalışma süreleri ortalama 13,61 yıldır (SS = 11,83). Katılımcılar uzman yardımcısı, uzman, danışman, alt düzey yönetici, orta seviye yönetici, üst seviye yönetici, yönetim kurulu üyesi ve diğer pozisyonlar dahil olmak üzere farklı hiyerarşik seviyelerde işe alım süreçlerinde

çalışmaktadırlar. Atmış iki katılımcı özel, 14 katılımcı kamu kurumlarında, iki katılımcı ise diğer tip kurumlarda çalışmaktadır. Katılımcıların çalıştıkları firmaların faaliyet gösterdikleri sektörler Tablo 2'de gösterilmiştir.

Prosedür

Çalışma iki adımda tamamlanmıştır. İlk adımda adayların mülakata davet edilmesinde rol oynayabilecek faktörleri belirlemek için ön çalışmalar yapılmış olup ikinci adımda hipotetik adaylara ait özet sosyal medya raporları katılımcılara verilerek her bir adayı mülakata çağırma olasılıklarını derecelendirmeleri istenmiştir.

Ön çalışmalar içerisinde iki odak grup çalışması yapılarak profesyonel İK uzmanlarından oluşan toplam sekiz iş/konu uzmanına sosyal medyadaki hangi bilgilerin işe alım kararlarını olumlu ya da olumsuz anlamda etkileyebilecekleri sorulmuştur. Konu uzmanları tarafından dile getirilen faktörler, konu ile ilgili anket sonuçları ile birleştirilerek 36 faktörlük bir liste oluşturulmuştur (bkz. Ek A). Daha sonrasında 10 farklı İK profesyoneline bu liste verilmiş ve bu faktörlerin işe alım kararlarındaki önemlerini 5 basamaklı Likert tipi ölçekte derecelendirmeleri istenmiştir (önem derecelendirme sonuçları için Ek A'ya bakınız). Önem bakımından en yüksek derecelendirilen üç pozitif ve üç negatif faktör ana çalışmada kullanılmak üzere seçilmiştir. Her bir faktör bu bilgi adayın sosyal medya profilinden çıkarılabilir/çıkarılamaz şeklinde iki seviyeli olacak şekilde eklenmiştir. Ana çalışmaya dahil edilen altı faktör Tablo 3'te gösterilmiştir.

Ön çalışmaların arkasından üç pozitif ve üç negatif olmak üzere toplamda altı faktör iki seviyeli olarak ana çalışmaya dahil edilmiştir. Bu faktörlerin olası bütün kombinasyonlarından oluşan toplam 64 (2^6) sosyal medya özet raporu hazırlanmıştır. 64 profilin değerlendirmesi katılımcılarda bıkkınlık, yorgunluk ve dikkatsiz cevap vermeye sahip olabileceğinden dolayı (Graham & Cable, 2001) Aiman-Smith ve arkadaşları (2002) tarafından önerilen eksik bloklar ('*incomplete blocks*') yaklaşımı kullanılarak her biri 16 aday içeren dört blok oluşturulmuştur. Her bir hipotetik aday ad ve soyadı oluşturucu programlarla isimlendirilmiş olup yaş ve cinsiyetler de eşit ve dengeli bir şekilde manipüle edilmiştir. Her bir katılımcı rastgele bir bloğa atanmış

olup ilgili bloktaki hipotetik adayların sıralaması da her katılımcı için rastgele verilmiştir. Özet raporları görmeden önce katılımcılara bir bankanın işe alım yöneticisi oldukları, astları tarafından hazırlanmış özet sosyal medya raporlarını inceleyerek kurumsal işe alım politikaları çerçevesinde adayları değerlendirmeleri gerektiği ve bütün adayların minimum iş gereklerini karşıladıkları bilgilerini içeren bir yönerge verilmiş olup daha sonrasında rollerine ısınmaları için söz konusu pozisyona dair özet iş tanımları ve özet iş gerekleri verilmiştir. Katılımcılardan her bir raporu dikkatlice okuduktan sonra adayı mülakata davet etme olasılıklarını 0 ile 100 arasında belirtmeleri istenmiştir. Kendi bloklarındaki 16 adayı değerlendirdikten sonra adaylara demografik bilgi formu sunulmuş ve çalışma sona erdirilmiştir.

