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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.
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ÖZ

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

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

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


group discussions, personality inventories and interviews are being used by the bank HR departments (Sarlar, 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 (Schmidman, 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 (Vazari & Gosling, 2004). Klumper 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
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 subject 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 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.

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sectors in Which Organizations of Participants Are Operating</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Banking</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Technology</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultancy</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durable Consumer Goods</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron and Steel</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auditing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Services</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemical Products</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logistic</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Services</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Automotive</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Services</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defense Industry</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textile</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telecommunication</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture and Stock Raising</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/Do not want to indicate</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

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 Aim-an-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’s 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distribution of Participants into Blocks</th>
<th>Block 1</th>
<th>Block 2</th>
<th>Block 3</th>
<th>Block 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of participants</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.

\[
\text{Interview} = \gamma_{00} + \gamma_{10} \times \text{Age} + \gamma_{20} \times \text{Gender} + u_0 + r
\]

Table 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fixed Effect</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>t – ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>37.10</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>17.28*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate Age</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>5.51*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate Gender</td>
<td>-.37</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>-.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textbf{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.

\[
\text{Interview} = \gamma_{00} + \gamma_{10} \times \text{Factor1} + \gamma_{20} \times \text{Factor2} + \gamma_{30} \times \text{Factor3} + \gamma_{40} \\
\star \text{Factor4} + \gamma_{50} \times \text{Factor5} + \gamma_{60} \times \text{Factor6} + \gamma_{70} \\
\star \text{CandidateAge} + \gamma_{80} \times \text{CandidateGender} + u_0 + r
\]

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:

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

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.

$$Interview = \gamma_{00} + \gamma_{10} * CandidateAge + \gamma_{20} * CandidateGender + \gamma_{30} * Negative + \gamma_{40} * Positive + \gamma_{50} * Positive * Negative + u_0 + \epsilon$$
### Table 6

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>HLM Results: Number of Positive and Negative Cues and Their Interaction</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fixed Effect</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate Gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Negative Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Positive Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Negative Information * Number of Positive Information</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*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_0 + \gamma_{01} \times \text{ParticipantAge} + \gamma_{02} \times \text{CurrentTenure} + \gamma_{03} \\ \times \text{TotalTenure} + \gamma_{04} \times \text{ParticipantGender} + \gamma_{10} \times \text{Factor1} + \gamma_{20} \times \text{Factor2} + \gamma_{30} \times \text{Factor3} + \gamma_{40} \times \text{Factor4} + \gamma_{50} \times \text{Factor5} + \gamma_{60} \times \text{Factor6} + \gamma_{70} \times \text{CandidateAge} + \gamma_{80} \times \text{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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fixed Effect</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>t – ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>58.93</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>13***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level 1 Effects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing confidential information about former organization</td>
<td>-24.09</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>-9.36***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social media profile consists of information conflicting with application form/resume</td>
<td>-8.05</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>-3.03**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate made offensive and disturbing sharings about minorities</td>
<td>-24.34</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>-9.19***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate’s profile creates an impression to be congruent with organizational culture</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>2.90**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate is actively engaged in extracurricular activities such as hobbies, sports activities, aid events, and social responsibility projects</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>2.56*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fixed Effect</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>t – ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Candidate made sharings about job related topics which are newsworthy and educational and got positive comments from his/her professional network</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>4.19***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate Age</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate Gender</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Level 2 Effects**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>t – ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participant Age</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant Gender</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>5.04</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure in current organization</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total tenure</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*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.

