Hired or rejected: dependent on your social network site profile?

The influence of social network sites on the job application procedure

Master thesis of:

Kirsten A. van Wingerden

Graduation commission:

Dr. S. Ben Allouch

Dr. N. P. Kotamraju

Faculty:
Behavioural Sciences

Study:
Communication Science

Postbus 217
7500 AE Enschede
www.gw.utwente.nl

Dutch summary

Tegenwoordig gebruiken recruiters sociale netwerk sites om meer informatie over sollicitanten te krijgen. Dit onderzoek onderzoekt op welke informatie op sociale netwerk sites door recruiters wordt gebruikt om een indruk te krijgen van sollicitanten en welke gevolgen dit heeft voor de baankansen van een sollicitant. Het warranting principle, een theorie over het vormen van indrukken in internetcommunicatie, stelt dat mensen bij het beoordelen van een persoon meer vertrouwd wordt op informatie die door anderen gegeven wordt dan op informatie die de persoon over zichzelf geeft. Er zijn twee studies ontwikkeld die deze theorie onderzocht hebben. Het eerste onderzoek (*N* = 11) was een kwalitatief onderzoek en in het tweede onderzoek (*N* = 159) is een online vragenlijst met experimentele condities gebruikt om de resultaten beter te kunnen generaliseren. De resultaten toonden aan dat alleen het experiment bewijs leverde voor het warranting principle en self-reports van recruiters niet. Dit geeft aan dat recruiters zelf niet aangeven dat informatie afkomstig van anderen belangrijker en geloofwaardiger is, maar wanneer dit experimenteel getoetst wordt, blijkt dat recruiters meer vertrouwen hebben in informatie die gegeven is door anderen. De baankansen van sollicitanten worden zowel positief als negatief beïnvloed door het gebruik van sociale netwerksites. Deze uitkomsten hebben theoretische implicaties voor het warranting principle en heeft praktische implicaties voor zowel recruiters als sollicitanten.

Abstract

Social network sites are nowadays tools for recruiters to get more information about job applicants. This study examined what information on social network sites is used by recruiters in order to form an impression of job applicants and how this affects applicants' career opportunities. Based on the warranting principle that pertains to impression formation in Internet communication, judgments about a target rely more heavily on information derived from others than information provided by the target self. Two studies were conducted to test this principle. The first study (N = 11) was qualitative of nature and the second study (N = 159) used an online questionnaire with experimental conditions in order to broaden the research scope. Results indicated that the warranting principle was only supported in the experiment and not in self-reports of recruiters. This indicated that recruiters selves do not indicate that other-generated information is more important and trustworthy, but when tested experimentally, recruiters rely more on information derived from others. The career opportunities are influenced by the use of social network sites, both positively and negatively. These findings have theoretical implications for the warranting principle and practical implications for both recruiters and job applicants.

Introduction

Various news media reported employers check out profiles of employees or job applicants at social network sites (*Advocatie*, n.d.; *Sync*, n.d.). In fact, Careerbuilder (n.d.), an American online career site, found that 45 percent of American employers check out job applicants' social network site profiles. Cross-Tab (2010) reported that 70 percent of American recruiters rejected candidates based on information they found online. In the United Kingdom and Germany this percentage was not that high but followed the same trend (Cross-Tab, 2010). This indicates that online reputation became an important factor for hiring decisions in recent years.

The career possibilities of employees can be influenced by social network sites. Decisions about hiring applicants or lengthening the contract of an employee may be depend of information found online. For example, a woman did not get the job she applied for after it was known (at a social network site) she also applied for a job at a rival company (*Sync*, n.d.). The question arises what does it mean for applicants' chances for a job when they are registered on a social network site. Before such sites existed, recruiters could only make decisions based on resumes and cover letters. Nowadays, job applicants must also take their personal profiles into account.

The question is not only in what way careers of job applicants are influenced, but also what kind of information on social network sites matters to recruiters. After all, social networks sites consist of different pieces of information. Photos might give an impression of an applicant but it is unclear whether comments of others, hobbies or membership in groups are also important information for recruiters. Researchers have looked at some aspects of these questions, but these studies did not often have a strong empirical foundation and did not test any theoretical rationale. Studies that tested theories about impression formation on social network sites only focused on personal relationships (e.g. Subrahmanyan, Reich, Waechter & Espinoza, 2008; Tom Tong Van der Heide, Langwell & Walther, 2008; Walther, Van der Heide, Kim, Westerman & Tom Tong, 2008; Antheunis, 2009; Walther, Van der Heide, Hamel & Shulman, 2009) and did not consider work-orientated relationships. Furthermore, most of the anecdotal studies used questionnaires to collect the data and were fully based on recruiters' self-reports. Although this is a decent way to the data collection, other methods might give another view. For example, self-reports imply respondents have control over the answers they gave, which is less likely when using an experiment. Therefore findings might be different when using another method.

To address this gap in research, this study used a theory that can help explain which pieces of information on social network site profiles enhance the impression formation of recruiters about job applicants. The warranting principle predicts that information about someone is more trustworthy when this information *is 'derived of another individual and immune for manipulation by the person to whom it refers'* (Walther & Parks, 2002, p. 552). Therefore, it is expected that people rely more on information derived of others than information provided by the target self when forming impressions. Based on this principle, this research examines the trustworthiness of information on social network sites and investigate in what way impressions of recruiters are influenced. Also, this study pays attention to the consequences of this information on career possibilities of job applicants.

The warranting principle is not often studied and then mostly in the context of interpersonal relationships (Walther & Parks, 2002; Walther et al., 2009) rather than work-related relationships. Therefore, this research can contribute knowledge in theoretical and practical contexts. It contributes to the theoretical knowledge about the robustness of the warranting principle. It is possible to see whether this principle is also applicable for another context, namely relationships in a work-related context. Also, this study provides useful insights for changing hiring activities of recruiters. Especially for job applicants who are busy applying for a job, this study can provide practical information. For recruiters, this study provides information about the way their profession might change from a selection of job applicants based on resumes and cover letters to a selection of job applicants with the help of digital social network sites. Also, recruiters may find out in what way other recruiters make use of social network sites and what consequences are attached to this activity.

Review of literature

Seeking a job, resume a must

Before an invitation for a job interview comes along, job applicants have to write a resume. The resume is an important part of the selection procedure (Knouse, 1994), because it is the first impression an employer gets from a job applicant. It offers initial information about the candidate that can create a clear impression of him/her. Resumes determine which applicants deserve a second look (Thoms, McMasters, Roberts & Dombkowski, 1999). Generally, a resume contains personal data and information about education, experience and remaining noteworthy information, like interesting hobbies or characteristics. Spinks and Wells (1987) point out that education and past job experience are the most important sections of a resume. In the education section, the job applicant lists the degrees which have been completed and the duration of study. Job titles, descriptions and responsibilities are listed in the job experience section. An employer can make a comparison between job applicants' previous jobs and the prospective job and judge which job applicant is suitable for the job (Knouse, 1994).

Knouse (1994) found that relevant education and relevant job experience produced more positive perceptions of a job applicant. Job applicants with a relevant education and job experience have more managerial potential and higher salaries in the future. Furthermore, he found that impression management enhanced perceptions of job applicants. Impression management is viewed as 'a person's attempt to control the image others have of that person' (Schlenker, 1980, p. 35). It is an influence process that goes with impression management tactics like self-description, opinion conformity, acclaiming and enhancement. Job applicants are able to present themselves selectively and can create a better image of themselves as a result of impression management tactics (Silvester, Anderson-Gough, Anderson & Mohamed, 2002). At first, employers will not notice this, they can easily been misled by the resume and invite an inappropriate candidate on a job interview instead of an appropriate one. Sometimes employers see through some tactics in job interviews, but precious time is already wasted.

To be sure to select an appropriate job applicant, some employers use social network sites to research candidates (*Careerbuilder*, n.d.). An American online career site, www.careerbuilder.com, reported that in their survey among 2.600 hiring managers 45 percent of them check out job applicants on social network sites. Also Cross-Tab (2010), a market research company, points out that recruiters from the U.S, Great-Britain, Germany and France check out job applicants on social network sites. Whether this also holds true for the Dutch employers has not been studied, but it is expected that the trend will be the same. In the Netherlands social network sites are also booming, their popularity has increase enormously in the past few years (Antheunis, 2009). Therefore it is expected that social network sites also have an increasingly influence on the way job applicants are screened by Dutch recruiters.

Social network sites

Social network sites clearly influence recruiters' activity. Social network sites are different comparing to other websites. A social network site is defined as 'a web-based service that allow individuals to (1) construct a public or semi-public profile within a bounded system, (2) articulate a list of other users with whom they share a connection, and (3) view and traverse their list of connections and those made by others within the system' (boyd & Ellison 2006, p. 211). Social network sites are unique in the way that they enable members to articulate and visualize their social networks. Users of these sites are often communicating with people they already know and who are part of their offline network. Meeting new people is, for most users, not the goal (Subrahmanyam et al., 2008). Social network sites share a couple of technical features. They consist of visible profiles from users who express themselves at their own profile page. Users fill in their demographic data, like their name, age, location, and give answers to series of questions, for example, 'what are your interests' and 'which brands do you like'. Most users upload a picture from themselves. Some sites provide the possibility to add other pictures or multimedia content, like short movies (boyd & Ellison, 2006).

After completing the profile page, users are prompted to discover users with whom they have a relationship and invite them to join their network. The related user can accept the invitation and becomes a so-called 'friend' of the profile owner. Most social network sites require a bi-directional confirmation for friendship. The label friend can be quite misleading in the sense that such connection not always include a 'real' friendship. The reasons people connect are varied (boyd & Ellison, 2006). Like the definition declares, the public display of connections is one of the differentiated components of social network sites. The list of friends contains links to each friend's profile, enabling users to traverse the network by clicking on the various profiles. Users who have permission to view a profile also have permission to view the list of friends. Some social network sites allow users to choose whether they publish their profile on public, friends from friends or friends only. Other sites use a different approach: users who are part of the same network can view each others' profiles, unless the profile owner has decided to deny permission (boyd & Ellison, 2006).

Another component of social network sites is the possibility for 'friends' to leave messages on their friends' profiles. These could be 'comments' which are visible for all friends of the profile owner, but it is also possible to write a private message, similar to messages at webmail.

Existing social network sites can be roughly distinguished into two groups: the first consists of social network sites that have a personal aim. These sites, such as Hyves and Facebook, are used privately by members and can be called 'friend networks'. Members add friends because they like to communicate with these people and have a personal online network of friends. The second group consists of social network sites with professional characteristics. The aim is to connect business professionals and enable them to share information, get answers and promote themselves and their business (Butow & Taylor, 2009). LinkedIn and Xing are examples of this group of social network sites. Since Hyves and LinkedIn are the most popular social network sites in the Netherlands and will be included in this research, these sites will be discussed in more detail.

Hyves

Hyves meets the requirements of the definition of social network sites given above. This social network site is comparable with Facebook and MySpace and it is the most popular social network site for Dutch citizens. Since the start of 2004, nine million Dutch people have a Hyves profile of which 67 percent are active users which mean they log in at least once a month (*Hyves*, n.d.). Hyves would like to cross boundaries and expand the memberships to other countries and even continents, but at this moment users are mainly Dutch (*Hyves*, n.d.).

Users of Hyves can create profiles which describe various characteristics about themselves like their name, age, hometown, birthday, preferred activities and favorite brands. Hyvers have the opportunity to disclose their profile to all users, to friends from friends or only to friends. Everyone can leave a message on their profile page or write a private message. Generally, a profile page consists of a description of the profile owner, photographs, comments from friends, a list (and number) of friends and sometimes short movies. Users can also join communities of subjects they like, for example an actor, a hotspot or an activity. The profile owner does not have influence on the messages friends write on the digital 'wall', which are visible for everyone with permission. Messages may be express common or individual activities or jokes between the owner and a friend. In fact, they may even reflect the desire to embarrass the profile owner (Walther et al., 2008).

Lots of users use Hyves to communicate with other users and to be up-to-date on others' lives. Subrahmanyam et al. (2008) found that the use of network sites is integrated with people from the offline life of users.

LinkedIn

LinkedIn is developed for business professionals and business owners. The aim of this site is to connect these professionals and enable them to do business together and to share information (Butow & Taylor, 2009). LinkedIn has over 60 million users over 200 countries and territories around the world (*LinkedIn*, n.d.). In the Netherlands, approximately 1.4 million Dutch people joined LinkedIn.

LinkedIn users create a profile that consists of professional and business accomplishments (Butow & Taylor, 2009). Users fill in their job experience including their current job position and their past job experience. Furthermore, they indicate their educational background and add contact information like their name, email address and address. It is possible to add a photo and give a summary of relevant information about oneself. Also, it is possible to be recommended by other people or to recommend other people. When working with others, contacts in the network can write (or get) a recommendation about the good job one did or one's personality. Members can also join groups with whom they identify themselves. Within these groups users can discuss with each other, add relevant news articles and send messages to each other. When developing a profile, one can invite people they know to their network. A LinkedIn network consists of one's connections and one's connections' connections and the people they know (*LinkedIn*, n.d.).

The aim of this professional network of trusted contacts is to give advantages in one's career. LinkedIn can help to make better use of one's professional network and help other people in return. It is also possible to apply for vacancies or fulfill vacancies and to ask questions at experts (*LinkedIn*, n.d.)

Online impression formation
When using social network sites during the application procedure, there is a chance recruiters' impressions of job applicants change because of this new information. A widely used model to research the online impression formation, is the hyperpersonal model (Walther, 1996). This model posits that computer-mediated communication (CMC) users take advantage of the interface and channel characteristics of CMC in order to manage impressions and facilitate desired relational outcomes (Walther, 2007). Because CMC provides only textual information and exists of reduced nonverbal cues, people can intentionally select positive and desirable cues and over attribute communication partners' personality. As a consequence, impression formation in CMC is less detailed, but more intense compared with impressions formed in face-to-face settings (Hancock & Dunham, 2001). Also, users liked each other better in a CMC setting than in a face-to-face setting (Antheunis, 2009). However, social network sites have more cues available compared to earlier text-based types of CMC. Social network sites exist for example also of photographs, comments of others and videos. Walther et al. (2001) showed that the presence of a photograph during computer conferencing had positive effects on the level of intimacy/affection and social attractiveness for short-term, unacquainted CMC partners. Moreover, three studies conducted by Tanis and Postmes (2003) showed that online social cues turned out to be significant for the online impression formation process. Social cues, for example photos or demographical details, appeared to have a strong influence on the quality of impressions formed by one another. These cues reduce ambiguity and foster more positive impressions of people. This means photos and other information on social network sites have impact on impressions formed by other people, like employers. The question arise on which of these aspects impressions are formed.