Araçlar

Ön çalışmalar sonucu oraya çıkan üç pozitif ve üç negatif faktör iki seviyeli olacak şekilde özet sosyal medya raporlarına entegre edilmiş olup olası bütün kombinasyonların içerildiği 64 profil hazırlanmıştır (faktörlerin profillere dağılımı için Ek C'ye ve örnek profiller için Ek D'ye bakınız).

Adayı mülakata davet etme olasılığı çalışmanın bağımlı değişkeni olarak dahil olup online platformda verilen kaydırma butonunu kullanarak 0 ile 100 arasında ölçümlenmiştir.

Demografik bilgiler olarak ise katılımcılardan cinsiyet, yaş, şu anki kurumlarında ne kadar süredir çalıştıkları, toplam çalışma süreleri, kurumsal hiyerarşideki statüleri, departmanları, en sık çalıştıkları insan kaynakları fonksiyonları, kurumlarının özel/kamu statüsü ve kurumlarının faaliyet gösterdikleri sektör bilgileri istenmiştir.

<div align="center">

SONUÇLAR

</div>

İlke yakalama yaklaşımında her bir karar verici birden fazla senaryoyu değerlendirdiğinden dolayı daha önce belirtildiği üzere hem katılımcılar içi hem de katılımcılar arası değişkenlik bulunmaktadır ve bu tarz iç-içe verilerin ('*nested data*')

bulunduğu durumlar çok seviyeli ('*multilevel*') analizler ile daha doğru ölçümlenebilmektedir. Bu sebeple hipotezlerin test edilmesi amacı ile HLM 7.03 yazılımı (Raudenbush, Bryk, & Congdon, 2017) kullanılarak 1312 işe alım kararının 82 katılımcı ile iç içe olduğu çok seviyeli bir analiz yapılmıştır.

Çoklu seviyeli analizlerde sınıf içi korelasyon (ICC) adı verilen bir gösterge katılımcılar içi değişkenliği analiz etmek için hesaplanır. Bu amaçla boş (null) bir model oluşturulmuş olup bu modelin çalıştırılması sonucu sınıf içi korelasyon değeri .315 olarak bulunmuştur. Bu değer toplam değişkenliğin %31,5'inin katılımcılara bağlı olduğunu göstermektedir ve çok seviyeli analizleri kullanmanın uygun olduğunu belirtmektedir (Lee, 2000).

Anderson (2012) tarafından önerildiği üzere aşamalı olarak önce kontrol verileri sonrasında ise ilgili değişkenler boş modelin üzerine eklenerek analiz yapılmıştır. Kontrol değişkenlerinin girilmesinin ardından elde edilen sonuçlar Tablo 5'te gösterilmiştir. Bu sonuçlara göre adayların ortalama mülakata çağırılma olasılığı 37,10 olarak bulunmuş ve adayların yaşı arttıkça mülakata davet edilme olasılığının 2,10 birim arttığı görülmüştür. Aday cinsiyetinin işe alım kararına olan etkisi ise anlamlı değildir.

Daha sonrasında altı ipucu değişkeni denkleme eklenmiş ve analiz tekrar çalıştırılmıştır. Bu adımda elde edilen sonuçlar Tablo 6'da gösterilmiştir. Analiz sonuçları, bütün ipucu değişkenlerinin, adayların yaş ve cinsiyetleri kontrol edildikten sonra, mülakata çağırılma olasılığıyla anlamlı ilişkili olduğunu göstermiştir. Bütün pozitif bilgilerin ve bütün negatif bilgilerin bağımlı değişken ile anlamlı bir şekilde ilişkili olması sebebiyle Hipotez 1 ve Hipotez 2 tamamen desteklenmiştir. İpucu değişkenlerinin modele eklenmesinin ardından kontrol değişkenlerinin ilişkisi anlamsız hale gelmiştir.