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

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 thought 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
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 larger 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


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


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


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


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


## APPENDICES

### A. FACTORS EMERGED FROM FOCUS GROUPS AND DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Deviation</th>
<th>Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Paylaşımlarının içeriğinin olumlu olması</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Kendini etkin bir şekilde ifade etmesi</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Pozisyon ile uyumlu, profesyonel paylaşımlar yapması</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Paylaşımın başkalarının gönderileri yerine kendine ait, özgün fikirleri içermesi</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Takipçi sayısının takip edilen den çok daha fazla olması</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Giyim tarzının kurum kültürüne uygun olması</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Adayın çok yönlü olduğunu gösteren hobileri, spor aktiviteleri, yardım etkinlikleri ve sosyal sorumluluk projelerine dair paylaşımlar yapması</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Feature Description</td>
<td>Scale</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Güncel olayları takip etmesi ve bu olaylara dair nitelikli yorumlar yapması</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Kendi uzmanlık alanı ile ilgili öğretmen paylaşımlar yapması</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Başkalarına ait paylaştığı yazıların kaynağı uzman ve güvenilir olması</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Alanıyla ilgili gündemi takip etmesi ve güncel paylaşımlar yapması</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paylaşımlarının profesyonel niteliklerini destekler nitelikte olması</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Profilin profesyonel bir imaj çizmesi</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Profilin adayın yaratıcılık seviyesini göstermesi</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Profilin kurum kültürü ile uyumlu bir izlenim vermesi</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Profilin kurum kültürü ile uyumlu bir izlenim vermesi</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Kişilik özelliklerine dair olumlu izlenim vermesi</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Kazanılan ödüllerin görülmesi ve adayın profesyonel çevresinin yaptığı yorumların olumlu olması</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Takipçi sayısının takip edilenden çok daha az olması</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Sürekli olarak şikayet eden, olumsuz içerikler paylaşması</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paylaştığı fotoğrafların hep tek başına olması, benmerkeççi izlenim yaratan profil içerikleri</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kurum kültürü ile uyumlu olmayan siyasi görüşleri destekleyen paylaşımlar yapması</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Profesyonel olmayan kullanıcı/hesap ismi</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>1.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Yازım hataları ve dili düzgün kullanmaması</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>1.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Herhangi bir görüşte (din, siyaset vb.) radikal paylaşımlar yapması</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Gözüçleri ifade ederken ya da savunurken agresif bir tutum göstermesi</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Özgeçmişindeki bilgilerle çelişen bilgilerin bulunması</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Başkalarını incitici, rahatsız edici, belirli bir gruba yönelik (cinsiyet, cinsel yönelim, politik grup vb.) saldırı, tehdit içeren paylaşımlar yapması</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Giấy tại trung kurum kültürune uygun olmaması</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Provakatif ya da uygunsuz fotoğraf, video ya da bilgi paylaşması</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Alkol ya da uyuşturucu kullandığını gösteren paylaşmların olması</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Önceki çalıştığı yer, yöneticisini ya da iş arkadaşlarını kötülemesi</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Suç içeren davranışların bulunması</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Önceki iş yeri ile ilgili gizli bilgileri paylaşması</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Çok sık paylaşımda bulunması</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>İçeriklerinde argo/küfür kullanması</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Cinsel içerikli paylaşmlarda bulunması</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>1.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B. SUMMARY JOB DESCRIPTION AND JOB SPECIFICATION

**Bireysel ve Ticari Bankacılık Uzmanı**

**Özet İş Tanımı**

- Mevcut müşteri ilişkilerinin devamlığını 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,
- Sektordeki eğitim, değişim ve gelişmeleri takip ederek ürün sürecine katkıda bulunmak.

**Özet İş Gereklileri**

- 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 yakınlık,
- Planlama ve organizasyon becerisi,
- Analitik düşünme yeteneği
### C. PRESENTATION OF FACTORS' DISTRIBUTION IN THE APPLICANT PROFILES

#### Block 1

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

#### Block 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate No</th>
<th>Name Surname</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>F1</th>
<th>F2</th>
<th>F3</th>
<th>F4</th>
<th>F5</th>
<th>F6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Yasin Aydın</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Deniz Yıldırım</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Ömer Çakır</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Orhan Güler</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Furkan Kaya</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Yağmur Yüksel</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Müge Özdemir</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Sezen Yılmaz</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Salih Yıldız</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Burak Şen</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Yunus Gül</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Bayram Doğan</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Zeynep Çelik</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Melis Aksoy</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Sena Kara</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Gülşah Acar</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate No</td>
<td>Name Surname</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>F1</td>
<td>F2</td>
<td>F3</td>
<td>F4</td>
<td>F5</td>
<td>F6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Filiz Özer</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Ali Güneş</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Selma Can</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Sude Özkan</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Hilal Bulut</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Ramazan Ünal</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Yılmaz İşik</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Adem Kaplan</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Canan Şahin</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>İlayda Sarı</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Sevilay Demir</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Didem Çetin</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Abdullah Keskin</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Musa Tekin</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Fatih Turan</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Kadir Taş</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

*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 DİKKATLIÇE OKUDUKTAN SONRA DEĞERLENDİRMENİZİ YAPINIZ!