Important characteristics of social network sites on impression formation
Research paid attention to characteristics of social network sites and impression formation in recent years. Various important characteristics of a profile on a social network site appeared to affect the impression one get from the profile owner. Tom Tong et al. (2008) found that the number of friends did affect judgments of social attraction. They found a curvilinear relationship between the number of friends and the perception of social attractiveness. When a profile owner had a few friends (102), people considered them less attractive. Ratings were highest when an one's profile had approximately 300 friends and declined beyond that level of friends. Having too many friends creates the image that profile owners are not outgoing and sociable and focus too much on social network sites. Also, the physical attractiveness of one's friends photos did influence the physical attractiveness of the profile owner. Profile owners who have pretty friends, look prettier themselves (Walther et al., 2008). However, it is difficult to expand these findings to a work-related context. Do employers for example pay attention to the same characteristics as friends or strangers? It can be, but perhaps other characteristics are much more important.

Use of social network sites and impression formation in work-related context
Several studies focused on the way social network sites are used by employers. Attention is paid to the number of employers that makes use of these sites during the application procedure and the way career perspectives of job applicants are influenced (Brandenburg, 2007; *Careerbuilder*, n.d.; *Manpower,* n.d., Cross-Tab, 2010). These studies were not empirically grounded and did not test a theoretical rationale. The results of these studies are not completely similar, but the results followed a similar trend. Manpower found that two third of the employers use social network sites during the application procedure while Careerbuilder found a percentage of 45 percent. Cross-Tab (2010) stated that this percentage is much higher but different among other countries: of recruiters in the U.S 79 percent use social network sites during the application procedure, in the United Kingdom 47 percent, in Germany 59 percent and in France 21 percent. Furthermore, Manpower stated that for one out of ten companies checking social network sites is an established part of the recruiting process. Especially Facebook, MySpace and LinkedIn are in great demand.

It was found that 35 percent of the employers found information on social network sites that caused them not to hire the relevant job applicant (*Careerbuilder,* n.d.). Brandenburg (2007) claimed that this percentage is even higher, up to 63 percent. The reasons for job rejection were examined and especially provocative or inappropriate pictures or information, content where the job applicant is drinking or using drugs, spreading inconvenient information about former employers or companies, showing poor communicational skills, made discriminatory comments, lying about qualifications and sharing confidential information from previous employer(s) are pernicious (*Careerbuilder,* n.d.). Cross-Tab (2010) adds concerns about applicants´ lifestyle, inappropriate text written by friends, family or colleagues and memberships in certain groups and networks to this. The studies indicate that employers form negative impressions of job applicants based on characteristics on social network sites. These negative impressions negatively influence the career opportunities of job applicants.

However, it appeared that a profile on a social network site does not always have a negative impact on career opportunities. About 18 percent of the studied employers reported they have found content on social network sites that caused them to hire a candidate (Careerbuilder, n.d.). Reasons for hiring are a good feel for the candidate's personality and fit based on one's profile, supported professional qualifications of a candidate, creativity skills, sufficient communication skills, good references of others about the applicant and received awards and accolades. This indicates social network sites could also create positive impressions of job applicants which could also influence their career perspectives.

In summary, social network sites can be seen as tools to screen job applicants. This can have positive and negative outcomes for job applicants depending on the content of a social network site profile. Brandenburg (2007) puts it this way: '*Online social networks provide you a screening tool for job applicants. It's unlikely that a job applicant would ever attach provocative photos, detailed descriptions of sexual escapades, or a list of hobbies that includes funneling beer and recreational drug use on his/her resume. But with just a few clicks of the mouse, you can find out all sorts of revealing information about potential candidates'* (p. 600).

Although applicants and employees are warned about the consequences of delicate content on social network sites, this message is still not landed. Peluchette and Karl (2008) showed American students are neutral about access by employers to their profiles on social network sites. Only 20 percent of students indicated there are items on their profile they would not want current or prospective employers to see. Among these items are, most commonly listed, drinking or alcohol-related pictures or comments, party photo's, comments about work, inappropriate humor and marijuana-related pictures and comments. Also results from Cross-Tab (2010) showed that only a few percent of employees thought information on social network sites could affect their job chances. For example, 7 percent of employees from the U.S believed information about them online affected their job search while 70 percent of the U.S. recruiters reported they had rejected applicants because of information found on social network sites. Apparently, the negative consequences that this content might have are not realized and understood by students and (future) employees. The results show

that employees are naïve and unaware about the effects concerning the access and use of these information that can vanish career chances into thin air.

However, the most important shortcoming of these studies is that these studies have no theoretical foundation. These studies do not give an explanation for these results. Also, these studies are based on self-reports of employers, which is all right but impression formation is mostly an unconscious process that cannot always be controlled by people themselves (Banaji, Lemm & Carpenter, 2004). Therefore, data collection by self-reports is not necessarily the most effective method. Also, these studies are a bit vague about what causes elicit what consequences. It is not known for example whether these characteristics the same for every employer. Also, it is not known which pieces of information on social network sites are responsible for job rejection and which can cause a positive impression of an applicant.

Warranting principle

When individuals check out someone's profile page, they get lots of information because of the amount of cues on social network sites. Information on social network sites consists of information that is provided by a profile owner self like descriptions, photo's, movies and of information that cannot be influenced by the owner, like comments placed on the digital 'wall'. Walther and Parks (2002) pointed out that the connection between who we are and who we claim to be on Internet has to be by no means the same.

When users of social network sites create a profile of themselves, they may engage in selective self-presentation. Users do not have to react immediately because it is an asynchronous medium whereas users have the opportunity to modify, edit and revise messages or texts before they are sent (Walther et al., 2001). Another advantage is that users are not visible. It is possible to make oneself more attractive than one would be in a face-to-face setting (Antheunis, 2009; Tidwell & Walther, 2002). Because it costs less effort to invent advantageous self-descriptions online, many Internet users have concerns about the reliability of online self-presentations (Walther & Parks, 2002). In many cases, it is not so hard to make reality prettier than it really is. Therefore, there is a general suspiciousness about the truthfulness of online self-presentation among Internet users (Walther et al., 2009) which is not unfound in various cases. For example, selective self-presentation also takes place in visual components of self-presentation. According to Hancock and Toma (2009), pictures on online dating sites were inaccurate representations of the current appearance of a person. The majority of photo's consisted at least one discrepancy compared with the real appearance, like age, weight, hair color, retouching photo's or hiring professional photographers. Many daters had the tendency to create a favorable impression and made the reality a little better than it actually is. This leads to disappointment when people see each other face-to-face.

A study of Haferkamp & Krämer (n.d.) show a striking discrepancy between the use of social network sites by users themselves and other users. They reported that students indicate they publish information on social network sites that forms a positive but realistic impression of themselves. However, when asking after evaluation of others, students indicate they think other users write false and exaggerating self-descriptions and manipulate their profile in a way that is advantageous for them. It seems that self-descriptions of other users are not perceived to be reliable, but a description of oneself is.

Walther and Parks (2002) pointed out that people prefer information with a great warranting value. They describe warrant as 'the capacity to draw a reliable connection between a presented persona online and a corporeally anchored person in the physical world' (Walther et al., 2009, p. 232). In the physical world the connection between the self and the self-presentation is often equally. In cyberspace however, it is relative easy to become somebody else. It is easier to present yourself differently when it is possible to control your behavior than when there is no possibility to hide, like in face-to-face settings. Warranting is therefore limited to CMC settings in which individuals do not meet each other off-line (Walther & Parks, 2002).

The warranting value of information is 'derived from the receivers' perception about the extent to which the content of that information is immune to manipulation by the person to whom it refers' (Walther & Parks, 2002, p. 552). This means that several forms of information have greater or less warranting value. For

example, a photo provided by a profile owner has less warranting value than a photo derived from a webpage of the company where the owner works. After all, an individual has more influence on a photo of his/her own website than on a photo on the company website. However, the degree of warrant is not only determined by the communication system, Walther and Parks (2002) proposed that warrant is also influenced by the social structures in which relationships exist and the symbolic effort partners undertake. When an individual has access to another individuals' social network the degree of warrant should rise. One will not give false or manipulated information about themselves that can be traced. Also, information that can be corroborated or used for corroboration provide greater warranting value. For example, a description of the appearance of the profile owner from someone who knows the profile owner provides greater warranting value than a self-description from the profile owner himself. Therefore, Walther et al. (2009) predict that externally generated information have greater warranting value than self-generated information. After all, information derived from others is more immune to manipulation by the person to whom it refers. Their examination whether friends' comments or self-descriptions of an individual self-description had more weight on impression formation supported the warranting principle although other explanations could not be fully ruled out. The authors presume that warranting may be mainly an explanation for impressions with a strong desirability value, like physical attractiveness. However, the studies have demonstrated that friends' comments on social network sites override the self-description of a profile owner: the participants attached more credence to information derived from others (Walther et al., 2009).

Profiles on social network sites consist of both self-generated information like demographic data, photographs and interests and other-generated information like comments of friends. Profile owners have control over the content they disclose on their social network site profile, but their friends can post detrimental and discrediting comments on their profile. Information on a social network site profile is not entirely self-presented but also presented by others and, therefore, less controllable by the profile owner. Thus, information generated by others might be more warrant and compelling than information provided by the profile owner self (Walther et al., 2009).

Research question
The review of literature showed a few questions remain still unanswered. This research wants to answer these questions and add knowledge to both theory and practice about online impression formation of recruiters about job applicants when social network sites are used. Therefore, the following research question is formulated:

Which influence does information on social network sites about an job applicant derived from others and information provided by an job applicant about him/herself have on the impression formation of a recruiter before a job interview takes place and what are the related consequences for career opportunities?

The research question is subdivided into four sub questions. The sub questions are formulated to answer a part of the research question and are outlined below.

It appeared (more than) half of the recruiters use social network sites to check out applicants. Still, it is not known why recruiters undertake this activity. It is interesting to know which considerations drive the decision of using social network sites during the application procedure. Therefore, the following sub question is constructed:
        SQ1: *How do recruiters make use of social network sites during the application procedure?*

Research showed that profiles on social network sites can be perceived negative as well as positive by recruiters. The studies point out that particular information on social network sites, like photographs, comments, applicant's lifestyle is responsible for negative or positive impressions of applicants. Findings of

which information is most important for recruiters is not reported. Also, no distinction is made between information provided by applicants selves and information derived of others. To further investigate the way information on social network sites is perceived by recruiters, the following sub question is formulated:

SQ2: *What information on social network sites is important and perceived as positive or negative by recruiters?*

Supplemental to sub question 2, specific information on social network sites could be perceived as more or less trustworthy by recruiters. The warranting principle posits that information derived from others is more trustworthy than information provided by applicants themselves. As a consequence, people take information of others more into account and mainly form their impression of someone based on this information. It is interesting to know whether this principle is also applicable for work-oriented relationships and on what information recruiters' impressions of job applicants are based. This question is summarized into the following sub question:

SQ3: *Do recruiters think that information about job applicants is less trustworthy when derived from job applicants themselves instead of information derived from others and on which information are recruiters' impressions based?*

Consequences of social network sites for job applicants could be twofold: these sites can increase the chance of getting a job or can decrease the job opportunity according to literature. It is very interesting to know under which circumstances career opportunities increase and decrease and which characteristics of social network sites influence this decision. Therefore, the following sub question was formulated:

SQ4: *What consequences does information on social network sites have on career possibilities of job applicants?*

Study 1: Qualitative research on the use of social network sites

The first study was an exploratory study to examine to questions above. This qualitative study was designed to discover how recruiters use social network sites during the application procedure. For example, the reasons why recruiters use social network sites during the application procedure were studied. Also, the study explained which information on social network sites can cause negative or positive impressions of applicants on recruiters and which reasons are attached to that. For instance, when a job applicant posts photographs of being drunk on his profile, this might lead to a poorer impression of this job applicant. On the contrary, a recruiter might get a positive view of a job applicant's capacities if this job applicant has a good-looking profile. Supplemental, it was asked what information on social network sites was perceived by recruiters as being trustworthy and what information was not and whether impressions are based on this information. Finally, it was tried to examine the consequences for job applicants which derived from these impressions. For example, it is possible that a negative impression leads to rejection while one was not if a recruiter had not checked out a job applicant's profile.

Method

Instrument
Given the exploratory character of the study, interviews were conducted to answer the aforementioned research questions. The interview was structured and consisted of ten questions. When recruiters said they did not check out profiles on social network sites, the questions were posed hypothetically. The interviewer began by posing a question by which the interviewee had to recall the application procedure in his/her organization and indicate what application procedure is followed. By starting with a general and relative simple question, the interviewee could grow into the interview and was more at one's ease. Then the interviewer asked if social

network sites were used during the application procedure and which reasons played a part in this decision. After that, the interviewer continued by asking if these sites are always used or whether this depends on other factors, like the position, name or gender of job applicants. Subsequently, the interviewer asked how long these sites are used, which aspects of information are viewed, which aspects are considered to be the most important and which aspects are perceived in a positive and negative way. After that, it was asked whether viewing profiles on social network sites can influence recruiters' judgments of a job applicant and which consequences are attached to this. At the end of the interview it was asked whether the interviewee had a profile on one or more social network sites. The interview scheme is attached in Appendix 1.

Participants
Participants (N = 11; 6 male and 5 female) were recruiters from different companies in the Netherlands who volunteered to participate in the study in exchange for the study results. The selected companies were geographically distributed within the Netherlands and differed in branch of industry and size. Some companies conducted technical activities while others conducted knowledge and employ activities. The size of the amount of employees differed from companies with more than 2.000 employees to companies with 20 employees.

Procedure
Participants were selected and approached, first, by face-to-face contact and shortly after that by email. Participants were approached on a career event and were asked to participate in an interview about 'the influence of social network sites on the application procedure' at their office. When they gave permission, an email was sent and an appointment for the interview was made. The day of the interview, the interviewer went to the company and started the interview after an introduction. The interviewer asked permission to audiotape the interview for data-analysis. If that was all right, the interview questions were posed. The duration of the interviews varied from twenty minutes until one hour depending on the answers participants gave. After the interview, participants were thanked and the interviewer promised to send the results when the study finished.

Analysis
Before the start of a study, one should pay attention to the method of analysis (Krueger, 1998). First, one has to choose in what way the data must be processed. Krueger stated there are four options of data processing and outlined these in figure 1.

← More time intensive			Less time intensive →
← More rigorous			Less rigorous →
Transcript-based	Tape-based	Note-based	Memory-based

Figure 1: Different ways of data analysis: amount of time and amount of rigorous (Krueger, 1998).

Because the study's exploratory nature, it was preferred to analyze the data in the most rigorous and complete way, so the transcript-based analysis was conducted. All interviews were audio taped and afterwards literally transcribed along with field notes.