Bu sonuçlara göre 28,5 yaşında, erkek ve sosyal medya profilinden hiçbir faktörle ilgili çıkarım yapılamayan bir adayın ortalama mülakata çağırılma olasılığı 60,18 olarak bulunmuştur. Daha önce çalıştığı kurumla ilgili gizlilik mahiyeti taşıyan bilgiler paylaşan adaylar için bu olasılık 24,09 birim, sosyal medya profilleri ile başvuru formu/özgeçmişi arasında çelişen bilgiler bulunan adaylar için 8,05 birim ve

farklı gruplarla ilgili rahatsızlık verici paylaşımlar yapan adaylar için 24,34 birim düşmektedir. Pozitif bilgilerle ilgili olarak ise, bu olasılık iş ile ilgili güncel ve eğitici paylaşımlar yapıp bu paylaşımlara profesyonel çevresinden olumlu yorumlar alan adaylar için 4,49 birim, kurum kültürü ile uyumlu bir imaj çizen adaylar için 3,52 birim ve hobiler, spor aktiviteleri, yardım etkinlikleri ve sosyal sorumluluk projeleri gibi aktivitelerde aktif olarak yer alan adaylar için 2,21 birim artmaktadır.

Hipotez 3 bağımlı değişkende negatif bilgilerin açıkladığı değişkenliğin pozitif bilginin açıkladığı değişkenlikten daha fazla olacağını ileri sürmüştür. Bu hipotezi test etmek için biri sadece pozitif bilgilerden oluşan diğeri sadece negatif bilgilerden oluşan iki model oluşturularak bu modellerin açıklanamayan değişkenliği ne kadar düşürdüğünü gösteren psödo R^2 değerleri hesaplanıp karşılaştırılmıştır. Analiz sonuçlarına göre sadece negatif bilgilerin bulunduğu model açıklanamayan değişkenliği %48,2 düşürürken sadece pozitif bilgilerin bulunduğu model açıklanamayan değişkenliği %1,2 düşürmüştür, dolayısı ile Hipotez 3 de tamamen desteklenmiştir. Pozitif ve negatif bilgiler ile bunların birbirleri ile olan etkileşimlerini daha derinlemesine araştırmak için her profildeki toplam pozitif bilgi ve toplam negatif bilgi sayıları yeni değişkenler olarak kodlanmış ve etkileşim değişkeni ile birlikte denkleme sokulmuştur. Analiz sonuçları, negatif bilgi sayısı arttıkça mülakata davet edilme olasılığı 17,46 birim azalırken pozitif bilgi sayısı arttıkça bu olasılık 4,93 birim yükseldiğini göstermiştir. Etkileşim etkisi ise anlamlı bulunmamıştır.

Hipotezlerde bulunmamasına rağmen katılımcı demografik değişkenleri olan yaş, cinsiyet, kurumdaki çalışma süresi ve toplam çalışma süresinin etkileri de ikinci seviyede denkleme dahil edilerek incelenmiştir. Bu analizin sonuçları Tablo 8'de gösterilmiştir. Sonuçlara göre dört katılımcı özelliğinden hiçbiri bağımlı değişkeni tahmin etmede anlamlı değildir. Ayrıca, bu dört değişken dahil edildikten sonra daha önceden denkleme girilmiş olan altı ipucu değişkeni anlamlı olarak mülakata davet olasılığını tahmin etmeye devam etmiştir.

TARTIŞMA

Tartışma ve Çıkarımlar

Hipotez 1 ve 2 sosyal medyadaki pozitif ve negatif bilgilerin işe alımcıların adayı mülakata davet etme olasılığını anlamlı bir şekilde tahmin edeceğini önermiş ve desteklenmiştir. Yordayıcı değişkenlerin katsayılarına bakıldığında eski çalıştığı yerle ilgili gizlilik mahiyet taşıyabilecek bilgiler paylaşması ve farklı gruplarla ilgili rahatsız edici paylaşımlar yapması faktörleri en yüksek katsayılara sahipken, bunları sosyal medya profili ile başvuru formu/özgeçmiş arasında çelişkili bilgiler bulunması takip etmiştir. Pozitif bilgelere dair katsayılar ise daha küçük bulunmuştur. Katsayılarına göre sıralama yapıldığında iş ile ilgili paylaşımlar yapması ve bunlara profesyonel çevresinden olumlu yorumlar alması ilk sırada gelirken, kurum kültürü ile uyumlu bir izlenim yaratması ikinci, iş dışı aktivitelere katılması ise üçüncü sırada yer almıştır. B katsayılarının değişkenlerin görece önemlerini belirlemek için kullanılması eleştirilebilir bir yaklaşım olsa da ilke yakalama yönteminin avantajlarından birisi olan araştırmacının değişkenleri dikey (*'orthagonal'*) olarak manipüle etmesine olanak sağlaması ile B katsayıları görece önemi ölçmek için kullanılabilir duruma gelmiştir.