Sosyal Medya Özet Raporu

Ad Soyad: Zehra Ünal
Cinsiyet: Kadın  Yaş: 27

- Adayın, daha önce çalıştığı kurumlarla ilgili herhangi bir paylaşımı rastlanmamıştır.
- Adayın proflinde, 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 proflinde 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 olmadığını dair herhangi bir bilgi vermemektedir.

ŞİMDİ BU ADAY İÇİN DEĞERLENDİRMENİZİ YAPINIZ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kesinlikle davet etmem</th>
<th>Kesinlikle davet ederim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

()
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 profiline, yer alan bazı bilgiler başvuru formu ve özgeçmişinde verdiği bilgilerle çelişmektedir.
- Adayın profiline 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 çalışabileceği gösteren bir izlenimi uyandırmaktadır.
- Adayın profiline aktif olarak ilgilendiği hobileri, spor aktiviteleri, yardım etkinlikleri ve sosyal sorumluluk projeleri ile ilgili paylaşımlar bulunmaktadır.

ŞİMDİ BU ADAY İÇİN DEĞERLENDİRMENİZİ YAPINIZ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kesinlikle davet etmem</th>
<th>Kesinlikle davet ederim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

0
E. DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION FORM

Cinsiyetiniz

- Kadın (1)
- Erkek (2)

Yaşınız


Şu an çalıştığınız kurumda kaç yıl çalışıyorsunuz?


Kariyeriniz boyunca toplamda kaç yıl çalışıyorsunuz?


Çalıştığınız kurumda pozisyonunu en iyi ifade eden seçeneği işaretleyiniz.

- Uzman Yardımcısı (1)
- Uzman (2)
- Danışman (3)
- Alt Kademe Yönetici (4)
- Orta Kademe Yönetici (5)
- Üst Kademe Yönetici (6)
- Yönetim Kurulu Üyesi (7)
- 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 sorumluklarınızıın 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ajans-Fuar-Organizasyon</th>
<th>Madencilik</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Akademi-Yüksek Öğretim</td>
<td>Mağazacılık</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Araştırma</td>
<td>Medya/Televisyon/Radyo/Film</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bankacılık</td>
<td>Mimarlık/Dizayn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basın-Yayın/Matbaa</td>
<td>Mobilya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilişim</td>
<td>Mühendislik Hizmetleri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cam ve Seramik</td>
<td>Otomasyon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Çağrı Merkezi</td>
<td>Otomotiv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danışmanlık</td>
<td>Perakendecilik/Toptancılık</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dayanıklı Tüketim</td>
<td>Petrol ve Ürünleri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demir-Çelik</td>
<td>Reklam ve Tanıtım</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denetim</td>
<td>Sağlık/Hastane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denizcilik ile ilgili Üretim&amp;</td>
<td>Savunma Sanayii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hizmetler</td>
<td>Sigorta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eğitim</td>
<td>Silahlı Kuvvetler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eğlence-Sanat</td>
<td>Sivil Toplum Kuruluşları</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elektrik-Elektronik</td>
<td>Spor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enerji</td>
<td>Tekstil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finansal Hizmet</td>
<td>Telekomünikasyon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gayrimenkul</td>
<td>Tibbi Malzeme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gıda</td>
<td>Turizm/Otelcilik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Güvenlik/Koruma Hizmetleri</td>
<td>Üretim/İmalat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimya/Kimyasal Ürünler</td>
<td>Yapı/İnşaat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kozmetik</td>
<td>Ziraat/Hayvancılık</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lojistik-Taşımacıılık</td>
<td>Diğer/Belirtmek istemiyor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
F. INFORMED CONSENT FORM