Given the fact that the warranting principle gives no explanation for all collected data and there is no existing theoretical framework behind all data, the analysis should be inductive. Inductive analysis involves discovering patterns, themes and categories in data to form theories or explanations how things work (Patton, 2002). In order to do so, a combination of the grounded theory and the five-stage analysis of McCracken (1988) were used as basic principles for data analysis. The grounded theory is the most influential paradigm for qualitative research in the social science today (Patton, 2002). The accent is on systematic rigor and thoroughness from initial design and it offers a framework of coding procedures to help provide standardization and rigor. The five-stage analysis of McCracken provided clear stages which have to be followed in order to be able to systematically reconstruct a right view of the research topic (McCracken, 1988).

11

First, a coding scheme was developed by a first reading through the data. A second reading was done to start the formal coding in a systematic way (Patton, 2002). By doing so, first each useful utterance was treated in its own terms and formulated incidents (or observations) in the data according to the coding scheme (McCracken, 1988). After each incident was identified, it was tried to form concepts or constructs of several incidents that were convergent, nearly similar and had the same properties. Subsequently, concepts or constructs that pertained to the same phenomena were grouped to form categories or themes. According to the grounded theory, analysis should make use of constant comparisons (Corbin & Strauss, 1990) because that is the way incidents are formed. These incidents form concepts and concepts form categories. This prevents bias and achieves greater precision and consistency. After that, patterns and variations in data were identified and regularities were found. Eventually, the constructs and themes from all interviews were taken together and by eliminating or renaming themes or constructs final general themes and constructs were formulated based on the data.

Results

Four themes were found that describe the data of study 1, namely motives of using profiles on social network sites, consequences of social network sites for recruiters' work, consequences of photographs for recruiters' work and judgment of information on social network sites. These themes can be seen as the main themes of the data and consist of subthemes. The themes will be described in more detail.

Motives of using social network site profiles
The first identified theme concerns recruiters' motives whether or not use job applicants' profiles on social network sites during the application procedure. We discovered that these motives influence the decision whether recruiters look at social network sites profiles or not. The interviews pointed out about half of the interviewed recruiters used social network sites of job applicants to get more information about them. These recruiters indicated that the duration they look at social network site profiles depends whether profiles are public or not. Public profiles are visible for everyone and all information is accessible. Profiles that are not public only show the profile picture, all other information is not accessible. Most recruiters viewed the profiles a few seconds varying until ten minutes. Most recruiters checked out profiles on social network sites when they received the resume and application letter, one checked out profiles before the job interview started and some recruiters thought one should wait until the job interview finished.

Job dependent
An important factor of using profiles on social network sites is job dependent. It appeared that recruiters who recruit technical employees or employees who are less educated were not interested in profiles on social network sites. However, when recruiters sought a representative or highly educated person, social network sites became more interesting: '*I understand why companies do this. Indications of important job qualities like appearance and social qualities are believed to be found on social network sites'.* Recruiters who sought someone for a hard and difficult job where more issues play a part, made use of social network sites as an extra procedure to make a deliberate choice. Apparently, some recruiters used social network sites as a tool to select candidates on their looks and skills that were represented on social network site profiles.

Reasons for using social network sites
Almost every recruiter who used social network sites, declared that they want to know what the applicant is like in real life: '*in a resume or an application letter everyone puts one's best foot foremost, but on a social network site like Hyves this is not the case.'* Recruiters expected that job applicants are more honest about themselves on social network sites than in resumes. Curiosity of job applicants' looks and job applicants' online presentation were also important. In that way, recruiters were able to form an impression which could help to

estimate a job applicant. Also, recruiters said to be searching for confirmation of their hiring decision and they were looking for aspects that confirmed and justified their choice.

Reasons for not using social network sites
Some recruiters were against using social network site profiles of applicants during the application procedure. Several recruiters indicated that social network profiles can cause wrong judgments of job applicants: '*There can arise prejudices or distorting images of job applicants caused by looking at social network sites.*' Also, some recruiters pointed out not to see an additional value in checking out profiles on social network sites. Information on social network sites was not considered as supplemental information that can help them form an impression of a job applicant or change anything about the hiring decision they make. Moreover, one recruiter declared job applicants remove all information that can have a negative influence and '*make their profile more recruiter-attractive this way*'. Furthermore, information on social network sites was not perceived as being reliable by several recruiters: '*On social network sites, information can easily be manipulated*'. Other ways to check job applicants were also considered to be useful, like tracing references.

 Besides that, recruiters identified several groups that do not fall into the target group of social network sites, therefore, recruiters did not use social network sites. Recruiters who did not have any experience with social network sites, who were older and did not belong to the younger generation (13 – 35 years) did not make use of social network sites. Also, when searching for older and more experienced employees, recruiters did not use social network sites. Social network sites were also not used because it was time-consuming and a little unethical: '*I want nothing to do with the personal life of (potential) employees, that has to be strictly private.* Other recruiters indicated it is not allowed to use social network sites, because a Dutch code prescribes '*it is not allowed to use information from thirds and other sources when it is not reported to a job applicant, when the source is not mentioned or without asking permission or checking the trustworthiness of this information'.* Although this is not a legal code, some recruiters liked to conform to this code.

Consequences of social network sites for recruiters' work
Not only the resume and the application letter create an impression of a job applicant, but also profiles on social network sites do. The question arises what influence social network site profiles have on the recruiters' impression of job applicants. Some recruiters said social network sites had no influence, others talked about positive and/or negative influence. It was obvious that, on one hand, recruiters who did not use social network sites thought these sites had a major influence on choices recruiters make and, on the other hand, recruiters who used social network sites claimed the influence is not that big; the candidate is hired based on the job interview and the resume. This result might suggest there is unaware influence: recruiters who use social network sites might be unaware of the influence this might have.

Impression formation and judgments
Almost all recruiters thought checking out profiles on social network sites lead to impression formation. Some recruiters also pointed out that they created judgments about job applicants' abilities when looking at social network sites: '*Profiles on social network sites put weight on judgments of the recruiter.*' Some aspects of a profile provided certain assumptions about job applicants' capacities. However, others claimed that it is not possible to judge a job applicant based on one's profile on a social network site. Photographs or business information on such sites offer too little information to ground (hiring) decisions: '*To make such decisions, a job interview is needed.*' Most recruiters confirmed this and agreed that '*the job interview is the most important aspect of the application procedure and that decisions are based upon these conversations.*' They pointed out that when the job interview is in favor of a job applicant and the profile is detrimental for this job applicant, the job interview is much more important than the quality of the social network site profile.

Selection tool

Furthermore, most recruiters posited that social network sites could function as a selection tool. Recruiters indicated that when there are more suitable candidates, job applicants who have a decent resume but also have a negative profile will not be selected for a job interview. Negative profiles can turn the scale and can be a crucial factor in the selection process. However, not every recruiter agreed with this point of view, one recruiter claimed that social network sites were not used as a selection tool: '*recruiters always have an opinion about someone but a (hiring) decision is never made based on this*'.

Changing job interview

Recruiters indicated they are not open-minded and blank anymore when using social network sites which have influence on the job interview. Many recruiters pointed out that job interviews might turn out quite differently when job applicants' profiles on social network sites are checked. Impressions and assumptions are already created and also the job interview is based on these impressions. On one hand, one recruiter thought it might be in job applicants' advantage when applicants have a positive profile because the first impression is taken into account. On the other hand, when job applicants have a negative profile this can work visa versa.

Type of social network site

One recruiter claimed that LinkedIn is advantageous for job applicants and Hyves is not because of the different goals they serve. LinkedIn is a professional network site and looks more like a online resume which serves the aim of job applicants. Contrary, Hyves is personal and is more like a friend network completed with photographs and other personal information which does not suit the purpose of job applicants. Another recruiter stated that social network sites have still never worked against applicants in his company.

Consequences of photographs on recruiters' work

Not every interviewed recruiter made use of social network sites and to avoid this possible gap, we have asked a few questions about photographs sent with the resume. The reason for that is that the basic thought is a little bit the same in comparison with social network sites in the sense that photographs on resumes also provide an certain impression of a job applicant. When collecting data about photographs on resumes it is possible to carefully compare these data with the data about the influence of social network sites.

Preference

About half of the interviewed recruiters indicated they preferred a photograph on the resume. According to them, it gave more information about job applicants and it was easier to form impressions about job applicants. The other half pointed out that a photograph on a resume was not interesting and that a photograph does not add value to a resume.

Dependent on job applicants

Recruiters pointed out that having a photograph on a resume is partly dependent on job applicants themselves. Especially good-looking and representative job applicants and older job applicants submit their photograph to their resume. For older people, it is their way of telling that they are representative despite of their age, according to the recruiters. Good-looking job applicants think they might have better chances because of their looks.

Impression formation

Recruiters were divided about the influence photographs have on impression formation. On one hand, several recruiters posited that photographs on resumes provide a picture of job applicants and create impressions: '*Unprofessional photos create a negative impression of a job applicant.*' On the other hand, others indicated

that a photograph of a job applicant does not have any influence on image-formation. Another recruiter pointed out it is difficult to create an independent picture when a photograph is added.

Selection tool
According to recruiters, photographs can influence the willingness to invite a job applicant to a job interview: '*It can be used as a kind of selection tool.*' In one case, a photograph on a resume led to a situation in which a job applicant was not invited while he should have been invited if he had not added a photograph. The opposite is, of course, also thinkable, a job applicant with a beautiful appearance might have a better chance to be invited to a job interview. Interviewed recruiters indicated that people are unconsciously attracted to pretty people who, therefore, have better chances. Other recruiters stated that a resume with photograph is not different from a resume without photograph: '*a job applicant should fit in the company despite of one's looks; photographs only show what a job applicant looks like and cannot express anything about his/her qualities'.*

Comparison between social network sites and photographs
These results show a lot of comparison with the results of theme 2, the consequences of social network sites for recruiters' work. Photos on a resume almost serve the same aims as the use of social network sites. These activities both facilitate the process of impression formation and give more information about job applicants. They are also both used as a selection tool to make distinctions between job applicants. Furthermore, they both raise the same questions whether this information must be taken into account or not. Photos attached to resumes and information on social network sites can both lead to bias in selecting job applicants and can have negative consequences for job applicants with negative photos or job applicants who have a negative social network site profile.

Judgment of information on social network sites
The interviews showed that several pieces of information on profiles on social network sites are important for recruiters. We identified which aspects were more or less important and whether these aspects were perceived either negative or positive. Also, it was identified whether self-generated information and other-generated information was important and trustworthy for recruiters. Recruiters were quite unanimous but some paid more attention to different aspects.

Importance of information
Photographs, personal information and work-related information were considered as the most important aspects of social network sites profiles. Photographs and profile photographs gave an impression of what a job applicant was like and looked like. Personal information is information someone gives about oneself like hobbies, interests and favorite books. Education, work experience and recommendations on a professional social network site fall into work-related information. Less important aspects were information derived from others and personal information. Comments by others were not interesting at all according to the recruiters, because the profile owner does not have influence on these comments and comments were not written by job applicants themselves. Therefore, some recruiters indicated that comments did not give a correct picture of the job applicant. The warranting principle was, therefore, not supported in this study. One recruiter thought hobbies and communities were not interesting.

Negative information
Recruiters repeatedly named photographs as aspect that could be detrimental for job applicants. Recruiters said some job applicants have weird, extreme photographs on their social network site profile, like posted photographs about them drinking and looking drunk or posted naked photographs of themselves. Recruiters were not amused seeing these kind of photographs and pointed out that these photographs have a negative influence on the acquired impression of a job applicant. Also, disarray on social network site profiles delivered

a negative view of job applicants. Especially errors in writing and not being selective did not leave a good impression, according to one recruiter.

Positive information
A few recruiters were able to name positive aspects of social network site profiles which might create a positive view of a job applicant. Charming and pleasant photographs, positive personal information and some profile features were perceived as positive aspects of social network site profiles which created a positive impression. Also, some features of social network site profiles were perceived as positive aspects. By preference, a profile should look neat and smooth and should be conveniently arranged.

Conclusion

It appeared that about half of the recruiters in this study use social network sites during the application procedure. The most mentioned reasons for using these sites are the possibility to form an impression, form judgments and curiosity about job applicants. The reasons why the other half of recruiters do not use social network sites are fear of misjudgment, unreliable information and the lack of absorbing information.

This study also examined aspects of social network site profiles which recruiters experienced as (un)important. Also, a comparison is made between positive and negative aspects and self- and other-generated information of job applicants' social network site profiles. The results of this first study showed no evidence for the warranting principle. Other-generated information on social network sites, like comments posted by others, were not perceived as important information. On the contrary, others' comments were perceived as information a job applicant could not control and, therefore, recruiters saw it as irrelevant and not more trustworthy. Rather, information from job applicants themselves was perceived as much more important, inter alia hobbies, interests and posted photographs of job applicants. The hypothesis that information derived from others has more warrant than self-generated information (Walther & Parks, 2002) is not supported in this exploratory study. However, like Walther et al. (2009) found in their study of exploring the warranting principle on extraversion, that aspects of social network sites are by no means static, rather they can vary between several profiles and can have multiple appearances and fulfillments. As for the validation of negative and positive information on social network sites, it is obvious that recruiters had ambiguous thoughts about the picture of a 'perfect' candidate and paid therefore different negative or positive value to aspects of social network site profiles. For example, whether (aspects of) a profile is experienced as positive or negative might be dependent of the function one's applying for and of the ideas and preferences of recruiters selves. However, it appeared that some aspects were experienced negatively by all recruiters, like dirty and drunken photographs.

It can also be concluded, based on this study, that profiles on social network sites can have negative or positive implications for job applicants. Recruiters get impressions of job applicants based on information on social network sites and some judge job applicants based on this information. As a consequence, when social network sites are used, these can serve as a selection tool for recruiters. Recruiters can make decisions based on information on these sites, whereas it is possible that one is not selected to a job interview and one does not have a chance to be hired. Photographs on resumes showed similar results. This might imply that photographs on resumes have similar consequences for career opportunities as using social network sites during the application procedure.

A qualitative study is very useful when a study has an exploratory nature, but the main disadvantage is that the results cannot be generalized to other recruiters or other situations (Krueger, 1998). Because we think the warranting principle is a very interesting hypothesis which deserves greater knowledge, this principle should also be studied in a larger sample. We also wanted to know if the results and effects of this study are applicable for a larger amount of recruiters. Therefore a second, quantitative study is conducted.

Study 2: Quantitative research on the use of social network sites

A second study was conducted to examine the research questions and the warranting principle in particular in more detail. This study was quantitative of nature because of the need for greater generalization of the data. The study pays attention to the way recruiters use social network sites during the application procedure. For instance, it is studied which social network sites are used, both privately as during the application procedure and whether there exist a connection between private use and use of social network sites during the application procedure. Furthermore, it is tested which information on social network sites is judgable according to recruiters and whether this information can be in favor of or can be detrimental for job applicants. Also, the warranting principle is tested both by posing statements about self- and other-generated information as well as by conducting an experiment. Finally, the consequences for career opportunities of job applicants when using social network sites during the application procedure are studied.