Bu bulgular önceki çalışılan yerle ilgili gizlilik mahiyetindeki bilgileri paylaşmak ve farklı gruplar ile ilgili rahatsız edici paylaşımlar yapmanın işe alım kararlarını en fazla etkileyen sosyal medya faktörleri olduğunu göstermektedir. Öte yandan üçüncü negatif bilgi olan sosyal medya profili ile başvuru formu/özgeçmiş arasında çelişen bilgilerin bulunması daha düşük bir katsayıya sahiptir. İlk iki faktöre bakıldığında üçüncü kişilere (önceki çalışılan kurum ve farklı gruplar) zarar verici davranışlar ön plana çıkarken diğer negatif faktörün çalışanın negatif bilgiyi saklamak ya da pozitif bilgiyi abartmak (ya da uydurmak) yoluyla kendi izlenimini olandan daha iyi hale getirmeye çalışmasının bir sonucu olabilir. Dolayısı ile karar vericilerin gözünde bu negatif bilgilerin farklı doğaları (başkalarına zarar vermek ve kendi izlenimini düzenlemek) farklı değerlendirme yapmalarına sebep olmuş olabilir.

Pozitif bilgilere bakıldığı zaman ise katsayıların daha küçük olduğu ve katsayılar arası fakların da negatiflere kıyasla daha az olduğu görülmektedir. Bu

bilgiler katsayılarına göre sıralandığında iş ile ilgili bilgi paylaşımının ön plana çıktığı görülmektedir. Bu faktör işe alımcılar tarafından belli bir bilgi birikimine sahip olmak ya da araştırmacı bir kişiliğe sahip olmak çıkarımlarının yapılmasına sebep olmuş olabilir. İkinci sıradaki faktör ise belirli bir iş koluna ya da pozisyona spesifik olmamakla birlikte kuruma özgü bir bileşen olan kurumsal kültür ile uyumu göstermektedir. Son faktör olan iş dışı faaliyetlerde yer alınması ise direkt olarak iş ya da kurum ile bağlantılı olmamakla birlikte bir ihtiyaçtan ziyade olmasının tercih edilebileceği bir 'artı bir durum' olarak görülebilir. Pozitif bilgilerdeki örüntü, bir faktörün spesifik bir iş ya da pozisyonla ne kadar ilişkili ise işe alım kararını o kadar etkilediğini göstermektedir.

Bu bilgiler ışığında adaylar için sosyal medya paylaşımlarında iş ve pozisyonla ilgili olumlu çıkarımlar yapılabilecek bilgileri paylaşmanın iyi bir strateji olabileceği ama daha önemlisi işe alımcıların gözünde negatif olarak değerlendirilebilecek bilgilerden kaçınmalarının daha kritik olduğu söylenebilir. Özellikle başkalarına bir şekilde zarar verebilecek paylaşımların yapılmasının işe alım kararlarını negatif olarak ve güçlü bir şekilde etkilediği gözlemlenmiştir.

Bu tez çalışmasının ön çalışmaları kapsamında İK profesyonelleri ile yapılan görüşmelerde sosyal medya bilgilerinin adayları değerlendirirken etkili olmadığı sözel olarak ifade edilmiştir. Ancak, bütün yordayıcıların karar verme sürecindeki etkisinin anlamlı çıkması, bilinç seviyesinde olmasa bile sosyal medya bilgilerinin, eleman seçicilerin kararlarını etkilediğini göstermektedir. Bohnert ve Ross (2010) çalışmalarında profesyonel ve aile odaklı sosyal medya profillerinin alkol temalı profillerle karşılaştırıldığında mülakata davet edilme olasılıklarının daha fazla olduğunu, daha yetkin algılandıklarını, teklif alma şanslarının arttığını, daha fazla başlangıç maaşı hak ettikleri ve öz disiplinlerinin daha yüksek olduğu çıkarımlarının yapıldığını göstermiş olup bu çalışmanın sonucu da bu bulgularla paralellik göstermektedir.