ARAŞTIRMAYA GÖNÜLLÜ KATILIM FORMU

Bu çalışma ODTÜ Psikoloji Bölümü yüksek lisans öğrencisi Seren Burak Özkm 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 belirtilmiş olduğu üzere belirli bir pozisyonun işe alımından sorumlu olan bir işe alım yöneticisi olduğunuz ve adayların sosyal medya profillerindeki bilgileri inceleyerek bir değerlendirme yapmanız istenmektedir. 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 olasılığını işaretlemenizdir.

Katılmınızla ilgili bilmeniz gerekenler:


Riskler:

Çalışma, katılımcıların fiziksel ya da psikolojik sağlığını etkileyebilecek riskleri taşımaktadır.

Araştırmaya ilgili daha fazla bilgi almak isterseniz:

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

Yukarıdaki bilgileri okudum ve bu çalışmaya tamamen gönüllü olarak katıldığımı ve bilgileri iletebilmek için burada Evet ve Hayır çekçilerine işaretledim.

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 alıcılar işe alm karar 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).


Temel İK Fonksiyonları Olarak Çalışan Seçme ve Yerleştirme

Farr ve Tippins (2010), çalışan seçiminin “işverenlerin organizasyon içerisindeki belirli bir iş ya da rol için hangi bireyleri seçeceğini dair karar vermek için kullandıkları süreçleri” (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 alma kararının kendilerine 25.000 dolardan fazla maliyet yaratığını ifade etmiştir. Dolayısı ile işe alım kalitesini artırmak için harcanan kaynaklar ilgili maliyetlere değmektedir.

Çalışan Seçiminde Kullanılan Test, Teknik ve Yöntemlerin Geçerlilikleri


Küresel Olarak En Sıklıkla Kullanılan Çalışan Seçme Yöntemleri

Birçok çalışan seçme yöntemi dünyadaki dört bir tarafiındaki 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 örneklemeleri, değerlendirime 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


Çalışan Seçiminde Sosyal Medya Kullanımı


Sosyal medya ağlarının birçok kişi tarafından kullanılmaması sebebi ile işe alıcılara adaylarla ilgili iş ile alakalı da kişisel birçok bilgiye ulaşabilmektedir. Adayların profillerini ziyaret eden şirketler adayın bilgileri, yaş, etnik kökeni, inançları, cinsel yönelimi, medeni hali, iş durumu, iş geçmişi, iş dışındaki davranışları ve siyasi görüşleri gibi bilgilere erişebilmektedir (Gross & Acquisti, 2005; Madera,
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 Sitelerinin Çalışan Seçmede Kullanılmasının Dezavantajları**


İşe Alımcıların Kararlarını Etkileyen Sosyal Medya İçerikleri


Sosyal Medya Site Lindseyek İnsan Yargısını Etkileyen İpuçları

İşe Alımla İlgili Kararlara İstatistiksel Bir Yaklaşım Olarak İlk Yakalama


Bu avantajların yanı sıra bu yaklaşıma karşı yapılan eleştiriler arasında, karar vericilerin kararlarını sabit sayındaki ipuçlara göre vermedikleri, bu kararların duruma ve şartlara göre değişebileceği, hipotetik insanlarla ilgili verilen kararların gerçekten farklı olabileceğini ve bu durumda gerçek durumların zenginliğinden mahrum
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olacağı sıralanmaktadır (Aiman-Smith ve diğerleri, 2002; Gorman, Clover, & Doherty, 1978; Hobson & Gibson, 1983).