Method

Manipulation
This study was quantitative and had a 2 x 2 factorial design, because there were two independent variables that defined the experimental conditions (Campbell & Stanley, 1966). One of these variables was self-generated information (positive or negative) and the other was other-generated information (positive or negative). There existed four conditions of the questionnaire as shown in figure 2.

Self-generated information	Other-generated information	
	Negative	Positive
Negative	Condition 1: Negative	Condition3: Negative-positive
Positive	Condition 4: Positive-negative	Condition 2: Positive

Figure 2. Four conditions of the questionnaire

Four different Hyves profiles were created and these differed in the way information was given on these profiles. Hyves was chosen, because it is the most popular social network sites in the Netherlands (*Hyves*, n.d.) and this also came forward in the interviews with recruiters in study 1. Furthermore, Hyves has no professional characteristics, so it is not expected that this site is necessarily used during the application procedure in contrast with LinkedIn. The Hyves profiles consisted of self-generated information (information from the profile owner self) and other-generated information (information derived from others). The profiles were manipulated and turned into four different versions of the questionnaire in order to test the warranting principle.

The self-generated information consisted of a profile photo, four other photos, the amount of friends, three Hyves communities, demographic data, the name of an university the job applicant had finished and applicants' passions. The demographic data, the number of friends and the name of the university were similar for all conditions. The job applicant was a female and was called 'Sanne de Jong' because Sanne is one of the most occurring names in the Netherlands (Sociale verzekeringsbank, 2009; Meertens Instituut, 2007) and de Jong is the most occurring surname (Meertens Instituut, 2007). Furthermore, the applicant was 23 years old and finished University of Twente. The number of friends was 147, because Hyves (n.d.) stated that the average number of friends on their site was 97, but also pointed out that most users of Hyves are students. Besides, Walther et al. (2008) pointed out that the average number of friends on Facebook in their sample on a university was 246, so the middle of these two numbers was chosen. The other self-generated information was manipulated into positive self-generated information and negative self-generated information. Based on study 1, negative information is information that suggests job applicants are bad employees. Characteristics that meet this suggestion are lots of alcoholic drinks, laxity, always coming late at appointments and only showing drunken photos on a profile. Positive self-generated information consists of nice looking photos, interesting

hobbies or interests and showing sense of responsibility. In the positive condition of the questionnaire, the profile photo was a nice photo of the job applicant and a friend and the four other photos were a photo of a nice view, a photo of the applicant alone, a photo with a friend and a photo with her boyfriend. Furthermore, the job applicant's passions were dancing and traveling and she connected herself with three Hyves communities: *Unicef, Dancing* and *University of Twente*. In the negative condition, the profile photo was a photo of the job applicant with a bottle of wine in her hands and on the other photos a shopping cart with bottles of beer and party photos were pictured. The job applicant's passions were partying and dancing and the Hyves communities with whom she was connected were: *I am too often fucked up, Just one more* and *Early-rising-sucks-club*.

Other-generated information on social network sites consists of comments of other users (so-called Hyves friends). This information was also manipulated into positive other-generated information and negative other-generated information. Four comments of different users were created that gave information about the job applicant. In the positive condition the comments suggest that the job applicant is a decent employee and comments were related to desired characteristics of employees like responsibility and spontaneity. In the negative condition, the comments meet again the suggestion that the job applicant is a bad employee. The comments were related to undesired characteristics like laxity and drinking huge amounts of alcoholic drinks.

Mixing the positive and negative self-generated information and the positive and negative other-generated information resulted into four conditions: a positive condition with positive self- and positive other-generated information, a negative-positive condition with negative self- and positive other-generated information, a positive-negative condition with positive self- and negative other- generated information and a negative condition with both negative self- and negative other-generated information. These four (fake) social network site profiles can be found in Appendix 3.

Instrument

The questionnaire consisted of questions that were based on the data of study 1. Unfortunately, not all data of study 1 could be integrated in the questionnaire, otherwise the questionnaire was too long to fill out. Only the subthemes (of the themes) that returned at least five times in the data were included. Also, the data of the theme about the consequences of photographs on resumes was not included, because the questionnaire was only about social network sites.

First, participants had to fill out the corporate data of the company they worked for, like the number of employees, the location of the company and the job they fulfilled. Then was asked after respondents' involvement at the application procedure and to what extent they made use of social network sites, both privately and during the application procedure. The respondents also had to indicate to what extent they perceived their own profiles on social network sites as being important and how much time they spend on these sites. In this study, 7-point Likert scales were used to indicate the importance of and time spending on social network sites, because these scales are repeatedly tested and appeared to be the most reliable and internal consistent (Symonds, 1923; Krosnick & Fabrigar, 1977; Preston & Colman, 2000).

Furthermore, it was asked with which aspects on social network sites one could judge the abilities of the job applicant and whether these aspects could work in favor or against job applicants. Also, respondents were shown the (fake) profile of the job applicant and they had to indicate what their opinion was of this job applicant. A five-item semantic differentiation scale was used to measure their opinion. This scale also ranged from 1 till 7. Finally, respondents had to indicate to what extent they agreed or disagreed with 27 statements about social network sites. Again, 7-point Likert scale was used, varying from 1 (totally disagree) till 7 (totally agree). The statements were self-developed, no scale was already available. The reliability of the constructs of the statements was tested during the study and it appeared all constructs were reliable and had an alpha above the minimum of .70 (Nunnally, 1978; Devellis, 2003). These constructs contained items about job dependency, information supplementation, judgments of applicants, reliability of information on social network sites, social network sites as selection tool and the career consequences social network sites bring

along. The construct job dependency consisted of five statements including: *'Using social network sites during the application procedure is dependent of the position one is applying for'* and *'I use social network sites more often when I have to fulfill commercial positions than technical positions'.* This construct had an alpha of .74. Information supplementation consisted of four items like *'I think checking job applicants on social network sites has an additional value'* and *'Looking at social network sites of job applicants provide extra information of applicants'* (α = .75). *'Using social network sites leads to prejudices about job applicants'* and *'Social network sites give information through which I can better estimate job applicants' abilities'* were examples of items that belong to the five items about the construct judgments of applicants (α = .85). Reliability of information (α = .75) were approximate by four statements, for example *'I rely on the correctness of information about applicants on social network sites'* and *'It is easy to manipulate information on social network sites'.* The construct social network sites as a selection tool consisted of five items including *'Information on social network sites has influence on the evaluation of job applicants'* and *'I get a better and more complete impression of job applicants when I use social network sites during the application procedure* (α = .83). *'Social network sites influence the career opportunities of job applicants'* and *'A negative social network sites profile can decline the career possibilities of job applicants'* belong to the four statements about career consequences of social network sites (α = .88). At last, respondents had to fill in their demographic data like their gender, age, education and income. The complete questionnaire is attached in Appendix 2.

The questionnaire was pretested among 12 participants by using a (current) think aloud protocol. Respondents had to read the questions and answers of the questionnaire aloud and subsequently answer the questions. The aim of the pretest was to find out if the questions and answers were understandable and clear and if the respondents could answer the questions. It was also asked if respondents missed something in the questionnaire. The questionnaire was revised based on these results.

Participants

The online questionnaire was administered among 159 participants (74 man and 85 women). Participants were recruiters from different organizations in the Netherlands. During data analysis, it appeared that 20 recruiters above these 159 participants filled in the questionnaire half. However, these data is included to support suitable analyses.

The participants were selected in different ways. The researcher went to career events, approached recruiters via LinkedIn, approached branch organizations for recruiters and HRM advisors, called recruiters within organizations and visited employment agencies. They were all asked to volunteer in this study in exchange for the study results. They were also asked to ask their colleagues to participate in this study. Participants were randomly assigned into one of the four experimental conditions of the questionnaire. To evaluate whether this randomization was successful, the research sample will be described in detail by showing the distribution of the participants demographic characteristics. Chi-square tests showed that the respondents were equally distributed among the experimental conditions both for gender, age, education and income. The demographic data are exposed in table 1.

Table 1
Demographic data of the respondents

Demographic characteristic		*N*	Percentage
Gender	Men	74	47%
	Women	85	53%
Age	21-30	46	29%
	31-40	66	42%
	41-50	31	20%
	51-60	12	8%
	> 60	4	2%

		N	Percentage
	HAVO	4	3%
	VWO	1	0,6%
Education	MBO	8	5%
	HBO	97	61%
	WO	44	28%
	Post-academic	4	3%
	< modal	4	3%
	Ca. modal	43	27%
Income	1,5 * modal	56	36%
	2 * modal	27	17%
	> 2 * modal	27	17%

Results indicated that a little more women than men participated in the study and that most recruiters were between 21 and 50 years old. By far, most recruiters were well educated and finished a HBO study or a study at an university. On the average, they had quite high incomes.

The recruiters worked for different organizations. Chi-square tests showed that there is no difference between the distribution of corporate data and the version of the questionnaire. The respondents are equally distributed among the conditions both for the number of employees, for branch of industry, for location of company and for work experience. The corporate data is exposed in table 2.

Table 2

Corporate data of companies respondents work for

Corporate characteristic		N	Percentage
Number of employees	1-20	48	27%
	21-100	25	14%
	101-500	36	20%
	> 500	68	39%
Branch of industry	Services	45	25%
	Healthcare	8	5%
	Wholesale business	2	1%
	Industry	6	4%
	ICT	11	6%
	Detaching services	36	20%
	Consultancy	18	10%
Different, namely			
	Education	19	11%
	Government	12	7%
	Bank/Insurances	9	5%
	Building industry	4	2%
	Marketing	3	2%
	Recruitment	5	3%
	Safety industry	2	1%
	Broadcasting company	1	0,6%
Location of company	North-Netherlands	19	11%
	West-Netherlands	68	39%
	East-Netherlands	58	33%
	South-Netherlands	30	17%
Work experience	< 1 year	11	7%
	1-3 years	55	32%

	4-6 years	38	23%
	7-10 years	30	18%
	10-15 years	21	12%
	> 15 years	13	8%

Table 2 showed that most respondents worked in small or large companies with a few or many employees. The branch of industry is very broad, but most recruiters worked in (detaching) services organizations, consultancy and education. Most recruiters came from West-Netherlands and East-Netherlands and had 1 till 10 years of work experience.

Procedure
When recruiters indicated that they wanted to volunteer in the study, the researcher sent them an e-mail with supplemental information and the link of the questionnaire. The questionnaire was an online questionnaire which could be filled out at respondents' office or home. There were four different versions of the questionnaire and respondents were randomly assigned to a condition. When respondents clicked on the link of the questionnaire, they were welcomed and thanked. Then was explained what the purpose of the questionnaire was and what they had to do. Completing the questionnaire took up about 10 till 15 minutes.

Results

The way recruiters use social network sites

At first, the way recruiters used social network sites is described in order to answer to first sub question. The focus was on recruiters' use of different social network sites, how and when these sites are used and reasons why recruiters used social network sites.

Use of social network sites privately and during the application procedure
The results showed that recruiters used social network sites both privately and during the application procedure. Hyves, LinkedIn, Facebook and MySpace were taken into account. The results are reported in table 3.

Table 3
Number of respondents using social network sites

Social network site	Private		During application procedure	
	Yes	No	Yes	No
Hyves	100	66	81	88
	60%	40%	48%	52%
LinkedIn	145	31	139	34
	82%	18%	80%	20%
Facebook	70	94	28	135
	43%	57%	17%	83%
MySpace	0	161	7	154
	0%	100%	4%	96%

Results showed that LinkedIn is the most used social network site, both privately as well during the application procedure. Almost half of the recruiters indicated they use Hyves during the application procedure and 17,2 percent used Facebook. None of the respondents used MySpace privately, so MySpace is not further analyzed.

It was expected that there existed a positive correlation between the private use and use of social network sites during the application procedure. An ANOVA confirmed this expectation and indicated that respondents who privately used a social network site in particular, were also more inclined to use this site during the application procedure (respectively, $F(1, 163) = 4.32$, $p = .04$ for Hyves, $F(1, 172) = 53.91$, $p < .000$ for LinkedIn and $F(1, 161) = 5.26$, $p = .02$ for Facebook), although the correlation between these variables was higher for LinkedIn ($R = .49$) than Facebook ($R = .18$) and Hyves ($R = .16$). Of course the opposite is also true, when a respondent did not privately use a social network site, this respondent was less inclined to use this social network site during the application procedure.

Furthermore, it was tested whether the demographic data differed from the use of social network sites during the application procedure. For gender there was a significant effect found for Facebook $F(1, 145) = 4.28$, $p = .04$. It appeared that men ($M = 1.74$, $SD = .44$) more often used Facebook during the application procedure than women ($M = 1.88$, $SD = .33$). For age, a significant effect for LinkedIn was found $F(4, 154) = 3.35$, $p = .012$. Bonferroni confidence intervals showed that recruiters in the age between 51 and 60 years old significantly used LinkedIn less than recruiters in the other age categories except recruiters above 60 years old. For education, no significant effect was found for Hyves, LinkedIn and Facebook. Income only had a significant effect on LinkedIn $F(4, 153) = 2.62$, $p = .037$. A comparison between the means showed that respondents with an income beneath the average income ($M = 1.50$, $SD = .58$) used Linked less often than recruiters with higher incomes (respectively, $M = 1.21$, $SD = .41$, $M = 1.07$, $SD = .26$, $M = 1.31$, $SD = .47$, $M = 1.19$, $SD = .40$).

Importance and spent time on social network sites
In the questionnaire was also asked whether the profile on social network sites of recruiters themselves, if they had a profile, was important to them and how much time they spent on their profile. It was expected that when respondents considered their profile on a social network site as important and when they spent more time on their profile, it was more likely that respondents use this social network site during the application procedure. When using LinkedIn during the application procedure, both time spending $F(6, 155) = 13.77$, $p < .000$ and the experienced importance of this site $F(6, 153) = 9.90$, $p < .000$ were significant. Recruiters who considered their profile on LinkedIn as important and spent more time this site, were also more inclined to use LinkedIn during the application procedure (respectively $R = .46$ and $R = .48$). This was the same for Facebook (respectively $F(6, 84) = 2.00$, $p = .038$ (one-sided) for importance and $F(6, 90) = 2.87$, $p = .014$ for time-spending). Respondents who considered Facebook as more important and spent more time on their Facebook profile were more inclined to use Facebook during the application procedure (respectively $R = .26$ and $R = .29$). The use of Hyves during the application procedure was not dependent on the time recruiters spent on their own Hyves profile. The extent of importance however was rather significant $F(6, 120) = 2.36$, $p = .035$: recruiters who perceived their profile on Hyves was important, were more inclined to use Hyves during the application procedure ($R = .25$).

Involvement in application procedure and use of social network sites
The way respondents were involved in the application procedure did not have influence whether respondents use social network sites, except for recruitment $F(1, 163) = 4.30$, $p = .04$. When recruiters were involved with hiring, they also use social network sites more often. When respondents were responsible for collecting resumes, for selection, for hiring and/or the overall application procedure, there was no difference between respondents' role in the application procedure and their use of social network sites.