Hipotez 3'ü destekler şekilde bu çalışmada, işe alım kararlarında negatif bilginin, pozitif bilgiden daha fazla ağırlık sahibi olduğu bulunmuştur. Bu bulgu geçmiş araştırmaların sonuçları ile uyumludur. Kanar, Collins ve Bell (2010) negatif

bilgilerin işe alım dahil farklı konularda daha fazla ağırlık taşıdığını belirtmiştir. Benzer bir şekilde Baumeister, Bratslavsky, Finekenauer ve Vohs (2001) sosyal ilişkiler, önyargılar, izlenim oluşturma, duygular gibi birçok alanda negatif bilgiye daha fazla ağırlık verildiğini göstermiştir. Olumsuzluk önyargısı dışında bir başka sebep ise damgalanmış ('*stigmatized*') bireylere karşı olan farklı davranma eğilimi olabilir. Radikal görüşler ya da atipik kişilik özellikleri gibi karakteristikler kişilerin sosyal kimliklerini olumsuz etkileyebilir (Black & Johnson, 2012) ve bu kişilerin sosyal beklentilerden farklı davranışlar sergilemesi bireylerin değerden düşmelerine sebep olmuş olabilir (Kleck, 1969).

Bu çalışmada kullanılan sosyal medya bilgilerine bakıldığında bilgilerin içerikleri ve doğası da negatif bilgilerin daha etkili olmasında rol oynamış olabilir. Özellikle gizli bilgileri paylaşma ve farklı gruplarla ilgili rahatsızlık verici paylaşımlarda bulunma faktörleri kurumlar için ciddi problemler doğurabilir. Diğer yandan pozitif bilgiler tercih edilir olmakla birlikte yoklukları kurumları negatiflerin varlığı kadar ciddi etkilemeyebilir ve bu durum işe alımcıların kararlarını etkilemiş olabilir.

Sadece kontrol değişkenlerinin dahil edildiği ön analiz aday yaşı ile işe alım kararı arasında pozitif ve anlamlı bir ilişki göstermiştir. Bu bulgu çalışmadaki adayların yaş aralığının (söz konusu pozisyona başvuru yapabilecek adayların yaşını temsil edecek şekilde) oldukça dar olması (27-30) sebebiyle oldukça ilginçtir. Ayrıca daha önceki çalışmalar aday yaşı ile işle alım kararı arasında ya anlamsız (ör. Raza & Carpenter, 1987) ya da ters yönlü (ör. Gordon & Arvey, 2004; Haefner, 1977) bir ilişki bulmuştur. Bu beklenmedik sonuç için yapılabilecek bir açıklama ise yaş aralığının oldukça dar olmasının yaş önyargısına değil bu iş için gerekli tecrübeye sahip olunduğu çıkarımının yapılmasına yol açmış olabileceğidir. Diğer bir kontrol değişkeni olan aday cinsiyeti ise söz konusu pozisyonun cinsiyet ayrımı gözetmeyen bir pozisyon olması sebebi ile anlamı bir ilişki göstermemiş olabilir.

Keşfedici analizler ile katılımcı demografik özellikleri olan yaş, cinsiyet, şu anki kurumda çalışılan süre ve toplam çalışma süresinin işe alım kararı üzerinde bir etkisi olup olmadığını (ana değişkenlerden sonra) bakılmış ve bu değişkenlerin

hiçbirinin karar üzerinde anlamlı bir etkisinin olmadığı görülmüştür. İşe alım kararları ile karar verici demografikleri arasındaki ilişkileri inceleyen diğer çalışmalar da (ör. Goldberg, 2005; Graves & Powell, 1995) karar vericilerin cinsiyet ve yaşı ile işe alım kararı arasında bir ilişki bulamamışlardır.

Kısıtlar ve Gelecek Çalışmalar İçin Öneriler

Aktif işe alımcılardan oluşan örneklemin çok büyük olmaması bu çalışmanın bir kısıtlılığı olarak görülebilir. Literatür ilke yakalama çalışmalarının daha düşük örneklem büyüklükleri ile de yeterli istatistiksel güce ulaşabileceğine söylese de (Oliphant & Alexander, 1982) gelecek çalışmaların daha büyük örneklem büyüklükleri ile çalışmaları kesinlikle tavsiye edilmektedir.