**Mevcut Çalışma**

Bu çalışma sosyal medyadaki ipuçlarının işe alınma kararlarını nasıl etkilediğini anlamayı amaçlamaktadır. Belirtildiği üzere adayların sosyal medya profileri üzerinden taranması giderek artan bir uygulamadır. İlk yaklaşımı yönteminin bahsedilen avantajları ile birlikte bu çalışma sosyal medyadan elde edilen ipuçlarının olumlu ya da olumsuz karar verme süreçlerini etkileyp etkilemediğini ve pozitif ve negatif bilgilerden hangisinin işe alın kararlarında daha etkili olduğunu araştırmaktadır. Dolayısı ile ilgili yakın 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 alın kararları üzerinde açıkladığı değişkenlik oranı, negatif sosyal medya bilgilerinin işe alın kararları üzerinde açıkladığı değişkenlik oranından daha düşüktür olacaktır.

**YÖNTEM**

**Katılımcılar**

Kartopu örneklemi stratejisinin kullanıldığı bu çalışmmanın katılımcıları aktif işe alınmalıdır ve 82 katılımcıdan bilgi toplanırken dört katılımcı demografik bilgi sağlamamıştır. Katılımcıların ortalama yaş 35,51’dir (SS = 8,68). Katılımcılar mevcut kurumlarda ortalama 8,70 yıl (SS = 10,49)CLUDIR transik, toplam çalışma süreleri ortalama 13,61 yıl (SS = 11,83)CLUDIR. Katılımcılar uzman yardımcı, uzman, danışman, alt düzey yönetici, orta seviye yönetici, üst seviye yönetici, yönetim kurulu üyesi ve diğer pozisyonlar dahil olmak üzere farklı hiyerarşik seviyelerde işe alın süreçlerinde
çalışmaktadırlar. Aynı 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 oynaması gereken faktörleri belirlemek için ön çalışmaları yapılmış olup ikinci adımda hipotetik adaylara ait özel sosyal medya raporları katılımcılara verilerek her bir adaya mülakata çağrıma olasılıklarını derecelendirmeleri istenmiştir.


Ön çalışmaların arkaştan üç pozitif ve üç negatif olmak üzere toplamda altı faktör iki seviyeli olarak ana çalışmaya dahil edilmiştir. Bu faktörlerin olduğu bütün kombinasyonlarından oluşan toplam 64 (2^6) sosyal medya özel rapor hazırlanmıştır. 64 profilin değerlendirilmesi katılımcılarda bıktınlık, yorgunluk ve dikkatsiz cevap vermeye sahip olabileceğinden dolayı (Graham & Cable, 2001) Aiman-Smith ve arkadaşları (2002) tarafından önerilen eksik bloklar (‘incomplete blocks’) yaklaşıımı 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 görmenden 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 isimləri için söz konusu pozisyonu daire iş tanınıları ve özet iş gerekleri verilmiştir. Katılımcılarından her bir raporu dikkatlice okuduktan sonra adayı mülakata davet etme olasılıklarını 0 ile 100 arasında belirtmeleri istenmiştir. Kendi bloklarındaki 16 adayı değerlendirirdikten sonra adaylara demografik bilgi formu sunulmuş ve çalışma sonda erdirilmiştir.

Araçlar

Ön çalışmalar sonucu oraya çıkan üç pozitif ve üç negatif faktör iki seviyeli olarak şeklinde özet sosyal medya raporlarına entegre edilmiş olup oluşan bütün kombinasyonların içerildiği 64 profil hazırlanmıştır (faktörlerin profilere dağılımı için Ek C’ye ve örnek profiler 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 ölçümlemiştir.

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

SONUÇLAR

İlke yakalama yaklaşımda her bir karar verici birde fazla senaryoyu değerlendirildiğinden dolayı daha önce belirtildiği üzere hem katılımcılar iç hem de katılımcılar arası değişkenlik bulunmaktadır ve bu tarz iç içe verilerin (‘nested data’)
bulunduğu durumlar çok seviyeli (‘multilevel’) analizler ile daha doğru ölçülnebilmektedir. Bu sebeple hipotezlerin test edilmesi amacı ile HLM 7.03 yazılımı (Raudenbush, Bryk, & Congdon, 2017) kullanılarak 1312 işçi alım kararının 82 katılımcı ile iç içe olduğu çok seviyeli bir analiz yapılmıştır.