Moment of using social network sites during the application procedure
From all respondents, 31 recruiters pointed out they never use social network sites, 52 recruiters said they did this after they received a job applicant's resume, 62 recruiters used these sites before a job interview took place and 5 recruiters used these sites after the job interview. 28 recruiters chose for 'different' and some indicated that they use social network sites both before and after the job interview, some indicated they never

look at these sites because of the Dutch Code that advised employers not to use information derived from thirds, some pointed out they only look at these sites when they rolled out a search engine and some indicated they use social network sites only in several cases.

Reasons for using social network sites
Based on data from study 1, there were several statements posed about the reasons why recruiters use social network sites during the application procedure. It was tested whether recruiters were inclined to use social network sites when a specific job was offered, when they perceived information on social network sites as additional information and reliable information and when they thought information on these sites can be used to judge job applicants.

It appeared that the use social network sites was not job dependent. Using social network sites did not significantly depend on the job offered. Most recruiters were not more inclined to use social network sites when hiring commercial job applicants in comparison with technical job applicants (M = 3.58, SD = 1.86) or when fulfilling a job with high demands in comparison with low demands (M = 3.47, SD = 1.89). Also, the way social network sites could be used to judge applicants was not significant for the way social network sites were used. Social network sites rather led to prejudices about applicants (M = 4.93, SD = 1.30) and could not be used to estimate applicants´ abilities (M = 3.56, SD = 1.56). However, recruiters indicated they get a better picture of applicant when using social network sites (M = 4.91, SD = 1.53) and are able to judge applicants (M = 4.23, SD = 1.60). On the contrary, it appeared that when recruiters thought social network sites give more information about job applicants (M = 4.65, SD = 1.16) and thought these sites provide additional value (M = 4.65, SD = 1.56), they also make more use of social network sites F(21, 157) = 2.62, p < .000. Information social network sites was perceived as additional information by most recruiters (M = 5.28, SD = 1.31) and as an enlargement of information on a resume (M = 5.10, SD = 1.46). Lastly, it appeared that when recruiters indicated they perceived information on social network sites as being reliable, they were also more inclined to use social network sites during the application procedure F(20, 157) = 1.93, p = .014. However, a majority of the recruiters indicated that they did not believe information on social network sites is reliable (M = 3.24, SD = 1.32) and that this information can easy be manipulated (M = 5.20, SD = 1.24). Information on social network sites could not give a trustworthy picture of job applicants (M = 3.36, SD = 1.29).

Judgments about information on social network sites
To answer sub question 2, it was investigated what information on social network sites is important for recruiters and what information could be used to judge job applicants. Therefore, it was asked on which pieces of information on social network sites, recruiters can make judgments about the abilities and capacities of job applicants. The results are reported in table 4.

Table 4
Judgmental aspects of social network sites

Aspects of social network sites	Judgments about abilities	
	Yes	No
None of the aspects	49	115
	30%	70%
Profile photo	39	125
	24%	76%
Photos	53	111
	32%	68%
Comments	76	88
	46%	54%

Hyves communities	47	117
	29%	71%
Particular hobbies	58	106
	35%	65%
Particular interests	84	80
	51%	49%
Number of friends	17	147
	10%	90%

The results showed that 30 percent thought there is no judgmental information on social network sites whereas 70 percent had a different view about that. Especially comments and particular interests were considered to be judgmental information. A profile photo and the number of friends were perceived as the least useful information to judge an applicant. It was tested if the way respondents answered this question was dependent of the version of the questionnaire they filled in, because it would not be preferable when this was the case. There were no significant differences found between the four conditions and the way in which they perceived the aspects of social network sites as judgmental information.

In the questionnaire was also asked which pieces of information can be advantageous for job applicants and which aspects can be detrimental for job applicants in regard with their career possibilities. Respondents had to indicate which aspects of social network sites they thought were advantageous for job applicants or detrimental for job applicants. It was also tested if there was a difference between aspects that can have positive effects and aspects that can have negative effects. The results are reported in table 5.

Table 5
Aspects that can be a (dis)advantage

Aspects of social network sites		Advantage		Disadvantage		*F*
		Yes	No	Yes	No	
None of the aspects		23	141	12	152	52.13***
		14%	86%	7%	93%	
Profile photo		79	85	89	75	15.68***
		48%	52%	54%	46%	
Photos						
	Nice looking photos	45	119			
		27%	73%			
	Drunken photos			125	39	
				76%	24%	
	Bad looking photos			25	139	
				15%	85%	
	Naked photos			135	29	
				82%	18%	
Comments		69	95	106	58	8.01**
		42%	58%	65%	35%	
Hyves communities		69	95	89	75	32.82***
		42%	58%	54%	46%	
Particular hobbies		81	83	66	98	5.68*
		49%	51%	40%	60%	
Particular interests		119	45	78	86	5.13*

24

	73%	27%	48%	52%	
Number of friends	15	149	9	155	6.90**
	9%	91%	6%	94%	

*P < .05, ** P < .01, *** P < .001.

Results showed many recruiters thought particular interests can be advantageous for job applicants. Also a profile photo, comments, particular hobbies and Hyves communities can have positive effects for job applicants. The number of friends and general photos were less perceived as advantages. Also prominent, only 14 percent thought none of the aspects of social network sites could be beneficial for job applicants and only 7 percent thought none of the aspects could be detrimental for job applicants. Especially drunken photographs, naked photographs, comments and Hyves communities could be detrimental for job applicants according to the respondents. It also appeared that there are significantly differences between similar aspects that can be advantageous for job applicants and aspects that can be detrimental for job applicants. For example, more recruiters thought job applicants could benefit from interests and hobbies and less recruiters thought these aspects also could have negative consequences for job applicants. This was similar for photos, comments and Hyves communities; less recruiters thought these aspects could have positive effects in comparison with detrimental effects.

The results of aspects that could be advantageous or detrimental for applicants were not different for gender and age. Specific age categories did not perceived information on social network sites more or less advantageous for applicants or more or less detrimental for job applicants. Also, men did not perceived information more or less beneficial or detrimental for job applicants than women.

Influence of self-generated and other-generated information
In order to answer the third sub question, the way self-generated information and other-generated information was perceived by recruiters was tested. To investigate the trustworthiness of information, the questionnaire contained three statements about the trustworthiness of self-generated information and other generated information that had to be answered. To examine whether perceivers' judgments about job applicants rely more heavily on other-generated information than self-generated information, an experiment was conducted. The experiment consisted of four different versions of the questionnaire with mixed self-generated and other-generated information on a social network site profile. Respondents were randomly assigned to a version. Respondents were asked to judge the job applicant on the profile. Based on the warranting principle, other-generated information is expected to be more warrant than self-generated information and therefore it was expected that the version with positive other-generated information and negative self-generated information would be judged more positive than the version that contains negative other-generated information and positive self-generated information, because of the warranting value of information.

Statements
On the statement '*Comments on a social network site offer the most reliable information about a job applicant, because this information cannot be manipulated*', about half of the respondents disagreed a little or more, 29 percent was neutral and 19 percent agreed a little or more. The mean score was 3.22 (*SD* = 1.47). This indicates that comments were not perceived as the most reliable information on social network sites. On the statement '*Information about a job applicant provided by others about is more trustworthy than information about a job applicant derived by a job applicant self*' 52 percent disagreed, 25 percent was neutral and about 23 percent agreed a little or more (*M* = 3.38, *SD* = 1.39). This implies that more than 75 percent of the recruiters did not think information derived from others is more trustworthy than self-generated information. The statement '*Information on social network sites that is provided by a job applicant self offers the most reliable picture of this person*' showed the same picture as the first statement: about 50 percent disagreed, 29 percent was neutral and 21 percent agreed a little or more, although the average score was a little bit higher namely 3.40

25

(*SD* = 1.25). Also self-generated information is not perceived to be more reliable because only 21 percent agreed with the statement a little or more. This implies information on social network sites is not reliable at all. Still, the mean score on this statement is higher than the statement that posits that comments offer the most reliable information. These statements do not convincingly indicate that other-generated information is perceived as more trustworthy than self-generated information. Contrary, these results pointed more into the other direction.

Experiment
In the experiment, respondents were shown one of the four profiles of a job applicant on Hyves and recruiters had to indicate what impression they got from the job applicant. They also had to judge the job applicant on several items. The overall impression of the job applicant was highest in the positive condition (*M* = 5.30, *SD* = .91), followed by the negative-positive condition (*M* = 4.07, *SD* = 1.22), then the positive-negative condition (*M* = 3.31, *SD* = 1.00) and at last the negative condition (*M* = 3.23, *SD* = .97). An ANOVA showed the conditions significantly differed from each other *F*(3, 162) = 35.12, *p* < .000. Also, the degree of competent nature, reliability, attractiveness, suitability and the likeliness to be invited to a job interview were measured. The results are reported in table 6.

Table 6
Conditions means of judgments about applicant

Judgment		Condition 'Positive'	Condition 'Negative'	Condition 'Negative-positive'	Condition 'Positive-Negative'	F
N		43	35	43	43	
Competent	*M*	3.42	4.43	3.84	3.95	6.55**
	SD	.98	.95	.92	1.54	
Reliability	*M*	3.33	4.97	3.74	4.51	16.12**
	SD	1.09	1.19	1.18	1.16	
Invitation job interview	*M*	3.07	4.40	3.30	3.77	5.73**
	SD	1.35	1.72	1.49	1.53	
Attractiveness	*M*	3.07	3.89	3.47	3.79	4.30*
	SD	1.12	1.16	1.28	.97	
Suitability	*M*	3.67	4.69	4.09	4.35	9.22**
	SD	.78	1.02	.75	.97	

* *p* < .01, ** *p* < .001.. *Note* : Judgments were made on a 7-point semantic differential scale (1 = very competent - 7 = very incompetent, 1 = very reliable - 7 = very unreliable, 1 = likely to get an invitation – 7 = very unlikely to get an invitation, 1 = very attractive – 7 = very unattractive, 1 = very suitable – 7 = very unsuitable) .

Table 6 showed that all conditions had the same distribution on all judgmental items. On all items, the positive condition scored highest, then the negative-positive condition, then the positive-negative condition and last the negative condition. The various conditions differed significantly from each other on the judgment criteria, although Bonferroni confidence intervals showed not all conditions did. These results obviously advocated for the warranting principle. The conditions with positive other-generated information were more highly judged than the conditions with negative-other generated information.

It was also tested whether the judgments on the criteria were different for gender, age, income and education. ANOVA´s indicated this was not the case: scores of recruiters were not different for demographic data. Complementary, it was tested whether the judgments were different for corporate data. There was no significant effect for the number of employees and the branch recruiters worked in. In contrast, recruiters of different locations scored significantly different on competence *F*(3, 160) = 3.17, *p* = .026. Bonferroni

confidence intervals showed that recruiters in East-Netherlands (M = 4.17, SD = .91) had lower scores on competence than recruiters from South-Netherland (M = 3.50, SD = .94, p = .028). Also, results on reliability F(5, 161) = 3.38, p = .006 and suitability F(5, 161) = 2.85, p = .017 were significantly different for recruiters' work experience. Further analysis with Bonferroni confidence intervals showed that recruiters with 7 till 10 years of work experience had lower scores on reliability (M = 4.45, SD = 1.34) and suitability (M = 4.42, SD = 1.06) than recruiters with less than one year of experience (M = 3.17, SD = 1.27, p = .045, M = 3.50, SD = .91, p = .058).

Consequences of social network sites
It was investigated which consequences were related to the use of social network sites during the application procedure in order to answer the fourth sub question. The consequences were measured in different ways which are outlined below.

Regression analysis
To investigate what consequences social network sites have on hiring decisions of recruiters in this study, it was questioned if there was a chance that recruiters hired the applicant based on the known fact that the applicant had a decent resume and based on her Hyves profile. A logistic linear regression analysis was conducted to find out which factors of social network sites have influence on hiring decisions of recruiters. Because there were no theoretical assumptions to test, all variables were included. It appeared four variables were significant and explained a part of the hiring decision of recruiters. The results are reported in table 7.

Table 7
Logistic regression analysis of the hiring decision

Predictor	β	$SE\ \beta$	Wald's X^2	df	p	e^{β}
Constant	-7.36	1.80	16.65	1	.000	.001
Judgment Hyves profile	2.16	.42	25.42	1	.000	8.46
Detrimental aspects	3.11	1.17	7.04	1	.008	22.35
Gender	-1.00	.44	5.17	1	.023	.37
Information supplementation	-.44	.19	5.10	1	.024	.65
Test			X^2	df	p	
Overall model evaluation						
Likelihood ratio test			52.92	4	.000	
Score test			45.70	4	.000	
Wald test			24.08	1	.000	
Goodness-of-fit test						
Hosmer & Lemeshow			9.13	8	.33	

Note. Cox and Snell R^2 = .29 and Nagelkerke R^2 = .41.

Results showed that four factors influenced the hiring decision namely judgments of the Hyves profile recruiters viewed, detrimental aspects of social network sites, gender of recruiters and information supplementation. The model was significant X^2(4, 155) = 52.92 p = .000. The Hosmer-Lemeshow test showed that the differences between the observed frequencies in data and the predicted frequencies in the model are not significant, which indicate that the model fits the data well (Peng, Lee & Ingersoll, 2002). This does not mean that the model necessarily explains much of the variance in the dependent variable, but only that however much or little it does explain is significant. However, the Nagelkerke (pseudo) R^2 showed that these variables explained 41 percent of the decision whether applicants in this study were hired or not. Although we should be careful with this measure because none pseudo R^2 render to meaning of the variance explained, the Nagelkerke R^2 is the most reported one in literature (*Logistic Regression Analysis,* n.d.) and results can be carefully interpreted.

According to the model, the log of the odds of a job applicant being hired was positively related to the judgments of Hyves profiles and detrimental aspects of social network sites. This indicates that job applicants with a higher score on the judgment criteria had a better chance to be hired. This is likely because when recruiters positively judged the job applicant, this applicant was perceived to be more competent, more reliable, more attractive, more suitable and more likely to be invited to a job interview and thus more likely to be hired. In fact, the odds of hiring a job applicant with higher scores was 8.46 times greater than the odds for applicants with lower scores. For detrimental aspects, the opposite was true: when recruiters thought social network sites had more detrimental effects, job applicants had less chance to be hired. It is likely when recruiters indicated social network sites had a lot of detrimental aspects for job applicants, they indicated they did not hire the job applicant based on this information. Gender had also influence on the decision whether someone is hired or not. This indicates that women in this study hired job applicants more often than men. Also, the variable information supplementation was significant. This indicates that when recruiters pointed out information on social network sites have additional value and perceived this information as being valuable, they were also more inclined to hire job applicants.