Bir diğer kısıt ise çalışmada sadece altı adet sosyal medya faktörünün kullanılabilmiş (manipüle edilebilmiş) olmasıdır. Konu uzmanları tarafından yapılan derecelendirmelerde en önemli bulunan faktörler çalışmaya dahil edilmesine rağmen gerçek hayatta sosyal medya tarafından sunulan aşırı büyük bilginin yanında, bu bilgiler sınırlı kalmaktadır. Ayrıca teknik anlamda da ilke yakalama çalışmalarında yedi civarı ipucu verisinin katılımcıların bilişsel kapasitelerinin limitlerine yaklaştırdığı için daha fazlasının kullanılması tavsiye edilmemektedir (Brehmer & Brehmer, 1988; Miller, 1956). Gelecek çalışmalar farklı ipucu setleri kullanarak farklı kombinasyonların etkilerini gösterebilir ve daha bütünsel bir bakış açısı sunabilir.

Atmış dört profilin her bir katılımcı tarafından doldurulması sonucu kaynaklanabilecek sorunları (yorgunluk, bıkkınlık, olumsuz katılımcı tepkileri vb.) engellemek amacı ile bu çalışmada eksik bloklar yöntemi kullanılmıştır. Tam faktöryel dizaynlar ile karşılaştırıldığında bu uygulama her katılımcının değerlendirdiği aday sayısını düşürerek istatistiksel gücü azaltsa da diğer alternatiflere göre (fraksiyonel dizayn) dezavantajları daha az olduğu için tercih edilmektedir (Karren & Barringer, 2002).

Son olarak, altı ipucu değişkeni ile sadece ikili etkileşimler analiz edilmek istense bile 15 farklı kombinasyon oluşacağından (örneklem büyüklüğü kısıtı sebebi ile) bu çalışmada ikili ve daha üst düzey etkileşim etkileri incelenememiştir. Buna bir

çözüm olarak da toplam pozitif ve negatif bilgi sayılarının yeniden kodlanarak iki değişken halinde çalışmaya dahil edilmesi ve değişken sayısının azalmasına bağlı olarak ortaya çıkan tek (ikili) etkileşim etkisinin incelenmesi mümkün olmuştur. Gelecek çalışmalar daha büyük örneklemler kullanarak yapıldığı taktirde spesifik ipucu verilerinin birbirleriyle nasıl etkileştiği konusunda daha detaylı bilgi sunma imkanı bulacaktır.

APPENDIX H. TEZ FOTOKOPİSİ İZİN FORMU

TEZ FOTOKOPİ İZİN FORMU / THESES PHOTOCOPY PERMISSION FORM

<u>ENSTİTÜ /</u> <u>INSTITUTE</u>

Fen Bilimleri Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Natural and Applied Sciences ☐

Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Social Sciences ■

Uygulamalı Matematik Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Applied Mathematics ☐

Enformatik Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Informatics ☐

Deniz Bilimleri Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Marine Sciences ☐

<u>YAZARIN /</u> <u>AUTHOR</u>

Soyadı/Surname : ÖZKUM
Adı/Name : SEREN BURAK
Bölümü / Department : PSİKOLOJİ

<u>**TEZİN ADI /**</u> <u>TITLE OF THE THESIS</u> (**İngilizce** / English) : EFFECT OF SOCIAL MEDIA INFORMATION ON RECRUITERS' HIRING DECISION MAKING PROCESSES: A POLICY CAPTURING APPROACH

<u>**TEZİN TÜRÜ**</u> **/** <u>DEGREE</u>**:** **Yüksek Lisans**/Master ■   **Doktora** /PhD ☐

1. **Tezimin tamamı dünya çapında erişime açılsın ve kaynak gösterilmek şartıyla tezimin bir kısmı veya tamamının fotokopisi alınsın.** / Release the entire work immediately for access worldwide and photocopy whether all or part of my thesis providing that cited. ■

2. **Tezimin tamamı yalnızca Orta Doğu Teknik Üniversitesi kullancılarının erişimine açılsın. (Bu seçenekle tezinizin fotokopisi ya da elektronik kopyası Kütüphane aracılığı ile ODTÜ dışına dağıtılmayacaktır.)** / Release the entire work for Middle East Technical University access only. (With this option your work will not be listed in any research sources, and no one outside METU will be able to provide both electronic and paper copies through the Library.) ☐

3. **Tezim bir (1) yıl süreyle erişime kapalı olsun. (Bu seçenekle tezinizin fotokopisi ya da elektronik kopyası Kütüphane aracılığı ile ODTÜ dışına dağıtılmayacaktır.)** / Secure the entire work for patent and/or proprietary purposes for a period of one year. ☐

Yazarın imzası/Signature .... **Tarih** / Date 20.07.2018