Çoklu seviyeli analizlerde sınıf içi korelasyon (ICC) adı verilen bir gösterge katılımcıların alt underini 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 değişkenin %31,5’sinin katılımcılara bağlı olduğunu göstermektedir ve çok seviyeli analizleri kullanmanın uygun olduğunu belirtmektedir (Lee, 2000).


Bu sonuçlara göre 28,5 yaşında, erkek ve sosyal medya profilinden hiçbir faktörle ilgili çıkarm 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 profilileri ile başvuru formu/özgeçmiş arasındaki 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 yapmış but paylaşımlarla profesyonel çevresinden olumlu yorumlar alan adaylar için 4,49 birim, kurum kültürü ile uyumlu bir imaj çizyen 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 diğer sadece negatif bilgilerden oluşan iki model oluşturularak bu modellerin açıklanamayan değişkenliği ne kadar düşürdüğü sözdüğü psödo $R^2$ değerleri hesaplanıp karşılaştırılmıştır. Analiz sonuçlarına göre sadece negatif bilgilerin bulunduğu model açıklanamayan değişkenliği %48,2 düşürken sadece pozitif bilgilerin bulunduğu model açıklanamayan değişkenliği %1,2 düşüştü, 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 sayısını yeni değişkenler olarak kodlanmış ve etkileşim değişkeni ile birlikte denkleme sokulmuştur. Analiz sonuçları, negatif bilgi sayısı arttıkça mülakata davet edilmeye 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 hiçbir 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


Bu bulgular önceki çalışılan yerle ilgili gizlilik mahiyetindeki bilgiler 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 katsayiya sahiptir. İlk iki faktöre bakıldığında üçüncü kişilere (önceki çalışılan kurum ve farklı gruplar) zarar verici davranışlar ön plana çıkarırken diğer negatif faktörün çalışanın negatif bilgiyi saklamak ya da pozitif bilgiyi abartmak (ya da uydurmak) yoluya 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 değerlendirirme yapmalara sebep olmuş olabilir.

Pozitif bilgileri bakıldığını zaman ise katsayılardı daha küçük olduğu ve katsayılara arası faktörlerin da negatiflere kıyasla daha az olduğu görülükmektedir. Bu

Bu bilgiler ışığında adaylar için sosyal medya paylaşılarda iş ve pozisyonla ilgili olumlu çıkarımlar yapılabileceği bilgileri paylaşmanın iyi bir strateji olabileceğini ama daha önelemişi işe alımların gözüne negatif olarak değerlendirilebilecek bilgilerden çıkılmalarının daha kritik olduğu söylenebilir. Özellikle başkalarına bir şekilde zarar verebilecek paylaşımın işe alım kararını negatif olarak ve güçlü bir şekilde etkilediğini göstermektedir.


Bu çalışmada kullanılan sosyal medya bilgilerine bakıldığında bilgilerin içerikleri ve doğası da negatif bilgilerin daha etkili olması 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 etkileyebilir ve bu durum işe alım kararlarını etkilemiş olabilir.


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

Kısıtlar ve Gelecek Çalışmalar İçin Öneriler

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


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 değerlendirildiği aday sayısını düşürecek istatistiksel gücü azalırsa 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 örneklemeler kullanarak yapıldığı taktirde spesifik ipucu verilerinin birbirleriyle nasıl etkileştiği konusunda daha detaylı bilgi sunma imkanı bulacaktır.
APPENDIX H. TEZ FOTOKÖPİ İZİN FORMU

TEZ FOTOKÖPİ İZİN FORMU / THESES PHOTOCOPY PERMISSION FORM

ENSTİTÜ / INSTITUTE

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 □

YAZARIN / AUTHOR

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

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

TEZİN TÜRÜ / DEGREE: Yüksek Lisans/Master □ Doktora/PhD □

1. Tezimin tamamı dünya çapında erişime açılsın ve kaynak gösterimle şartıyla tezimin bir kısmı veya tamamının fotokopisi alının. / 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 kullanıcılarının erişimine açılsın. (Bu seçenekle tezinizin fotokopisi ya da elektronik kopyası Kütüphane aracı 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 seçeneğe tezinizin fotokopisi ya da elektronik kopyası Kütüphane aracı 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