These four variables did not explained all the variance in the dependent variable. This implies that other variables, like for example the resume or the job interview, will also be important to make hiring decision.

Consequences of experimental Hyves profiles
It was tested whether different versions of the questionnaire caused different hiring decisions. Results showed that in the negative condition, 54 percent of the respondents reported that there is a chance that the job applicant will be hired (M = 1.46, SD = .51), in the negative-positive condition 63 percent (M = 1.37, SD = .49), in the positive-negative condition 74 percent (M = 1.26, SD = .44) and in the positive condition 82 percent (M = 1.19, SD = .39). This result was significant $F(3, 163)$ = 2.73, p = .046. This indicates that a job applicant with a positive profile on Hyves had a much better chance to be hired compared with job applicants in the other conditions. However, when recruiters explained why they would hire the job applicant (or not), many of them pointed out they had too little information to make a justified hiring decision. Some also indicated they did not use this information to make a hiring decision, they first wanted to wait for the job interview. Therefore, it is possible that some recruiters who wrote this have chosen to say yes to this question and others said no, but basically had the same explanation. Other recruiters gave other arguments why they would hire or reject a candidate. Recruiters in the negative condition declared they were worried about the negative aspects of the profile, such as the Hyves communities and the negative comments about the amount of alcohol and being late all the time. In the negative-positive condition, opinions about this were mixed. Some worried about the amount of alcohol on the pictures and Hyves communities, others were more positive and pointed out that the comments of friends were rather positive. This contradiction was also seen in the positive-negative condition. Some recruiters thought the job applicant was young, just graduated and drinking alcohol was an appropriate way to celebrate the finishing of the study, others were concerned about coming late at additional jobs, decreased responsibility and alcoholic drinks. In the positive condition, recruiters were quite positive about the job applicant based on the social network site. They thought the job applicant was balanced and representative and got good comments of her friends. It is obvious that the kind of information on social network site profiles has influence on the chance to be hired of a job applicant. When applicants have a profile that consist of negative information, it was less likely a job applicant was hired in comparison with a job applicant with positive information on social network sites. These findings indicate that information on social network sites can be critical for career opportunities of applicants.

Statements about career consequences
In the questionnaire was also tested what recruiters themselves thought about the influence of social network sites on career possibilities of job applicants. There were several statements posed and recruiters had to

indicate in what way they agreed with these statements. On the statement about the influence of job applicants' profiles on social network sites, 66 percent of the respondents answered they think little or more that social network sites influence the career possibilities of job applicants (M = 4.86, SD = 1.39). They indicated this influence can be negative when a job applicant has a negative profile (M = 4.88, SD = 1.49) and can be positive when a job applicant has a positive profile (M = 4.65, SD = 1.49). On the statement '*of two job applicants with a comparable resume, the job applicant with a negative profile a social network sites has smaller chance to be hired*', 67 percent of the recruiters agreed a little and more (M = 4.65, SD = 1.57). Recruiters also indicated that profiles on social network sites influence the picture of a job applicant (M = 4.75, SD = 1.40) and 40 percent of them indicated that these sites can be used to make judgments about job applicants (M = 3.89, SD = 1.69). Furthermore, 51 percent thought that profiles on social network sites can lead to not be invited to a job interview (M = 4.11, SD = 1.88). The same percentage indicated they get a better and more complete impression of job applicants when using social network sites (M = 4.34, SD = 1.66). About 41 percent of the recruiters indicated a little or more that using social network sites is part of their selection procedure during the application procedure (M = 3.90, SD = 1.89). Overall, most recruiters used social network sites somehow in the application procedure and acknowledged that these sites have impact on the career opportunities of job applicants.

Conclusion study 2

This study showed recruiters frequently use social network sites during the application procedure. Social network sites were especially used after receiving a resume and cover letter and before a job interview. Recruiters who had a profile on a social network site themselves were more inclined to use this site during the application procedure than recruiters who had no profile. When recruiters considered their own profile as important and when they spent more time on their profile, they were also more inclined to use this particular social network site. Using social network sites during the application procedure was not depend on the job applicants applied for and not of the degree in which social network sites can be used to judge job applicants, but rather on the way information on social network sites was perceived as additional valuable and reliable.

Results showed comments and particular interests posted on social network sites were most suitable to judge applicants. A profile photograph, comments and particular hobbies and Hyves communities can be advantageous for job applicants instead of drunken and naked photographs, negative comments and Hyves communities who can be detrimental for job applicants. The number of friends and good or bad looking photographs were perceived as having the least positive or negative influence on recruiters.

The warranting principle was not supported by the statements about self-generated and other-generated information. Results indicate that information derived from others was not perceived as more trustworthy than information provided by applicants selves. Also, comments were not seen as the most reliable aspect of social network sites. Contrary, the experiment provide support for the warranting principle. The profile with negative self-generated and positive other-generated information was more positively judged than the Hyves profile consisted of positive self-generated and negative other-generated information on the overall impression, competent nature, reliability, the likelihood to be invited for a job interview, attractiveness and suitability.

Furthermore, the career opportunities of job applicants are influenced by social network sites. Results showed that the way job applicants were judged by recruiters, gender, detrimental effects of social network sites and the way recruiters perceived information on these sites as being additional valuable have significant impact on the hiring decision of recruiters. When a job applicant is negatively judged based on one's social network site profile, this applicant has less chance to be hired in comparison with a job applicant with a positive profile. The experiment showed the same result and convincingly indicate that job applicants with a positive profile on Hyves have a much better chance to be hired than job applicants with a negative profile. Also recruiters selves indicate that the use of social network sites have influence on career opportunities of job applicants, both negatively as positively. Social network sites shape impressions and judgments about job

applicants which influence recruiters' selection decisions. These results are in agreement with the aforementioned results about the chance to be hired: recruiters realize that information on social network sites influenced them when they make a decision about hiring job applicants.

Discussion

The purpose of these studies was to examine the way recruiters form impressions of job applicants when using social network sites during the application procedure and the consequences of job applicants' career perspectives that follow from this. This resulted in the following research question:

Which influence does information from social network sites about an applicant derived from others and information provided by a job applicant about him/herself have on the impression formation of an recruiter before a job interview takes place and what are the related consequences for career opportunities?

Self-generated versus other-generated information

The results of these studies show a remarkable conclusion. It appeared that when self-reports were used, other-generated information was not considered to be more important and trustworthy than self-generated information. Contrary, the qualitative study showed that photographs and personal information were perceived as the most useful information to judge job applicants, comments were perceived as information that job applicants could not control and were therefore less important and trustworthy. In the quantitative study, especially particular interests and comments were perceived as information on which impressions could be formed. Answers on the statements about self-generated and other-generated information showed a similar result, which indicate that both self-generated information as well as other-generated information is important for recruiters. However, when using an experiment, it appeared other-generated information was convincingly more important and trustworthy than self-generated information. Results of the experiment showed that recruiters relied more on other-generated information when forming an impression about a job applicant. A job applicant with positive self-generated and negative other-generated information on a social network site profile was significantly less positively judged than a job applicant with a profile consisted of negative self-generated and positive other-generated information. These findings indicate that recruiters selves do not indicate other-generated information to be more important and trustworthy, but when tested experimentally, they actually rely more on information others give about a job applicant and take this information more into account when judging a job applicant. This implies that the warranting principle in this study is only applicable when an experiment was used and not when self-reports were used.

Possible explanations

This finding could be explained in several ways. It might imply that recruiters selves are perhaps unconscious of their actual information preference and rather think they pay more attention to self-generated information on social network sites instead of other-generated information. Banaji, Lemm & Carpenter (2004) posited that 'constructs that are active in a perceiver's mind implicitly shape perceptions and judgments of others' (p. 32) and persons are not aware of the influence of these constructs in shaping their judgments. It is possible that recruiters unconsciously think job applicants present themselves better on social network sites than they actually are and that therefore comments of others are perceived as more reliable. Haferkamp & Krämer (n.d.) showed that this was true for students, so this might also be true for recruiters. Their study showed that students indicated that they strive to present themselves as realistic as possible, but assumed that other users had false and exaggerated self-descriptions. However, Walther et al. (2009) point out that perceivers are anyway suspicious about the trustworthiness of self-descriptions on social network sites, so the question is why this construct would be unconscious in recruiters' mind.

Another plausible explanation for this finding might be that recruiters were confronted with comments of others in the experiment and therefore paid attention to these comments while they do not look

at these comments in real life. It is likely that when recruiters indicated in the interviews they do not look at comments on social network sites, they also not consider these comments as being important. However, when confronted with comments in the experiment, they pay attention to these comments whereas impressions formed. It is also possible that the interviewer effect and the tendency to present oneself in a favorable light influenced recruiters' answers in the interviews. It might be that recruiters did not want to admit they look at comments of job applicants in the interviews, because they actually think comments are private and it is embarrassing to look at these comments. Future research have to pay attention to this phenomenon and investigate what is the rationale behind this.

Influence on career opportunities
The studies convincingly show that the use of social network sites during the application procedure influence career opportunities of job applicants, both positively and negatively. Whereas results in the qualitative study suggest that the influence of social network sites is possibly unconscious, the results in the quantitative study indicate that recruiters are aware of the consequences of the use of these sites for job applicants. This might also be due to the interviewer effect in the sense that recruiters who use social network sites during the application procedure do not want to admit these sites have influence on the hiring decisions they make.

Both studies indicate that social network sites are used to form impressions of job applicants and can be used as a screening tool. Social network sites are especially important before a job interview and during the selection procedure, because recruiters pointed out they most often looked at social network sites at these moments. In selection procedure, profiles on social network sites can be especially critical in whether or not having an invitation to a job interview. The way a job interview works out is influenced by the use of social network sites before the job interview takes place. Social network sites have more influence on career opportunities before the job interview than after a job interview, because the interview self is perceived as the most important factor whether a job applicant is hired or not. Also, after a job interview the importance of a social network site profile is reduced, because the impression of a job applicant is based on many factors whereas it is less likely that a candidate is rejected only because of one's profile. However, a social network site can change the way a job interview works out, because the impressions formed on information on social network sites also exists during the job interview. During the selection procedure however, an impression is based on reduced factors, namely the resume, the cover letter and one's social network site profile. It is more likely that when a job applicant has a negative profile, this applicant is not invited to a job interview.

Social network sites positively and negatively influence the career opportunities of job applicants. Especially job applicants' profile photo, comments, Hyves communities, hobbies and interests could lead to positive but also detrimental effects. The number of friends on social network sites, however, was only by 10 percent of the recruiters judged as judgmental information which was not consisted with results of the study of Tom Tong et al. (2008) that showed the number of friends creates judgments about profile owners. It is possible that the number of friends is less important for employers than for other target groups like students, because recruiters pay attention to other information. Another explanation might be that the meaning of the number of friends is changed and that people have realized that the number of friends is not meaningful because it is hard to distinguish between real friends and vague acquaintance.

Results of the regression analysis and the experiment in the quantitative study showed that job applicants with a positive profile had much more chance to be hired than job applicants with a negative profile. Also recruiters themselves indicate negative and positive profiles on social network sites can decrease and increase career opportunities of job applicants. The regression analysis showed that positive judgments about job applicants' Hyves profile and a low amount of detrimental aspects on social network sites increase the chance to be hired. Also, when recruiters think information on social network sites delivers additional information, they are more inclined to hire job applicants based on their resume and social network site profile. Women are more inclined to hire job applicants based on resume and social network site profile than

men. However, the hiring decision is not only based on these factors, other factors outside this study also influence this decision. A job interview, a resume and a cover letter are good examples.

Limitations and future research

There were a few limitations concerning these studies. The first limitation is a general problem when conducting behavioral research. The results of both studies are partly based on self-reports of respondents which can lead to problems because self-reports usually are not verifiable and one has to trust on the recall ability and honesty of respondents (Podsakoff & Organ, 1986). In the qualitative study, it was tried to avoid this by asking respondents to recall the last job applicant they hired (or not) and describe what application procedure is followed. In this way, they could express themselves from their own experience which might help to recall. Subsequently, social desirability could have play a part in these studies. Social desirability refers to 'the need for social approval and acceptance and the belief that it can be attained by means of culturally acceptable and appropriate behaviors' (p. 109, Crowne & Marlowe, 1964 in: Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Lee & Podsakoff, 2003). The subject of the interviews in this study could be taken as confronting and a little ethical and therefore respondents might had the tendency to give social desirable answers. For example, nobody wants to admit (s)he hired an applicant because of his looks, that is not acceptable in both legal and ethical way. It was tried to avoid this by telling there are no good or bad answers and everything that had been said would have treated confidentially. Still, we cannot be certain that respondents were completely honest despite of these measures. The subject of the quantitative study was the same as the qualitative study, but respondents could answer anonymously and privately. Also, the questionnaire contained an experimental section by which the results were not fully based on self-reports of respondents, but also of experimental data which respondents could not control. In this study, social desirability had less chance to occur. Rather, the generalization of the study could be problematic in the way that the reality is not totally copied. The representation of the Hyves profiles in the quantitative study was different than in reality. The profiles were add into the questionnaire as an image for technical reasons. Therefore it was not possible to scroll through the Hyves page and click on links of the page. Subsequently, respondents had to answer the questions of the questionnaire only based on the given information that the resume was decent and the Hyves profile. In reality, respondents can check all information on resumes, click on every link on a Hyves page and know for which job one is applying. The reality is approximate by this study, but it is not the same. Therefore, it is difficult to completely generalized these results. However, this study contributes to the literature about the way these kind of studies are conducted. Future research should pay attention to the way real profiles on social network sites can be implemented in research.

Future research should also address the finding in these studies that the warranting principle is only applicable in an experiment and not in self-reports. It is interesting what is the rationale behind this finding and whether this also holds true for future research about the warranting principle, as well in work-related context as in interpersonal-related context. It is also interesting to study how social network sites can be successfully implemented in the application procedure. Social network sites can be useful in this procedure, but a lot of recruiters do not know how to implement these sites effectively during the application procedure, both during selection and recruitment and hiring. An empirical study might give answers.

Theoretical and practical implications

The warranting principle is applicable in work-related context, but only in the experiment. This might imply that people are not aware of their information preference or their suspiciousness about self-descriptions on social network sites. This might suggest that other-generated information is not directly perceived as being more trustworthy, like Walther et al. (2009) point out, but that this information is implicitly perceived as being more reliable. It is possible that people does not know that information derived from others is more important for the formation of impressions than information provided the target self. Further research should further address this issue.

The studies have practical implications for both applicants and recruiters. Applicants have to realize that information on social network sites is also available for (future) employers. It is now known that applicants with negative information have less chance to be hired than applicants with a positive profile. Negative information is information that gives recruiters the idea someone is a bad employee and cannot function in an organization. It is therefore advisable to avoid this information on the social network site profile. Examples of negative information are naked and drunken photographs, comments that suggest the applicant is very lazy, also comes late and likes alcohol a little too much and weird Hyves communities like (in this study) *'Early-rising-suchs-club'*. It is also known that comments from others have most impact on recruiters, so when applicants avoid negative information on their sites, it is recommendable to ask friends to do the same. When applicants do not want to reckon with the possibility that recruiters see their profile, it is wise to disclose the profile only to friends. Thus, job applicants are warned: to maximize career perspectives, it is advisable to check your social network site before recruiters do.

Recruiters have to be careful with using information of social network sites. This information have consequences for the way applicants are judged and for applicants´ career opportunities. On one hand, it is advisable to remember this when recruiting applicants, because information on social network sites is not always representative and can easy be manipulated. On the other hand, social network sites are excellent sites to get more information about job applicants and to create a more complete picture of job applicants. However, it might be a matter of time but it is likely that impression management will also occur on social network sites in future so it is advisable to take this into account.

References

Advocatie. (n.d.). Retrieved July 15, 2009 from http://www.advocatie.nl/page?1,2439.

Antheunis, M. L. (2009). *Online Communication, Interpersonal Attraction, and Friendship Formation.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Amsterdam, Amsterdam.

Banaji, M. R., Lemm, K. M. & Carpenter, S. J. (2004). The Social Unconscious. In M. D. Brewer & M. Hewstone (Eds.), *Social Cognition* (pp. 28 – 52). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

boyd, d. m. & Ellison, N. B. (2008). Social Network Sites: Definition, History and Scholarship. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication, 13,* 210 – 230.

Brandenburg, C. (2007). The Newest Way to Screen Job Applicants: A Social Networker's Nightmare. *Federal Communications Law Journal, 60,* 597 – 626.

Butow, E. & Taylor, K. (2009). *How to Succeed in Business using LinkedIn?* New York: AMACON.

Campbell, D. T. & Stanley, J. C. (1966). *Experimental and Quasi-experimental Designs for Research*. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Careerbuilder   (n.d.)   Retrieved   September   22,   2009   from http://www.careerbuilder.com/share/aboutus/pressreleasesdetail.aspx?id=pr519&sd=8%2f19%2f2009&ed=12%2f31%2f2009&siteid=cbpr&sc_cmp1=cb_pr519_&cbRecursionCnt=2&cbsid=41e4530386af4bf981379c964ae55a09-306917107-JC-5

Corbin, J. & Strauss, A. (1990). Grounded Theory Research: Procedures, Canons, and Evaluative Criteria. *Qualitative Sociology, 13,* 3 – 21.

Cross-Tab. (2010, January). *Online Reputation in a Connected World* (Research Document). Seattle.

DeVellis, R. F. (2003). *Scale Development: Theory and Applications* (2nd ed.) Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Ellison, N. B., Steinfield, C. & Lampe, C. (2007). The Benefits of Facebook "Friends:" Social Capital and College Students' Use of Online Social Network Sites. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, *12*(4).

Haferkamp, N. & Krämer, N. C. (n.d.). *Creating a digital self: Impression management and impression formation on social network sites.* Duisburg, Germany: University of Duisburg-Essen, Department of Social Psychology, Media and Communication.

Hancock, J. T., & Dunham, P. T. (2001). Impression formation in computer-mediated communication revisited: an analysis of the breadth and intensity of impressions. *Communication Research, 28*, 325–347.

Hancock, J. T. & Toma, C. L. (2009). Putting Your Best Face Forward: The Accuracy of Online Dating Photographs. *Journal of Communication, 59,* 367 – 386.

Hyves.   (n.d.).   Retrieved   August   24,   2009   from http://www.hyves.nl/index.php?l1=ut&l2=ab&l3=ns&pressmessage_id=1265944.

Knouse, S. B., Giacalone, R. A. & Pollard, H. (1988). Impression Management in the Resume and its Cover Letter. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 3*(2)*,* 242 – 249*.*

Knouse, S. B. (1994). Impressions of the Resume: The Effects of Applicant Education, Experience, and Impression Management. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 9,* 33 – 45*.*

Krosnick, J. A. & Fabrigar, L. R. (1997). Designing Rating Scales for Effective Measurement in Surveys. In: L. E. Lyberg, P. Biemer, M. Collins, E. D. De Leeuw, C. Dippo, N. Schwarz & D. Trewin. *Survey Measurement and Process Quality* (p. 141 – 164). New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Krueger, R. A. (1998). *Analyzing and reporting focus groups results.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage*.*

Lampe, C., Ellison, N.B. & Steinfield, C. (2006). A (Face)book in the Crowd: Social Searching vs. Social Browsing. *Computer Supportive Cooperative Work,* 167 – 170*.*

LinkedIn. (n.d.). Retrieved March 22, 2010 from http://press.linkedin.com/about.

Logistic Regression Analysis. (n.d.). Retrieved April 23, 2010 from http://faculty.chass.ncsu.edu/garson/PA765/logistic.htm.

Manpower. (n.d.). Retrieved October 4, 2009 from http://www.managersonline.nl/nieuws/6380/sollicitant-steeds-vaker-online-nagetrokken.html

McCracken, G. (1988). *The Long Interview. Sage University Paper Series on Qualitative Research Methods, 13.* Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Meertens Instituut (2007). *De Top 100 van de Familienamen in Nederland.* (Research document). Amsterdam: Brouwer, L.

Nunnally, J. C. (1978). *Psychometric theory* (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative Research & Evaluation Methods* (3rd ed.)*.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Peluchette, J. & Karl, K. (2008). Social Networking Profiles: An Examination of Student Attitude Regarding Use and Appropriateness of Content. *Cyberpsychology & Behavior, 11,* 95 – 97*.*

Peng, C., Lee, K. L. & Ingersoll, G. M. (2002). An Introduction to Logistic Regression Analysis and Reporting. *The Journal of Educational Research, 96,* 3 – 14.

Podsakoff, P. M. & Organ, D. W. (1986). Self Reports in Organizational Research: Problems and Prospects. *Journal of Management, 12*(4)*,* 531 - 544.

Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Lee, J. & Podsakoff, N. P. (2003). Common Method Biases in Behavioral Research: A Critical Review of the Literature and Recommended Remedies. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 88*(5)*,* 879 – 903.

Preston, C. C. & Colman, A. M. (2000). Optimal Number of Response Categories in Rating Scales: Reliability, Validity, Discriminating power and Respondent Preferences. *Acta Psychologica, 104,* 1 – 15.

Schlenker, B. R. (1980). *Impression management.* Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole.

Schullery, N. M., Ickes, L. & Schullery, S. E. (2009). Employer Preferences for Résumés and Cover Letters. *Business Communication Quarterly, 72*(2)*,* 163 - 176.

Silvester, J., Anderson-Gough, F. M., Anderson, N. R. & Mohamed, A. R. (2002). Locus of control, attributions and impression management in the selection interview. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 75,* 59 – 76.

Sociale verzekeringsbank (2009). Retrieved, January 17, 2010 from http://www.svb.nl/int/nl/kinderbijslag/actueel/kindernamen/index.jsp

Spinks, N. & Wells, B. (1987). Letters of Application and Resumes: A Comparison of Corporate Views. *Bulletin of the American Business Communication Association, 50*(3), 9 - 16.

Subrahmanyam, K., Reich, S. M., Waechter, N. & Espinoza, G. (2008). Online and Offline Social networks: Use of Social Networking Sites by Emerging Adults. *Journal of Applied Development Psychology, 29,* 420 – 433.

Symonds, P. M. (1924). On the Loss of Reliability in Ratings Due to Coarseness of the Scale. *Journal of Experimental Psychology, 7*, 456 – 461.

Sync. (n.d.). Retrieved July 15, 2009 form http://sync.nl/solliciteren-check-eerst-je-hyves/.

Tanis, M. & Postmes, T. (2003). Social Cues and Impression Formation in CMC. *Journal of Communication, 53*(4)*,* 676 – 693.

Thoms, P., McMasters, R., Roberts, M. R. & Dombkowski, D. A. (1999). Resume Characteristics as Predictors of an Invitation to Interview. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 13*(3)*,* 339 – 356*.*

Tidwell, L. C. & Walther, J. B. Computer-Mediated Communication Effects on Disclosure, Impressions, and Interpersonal Evaluations. Getting to Know One Another a Bit at a Time. *Human Communication Research, 28*(3)*,* 317 – 348.

Tom Tong, S., Van Der Heide, B., Langwell, L. & Walther, J. B. (2008). Too Much of a Good Thing? The Relationship Between Number of Friends and Interpersonal Impressions on Facebook. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication, 13,* 531 – 549.

Walther, J. B. (1996). Computer-mediated communication: impersonal, interpersonal, and hyperpersonal interaction. *Communication Research*, 2(2), 3-43.

Walther, J. B. (2007). Selective self-presentation in computer-mediated communication: Hyperpersonal dimensions of technology, language, and cognition. *Computers in Human Behavior, 23*, 2538–2557.

Walther, J. B., Slovacek, C. L. & Tidwell, L. C. (2001). Is a Picture Worth a Thousand Words? *Communication Research, 28,* 105 – 134.

Walther, J. B. & Parks, M. R. (2002). Cues Filtered Out, Cues Filtered In: Computer-mediated Communication and Relationships. In M. L. Knapp & J. A. Daly (Eds.), *Handbook of interpersonal communication* (3rd ed., pp. 529-563). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Walther, J. B., Van Der Heide, B., Kim, S., Westerman, D. & Tom Tong, S. (2008). The Role of Friends' Appearance and Behavior on Evaluations of Individuals on Facebook: Are We Known by the Company We Keep? *Human Communication Research, 34,* 28 – 49.

Walther, J. B., Van Der Heide, B., Hamel, L. M. & Shulman, H. C. (2009). Self-Generated Versus Other-Generated Statements and Impressions in Facebook Computer-Mediated Communication: A Test of Warranting Theory Using. *Communication Research, 36,* 229 – 254.

Appendix 1: Interview schema

Hartelijk dank dat u mee wilt doen aan het interview. Het interview zal gaan over profielen op sociale netwerksites. Tegenwoordig checken werkgevers met regelmaat de profielen van sollicitanten op Hyves of andere netwerksites. Ik ben benieuwd naar de factoren van profielen op sociale netwerksites die als negatief of positief ervaren worden. Aan het eind wil ik er graag achter gekomen zijn wat een profiel nou positief of negatief maakt en wat de gevolgen hiervan zijn voor sollicitanten.

Voordat we gaan beginnen wil ik graag nog enkele huisregels met u doornemen. Het interview zal ongeveer een half uur in beslag nemen. De antwoorden die gegeven zullen, neem ik op omdat ik deze dan beter en zorgvuldiger kan verwerken. Het onderzoek is geheel anoniem en vertrouwelijk: niemand zal de opnames te horen krijgen behalve ik en namen worden niet opgenomen in de verslaglegging. Niemand weet dus door wie wat gezegd is. Ook vind ik het heel belangrijk om te vermelden dat er geen goede of foute antwoorden zijn, het gaat om uw mening over het onderwerp. Het is daarom erg belangrijk dat u gewoon uw mening geeft, ook al wordt deze niet gedeeld. Zijn er nog vragen hierover?

Neem de laatste persoon die u hebt voorgedragen of aangenomen in uw hoofd. Hoe heeft u dit aangepakt en welke procedure hebt u daarbij gevolgd?
  a.   Doorvragen: maakt u gebruik van sociale netwerksites wanneer sollicitanten solliciteren voor een baan binnen uw bedrijf? Kunt u uitleggen waarom u dit wel of niet doet?
  b.   Verder doorvragen: Was dit eenmalig of doet u dit ook op deze manier bij andere sollicitanten?
        i.   Doorvragen: Is dit bijvoorbeeld afhankelijk van de naam van de sollicitant, de functie waarop iemand solliciteert of de CV van de sollicitant?
        ii.   Doorvragen: Hanteren uw collega's dezelfde procedure?
  c.   Wanneer bekijkt u het profiel van de sollicitant?
        i.   Doorvragen: Is dit bijvoorbeeld vooraf/na het lezen van de sollicitatiebrief, voor of nadat de persoon is uitgenodigd of voor het gesprek?
  d.   Als u een profiel bekijkt op een sociale netwerksite, hoe lang kijkt u er dan naar?
        i.   Doorvragen: Is dit afhankelijk van wat u ziet op een profiel? Waar ligt dit dan aan?
  e.   Welke onderdelen van het profiel bekijkt u?
        i.   Doorvragen: Waar let u op als u een profiel bekijkt?
        ii.   Doorvragen: Wat zijn de belangrijkste onderdelen van een profiel? (bijvoorbeeld foto's, krabbels, informatie over de eigenaar zelf)
        iii. Doorvragen: In hoeverre beoordeelt u een profiel als positief of negatief nadat u het bekeken heeft?
  f.   Heeft u zelf een profiel op een sociale netwerk site?
  g.   In hoeverre weegt het profiel van een sollicitant mee in de beoordeling van geschiktheid voor een baan waarop de persoon heeft gesolliciteerd?
        i.   Doorvragen: Is het bijvoorbeeld weleens voorgekomen dat u iemand heeft afgewezen of juist aangenomen doordat u het profiel had bekeken?

Appendix 2: Questionnaire

Bedrijfsgegevens

1. Hoeveel werknemers heeft het bedrijf waar u momenteel werkzaam bent?
   1-20   20-100   100-500   500 of meer

2. In welke branche valt het bedrijf waar u momenteel werkzaam bent?
   Agrarisch   Detailhandel   Dienstverlening   Gezondheidszorg Groothandel
   Horeca/recreatie Industrie   ICT   Metaal   Transport   Uitzendbranche
   Anders, namelijk…

3. Waar is het bedrijf gevestigd waar u momenteel werkzaam bent?
   Noord-Nederland   West-Nederland   Oost-Nederland   Zuid-Nederland

4. Welke functie oefent u momenteel uit bij dit bedrijf?

5. Hoe lang bent u werkzaam in deze of een soortgelijke functie?
   < 1 jaar   1 -3 jaar   4 – 6 jaar   7 – 10 jaar   10 – 15 jaar   > 15 jaar

Internetgebruik

6. Hoe vaak maakt u gemiddeld per dag gebruik van Internet?
   Nooit   1 2 3 4 5 6 7   Heel vaak

Gebruik sociale netwerksites/sollicitatieprocedure

7. In welke mate bent u betrokken bij het sollicitatieproces bij de organisatie waar u werkzaam bent?
   Helemaal niet   Betrokken bij het verzamelen van CV's van sollicitanten   Betrokken   bij   het
   werven van sollicitanten   Betrokken bij het selecteren van sollicitanten   Betrokken   bij   het
   aannemen van sollicitanten   Verantwoordelijk voor het gehele sollicitatieproces

8. Geef aan of u gebruik maakt van de onderstaande sociale netwerksites, zowel privé (eerste kolom) als tijdens de sollicitatieprocedure (tweede kolom).

	Privégebruik	Tijdens sollicitatieproces
Hyves	Ja / Nee	Ja / Nee
LinkedIn	Ja / Nee	Ja / Nee
Facebook	Ja / Nee	Ja / Nee
MySpace	Ja / Nee	Ja / Nee
Anders, namelijk…	Ja / Nee	Ja / Nee

Geef aan in hoeverre u uw eigen profiel op de onderstaande sociale netwerksites belangrijk vindt. Wanneer u geen profiel heeft op een sociale netwerksite, vul dan 'niet van toepassing' (n.v.t.) in.

	Mate van belang	
Hyves	Helemaal niet belangrijk 1234567 Heel belangrijk	n.v.t.
LinkedIn	Helemaal niet belangrijk 1234567 Heel belangrijk	n.v.t.
Facebook	Helemaal niet belangrijk 1234567 Heel belangrijk	n.v.t.
MySpace	Helemaal niet belangrijk 1234567 Heel belangrijk	n.v.t.

9. Geef aan hoeveel tijd u besteedt aan het bekijken van uw <u>eigen</u> profiel op de onderstaande sociale netwerksites. Wanneer u geen profiel heeft op een sociale netwerksite, vul dan niet van toepassing (n.v.t.) in.

	Hoeveelheid tijd	
Hyves	Geen tijd 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Heel veel tijd	n.v.t.
LinkedIn	Geen tijd 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Heel veel tijd	n.v.t.
Facebook	Geen tijd 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Heel veel tijd	n.v.t.
MySpace	Geen tijd 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Heel veel tijd	n.v.t.

10. Wanneer bekijkt u profielen van sollicitanten op sociale netwerksites?
Nooit   Na ontvangst CV   Voorafgaand aan het sollicitatiegesprek   na het sollicitatiegesprek   Anders, namelijk…

Geef aan in hoeverre u het eens bent met de stellingen. Hierbij staat het eerste hokje voor helemaal niet mee eens en het laatste hokje voor helemaal mee eens.

Ter informatie: krabbels zijn berichten die anderen achterlaten op het profiel van de profieleigenaar en zijn zichtbaar voor andere leden die toestemming hebben.

11. Krabbels op een sociale netwerksite geven de meest betrouwbare informatie over een sollicitant, omdat deze <u>niet</u> gemanipuleerd kunnen worden
12. Informatie die anderen op een sociale netwerksite geven over een sollicitant is betrouwbaarder dan de informatie die de sollicitant over zichzelf geeft
13. De informatie die de sollicitant over zichzelf geeft op een sociale netwerksite geeft het meest betrouwbare beeld van deze persoon

Situatieschets

Stelt u zich voor dat u iemand moet aannemen voor een functie binnen uw bedrijf. U krijgt een CV van een sollicitant en op basis daarvan denkt u dat deze kandidaat geschikt is voor de baan die u aanbiedt. Voordat er een sollicitatiegesprek plaatsvindt, heeft u de mogelijkheid om een profiel van de sollicitant op Hyves te bekijken.

<u>Ter informatie:</u>
Hyves is een Nederlandse sociale netwerksite waar leden een profiel van zichzelf kunnen maken en kunnen communiceren met vrienden uit hun netwerk.

Een Hyvescommunity is een site op Hyves over een bepaalde interesse of hobby waarbij leden die zich daarmee identificeren zich kunnen aanmelden.

14. Zou u in werkelijkheid, als werknemer in uw huidige functie, het profiel van de sollicitant op Hyves bekijken?
Ja   Nee

Bekijk nu het Hyvesprofiel van de sollicitant tot het moment dat u denkt dat u voldoende informatie hebt over de sollicitant.

Beantwoord nu de volgende vragen. (Het is mogelijk om terug te kijken naar het Hyvesprofiel wanneer u dit wilt)
15. Welke indruk krijgt u van deze sollicitant?

Heel negatief   1 2 3 4 5 6 7   Heel positief

16. Geef aan wat uw mening is over deze sollicitant. Voorbeeld: als u de sollicitant heel competent vindt, vinkt u het cijfer 1 aan. Wanneer u de sollicitant helemaal niet competent acht, vinkt u cijfer 7 aan.

Competent   1 2 3 4 5 6 7   Niet competent
Betrouwbaar   1 2 3 4 5 6 7   Onbetrouwbaar
Uitnodiging sollicitatiegesprek   1 2 3 4 5 6 7   Geen uitnodiging sollicitatiegesprek
Aantrekkelijk   1 2 3 4 5 6 7   Onaantrekkelijk
Geschikt   1 2 3 4 5 6 7   Ongeschikt

17. Heeft deze sollicitant een kans om aangenomen te worden door u (op basis van het CV en Hyvesprofiel)?
Ja   Nee

18. Geef in het kort aan waarom u deze sollicitant wel of niet zou aannemen.
……………………………….

19. Op basis van welke aspecten van de sociale netwerksite denkt u een oordeel te kunnen vestigen over geschiktheid van een sollicitant? (Let op: er zijn meerdere antwoorden mogelijk)
Geen   Profielfoto's Foto's   krabbelsHyvescommunities   Hobby's Interesses
Aantal vrienden   Anders, namelijk…

20. Van welke aspecten op profielen op sociale netwerksites van sollicitanten denkt u dat ze in het voordeel van de sollicitant kunnen werken? (Let op: er zijn meerdere antwoorden mogelijk)
Geen   Leuke profielfoto Leuke foto's   Leuke krabbels   Hyvescommunities
Bepaalde hobby's   Bepaalde interesses   Aantal vrienden Anders, namelijk…

21. Van welke aspecten op profielen op sociale netwerksites van sollicitanten denkt u dat ze in het voordeel van de sollicitant kunnen werken? (Let op: er zijn meerdere antwoorden mogelijk)
Geen   Negatieve profielfoto Foto's waarop sollicitant dronken is   Foto's waar sollicitant niet leuk op staat Foto's waar sollicitant (half)naakt op staat Negatieve krabbels Bepaalde Hyvescommunities Bepaalde hobby's Bepaalde interesses   Aantal vrienden Anders, namelijk…

Beantwoord nu los van het net bekeken profiel de volgende stellingen. Het betreffen zowel algemene stellingen als stellingen over uw ervaring. Geef aan in hoeverre u het eens bent met de stellingen. Hierbij staat het eerste hokje voor helemaal mee niet eens en het laatste hokje voor helemaal mee eens.

22. Het bekijken van sociale netwerksites van sollicitanten is voor mij afhankelijk van de functie waarop gesolliciteerd wordt
23. Ik zal eerder op sociale netwerksites kijken wanneer ik een commerciële functie moet vervullen dan een technische functie
24. Wanneer ik een zware functie met hoge eisen moet vervullen zal ik eerder op sociale netwerksites kijken dan wanneer het om een minder zware functie met lage eisen gaat
25. Sollicitanten die solliciteren op een commerciële functie worden zwaarder beoordeeld op informatie die ze op sociale netwerksites hebben staan dan technische sollicitanten
26. Bij elke vacature die ik moet vervullen maak ik gebruik van sociale netwerksites ongeacht de functie waarop gesolliciteerd wordt

27. Ik vind dat het checken van sollicitanten op sociale netwerksites een toegevoegde waarde heeft
28. Informatie die relevant is voor het aannemen van sollicitanten komt naar voren in het sollicitatiegesprek en CV en is <u>niet</u> te vinden op sociale netwerksites
29. Informatie die ik vind op sociale netwerksites is een aanvulling op informatie die ik krijg ik in een CV
30. Het bekijken van profielen van sollicitanten op sociale netwerksites levert extra informatie op over de sollicitanten

31. Het bekijken van profielen op sociale netwerksites leidt tot het krijgen van vooroordelen over sollicitanten
32. Ik denk dat ik door te kijken op sociale netwerksites meer te weten kan komen over een sollicitant en daardoor de sollicitant beter kan beoordelen
33. Door sociale netwerksites van sollicitanten te bekijken, kan ik beter beoordelen of de sollicitant geschikt is voor de baan die ik aanbiedt
34. Door op sociale netwerksites te kijken krijg ik een beter beeld van de persoon achter het CV en de sollicitatiebrief
35. Via sociale netwerksites krijg ik informatie over een sollicitant waardoor ik zijn/haar kwaliteiten beter kan inschatten

36. Informatie op sociale netwerksites geeft eerder verkeerde informatie, dan informatie waar ik wat mee kan
37. Ik vertrouw op de juistheid van informatie over sollicitanten die op hun sociale netwerksites staat
38. Het is makkelijk om informatie op sociale netwerksites te manipuleren
39. Sociale netwerksites geven een betrouwbaar beeld van een sollicitant

40. Kijken op een sociale netwerksite maakt voor mij onderdeel uit van het selectieproces bij een sollicitatieprocedure
41. Een profiel op sociale netwerksites beïnvloedt het beeld van een sollicitant dat op basis van het CV verkregen is
42. Informatie op een profiel op een sociale netwerksite wordt meegenomen in de beoordeling van een sollicitant
43. Informatie op sociale netwerksites kan ertoe leiden dat een sollicitant <u>niet</u> uitgenodigd wordt voor een sollicitatiegesprek
44. Ik krijg een betere en volledige indruk van een sollicitant door te kijken op sociale netwerksites

45. Sociale netwerksites beïnvloeden de baankansen van een sollicitant
46. Van twee sollicitanten met een vergelijkbaar CV heeft de sollicitant met een negatief profiel op een sociale netwerksite een kleinere kans om aangenomen te worden
47. En negatief profiel kan ervoor zorgen dat de baankansen van een sollicitant afnemen
48. Een positief profiel kan ervoor zorgen dat de baankansen van een sollicitant toenemen

Demografische gegevens

49. Wat is uw geslacht?
    Man   Vrouw

50. Wat is uw leeftijd?
    < 20 jaar   20 – 30 jaar   31 – 40 jaar 41 – 50 jaar 51 – 60 jaar   > 60 jaar

51. Wat is uw hoogst genoten afgemaakte opleiding?

Basisschool   MAVO HAVO   VWO MBO   HBO   WO/Universiteit   Post   academisch onderwijs

52. Hoeveel bedraagt uw jaarlijkse inkomen ongeveer? (NB. een modaal salaris bedraagt ongeveer 30.000 euro op jaarbasis voor een fulltime werknemer)

Beneden modaal   Ongeveer modaal   Ongeveer 1,5 keer modaal   Ongeveer 2 keer modaal   Meer dan 2 keer modaal

U bent aan het einde gekomen van de vragenlijst. Hartelijk bedankt voor het meedoen! Als u geïnteresseerd bent in de resultaten van dit onderzoek, laat dan uw naam en e-mailadres achter, dan krijgt u het afgeronde rapport toegestuurd.

Naam:

E-mailadres:

Appendix 3: Hyves profiles

Positive version:

Sanne

Over | Vrienden | Foto's | Meer

Toon eigen design! Toon in standaard design

Profiel   ✎wijzigen
Naam: Sanne de Jong
Leeftijd: 23
Relatie: relatie
Woonplaats: Enschede
5682 x bekeken, Hyver sinds 02-07-2007

Spots: (?) Voeg nu je spots toe!
MBO/HBO/Universiteit: Universiteit Twente
Passies: Dansen, reizen

🔦 Tik
✉ Bericht
🖼 Kaartje
🎁 Kado
👤 Google Sanne
❤ Crush

Vrienden (147)

Viola (561)   Remco (123)   Sanne (270)

Grace (56)   Wendy (863)   Remco(110)

Doreth (218)   Michael (136)   Peter (410)

> Meer vrienden

Foto's & video's

Krabbels

1 2 3 4 .. 58 >>

Mariët (241)
Heey!
Top dat je het vriendenweekend geregeld hebt!
Kan je aan jou wel overlaten, je bent altijd zo stipt en op tijd! Tot snel!

Isabel(209)
Bedankt voor je luisterend oor gisteren! Vond het super fijn om met je praten. Ik weet zeker dat het helemaal goed komt met behulp van jouw tips! 💋

Niels (30)
Was gezellig vorige week hè?! Echt leuk om even bij te kletsen! Mijn vrienden vonden je ook erg leuk! Wanneer spreken we weer af?
X Niels

Laura (163)
Veeeel succes met je sollicitatie! Komt vast helemaal goed, zo'n leuke en enthousiaste meid nemen ze vast wel aan! ;)
💋 Laura

1 2 3 4 .. 58 >>

Reageren:

WieWatWaar ⊕Plaats nieuwe WWW ⊚Overzicht

@ Enschede
3 dec. 2009

Hyves

unicef ✚
unite for children

iversiteit Twe
ondernemende univer

Unicef (10181)   Dansen (62499)   UniversityTwente (2176)

Blog

Sanne heeft nog geen blog.

Negative version:

Negative-positive version:

Sanne

Over | Vrienden | Foto's | Meer

Toon eigen design! Toon in standaard design

Profiel ✏️wijzigen
Naam: Sanne de Jong
Leeftijd: 23
Relatie: relatie
Woonplaats: Enschede
5682 x bekeken, Hyver sinds 02-07-2007

Spots: (?) Voeg nu je spots toe!
MBO/HBO/Universiteit: Universiteit Twente
Passies: Uitgaan, dansen

🎤 Tik
✉️ Bericht
🖼️ Kaartje
🎁 Kado
👤 Google Sanne
❤️ Crush

👥 **Vrienden (147)**

Niels (125)   Robin(457)   -DEBOO' (574)

Loes (203)   Patty (835)   Nanja.. (140)

Rosanne (258)   Rick (183)   Manja (166)

> Meer vrienden

🖼️ **Foto's & video's**

✏️ **Krabbels**

1 2 3 4 .. 58 >>

Heey!
Top dat je het vriendenweekend geregeld hebt!
Kan je aan jou wel overlaten, je bent altijd zo stipt
en op tijd! Tot snel!

Mariët (241)

Bedankt voor je luisterend oor gisteren! Vond het
super fijn om met je praten. Ik weet zeker dat het
helemaal goed komt met behulp van jouw tips! 💋

Isabel(209)

Was gezellig vorige week hè?! Echt leuk om even
bij te kletsen! Mijn vrienden vonden je ook erg leuk!
Wanneer spreken we weer af?
X Niels

Niels (30)

Veeeel succes met je sollicitatie! Komt vast
helemaal goed, zo'n leuke en enthousiaste meid
nemen ze vast wel aan! ;)
💋 Laura

Laura (163)

1 2 3 4 .. 58 >>

Reageren:

🌐 **WieWatWaar** ➕Plaats nieuwe WWW 🌐Overzicht

@ Enschede
3 dec. 2009

📘 **Hyves**

Ik ben (te) vaak   Nog eentje dan(330)   Vroeg-opstaan-is-Kut-
naar de klote (4095)   club (112665)

📝 **Blog**

Sanne heeft nog geen blog.

Positive-negative version: