FIRST IMPRESSION 2.0: COMPETENCY REPRESENTATION ON LINKEDIN

UNIVERSITY OF TWENTE.

First Impression 2.0: Competency Representation on LinkedIn

Katharina Christiane Damaschke

S1034359

Master Communication Studies –

Corporate Communication

September 2011 – March 2012

Mark van Vuuren

Joris van Hoof

March 22nd, 2012

University of Twente

Enschede, The Netherlands

Table of Contents

Samenvatting – First Impression 2.0: Competency Representation on LinkedIn

First Impression 2.0: Competency Representation on LinkedIn

Iedere organisatie is op zoek naar de beste kandidaat voor zijn vrije posities. In het heden wordt het internet vaak gebruikt om bij het identificeren van deze persoon te helpen. Sociale netwerken (SN) hebben zich tot erg handige hulpmiddelen ontwikkeld om de naamsbekendheid van organisaties te vergroten, maar ook om de organisatie te helpen informatie over sollicitaten via een informele manier te verkreigen. Er is echter nog discussie over de legaliteit van deze check-up's en de meningten verschillen enorm tussen én binnen landen. Hiernaast, zijn er ook ethische problemen, want sollicitanten zijn vaak niet op de hoogte van deze informele screening methodes. Afgezien van de legale en ethische issues, blijft het onduidelijk in hoeverre deze online profielen überhaupt accuraat zijn. Dus dient zich de vraag aan tot en met welke omvang een SN profiel de daadwerkelijke competenties weergeeft. Binnen dit onderzoek werd daarom gekeken welke elementen van een SN profiel, hier LinkedIn, nauwkeurige indicatoren voor welke competentie vormen. Deze vraag werd verder opgesplits in de volgende drie onderzoeksvragen:

1. Welke competenties zijn algemeen relevant in de huidige 'rekruteringswereld'?
2. Welke LinkedIn elementen vormen indicatoren voor de capaciteiten van een persoon met betrekking tot de geselecteerde competenties?
3. Hoe goed vertegenwoordigt een LinkedIn profiel de respectievelijk competenties?

Methode

Om deze vragen te beantwoorden werden drie studies uitgevoerd. De eerste studie gaf antwoord of vraag één en leverde verder input. Deze studie werd opgesplits in twee fases, waarvan de eerste met behulp van een inhoudsanalyse van 34 vacatures en tien interviews relevante competenties identificeerde. Van de gezamenlijke resultaten werden de zes meest genoemde competenties geselecteerd, namelijk: teamwork, leiderschap, flexibiliteit, communicatievaardigheden, assertiviteit en geordende/ analytische/ structurele vaardigheden. Van de genoemde competenties werden er zeven definities gemaakt door communicatievaardigheden te splitsen in 'communicatieve openheid' en 'schriftelijke communicatie'. In de tweede fase werden drie interviews met HR managers gehouden, waar de respondenten de definities van de zeven constructen en drie LinkedIn profielen werden gegeven. De respondenten werden gevraagd om commentaar te geven over welke elementen op de profielen indicatoren voor de competenties, zoals gedefinieerd, zouden kunnen zijn. Dezelfde procedure werd ook tijdens de focus groep aangehouden, die uit twee mannen en twee vrouwen bestond. Vergelijkbare of gelijke uitingen werden later samengevoegd en de ideen van de onderzoeker toegevoegd. Hier kwamen 74 codeer elementen uit, die over tien secties van een LinkedIn verspreid zijn, namelijk: overzicht, samenvatting, ervaring, opleiding, clubs, groepen, aanbevelingen, verdere elementen, contact en algemeen.

De tweede studie bestond uit een vragenlijst met 46 standpunten, een aantal achtergrondvragen en drie vragen over het gebruik van LinkedIn, zodat het competentielevel van de respondenten bepaald kon worden. In totaal werden 45 bruikbare reacties verzameld (14% respons). De meerderheid van de respondenten was mannelijk (64%), Nederlands (69%) en tussen de 22 en 30 jaar out (51%, M=34, SD=11). Alle constructen in de vragenlijst vormden betrouwbare schalen, met α tussen de .69 en .88.

In de derde studie werden de 45 profielen gecodeerd. Er werden 53 elementen van een LinkedIn profiel in de analyse meegenomen; de overige werden uitgesloten op basis van nul-variantie of omdat er te weinig respondenten waren. Uit een factor analyse bleek één betrouwbare groepering (α .90), welke samen met de 52 elementen deel uitmaakte van de correlatieanalyse.

Gezamenlijke Resultaten

Uit de correlatieanalyse bleek date r 18 significante relaties met de seven constructen waren; met een maximum van vier relaties met hetzelfde construct (teamwork en geordende/ analytische/ structurele vaardigheden). De variable 'taal gebruik' was de enige met een positieve relatie met alle constructen, deze varierde tussen .61 en .82. Groepen en clubs (beide: aantal en aantal verschillende types),

profielfoto, lengte van de samenvating (in regels), het aantal aanbevelingen en spelfouten waren andere significante factoren.

<u>Discussie</u>
In total werden er zes competenties gevonden die in de huidige rekruteringswereld relevant zijn (zie Studie 1 Fase 1) en werden er negen elementen van een LinkedIn profiel als indicatoren geidentificeerd (zie Gezamenlijke Resultaten) geidentificeerd. Dus zou men kunnen zeggen dat een LinkedIn profiel geen goede vertegenwoordiging van de competenties van de profiel eigenaar is. Daarom moet men voor oordelen op basis van zo'n profiel waarschuwen.

Werkgevers zouden, in conclusie, check-up's van sollicitanten via LinkedIn geen onderdeel van de selectieprocedure maken, omdat de actie op zich niet alleen gedebateerd wordt vanwege de ethische problemen, maar omdat blijkt dat de informatie niet erg representatief is. Het lijkt echter onwaarschijnlijk dat HR personneel in de nabije toekomst ophouden met deze checks, en daarom is het werkzoekenden het volgende aan te raden: formeel taalgebruik, een serieuze profielfoto en geen spelfouten.

Dus wat is het nut van LinkedIn? Dit SN geeft personen de mogelijkheid om met hun zakenpartners en andere professionals in contact te blijven en daardoor op de hoogte van alle ontwikkelingen te zijn. Een LinkedInlid kan ook organisaties volgen; dit is best handig voor werkzoekenden omdat zij zich kunnen informeren over nieuwe vacatures. Sinds sociale media steeds belangrijker wordt, is het belangrijk om zijn interesses en vaardigheden op dit gebied te tonen. Toch lijkt duidelijk dat het beter is om geen profiel te hebben dan een slecht profiel te hebben. Dit is het geval vanwege de zwakke vertegenwoordiging van competenties op een profiel, zoals uit dit onderzoek bleek. Als een goed profiel slechts een beetje representatief voor de vaardigheden is, dan zou een slecht profiel mogelijk tot foute conclusies kunnen leiden. Het is alleen logisch dat een goed profiel niet alleen beter, maar ook hulpzamer is dan geen profiel.

Als men bedenkt dat LinkedIn een duidelijk professionele focus heeft, lijkt het moeilijk om de resultaten op andere SN, zoals Facebook of MySpace, aan te wenden, omdat deze netwerken een sterkere orientatie tot 'vrije tijd activiteiten' hebben. Verder geven de elementen op deze sites meer inzicht in het karakter of persoonlijkheid van de eigenaar dan zijn/ haar competenties. Vergelijkt men LinkedIn met het US 'glass door' concept, dan zou men moeten toegeven dat een persoon misschien iets beter beschreven is, omdat meerdere personen uitingen over dit individueel kunnen maken. Men moet echter in de gaten houden dat de evaluaties of opinies niet waar hoeven te zijn, maar dat collegae of medestrijders deze site ook kunnen misbruiken. Wanneer er meerdere vergelijkbare uitingen zijn, blijkt het beeld echter betrouwbaar en zou dit misschien beter indicatoren voor de competenties van dit persoon kunnen opleveren.

Wanneer men dit onderzoek bekijkt wordt helder dat de data grotendeels zelf gerapporteerd is, wat een invloed op de betrouwbaarheid heeft. Verder is het aantal respondenten aan de lage kant en werden sommige delen van het codeerschema slechts enkele keren (5) terug gevonden, waardoor deze van de analyse uitgesloten werden. Hiernaast varieert de overeenkomst van de codeurs; verschillen konden wel na discussie worden opgelost. Echter is het aan te raden om de richtlijnen van het code boek in toekomstig onderzoek verder te verfijnen.

In dit onderzoek werd alleen aan zes competenties aandacht besteed, maar er zijn natuurlijk meer. Daarom zou in verder onderzoek naar andere competenties en andere netwerken gekeken moeten worden. Verder zou men moeten nagaan hoe HR personneel SN profielen en andere persoonlijke online verkrijgbare data in het selectieproces gebruikt.

Summary – First Impression 2.0: Competency Representation on LinkedIn

First Impression 2.0: Competency Representation on LinkedIn

Every organisation seeks to fill their open positions with the best candidate. Nowadays, the internet is often used to help identifying this person. Social network sites (SNSs) have developed into a very useful means for organisations to increase awareness and to gain information about, for example, job applicants by informally consulting their SNS profiles. Yet, discussion regarding the legality of these check-ups exists and opinions differ greatly among countries as well as within. Furthermore, there are also ethical concerns, because job applicants are often unaware of these informal screening methods. Apart from the legal and ethical questions, however, it remains uncertain to what degree such an online profile of a person is actually accurate. Thus the question can be raised to what extent a SNS profile represents "real life" competencies. Therefore, the question arises which elements of a SNS profile, in this case LinkedIn, are accurate indicators for which competency. This question is further broken down to form the following research questions:

4. Which competencies are generally relevant in today's 'recruitment world'?
5. Which LinkedIn elements serve as indicators for a person's capacities regarding the selected competencies respectively?
6. How well does a LinkedIn profile represent or indicate the respective competencies?

Method
To answer these questions, three studies were performed. The first study addressed research question one and provided further input for the project. This study was broken down into two phases, where the first included a content analysis of 34 job advertisements and ten interviews with entrepreneurs to identify relevant competencies. From the combined results the six most mentioned competencies were selected; namely: teamwork, leadership, flexibility, communicativeness, assertiveness, and orderly/ analytical/ structural abilities. These competencies were defined to form seven constructs; splitting communicativeness into 'communicative openness' and 'written communication'. In the second phase three interviews with HR managers were held, where the respondents were given the definitions of the seven constructs as well as three different LinkedIn profiles. The interviewees were asked to comment on which element of each profile might serve as an indicator of which competency as defined. The same procedure was used during the focus group, which consisted of four people (two male, two female). The results of each interviewee were listed separately as well as the outcomes of the focus group. Similar or equal statements were merged and the ideas of the researcher were included as well. This resulted in 74 coding elements covering ten sections of a LinkedIn profile; these are: Overview, summary, experience, education, clubs, groups, recommendations, additional elements, contact and general.

The second study involved a questionnaire including 46 statements, a couple of background variables, and three questions regarding usage of LinkedIn in order to establish the competency levels of the respondents. A total of 45 useful responses to the questionnaire was received (14% response rate). The majority of the respondents was male (64%), Dutch (69%) and between 22 and 30 years of age (51%, M=34, SD=11). All constructs of the questionnaire formed reliable scales, with α ranging from .69 to .88.

In study three a total of 45 profiles were coded. The final analysis included 52 elements of a LinkedIn profile; the remaining had been discarded due to zero-variance or too few respondents. Factor analysis revealed one reliable cluster (α .90), which was then included in the correlation analysis together with the other 53 elements.

Combined Results
The correlation analysis showed 18 significant relations with the seven constructs; at most four correlations were found with the same constructs (teamwork and orderly/ analytical/ structured). The variable 'language use' has a strong positive correlation with all constructs, with degrees ranging from .61 to .82. Other elements that have been shown to be significant indicators include groups and clubs

(both: number and number of different types), profile picture, length of summary (in lines) and number of recommendations as well as spelling errors.

Discussion

A total of six competencies have been found that are relevant in today's recruitment world (see Study 1 Phase 1) and nine elements of a LinkedIn profile have shown to be indicators of these (see Combined Results). Consequentially, one could say that a LinkedIn profile is not very representative of the profile owner's competencies. Thus, it has to be cautioned from making judgements based on such a profile.

Employers should, in conclusion, not include background checks via LinkedIn in their selection process, because the question is not only highly debated regarding its ethical implications, but the representativeness of the information appears to be rather low. Yet it seems unlikely that recruiters will stop using SNS profiles in the near future and therefore job seekers should make sure to use formal language, include a picture and keep their profiles free of spelling errors.

So what is the use of LinkedIn? This SNS enables persons to keep in touch with their business partners and other professionals, thus enabling them to stay up to date with recent developments. A LinkedIn member can also follow organisations, which is rather handy for job seekers as they can inform themselves about possible job openings. Since social media is increasing in importance, showing one's interest and abilities in, for example, SNSs is important. However, having no profile can still be considered better than having a bad profile. This is the case due to the weak representativeness of a profile, which was discovered in this research. If a good profile is only slightly representing the actual competencies of the profile owner, a bad profile might in fact lead to false conclusions. It goes without saying that a good profile is always preferable and more beneficial to having no profile.

Taking into account the clear professional focus of LinkedIn, it appears to be rather difficult to expand the results to other SNSs such as Facebook or MySpace, because these sites have an orientation towards 'leisure'. Moreover, the elements visible on these sites seem less related to a person's competencies and more to his/ her character or personality. When comparing LinkedIn to the 'glass door' concept used in the USA, one has to admit that a person might be described more accurately because multiple persons can 'review' and comment on the same individual. However, one has to be aware of the fact that these evaluations do not necessarily have to be truthful, because colleagues or competitors could abuse the system. Yet, whenever many similar views are expressed, the picture appears to be more reliable and trustworthy. A truthful picture/ opinion might therefore provide better indications on this person's competencies than his/ her self-reported LinkedIn profile.

Looking at this research one has to be aware of the fact that the majority of the data is self-reported, which might affect its reliability. Furthermore, the number of respondents is relatively small and for some parts of the coding scheme even fewer responses (5) were registered, which is why these parts were excluded from the final analysis. Another shortcoming of the project is the varying degree of agreement between the two coders; however, disagreements could be settled after discussion. Yet the guidelines as well as the coding scheme should be further refined in future research.

The present project took only six competencies into consideration, but there is a substantially larger amount of qualifications a person can posses. Thus, future studies should look into which other competencies can be targeted and through what other SNSs these could be assessed. Additionally, it should be explored how HR personnel actually uses SNS profiles and other personal information about a candidate available online.

Article – First Impression 2.0: Competency Representation on LinkedIn

First Impression 2.0: Competency representation on LinkedIn

Abstract

This research explored to which extent six competencies (teamwork, leadership, flexibility, communication, assertiveness, orderly/analytical/structural capabilities) are reflected on LinkedIn profiles, because employers perform increasingly more informal background checks on job applicants via social network sites (SNSs) such as Facebook and LinkedIn. A combination of online questionnaire and content analysis was used. Preliminary research provided input for a coding scheme for the content analysis, which has been edited during the analysis, leaving a total of 73 variables of which 53 were included in the final statistical analysis. All competency constructs were reliable (α ranging from .69 to .88) and inter-coder agreement was mainly substantial to perfect (48%). A total of ten variables with a significant correlation were identified, although, most correlations were rather low. All relationships between the respective variable and the construct in question were positive, except for three correlations (teamwork –number of group; teamwork – types of groups; orderly/ analytical/ structured – types of groups). In conclusion, one has to say that a LinkedIn profile provides a rather weak representation of a person's competencies and that any observer should be careful to judge a person's abilities on the basis of his/her LinkedIn profile. A significant shortcoming of this study is the fact that the content of recommendations was not included in the analysis, due to the low number of respondents allowing access to these (5). Future research should consider the manner and the extent to which potential employers actually use SNS in decisions as well as explore which other competencies could be represented in these profiles.

Keywords

Social Network Site, LinkedIn, Competencies, Teamwork, Leadership, Communication, Flexibility, Assertiveness, Representation, Impression

Introduction

Every organisation seeks to fill their open positions with the best candidate. Nowadays, the internet is often used to help identifying this person. Social network sites (SNSs) have developed into a very useful means for organisations to increase awareness and to gain information about, for example, job applicants. Apart from the legal and ethical questions (see page 3) it remains uncertain to what degree such an online profile of a person is actually accurate. Thus the question arises to what extent a SNS profile represents "real life" competencies. However, as of now, it is uncertain which competencies are and which ones are not represented on such a profile. Moreover, the accuracy of the representation of any competency is entirely unknown.

Social Network Sites

Within this study, social network sites (SNSs) are defined as "web-based services 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, 2007, p. 211).

Profile Construction

The number of SNSs has grown rapidly and there now exist a wide range of different Web 2.0 applications (Boyd & Ellison, 2007). However, because each SNS has a different target group and thus creates a different culture, the technological structure is their biggest similarity. A person's choice for a certain SNS may be affected by a number of aspects, such as usability, membership of real-life

friends, possibilities of self-expression as well as whether it is a free-of-charge network and demographic characteristics (Lampe, Ellison, & Steinfield, 2008).

Furthermore, the intended usage of the profile owner might affect the choice of an SNS. An online profile can be established solely for 'private' use, such as connecting with friends, sharing pictures and memories as well as finding one's identity. For these and comparable purposes, SNSs with a considerable orientation towards leisure appear to be most appropriate. Examples include Facebook, which is currently the most popular SNS, MySpace, Hyves and Friendster. On the other hand, when considering to use an SNS for a rather professional purpose, LinkedIn can be considered the best choice, because it is not only the biggest professional network (Janssen, 2011), but also leading in this sector (Rutledge, 2011).

Hinduja and Patchin (2008) showed that participation in SNSs by adolescents is largely used in order to explore one's identity and to refine one's values, beliefs and self-image. Yet, not only adolescents currently participate in SNSs, also many adults have online profiles. Hargittai (2007) discovered that persons cannot prevent their real identities to carry over to online interactions. As such, SNSs appear to be not only a relevant but also a valid mean for communicating personality (Gosling, Gaddis, & Vazire, 2007). In conclusion, the profiles present more or less reliable information about the profile owner(s). This view is contrasted by the notion that any person active on a SNS provides an edited presentation of him- or herself depending on the respective goal that he or she seeks to achieve (Rosenberg & Egbert, 2011). Any observer of a SNS profile would thus form his/ her opinion about the profile owner based on the public processing of his or her identity claims (Zhao, Grasmuck, & Martin, 2008). It was shown that an impression solely formed on the basis of such a personalised website accurately mirrors what the profile owner is actually like (Brown & Vaughn, 2011; Vazire & Gosling, 2004). Donath and Boyd (2004) suggest that this is the case due to the publicly visible connections, which ensure truthful statements of the profile owner and thus increase the reliability of the claims made. However, it is argued that the degree of 'public' depends on the personal information displayed by the participant (Lange, 2007).

Establishing Connections

In the last century, face-to-face interaction or the telephone was used in order to stay in touch with friends. In the 21st century, this need can be easily satisfied with the help of the internet (Hinduja & Patchin, 2008). However, the internet and SNSs do not limit one's curiosity and search for information to already acquainted persons. Within every SNS a person has the chance to articulate relationships. For establishing connections three general approaches have been spread: Connecting with (a) only persons one knows, (b) known persons and strategic contacts one would like to know, and (c) simply anyone (Rutledge, 2011). Here, the second approach appears to be the most desirable, because it would allow a more controlled network growth than strategy three and it is less restricted than approach number one.

Shared Connectivity

Among the connections a person articulates on his/her LinkedIn profile, for example, and non-connections, the profile owner can tailor the accessibility of the information displayed for the different audiences. For example, profile owners can choose to not reveal their last name to non-connections, to accept new connections only through introductions or to allow anyone to contact via LinkedIn's InMail (Rutledge, 2011). Moreover, profiles can be customized and the elements visible to the general public can be altered. The development of these public SNS profiles gave way to an easy, informal and anonymous way to learn more about any person, provided that he/she has a SNS

profile (Peluchette & Klark, 2008; Westerman, van der Heide, Klein, & Walther, 2008). Naturally, this opportunity was realised by the economic sector, resulting in informal job applicant screening by at least 25% of all employers (Clark & Roberts, 2010).

Despite the fact that information shared publicly with others is no longer considered as private according to the law(Brandenburg, 2008), there are still many legal uncertainties regarding background checks of job applicants via SNSs. Governments deal differently with these uncertainties; in Germany Facebook is explicitly excluded from employment decisions by the law, whereas there is no such direct restriction within the Netherlands (Schoemaker, 2010; Thole & van der Jagt, 2010). Nevertheless, it appears unlikely that the praxis will become legally prohibited in many countries since it is hard to proof(Byrnside, 2007). SNSs often offer the option to communicate with others either in public or privately (Brown & Vaughn, 2011). The critical part of the public messages or conversations is that the profile owner intends it only for selected audiences, with different accessibility levels (Cain, 2008; Lampe, Ellison, & Steinfield, 2006). However, other parties have encountered ways to access these partially public messages as well, thus resulting in misalignments of the actual and the intended audience (Ellison, Steinfield, & Lampe, 2006). Therefore, potential employers end up viewing aspects they should not have access to. This information is then included in the informal, anonymous applicant check-ups. Although these unofficial job screenings are taken for granted by employers, there is a gap in what students and employers regard as fair when it comes to using SNS profiles in employment decisions -with a slight increase in students' awareness of the practice itself (Clark & Roberts, 2010; Cain, 2008; Lampe, Ellison, & Steinfield, 2008).

Employers unofficially research their job applicants because they are certain that a person's SNS profile provides them with insights on his/her competencies. Within this study, it is established that the terms 'competence' and 'competency' are considered synonyms (Moore, Cheng, & Dainty, 2002). The term 'competence' refers to a concept, which is highly analytical and has to deal with the dichotomous relationship of subjective as well as cultural-social impacts (Højgaard, 2009). The notion of 'professional competence' extends this idea to include the use of "communication, knowledge, technical skills, clinical reasoning, emotions, values, and reflection" (Epstein & Hundert, 2002, p. 226) as part of a daily habit or judicious use.

Because competencies are said to be part of habitual behaviour and prudent in use, it appears likely that SNS users could convey (part of) their competencies within the course of their online activities. Yet again, the matter of the accuracy of this representation remains unanswered. Therefore, the question arises which elements of a SNS profile, in this case LinkedIn, are accurate indicators for which competency. This question is further broken down to form the following research questions:

7. Which competencies are generally relevant in today's 'recruitment world'?
8. Which LinkedIn elements serve as indicators for a person's capacities regarding the selected competencies respectively?
9. How well does a LinkedIn profile represent or indicate the respective competencies?

This project was split into three studies. The first study consisted of two phases, where the first research question was addressed and input for the third study was generated. In the second study the general competency level of the respondents was assessed with the help of an online questionnaire. Study three dealt with the analysis of the LinkedIn profiles and was rounded off with the combined analysis of the results from study 2 and study 3.

Phase 1

Before getting started with the main studies, preliminary research was carried out in order to identify which competencies are relevant in today's 'recruitment world' and to provide input for the further research project.

Instrument

In this phase two approaches were used; applying a content analysis of job advertisements and interviews with entrepreneurs.

Procedure

The job advertisements were randomly selected on a Dutch website (www.nationalevacaturebank.nl), which was the first search result in Google. The advertisements were then analysed by listing all required competencies and then ordering these according to frequency.

The interviews were held in an informal atmosphere and lasted 30 minutes on average. Sample questions include the following: When looking for a new employee, which competencies are particularly important? Are there a set of general or non-job-specific competencies that all your employees should have? Any competencies mentioned were, again, ordered by their frequency.

Participants

A total of 34 job advertisements have been included in the analysis and ten, mostly male (9), entrepreneurs have been interviewed. Eight of the respondents were German and two were Dutch. Most respondents (8) worked in a rather technical field, but within middle or upper management positions. The other two respondents were employees of an educational facility, one at management level and the other as a management assistant.

Analysis

As can be seen in Table 1, a rather long list of competencies was identified; including very diverse elements such as experience, pro-active behaviour, language skills, and an economic attitude. However, not too many results of the jobs advertisements and the interviews overlap. It also became obvious that the importance of competencies varies, because while flexibility was only encountered in 8 of the 34 advertisements, seven of the 10 respondents mentioned this ability.

Table 1 - Results Analysis Job Advertisements & Interviews

Top 10 Competencies Job Advertisements	Competencies Interviews
Experience (24)	Flexible (7)
at least University of Applied Science (17)	Leadership, Teamwork, Communicative (5)
Speaking English (13)	Assertive/taking initiative; pro-active (4)
Analytical; Communicative (12)	Pragmatic (3)
Customer focused; speaking Dutch; Team work (11)	Language skills; out-of-the-box thinker; open (2)
Pro-active (9)	Friendly; punctual; social competence; entrepreneurship; creativity (1)
Flexible; al least vocational training; result focused (8)	
Assertive; independent; structured working (7)	
Economic (6)	
Curious; speaking German; leadership (5)	

Results

After comparing the results of both, job advertisements and interviews, it was decided to use the six most encountered competencies that could be operationalised, from both sources. The definitions of these competencies were a combination of earlier definitions, formulations of the Oxford Dictionary (Hornby, 2005) and personal adjustments to better fit the context of this research. A total of seven constructs were developed.

Teamwork	In the context of this research "teamwork" is understood as an individual's commitment to the group, being social, inventive, trusting and cooperative, sharing information as well as experience, without displaying inter-professional jealousy, nor fearing chaotic circumstances or uncertainties. (Molyneux,2001; du Chatenier, Verstegen, Biemans, Mulder & Omta, 2010)
Leader	A person who can envision his/her company's future, is able to motivate and empower colleagues, is persuasive and exudes influence on a general level is considered a "leader" in the context of this research. Furthermore, strategic thinking abilities and making sure that processes are being implemented are core elements. (Kets de Vries, Vrignaud & Florent-Treacy, 2004; Jeffrey & Brunton, 2011)
Flexible	The term 'flexible' is interpreted as being able to switch subjects without problems as well as being able to work on several projects simultaneously, thus being not only spontaneous but also spatially mobile.
Communicative	In the context of this research a distinction is made between communicative openness and written communication skills. 'Communicative openness' thus refers to the degree that a person shares personal information, such as contact information, experience or pictures, and the ease with which a person moves on different social and/or professional levels. 'Written communication' skills naturally imply spelling and grammar capabilities, but stretch as far as style, sentences or formulations utilized and language use.
Assertive	Assertiveness has also been referred to as 'taking initiative' (Lee, 2009), but further entails aspects such as being able to promote oneself, showing a considerable drive/degree of ambition in the context of this research.
Orderly/ Analytical/ Structured	Within the context of this research the terms 'structured', 'orderly' and 'analytical' are used as synonyms, which are all understood as presenting oneself and working in a manner that is easy to oversee and to understand; which follows as "red thread" and can be considered as compact with a clear distinction of main points from additional information.

<u>Phase 2</u>

Since the representation of competencies, rather than the expression of personality, lies at the heart of this research LinkedIn has been chosen to provide the framework rather than Facebook. While the latter is widely known for its association with leisure activities as well as the considerably strong focus on personal interests and activities, the former is considered to be the number one SNS for professionals. This is the case, because it offers the opportunity to utilize one's online network to the

maximum potential (Rutledge, 2011) and as such developed into a rather powerful example of business services (Boyd & Ellison, 2007). For these reasons it has been decided that LinkedIn is the most suitable SNS to form the frame of this research.

Instrument
This phase of the first study included three interviews and a focus group in order to gain knowledge about which elements of a LinkedIn profile could possibly be indicators of the established constructs.

Procedure
The participants were given the definitions of the seven constructs as well as three different LinkedIn profiles. The profiles differed in length and consequentially in degree of information presented. In order to ensure anonymity, the profile picture as well as the name of the profile owner was replaced by a different picture and a fictional name. In the course of the interview, each profile was addressed independently and the respondents deliberated on why they thought a certain element of the respective profile was or was not a good indicator of the seven constructs, which were looked at in turns.

The participants of the focus group were presented with the same information as the interviewees and were asked to discuss freely with each other which LinkedIn elements might be indicators for what respective construct.

Participants
The three interviewees all were female HR managers, each responsible for a different department at a facility of higher education. The average duration of the interview was 55 minutes.

The focus group consisted of four participants (two male, two female), who were between 20 and 23 years old.

Analysis
The results of the interviews and the focus group had been listed independently and were then combined in one document. Here, all notions that turned out to be the same or similar were combined. Furthermore, the associations made by the author were integrated into the document in the same way.

Results
From the elaborate overview of LinkedIn elements a total of 74 coding elements were derived. As presented in Table 2, the coding scheme covers ten broad areas of a LinkedIn profile including the overview, summary, experience, education, clubs and groups as well as recommendations, additional elements, contact and general aspects.

Table 2 – Results Study 1 Phase 2

LinkedIn Section	Elements Coded
Overview	Picture, Number of Contacts
Summary	Existing, Length (Paragraphs, Lines), (Un)Supported Claims, Result-focus, Assertive, Manner of Presentation (Self-promotion, Narrative, Modest, Bullet points), Leader, Teamwork/Joint efforts, Networking; Specialties
Experience	Number of Task Descriptions (Leader, Responsibilities, Additional Information), Number of Jobs (Total/Parallel/within 5 Years/ within 10 Years), Position (Average number of Years, Type of Development, Similar/Different positions), Different Locations
Education	Number of Studies, Different Locations, Highest Degree, Number of types of studies
Clubs	Count, Position, Number of types
Groups	Count, Number of types
Recommendations	Count, Coordination, Result-focus, Order/Structure, Analytical, Leader, Number of positive words, Networking, Empathy, Persuasion skills, Presentation skills, Being able to move among different social levels, Mood (Open, Friendly, Business, Factual, Other), Assertive, Flexible, Teamwork/Joint efforts, Comparable content to Summary
Additional Elements	Language (Count, Average level), Skills (Count)
Contact	Social Media Links (Count), Personal Information (Name, Birthday, Civil Status, Address, Email, Telephone, etc.), Desired Contact about (Career Opportunities, Consulting Offers, New Ventures, Job Inquiries, Expertise Request, Business Deals, Reference Request, Getting Back In Touch)
General	Errors (Spelling, Grammar), Length (Paragraphs, Pages), Ambition

Study 2

It was chosen to address the research questions with an exploratory approach including an online questionnaire and a content analysis. Study 2 provides insight into the development of the questionnaire as well as descriptive outcomes.

Instrument

An online questionnaire was used to assess the extent to which a respondent is capable of the selected competencies. The questionnaire contained 46 statements to be answered on a 5-point Likert scale, with a higher number referring to stronger agreement with the statement (after possible recoding). Each construct was represented by five to seven statements, which was a combination of previously established scales and additions made by the researcher. Furthermore, three questions regarding the usage of LinkedIn were also included next to six background variables and the request for the respondent to place his or her public LinkedIn page link.

Procedure

A total of 332 (N) persons were directly approached via their personal email with the request to fill in the questionnaire. These people were reminded twice with a break of two weeks in between each contact. Furthermore, the link to the online questionnaire was published in five LinkedIn groups: The Recruiter Network - #1 Group for Recruiters, Jobs 2.0 Search Career Networking Staff, Linked:HR (#1 Human Resources Group), H. R. Professionals and E-Recruitment. All groups dealt with human resources or recruiting; the choice for groups in this field was made due to the divers opinions

regarding the use of SNS profiles during application procedures. Consequentially, at least 332 persons had access to the questionnaire, of which 97 persons responded. A total of 52 responses were evaluated as unsuitable, because the respondents had not provided a (valid) link to their LinkedIn profile. This resulted in a total of 45 useful respondents, which equals a response rate of 14%.

Participants

The great majority of the respondents was male (64%), had a Dutch background (69%) and was between 22 and 30 years old (51%; M=34; SD=11). Most people either went to a university of applied science (44%) or a university (43%). With the help of the LinkedIn profiles, it was confirmed that the 44% selecting 'Other' as their current position, were students; given the current LinkedIn hype, this seemed only logical. Seven respondents selected the option 'owner/CEO/director' and six were managers. Moreover, the great majority (77%) indicated that he/she had changed their LinkedIn profile in the past 12 months. Whereas 40% stated to have added a contact between 10 and 39 times, about one third (33%) indicated to have added a person at least 40 times within the past year. Most interestingly, 21% of the respondents stated that they had searched for a person between either three and five or six and nine times in the past 12 months. An additional quarter of the respondents (26%) indicated to have looked up a person between 10 and 19 times in the past year.

Analysis

As shown in Table 3, the reliability of the constructs measured by the questionnaire range from .69 to .88.

Table 3 – Reliability, Descriptives, Number of items, Sources of Constructs

Construct	M	Std.	α	Items	Source Scale Items
Teamwork	3.47	.66	.69	6	Baker, D. P. & Salas, E. (1992), HR-website.com (2001)
Leadership	3.47	.76	.88	7	Gnambs, T. & Batinic, B.(2011), Houghton, J. D. & Neck, C.P. (2002)
Flexible	3.59	.78	.82	7	Bhawuk, D.P.S. (1992)
Communicative Openness	3.64	.75	.82	6	Brown, J.B., Boles, M., Mullooly, J. P., & Levinson, W. (1999), Cohen, D. S., Colliver, J. A., Marcy, M. S., Fried, E. D., & Swartz, M. H. (1996)
Written Communication	3.56	.91	.85	5	HR-website.com (2001)
Assertive	3.43	.74	.77	7	Galassi, j.P., DeLo, J.S., Galassi, M.D., & Bastien, S. (1974)
Order	3.30	.71	.79	7	HR-website.com (2001)

Note: One item was deleted in construct 'Teamwork'. Deleted item: 'I am used to being provided with directions on what to do next.' Original α: .64

Study 3

In the third study the received LinkedIn profiles were coded according to the scheme developed in Phase 2 of Study 1. The research design was inspired by Krämer and Winter (2008), but the present content analysis did not involve a detailed analysis of pictures other than the profile picture, for the simple reason that a LinkedIn profile does not contain any other pictures.

17

Instrument

The 45 profiles were coded according to the coding scheme that was developed beforehand, as described above (Table 2).

Procedure

The coding elements were adapted, extended or deleted after ten profiles had been coded and the results discussed by the two coders; providing a final total of 73 coding elements. The calculated inter-coder correlations, regarding the ten profiles coded by two researchers, covered a great scope, with the majority (48%) showing substantial to almost perfect agreement. Approximately 12% of the agreement can be considered 'fair' and the remaining 19% showed a poor or slight agreement.

It was decided to exclude any variables dealing with the content of the recommendations from further analysis, because of the rather limited amount of respondents (5) that allowed the observer to read his/her recommendations. Additionally, any variables that revealed a constant score across respondents were excluded as these variables did not offer any additional insights; thus resulting in a total of 53 coded variables being included in further analysis.

Analysis

A factor analysis has been performed in order to identify possible clusters of variables. Here, a total of eight groups were tested regarding their internal validity, but only one cluster turned out to be reliable. The various variables included in this group dealt with a person's work experience (all jobs, jobs within 5 years, jobs within 10 years and amount of task descriptions). These variables were added up to form the variable 'Job Information' (α .90), which was then included in a correlation analysis together with the remaining variables.

The correlation analysis revealed that 'Language Use' has a strong positive relationship with six of the seven constructs; written communication being the exception with a considerable low value of .61. The constructs 'teamwork' and 'orderly/analytic/structured' showed the most correlations, with four correlations each. Additionally, it is worth mentioning that two correlations of the former and one correlation of the latter construct were negative. A total of 18 significant correlations, covering a range from -.41 to .82, were encountered. A full overview of all the correlations can be found in Appendix C.

Findings

An overview of some core elements of a LinkedIn profile is presented in Table 4, where the average score of the 45 coded profiles is given as well.

Table 4 – Characteristics of the LinkedIn profiles

LinkedIn Section	Variable	M	Std
Overview	Picture	.82	.39
	Contacts	183.53	147.71
Experience	Number of Jobs	4.53	2.71
Education	Number of Studies	2.56	1.32
Clubs	Number of Clubs	.51	1.14
Groups	Number of Groups	10.42	13.30
Recommendations	Number of Recommendations	1.27	3.18
General	Length (Pages)	1.87	.89

Combined Results

In the following section the findings of the questionnaire and those of the content analysis were combined in order to determine the accuracy of the competencies' representation. The correlation analysis revealed a total of 18 significant relations with the seven constructs. These and some striking, yet non-significant, correlations are elaborated according to competency.

Teamwork

There were four LinkedIn elements with significant correlations; two deal with the profile owner's groups (number and number of different types) and were negative (-.31 and -.41 respectively). Keeping in mind that the group count was negative (-.31), it appeared to be rather surprising that the club count was, almost equally, positive (.33). The strongest correlation was identified with the variable 'language use' (.82), which refers to the choice between formal and informal styles.

Thinking of a person that is very good in teamwork, it was expected that this person would know a lot of people. However, it turned out that the correlation with the amount of contacts was negative (-.17) but not significant.

Leadership

Two significant relations could be identified with the construct 'leadership'. One being the profile owner's picture (.36) and the other being his or her choice of words ('language use' .71).

However, three other variables were identified, which –despite their non-significant correlations- seemed to be logical indicators for leadership, but revealed rather weak relationships. First, one would expect a leader to express a certain degree of 'ambition', however, any references to this only correlate with .08 to actual leadership competence. Furthermore, one expects persons to be leaders in their fields of expertise ('specialties'). Yet again, the correlation with leadership was considerably low (.18). Leaders generally have many ties, either with people they supervise or with other leaders, and for this reason it was looked at the correlation with the number of LinkedIn connections ('contacts'), which was very low with .04.

Flexible

The number of lines composing a person's profile summary (.49), his/her highest position in clubs during his/her education (.73) and his/her style of language used (.72) were the only significant correlations with the construct 'flexible'.

One would expect that the fact whether a person worked and/or studied in different locations would provide good indicators of this person's flexibility. However, the correlations of both variables (locations of jobs; locations of studies) were not significant and rather low with .10 and .17 respectively. Additionally, it can be argued that someone who is flexible does not have trouble switching topics and thus is able to work several jobs at the same time (number of parallel jobs). Yet, the encountered relationship with the construct was not only non-significant, but also very low (.07).

Communicative Openness

It was shown that this construct had significant correlations with three LinkedIn elements. The amount of recommendations showed the weakest relation (.36), followed by the length of the profile owner's summary (in lines; .46) and his/her style of language used (.76).

It seemed logical that a highly communicative person would be able to speak several languages. However, this (not significant) correlation was negative with -.02. Persons who are good

communicators often also have a lot of connections, which is why it was also surprising that the number of contacts had a weak, non-significant relation with this construct (.02).

Written Communication
The only significant correlation found for this construct was 'language use' (.61), which is rather astonishing given the fact that spelling and grammar were also coded variables. Not only revealed the later two not significant relationships with 'written communication', the correlations were considerably low with .07 and .18 respectively.
One might argue that a person who is strong in written communication, would be more inclined to include a summary on his/her LinkedIn profile, yet the correlation analysis showed that this relationship was weak (.06) and non-significant.

Assertive
The variable 'language use' turned out to be the only element with a significant correlation with the construct 'assertive'. This relationship was shown to be rather strong with .72.
Surprisingly, the number of claims a person made within their summary about their abilities ('claims') did not come up as a significant correlation; the relationship turned out to be negative indeed (-.30). Additionally, a self-promotional manner of writing one's summary showed a non-significant positive (.29) correlation. These two findings appeared to be illogical; especially so because a respondent provides an example of a profile where formal language is used, yet the summary is formulated in a rather self-promotional style and contains a total of ten claims about the person's abilities.

Orderly/ Analytical/ Structured
A total of four variables were identified that had a significant correlation with this construct. All variables except for the 'number of group types' were positive; this variable showed a correlation of -.34. The amount of different types of clubs, on the other hand, was strongly positive with a correlation of .74. Taking into account that less distinctions were made between the types of clubs, this might account for the strong difference in correlations. Spelling revealed to have a moderate impact on the variable (.33) and the correlation with 'language use' was strongly positive (.73).
One would have expected that a person that is rather ordered and structured would use bullet points when presenting his/her summary on LinkedIn. However, this aspect turned not only out to be non-significant, but also negatively correlated with -.17.

Discussion
Study Findings
Generally speaking, the participants of this research were considerably active users of LinkedIn, since the great majority engaged in changing his/her profile, adding a new contact or searching for information on a person via LinkedIn or a combination of these activities.

RQ 1: Which competencies are generally relevant in today's 'recruitment world'?
It was shown that a wide variety of general, thus non-job-specific, competencies are requested across diverse job openings. The most relevant competencies encountered appeared to be teamwork, leadership, flexibility, communicativeness, assertiveness and orderly/analytical/structural capabilities.

RQ 2: Which LinkedIn elements serve as indicators for a person's capacities regarding the selected competencies respectively?

There are a total of ten different LinkedIn variables which can be considered indicators of the established seven competency-related constructs. Three variables deal with clubs (number, number of types and position) and two with groups (number and number of types). One variable each concerns the number of recommendations a person has, the amount of spelling mistakes on the profile, and the number of lines that the summary consists of. Moreover, the profile picture as well as the general language use (informal/ formal) provides insights on certain competencies.

RQ 3: How well does a LinkedIn profile represent or indicate the respective competencies?
As has become clear during the analyzing process, it is not as easy for an observer to 'predict' a person's competencies on the basis of his/her LinkedIn profile as one might think. This is mainly the case because it is difficult to identify accurate indicators (10 out of 53 variables and one factor) and because it has been proven that many relations are, indeed, rather weak or even negative. Since, for example, the number of clubs has a slight positive relation with the competency 'teamwork', but the amount of groups has an almost equally negative relation with the same competency, the question arises as to why two aspects that appear to be rather similar in nature, have opposing relations with the same competency.

One aspect probably influencing this result is the fact that the number of clubs a person is a member of is limited by those clubs offered by the respective educational institute, whereas LinkedIn offers an infinite amount of groups that one can join. Thus, the likelihood of being a member of a LinkedIn group is considerably higher than having been a member at a club. Furthermore, membership at clubs, mainly, deals with activities in the past as compared to membership at LinkedIn groups dealing with present interests and activities. The clubs one was engaged in during educational development might represent true strengths and capabilities, while today's membership at LinkedIn groups might express a mere interest, but not a strength or capability. Additionally, it appears logical that the more groups a person has, the less this person is actually involved and actively participating. As such, membership in clubs might have been very active, whereas group membership on LinkedIn might be passive to a large extent.

Furthermore, the research revealed that the language used by the profile owner (formal versus informal) has a considerable impact on all seven competency constructs. With this in mind, the question arises whether this is an actual result or a coding error. The fact that the strength of the correlation between 'language use' and the seven constructs varies from .61 to .82, can be viewed as supporting the notion of it being a 'result', because there is reasonable variation in the degree of correlation. Moreover, the guidelines used throughout the coding process clearly stated the distinction between formal and informal language use, supplying examples to make the distinction even more evident.

Practical Implications
It has been shown that the representation of the seven constructs by LinkedIn elements is rather challenging. But in what way can one translate the competencies into variables present on LinkedIn profiles? The results of this research revealed relations between the respective competence and rather unexpected profile elements, which makes it considerably more difficult to deduce competency indicators. Connections, which seemed to be logical, turned out to be not significant; thus enhancing the notion of unpredictability. It therefore should not be advised to assume that specific elements of LinkedIn profiles can provide clear, one-to-one indications of respective competencies.

Consequentially, HR professionals or recruitment personnel have to be cautioned to include these, yet easy, informal background check. First of all, it is still debated whether such a secretive activity is unethical and morally wrong. Moreover, this basis on which the employers form an impression about the profile owner is based on only slightly representative information. The fact that some countries, such as Germany, have legally prohibited the usage of SNS profiles within the selection process (Schoemaker, 2010) provides an example of the extreme views regarding the suitability of including SNS profiles in selection procedures.

This research pointed out that the rather unexpected correlations, which have been encountered, were considerably low. For an employer, this means that when assessing a job applicant's profile page the employer is not very likely to find statements, which provide sufficient indications of this applicant's actual abilities. Furthermore, the question arises how one could possibly make certain that all profiles would be judged in the same manner. It frequently occurs that one profile is more elaborate than another, yet this study provided evidence that profile length is not a significant indicator for any of the seven competencies. In conclusion, it would be best for both the hiring and the to-be-hired party if SNS profiles, such as LinkedIn, were firmly excluded from the selection process.

Job seekers should also be cautioned, because it appears to be rather unlikely that employers will stop using SNS profiles during selection processes in the near future. Thus, job seekers should make sure to use a formal language style throughout their profile, because this variable had been identified as rather good indicator of all seven constructs. One might want to focus on the summary of his/ her LinkedIn profile, because the length (in lines) of this section provides insights on the profile owner's flexibility as well as his/her communicative skills. The amount of recommendations of the profile owner provides additional insight on the latter. Furthermore, including a profile picture is advisable, because it makes a profile more appealing and, moreover, it serves as an indication of leadership.

Job seekers should be rather selective in their participation in LinkedIn groups, because the number as well as the amount of different types of groups has been shown to have negative correlations. The number of groups listed on a profile was adversely associated with the person's teamwork abilities, while the count of different group types turned out to have negative relationships with teamwork and a person's analytical/ structural abilities.

Taking into account the average LinkedIn member, the implications of this research appear to be considerably small. The use of formal language always seems preferable over slang within a rather professional environment such as LinkedIn, as does a simple profile picture. With regard to membership of LinkedIn groups, it would be advisable for profile owners to be very selective in the groups they choose, because not only the total amount of groups but also the number of different LinkedIn groups revealed negative relationships; thus downplaying a person's actual abilities.

Nevertheless, the average LinkedIn user should not dread the conclusions based on their online profiles. It was proven multiple times that these public identity claims are truthful for a number of reasons (Donath & Boyd, 2004; Gosling, Gaddis, & Vazire, 2007; Hargittai, 2007). It was revealed in this research that most elements of LinkedIn profiles do not serve as indicators of competencies. However, a couple do actually provide this insight, yet the correlation is rather week. This merely means that the representation of a person's competencies online is weaker than their actual abilities

in the respective field. Knowing this, profile owners might want to compensate for this by overly emphasising their abilities; which would mean more identity claims. However, these identity claims could not be identified as significant elements for representing competencies. Thus, it appears that profile owners cannot take a lot of extra precautions –except for the selective choice of LinkedIn groups as mentioned above. Most importantly, however, the risk of false information gaining or impression forming can be considered rather low, because SNS profiles mirror actual owner characteristics (Brown & Vaughn, 2011) and only two adverse, and thus potentially harming, correlations could be identified.

Thus the question arises what the actual use of LinkedIn is. This SNS focuses on professionals and thus serves as a platform providing the opportunity to connect oneself with business partners and/or other professionals. The site offers the chance to keep up with recent developments on personal as well as professional levels and enables members to follow organisations in their activities. Thus, job seekers, for example, are enabled by this option to find out about new vacancies and to learn more about the most current activities.

As a job seeker, on the other hand, showing that one is interested in and can work with social media is very important within this time. However, it would be wrong to assume that any SNS profile, even a bad one, was better than no profile. Despite the fact that not many significant correlations could be identified within this study, it appears logical that a bad profile –meaning, for example, spelling mistakes, slang, and inappropriate profile picture –would have a negative impact on the impression formed by observers. Thus, it can be concluded that no profile is better than a bad, and therefore downplaying, SNS profile. It goes without saying that a good profile –one without the flaws mentioned previously –is better than no profile, because it does not produce a negative impression.

Whereas a bad profile would clearly produce an adverse opinion among SNS observers, which might even result in abandoning the profile before viewing the entire profile, a good profile is more likely to enhance the reader's interest. Despite the fact that only few correlations between competencies and LinkedIn elements could be encountered, a good profile can still do a lot for the profile owner in terms of providing an entrance. A good profile can be viewed as a snap shot of the profile owner, and thus can result in observers wanting to get the actual person. This results not only in a growing network, but can also give way to job opportunities.

As mentioned before, LinkedIn appears to be the best suited SNS when it comes to competencies, because Facebook, for example, has a stronger orientation towards leisure or private use. The same can be said about other SNS such as MySpace and Friendster. But how does it compare to the US concept of the 'glass door'?

Whereas LinkedIn is about self-presentation of the profile owner, on the 'glass door' websites, however, persons express their opinions about the person in question rather than presenting facts about this individual. Thus, opening this person not only to praise by colleagues or business partners, but also to hurtful comments by competitors or colleagues, who might feel jealous or threatened by this person. Consequently, the trustworthiness of the statements is doubtful. One could say that the more often a comparable statement was made, the more reliable or valid this expression could be. Yet, this does not address the issue to which extent these opinions represent actual competencies of the person. Reconciling on the results of this research, one could argue that these opinions do not provide an accurate representation of the person's competencies. However, the 'glass door' concept does not involve self-presentation, which might result in different results. Outsiders might have a

clearer view on a person's competencies and thus might be able to provide more accurate information about these, provided that the opinion giver is authentic and honest in his/ her expressions. In conclusion, it appears reasonable that profiles according to the 'glass door' concept include better indicators of competencies.

<u>Limitations</u>
The fact whether a profile is complete or not may affect the way a person weighs the information contained on the profile, similar to the differences made between pictures and self-descriptions (Westerman, van der Heide, Klein, & Walther, 2008). It has been pointed out that complete LinkedIn profiles are viewed about 40 times more often than those missing items; especially recommendations are of particular interest to the observers (Janssen, 2011). Thus, it appears to be rather unfortunate that the actual degree to which the content of recommendations correlates with the selected competencies could not be assessed in the course of this study. While LinkedIn can be considered a SNS that encourages authentic self-representation, partially due to the connectivity as well as the recommendations, (Boyd & Ellison, 2007) only few respondents in the study actually had (12) or showed (5) their recommendations.

Other areas that have been provided by a rather limited number of respondents were the additional element 'skills'(5) and the additional group activities (clubs), in which a person participated during his/her educational development (9). Thus, one has to ask the question whether the correlations found regarding the type of club(s) in which a person used to participate and the position, which this person occupied within this club, can be considered equally valid as the remaining ones. Since the reliability of the correlation increases with the number of cases, any conclusions or comments regarding the elements in question (types of clubs and position within a club) should be made very tentatively and keeping in mind that the indication is not very strong. For these reasons it has been debated as to whether the two variables should be excluded from the analysis. However, it was decided against this exclusion due to the fact that the type of clubs shows an entirely opposing correlation as the type of groups a person is part off on LinkedIn; two aspects which one would regard to be very similar in nature. Therefore, it is suggested to look into further detail regarding the different elements on a LinkedIn profile, so that it can be determined which aspects are truly similar. Moreover, the stated population is merely the lower limit of a possible number of persons who could have accessed the questionnaire. Thus, the indicated response rate is, consequentially, the possible maximum. It therefore remains questionable how big the actual population was- yet the importance of this fact is also discussable.

As indicated above, it was rather difficult to deduce significant factors from the general scope of variables. Thus, one has to ask the question why only one significant combination of variables could be found, which, however, turned out to have no correlation with the seven constructs. Despite the preliminary research and the adjustments made after discussions with the second coder, it could be possible that the coding guidelines were still too broad or that the coding label does not accurately capture the actual coded content of the variable coded. A combination of inductive and deductive code development might possibly help to solve ease this discrepancy.

Furthermore, one has to be aware of the fact that all the data involved in this research was based solely on self-reporting by the respondents, thus opening the possibility for errors or inaccuracies in the findings (Lampe, Ellison & Steinfield, 2008; Westerman, van der Heide, Klein & Walther, 2008). However, it has been proven earlier that SNS impressions reflect an individual's personality to a

significant extent even when one controls for self-idealisation (Back, et al., 2010), which is further supported by the notion that the public connectivity ensures a certain level of authenticity (Donath & Boyd, 2004).

Even though the majority of the coded variables showed a (almost) perfect inter-coder agreement, one cannot completely neglect the fact that a considerable number of the variables (24) showed a less than moderate level of agreement of the two coders. As was already mentioned, this as well might have been due to discrepancies between code label and variable content; however, keeping in mind that the two coders edited the coding scheme together, the influence of these discrepancies ought to be considerably small. Possible measures to enhance agreement of these variables could include the deduction of even more specific –maybe even yes or no- sub-variables, which would provide more clear-cut guidelines on what is understood under the respective sub-variable.

Since LinkedIn is a SNS that has a clearly different target group than, for example, Facebook (Rutledge, 2011), one has to be very careful with broadening the scope of the conclusions made. It does not appear wise to extent the applicability towards SNSs with other cultures or target groups, because the structure as well as the purpose of LinkedIn is visibly different and as thus somewhat unique.

Future Research

This study has made an effort to explore the helpfulness of LinkedIn profiles in determining a person's competencies. However, only seven constructs were taken into account, while there are a lot more competencies than this that need to be looked at. Thus, it is suggested that future research assesses which other competencies can be indicated or evaluated with the help of LinkedIn profiles. It would also be interesting to know how the selected seven competency constructs correlate with other SNSs; especially 'glass door' websites, where a person is sketched by other individuals instead of self-reporting. Furthermore, one might consider exploring why seemingly related or similar profile elements score adversely in the correlation analysis. Moreover, it is rather essential to what extent and with what goal employers consult online profiles such as LinkedIn.

References

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

Baker, D., & Salas, E. (1992). Principles for measuring teamwork skills. *Human Factors. 34 ,*469-475.

Beer, D. (2008). Social network(ing)sites... revisiting the story so far: A response to danah boyd & Nicole Ellison. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication. 13 ,*516-529.

Bhawuk, D. P. (1992). The measurement of intercultural sensitivity using the concepts of individualism and collectivism. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations. 16*, 413-436.

Boyd, D., & Ellison, N. (2007). Social Network Sites: Definition, History, and Scholarship. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication. 13 ,*210-230.

Brandenburg, C. (2008). The Newest Way to Screen Job Applicants: A Social Networker's Nightmare. *Federal Communications Law Journal, 60 ,* 597-626.

Brown, J. B., Boles, M., Mullooly, J. P., & Levinson, W. (1999). Effect of clinical communication skills training on patient satisfaction. *Annals of Internal Medicine. 131 ,* 822-829.

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

Byrnside, I. (2007). Six Clicks of Separation: The Legal Ramifications of Employers Using Social Networking Sites to Research Applicants. *Vanderbilt Journal of Entertainment and Technology Law. 10 ,* 445-477.

Cain, J. (2008). Online Social Networking Issues Within Academia and Pharmacy Education. *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education. 72 (Article 10).*

Clark, L., & Roberts, S. (2010). Employers' Use of Social Networking Sites: A Socially Irresponsible Practice. *Journal of Business Ethics. 95*, 507-525.

Cohen, D. S., Colliver, J. A., Marcy, M. S., Fried, E. D., & Swartz, M. H. (1996). Psychometric properties of a standardized-patient checklist and rating-scale form used to assess interpersonal and communication skills. *Academic Medicine. 71 ,* S87-S89.

Donath, J., & Boyd, D. (2004). Public displays of connection. *BT Technology Journal. 22 ,* 71-82.

du Chatenier, E., Verstegen, J., Biemans, H., Mulder, M., & Omta, O. (2010). Identification of competencies for professionals in open innovation teams. *R&D Management. 40 ,* 271-279.

Ellison, N., Steinfield, C., & Lampe, C. (2006). Spatially bounded online social networks and social capital: The role of Facebook. *Annual Conference of International Communication Associateion*, Dresden, Germany.

Epstein, R., & Hundert, E. (2002). Defining and assessing professional competence. *Journal of American Medical Association. 287 ,* 226-235.

Galassi, J. P., DeLo, J. S., Galassi, M. D., & Bastien, S. (1974). The college self-expression scale: A measure of assertiveness. *Behavior Therapy. 5*, 165-171.

Gnambs, T., & Batinic, B. (2011). Convergent and Discriminant Validity of Opinion Leadership. *Journal of Individual Differences*, 94-102.

Gosling, S., Gaddis, S., & Vazire, S. (2007). Personality Impressions Based on Facebook Profiles. *Psychology.*, pp. 1-4. Retrieved from http://www.icwsm.org/papers/3--Gosling-Gaddis-Vazire.pdf.

Hargittai, E. (2007). Whose Space? Differences among users and non-users of social network sites. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication. 13 ,* 276-297.

Hinduja, S., & Patchin, J. W. (2008). Personal Information of Adolescent on the Internet: A quantitative content analysis of MySpace. *Journal of Adolescence, 31*, 125-146.

Højgaard, T. (2009). *Competencies, skills and assessment.* Denmark.

Hornby, A. (2005). *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English.* Oxford, Great Brittain: Oxford University Press.

Houghton, J. D., & Neck, C. (2002). The revised self-leadership questionnaire- Testing a hierarchical factor structure for self-leadership. *Journal of Managerial Psychology. 17 ,* 672-691.

HR-website.com. (2001). Retrieved 10 15, 2011, from Staff member guide to interviewing: http://www.hr-guide.com/data/A302.htm

Janssen, R. (2011). *De kleine LinkedIn voor Dummies.* Nijmegen, Netherlands: Pearson Education Benelux.

Jeffrey, L., & Brunton, M. (2011). Developing a framework for communication management competencies. *Journal of Vocational Education and Training. 63 ,* 57-75.

Kets de Vries, M., Vrignaud, P., & Florent-Treacy, E. (2004). The Global Leadership Life Inventory: development and psychometric properties of a 360-degree feedback instrument. *International Journal of Human Resource management. 15 ,* 475-492.

Krämer, N., & Winter, S. (2008). Impression Management 2.0 The Relationship of Self-Esteem, Extraversio, Self-Efficacy, and Self-Presentation Within Social Networking Sites. *Journal of Media Psychology. 20 ,* 106-116.

Lampe, C., Ellison, N., & Steinfield, C. (2006). A Face(book) in the crowd: Social Searching vs. Social Browsing. *Proceedings of the 2006 20th anniversary conference on Computer supported cooperative work*, (pp. 167-170).

Lampe, C., Ellison, N., & Steinfield, C. (2008). Changes in Use and Perception of Facebook. *Proceedings of the 2008 ACM conference on Computer supported cooperative work*, (pp. 721-730).

Lange, P. (2007). Publicly Private and Privately Public: Social Networking on YouTube. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication. 13 ,* 361-380.

Lee, Y.-T. (2010). Exploring high-performers' required competencies. *Expert Systems with Applications. 37,* 434-439.

Molyneux, J. (2001). Interprofessional teamworking: what makes teams work well? *Journal of Interprofessional Care. 15 ,* 29-35.

Moore, D., Cheng, M.-I., & Dainty, A. (2002). Competence, competency and competencies: performance assessment in organisations. *Work Study. 51 ,* 314-319.

Palank, J. (2006). Face it: 'Book' no secret to employers. *The Washington Times*, unknown.

Peluchette, J., & Klark, K. (2008). Social Networking Profiles: An Examination of Student Attitudes Regarding Use and Appropriateness of Content. *CyberPsychology & Behaviour. 11 ,* 95-97.

Rosenberg, J., & Egbert, N. (2011). Online Impression Management: Personality Traits and Concerns for Secondary Goals as Predictors of Self-Presentation Tactics on Facebook. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication. 17 ,* 1-18.

Rutledge, P.-A. (2011). *Sams Teach Yourself LinkedIn in 10 minutes.* Indianapolis, Indiana: Sama Publishing.

Schoemaker, R. (2010, 08 27). *www.webwereld.nl.* Retrieved 02 23, 2012, from http://webwereld.nl/nieuws/66974/-nederlands-facebook-verbod-is-ondenkbaar-.html

Thole, E., & van der Jagt, F. (2010). *www.stribbe.nl.* Retrieved 02 23, 2012, from http://www.stibbe.nl/upload/14c272000133c6a31cda0117b7.PDF

Vazire, S., & Gosling, S. (2004). E-Perceptions: Personality Impressions Based on Personal Websites. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology. 87 ,* 123-132.

Westerman, D., van der Heide, B., Klein, K., & Walther, J. (2008). How do people really seek information about others?: Information seeking across Internet and traditional communication channels. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication. 13 .* 751-767.

Zhao, S., Grasmuck, S., & Martin, J. (2008). Identity construction on Facebook: Digital empowerment in anchored relationships. *Computers in Human Behavior. 24 ,* 1816-1836.

Appendices

Appendix A - Questionnaire

1. Please name any element(s) of your LinkedIn profile, which you think that person looking at your profile considers important.
2. Please provide the public link (as marked in the picture above) to YOUR LinkedIn profile.
3. With respect to your own person, please indicate to what degree you agree or disagree with the following statements.

(1) I make sure to use words that are easy to understand.
(2) I usually prompt other members on what to do next.
(3) I do not like to receive unannounced visitors at home.
(4) I ignore it when someone pushes in front of me in line.
(5) I often receive compliments for my written reports.
(6) I usually succeed if I want to convince someone about something.
(7) I organize ideas and information in unique ways.
(8) Working on several projects simultaneously is a problem for me.
(9) I like to share information and experiences with other people.
(10) I put people at ease.
(11) It is easy for me to influence other people.
(12) When I am unsure whether the procedure or information is correct, I ask.
(13) I utilize a 'to do' list, calendar, or some type of planning tool.
(14) I find it difficult to stand up for my rights.
(15) I decorate my home or office with artifacts from other countries.
(16) It is difficult for me to put my thoughts down on paper.
(17) People in my social circle frequently act upon my advice.
(18) One considers me to be over-apologetic.
(19) I do not feel threatened by other professionals in my field.
(20) I am confident.
(21) I maintain a balance and awareness of status of all projects.
(22) I think about the goals that I intend to achieve in the future.
(23) I am used to being provided with direction on what to do next.
(24) I can change topics quickly without problems.
(25) I am overly careful to avoid hurting other people's feelings.
(26) I make eye contact.
(27) Among my friends and acquaintances, I often decide which issues are current.
(28) I never make decisions based on my "gut feeling".
(29) I change the way of performing a task when asked to do so.
(30) I frequently find myself confronted with spelling issues.
(31) I maintain a comfortable and appropriate distance when talking to people.
(32) I keep my opinion to myself.
(33) I need facts and figures in order to form an opinion.
(34) I am often the one among my friends and acquaintances who has to approve important decisions.
(35) I am thankful when other crew members catch my mistakes.
(36) Switching projects several times a day is very confusing for me.
(37) I resolve conflicting priorities and accomplish work on time.
(38) I write in a concise and organized manner.
(39) I often use my persuasive powers during discussions to reach agreements quickly.

(40) When I am living abroad, I assess situations as quickly as I do when I am living in my own country.

(41) If someone I respect expresses opinions with which I strongly disagree, I would venture to state my own point of view.

(42) I express results clearly and grammatically correct.

(43) In my office, every element (pencil, picture, etc.) has a fixed place.

(44) To me, it is easiest to react on someone's request, rather than taking action independently.

(45) I am sensitive to the communication levels required by different audiences.

(46) We all have a right to hold different beliefs about God and religion.

4. Gender
5. Nationality
6. Age
7. Highest finished level of education
8. Current Position
9. Please indicate how many persons you directly supervise.
10. How many times in the last 12 months (if ever) have you changed your LinkedIn profile?
11. How many times in the last 12 months (if ever) have you added a new connectection on LinkedIn?
12. How many times in the last 12 months (if ever) have you searched for a person on LinkedIn?

Appendix B – Code Book

LinkedIn Element	What	How	Guidelines/Explanations	SCORE	Sub-score
Picture	Yes/No	Yes (1), No (0)			
	Type	Professional (1), Leisure (2), Abstract (3)	Professional in this context is understood as displaying the person only, who is dressed neatly. Leisure referrs to depiction of the person during, for example, vacation or a party. Images displaying no person at all, but something else can be considered as abstract.		
Contacts	Count	Indicate the total NUMBER of contacts.			
Summary	Yes/No	Yes (1), No (0)	If NO, continue with the next section: Specialties		
	No. Of paragraphs	Indicate the total NUMBER of Paragraphs within this section.	Paragraph entails the seperation of two pieces of text (at least a line each) by an 'empty' line; a new paragraph may be started off/indicated by a headline. Exclude 'specialties'		
	Size of paragraphs	Indicate the NUMBER of LINES of each Paragraph in this section.	Indicate each new paragraph under Subscore. Add up all lines for the Score section.		
	(Un)Supported Claims — Claims	Indicate the total NUMBER of claims.	Claims usually start with 'I do', 'I can', 'I am'; 'specialties' can be viewed as unsupported claims, but will not be included here. This section looks at claims mentioned in sentences only, here it is possible to mention several claims within just one sentence.(0=0; 1-3=1; 4-6=2; 7-9=3; 10-12=4; 13-15=5; 16-18=6; 18+=7) Select an interval under Score and mention the exact number under subscore		
	Evidence	Indicate the total NUMBER of evidences.	Evidence includes any examples that imply a claim, whithout clearly/directly stating the claim. (0=0; 1-3=1; 4-6=2; 7-9=3; 10-12=4; 13-15=5; 16-18=6; 18+=7) Select an interval under Score and mention the exact number under subscore		
	Supported Claims	Indicate the total NUMBER of supported claims.	Supported claims are those that are stated directly and where evidence is provided. (0=0; 1-3=1; 4-6=2; 7-9=3; 10-12=4; 13-15=5; 16-18=6; 18+=7) Select an interval under Score and mention the exact number under subscore		
	Indication of focus/result-focus	Indicate the total NUMBER of times that any of the selected terms referring to the profile owner were mentioned.	result-focused, focus, focal point, spotlight, goal-oriented, determined, dedicated, passion(ate), realise; please indicate any other words included in the count under Subscore; (0=0; 1-3=1; 4-6=2; 7-9=3; 10-12=4; 13-15=5; 16-18=6; 18+=7) Select an interval under Score and mention the exact number under subscore		
	No. Of 'assertive', 'taking initiative', etc.	Indicate the total NUMBER of times that any of the selected terms referring to the profile owner were mentioned.	assertive, assertiveness, taking the initiative, making the first move, acting without being told, taking chances (?); please indicate any other words included in the count under Subscore; (0=0; 1-3=1; 4-6=2; 7-9=3; 10-12=4; 13-15=5; 16-18=6; 18+=7) Select an interval under Score and mention the exact number under subscore		

Specialties	Manner of self-presentation	self-promotion	Yes (1), No (0)	
		Narrative	Yes (1), No (0)	
		modest	Yes (1), No (0)	
		bullet points	Yes (1), No (0)	no descriptive text, bullets only
	No. Of 'leader', 'leadership', etc.		Indicate the total NUMBER of times that any of the selected terms referring to the profile owner were mentioned.	leader, leadership, taking the lead, assigning tasks/responsibilities, delegating, being in charge,providing direction, envisioning the future; please indicate any other words included in the count under Subscore; (0=0; 1-3=1; 4-6=2; 7-9=3; 10-12=4; 13-15=5; 16-18=6; 18+=7) Select an interval under Score and mention the exact number under subscore
	No. Of 'teamwork', 'teamplayer', etc.		Indicate the total NUMBER of times that any of the selected terms referring to the profile owner were mentioned.	teamwork, team player, team/ group/joint effort, crew, group, sharing information/experience, joint/common goal, cooperation; please indicate any other words included in the count under Subscore; (0=0; 1-3=1; 4-6=2; 7-9=3; 10-12=4; 13-15=5; 16-18=6; 18+=7) Select an interval under Score and mention the exact number under subscore
	Examples of joint efforts		Indicate the total NUMBER of joint efforts mentioned.	joint/ common/ team effort, joint/common goal; (0=0; 1-3=1; 4-6=2; 7-9=3; 10-12=4; 13-15=5; 16-18=6; 18+=7) Select an interval under Score and mention the exact number under subscore
	indication of networking		Indicate the total NUMBER of times that any of the selected terms were mentioned.	being open, communicative, social, easily accessible, quick to establish new contacts, effective communicator; please indicate any other words included in the count under Subscore; (0=0; 1-3=1; 4-6=2; 7-9=3; 10-12=4; 13-15=5; 16-18=6; 18+=7) Select an interval under Score and mention the exact number under subscore
	Leadership; Coordination		Indicate the total NUMBER of terms with regard to each item: Teamwork (1), Leadership (2), Flexibility (3), Assertive (4), Communicative (5), Orderly/Structured/ Analytical (6), Other (7)	Allocate each specialty named to one or more of the competencies listed. Indicate the count per competency as follows: 1-X (here 1 refers to teamwork, the - is a seperation, and X is the counted amount of terms refering to this competency) under Subscore. In the score collumn mention the total number of specialties.
Experience	Tasks description	Task description	Indicate the NUMBER of task desciptions provided by the profile owner.	any additional information
		No. Of 'leader', 'leadership', etc.	Indicate the total NUMBER of times that any of the selected terms were mentioned.	leader, leadership, taking the lead, assigning tasks/responsibilities, delegating, being in charge,providing direction, envisioning the future, responsible, responsibility, manager; please indicate any other words included in the count under Subscore; (0=0; 1-3=1; 4-6=2; 7-9=3; 10-12=4; 13-15=5; 16-18=6; 18+=7) Select an interval under Score and mention the exact number under subscore

		Amount of different responsibilities	Indicate the total NUMBER of different areas mentioned within one job position.	For each new job position indicate under Subscore. Add up the different responsibilities under the Score section.
		Additional information/ stating the obvious	Additional (1), Obvious (0)	any information/tasks that logically follow from the job position are regarded as 'obvious'
	No. Of jobs		Indicate the total NUMBER of jobs held.	This implies the entire period displayed.
	No. Of parallel jobs		Indicate the total NUMBER of jobs held during the SAME period of time.	if 1 job is held, put 1
	No. Of jobs within 5 years time		Indicate the total NUMBER of jobs held within 5 years time.	5 years referring to the most recent 5, thus from 2007-2011
	No. Of jobs within 10 years time		Indicate the total NUMBER of jobs held within 10 years time.	10 years referring to the most recent 10, thus 2002-2011
	Different locations		Yes (1), No (0), Not Available (3)	
	Position	No. Of years	Indicate the total NUMBER of years a position was held.	Display each position under subscore: 0.5 year steps will be applied, thus jobs held for 1-6 months will be displayed as 0.5 years and 7-12 will be displayed as 1 year. Under score, indicate the AVERAGE time period.
		Type of development	None (0), Upward (1), Downward (-1)	only use when CLEARLY visible difference
		Type	Same (0), Comparable (1), Different (2)	
Education	No. of Studies		Indicate the total NUMBER of studies.	
	Different locations		Yes (1), No (0), Not Available (3)	
	Highest degree		Bachelor (1), Master (2), Engineer (3), Phd (4), Dr. (5), Professor (6), Other (7), Not Available (8)	Indicate the highest degree displayed on the profile
	Type of studies		Behavioural (1), Economic (2), Law (3), Medicine (4), Technical (5), Science/Natural (6), Other (7), Not Available (8)	Indicate the various types of under Subscore. Display the number of different type(s) of studies in the score section.
Clubs	Count		Indicate the total NUMBER of clubs on the profile.	Only count the total number of clubs that a person has been a member of during the ENTIRE educational development.

	Position	President/Chairman (1), Vice-President (2), Secretary (3), Member (4), Honory Member (5), Other (6), Not Available (7)	Indicate the position for each club under subscore. In the score section mention the highest position held.
	Type	sports (1), economics (2), political (3), religious (4), cultures (5), school (6), other (7)	Indicate the various types of clubs under Subscore. Display the number of different clubs in the score section.
Groups	Count	Indicate the total NUMBER of groups on the profile.	
	Type	Alumni (1), Corporate (2), Conference (3), Networking (4), Nonprofit (5), Professional (6), Other (7)	Indicate the different types under Subscore. Display the number of different groups in the score section. Alumni includes any school(related) groups. Corporate refers to a specific organisation. Conference to particular conferences. Networking includes anything related to networks, forums or discussion groups. Nonprofit is about actions or organisations that are known to be not-for-profit facilities. Professional relates to groups dealing with a certain/specific group of jobs.
Recommendations	Count	Indicate the NUMBER of recommendations this person has.	If there are 0 recommendations, continue with the next section: Languages
	indication of coordination	Indicate the total NUMBER of times that any of the selected terms were mentioned.	coordination, coordinate, coordinator, bringing together, multitasking, making arrangements, arranging, scheduling, timely, flow easily, organisational skills, cooperate, complex issues, made a team; please indicate any other words included in the count under Subscore; (0=0; 1-3=1; 4-6=2; 7-9=3; 10-12=4; 13-15=5; 16-18=6; 18+=7) Select an interval under Score and mention the exact number under subscore
	indication of result-focus	Indicate the total NUMBER of times that any of the selected terms were mentioned.	result-focused, focus, focal point, spotlight, goal-oriented, determined, dedicated, passion(ate), client-focused, win-win, ambition, determination, achieve, drive; please indicate any other words included in the count under Subscore; (0=0; 1-3=1; 4-6=2; 7-9=3; 10-12=4; 13-15=5; 16-18=6; 18+=7) Select an interval under Score and mention the exact number under subscore
	No.of 'order', 'structured', 'analytical', etc.	Indicate the total NUMBER of times that any of the selected terms were mentioned.	ordered, structured, analytical, planned, order, structure, analytic, plan, agenda, outline, big structure; please indicate any other words included in the count under Subscore; (0=0; 1-3=1; 4-6=2; 7-9=3; 10-12=4; 13-15=5; 16-18=6; 18+=7) Select an interval under Score and mention the exact number under subscore
	No. Of 'leader', 'leadership', etc.	Indicate the total NUMBER of times that any of the selected terms were mentioned.	leader, leadership, taking the lead, assigning tasks/responsibilities, delegating, being in charge,providing direction, envisioning the future, responsible, manager, mentor, coach, connect to people; please indicate any other words included in the count under Subscore; (0=0; 1-3=1; 4-6=2; 7-9=3; 10-12=4; 13-15=5; 16-18=6; 18+=7) Select an interval under Score and mention the exact number under subscore

No. Of positive words		Count the number of positive words.	for example: helpful, supportive, eager, enthusiastic, open, passionate, top, amazing, exceptional, strong, great, dedicated, well, exemplary, valuable, reliable, smart, motivated, excellent, teriffic, professional, capable, sagacious, good, highest, ability, mature, impressed, useful, added value, creative, pleasant, interested, ambition, enthusiasm, appreciated, specialism; mention any other term(s) counted under subscore; (0=0; 1-3=1; 4-6=2; 7-9=3; 10-12=4; 13-15=5; 16-18=6; 18+=7) Select an interval under Score and mention the exact number under subscore
indication of networking		Indicate the total NUMBER of times that any of the selected terms referring to the profile owner were mentioned.	being open, communicative, social, easily accessible, quick to establish new contacts, relationship (building), good listener, reliable friend, connect to people, pleasant to work with, cooperate; please indicate any other words included in the count under Subscore; (0=0; 1-3=1; 4-6=2; 7-9=3; 10-12=4; 13-15=5; 16-18=6; 18+=7) Select an interval under Score and mention the exact number under subscore
indication of empathetic behaviour		Indicate the total NUMBER of times that any of the selected terms referring to the profile owner were mentioned.	empathy, empathetic, being able to put oneself in somebody elses position/shoes, being able to translate the needs of others, compassion, compassionate, sensitive to others' feelings, good listener, received well by all stakeholders, humor, handed useful tips, helped with complicated questions; (0=0; 1-3=1; 4-6=2; 7-9=3; 10-12=4; 13-15=5; 16-18=6; 18+=7) Select an interval under Score and mention the exact number under subscore
indication of presentation skills		Indicate the total NUMBER of times that any of the selected terms referring to the profile owner were mentioned.	presentation, presenting, speaking before (a group of) people, brought to the table; please indicate any other words included in the count under Subscore; (0=0; 1-3=1; 4-6=2; 7-9=3; 10-12=4; 13-15=5; 16-18=6; 18+=7) Select an interval under Score and mention the exact number under subscore
indication of persuasion skills		Indicate the total NUMBER of times that any of the selected terms referring to the profile owner were mentioned.	persuasion, persuade, persuasiveness, sell one's idea, convince, convert; please indicate any other words included in the count under Subscore; (0=0; 1-3=1; 4-6=2; 7-9=3; 10-12=4; 13-15=5; 16-18=6; 18+=7) Select an interval under Score and mention the exact number under subscore
being able to move among different levels/groups of persons		Yes (1), No (0)	Do you think the person has the following abilities/characteristincs? Can put aspects in language that is appropriate for the audience; is broad-mindedness; has good general knowledge; is open; is sociable; empathy; can put him-/herself in somebody else's position
Mood	Open	Yes (1), No (0)	Indicate which style/mood best describes the overall tone of the recommendations.
	Friendly	Yes (1), No (0)	
	Busines slike	Yes (1), No (0)	
	Factual	Yes (1), No (0)	
	Other	Yes (1), No (0)	

	No. Of 'assertive', 'taking initiative', etc.		Indicate the total NUMBER of times that any of the selected terms referring to the profile owner were mentioned.	assertive, assertiveness, taking the initiative, making the first move, acting without being told, taking chances (?), to raise her level of professionalism, ideas, initiatives; please indicate any other words included in the count under Subscore
	No. Of 'flexible', etc.		Indicate the total NUMBER of times that any of the selected terms referring to the profile owner were mentioned.	flexible, flexibility, able to change subjects/topics/projects quickly, spontaneous, not spacially bound, adjustable, multitasking (?), thinking on her feet, dealing with complex issues, creative; please indicate any other words included in the count under Subscore
	No. Of 'teamwork', 'teamplayer', etc.		Indicate the total NUMBER of times that any of the selected terms referring to the profile owner were mentioned.	teamwork, team player/member, team/ group/joint effort, crew, group, sharing information/experience, joint/common goal, cooperate, work with others, helped me out; please indicate any other words included in the count under Subscore
	Compare content with summary		Yes (1), No (0)	Is the overall picture presented in (all) the recommendation(s) identical/comparable to the statements made in the summary? Please comment under subsection on the reasons for your choice.
Additional elements	Languages	Count	Indicate the total NUMBER of DIFFERENT languages.	
		Level(s)	Mothertoung/Bilingual (1), Suitable for negotiations (2), Fluent (3), Suitable for conversations (4), Basic knowledge (5)	Indicate the different language levels under Subscore. Display the AVERAGE language level in the Score section.
	Skills	Count	Indicate the total NUMBER of skills mentioned.	Skills can be regarded unsupported claims, make sure not to include them in both sections!
Links Social Media	Count		Indicate the total NUMBER of links to Social Media.	Social Media including Facebook, Twitter, Hyves and the like. Company websites are excluded.
Contact Information	Yes/No		Name (1), Email (2), IM (3), Website (4), Telephone (5), Address (6), Birthday (7), Other (8)	Indicate which elements are filled in/provided by the person. Seperate the different elements present by "," under Subscore. Display the total number of different elements for the Score section (IM-Instant Messaging:eg Skype, MSN)
Desired Contact about	Yes/No		Career Opportunities (1), Consulting Offers (2), New Ventures (3), Job Inquiries (4), Expertise Requests (5), Business Deals (6), Personal Reference Requests (7), Requests to Reconnect (8)	Indicate which elements are filled in/provided by the person. Seperate the different elements present by "," under Subscore. Display the total number of different elements for the Score section.
Spelling mistakes	Count		Indicate the total NUMBER of mistakes in the profile.	This includes the recommendations.

Length	Paragraphs	Indicate the total NUMBER of paragraphs in the profile.	A paragraph either starts with each new headline, or is indicated by an empty line within the desciption section. The top section, which is framed by a box, is Excluded here. The groups are included as 1 paragraph as well as Contact information.
	Entire profile	Indicate the total NUMBER of pages.	
Grammar		Indicate the total NUMBER of mistakes in the profile.	This includes the recommendations.
Language use	Formal/ Informal	Formal (1), INformal (0)	Formal language use implies explicit writing (you are, do not); Informal language use implies abbreviations (etc.), shortenings (You're, don't) and colloquial style.
Elements visible	Count	Indicate the total NUMBER of elements of the profile.	Picture, Name, Position, Location, Summary, Specialties, Experience, Education, Groups, Recommendations, Lanugages, etc.
Content	drive & ambition let a person appear more assertive	Indicate the total NUMBER of times that any of the selected terms referring to the profile owner were mentioned.	ambition, determination, enthusiasm, drive, high energy; (0=0; 1-3=1; 4-6=2; 7-9=3; 10-12=4; 13-15=5; 16-18=6; 18+=7) Select an interval under Score and mention the exact number under subscore

		Comm unicati ve	Flexibl e	Assertiv e	Written Commu nication	Leading	Order	Team
						Correlations		
Picture	Pearson Correlation	0,253	0,179	0,185	0,19	,365[*]	0,155	0,127
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0,102	0,252	0,236	0,222	0,016	0,32	0,419
	N	43	43	43	43	43	43	43
Contacts	Pearson Correlation	0,015	0,007	0,013	0,093	0,042	-0,142	-0,165
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0,924	0,963	0,934	0,555	0,79	0,364	0,289
	N	43	43	43	43	43	43	43
Summary	Pearson Correlation	0,017	-0,009	0,096	0,058	0,074	0,094	-0,253
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0,916	0,953	0,542	0,712	0,636	0,547	0,102
	N	43	43	43	43	43	43	43
Sum_ Paragraphs	Pearson Correlation	0,304	0,286	0,154	0,172	0,142	0,131	0,253
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0,169	0,197	0,493	0,445	0,527	0,561	0,256
	N	22	22	22	22	22	22	22
Sum_ Lines	Pearson Correlation	,464[*]	,486[*]	0,193	0,353	0,283	0,345	0,392
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0,03	0,022	0,389	0,107	0,202	0,116	0,071
	N	22	22	22	22	22	22	22
Sum_ Claims	Pearson Correlation	0,002	-0,103	-0,302	-0,068	-0,269	-0,065	-0,209
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0,992	0,648	0,171	0,764	0,226	0,775	0,352
	N	22	22	22	22	22	22	22
Sum_ Evidence	Pearson Correlation	0,125	0,233	0,206	0,162	0,148	0,19	0,126
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0,58	0,296	0,358	0,471	0,511	0,397	0,575
	N	22	22	22	22	22	22	22
Sum_ SupClaims	Pearson Correlation	0,099	0,331	0,218	0,27	0,169	0,053	0,28
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0,66	0,132	0,331	0,224	0,451	0,816	0,208
	N	22	22	22	22	22	22	22
Sum_ Result	Pearson Correlation	0,059	-0,055	0,095	0,198	0,119	-0,093	0,016
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0,794	0,809	0,674	0,377	0,598	0,679	0,943
	N	22	22	22	22	22	22	22
Sum_ Assertive	Pearson Correlation	0,054	-0,079	0,13	0,219	0,13	-0,153	0,047
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0,81	0,725	0,563	0,327	0,564	0,496	0,835
	N	22	22	22	22	22	22	22
Sum_ Pres_ Promo	Pearson Correlation	0,42	0,159	0,292	0,385	0,279	0,195	0,288
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0,052	0,479	0,187	0,077	0,208	0,383	0,194
	N	22	22	22	22	22	22	22

Sum_ Pres_ Narrative	Pearson Correlation	0,045	0,175	0,102	0,015	0,131	0,162	0,174
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0,843	0,436	0,651	0,948	0,562	0,47	0,439
	N	22	22	22	22	22	22	22
Sum_ Pres_ Modest	Pearson Correlation	-0,306	0,053	-0,217	-0,198	-0,191	-0,164	-0,208
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0,167	0,816	0,333	0,376	0,395	0,465	0,352
	N	22	22	22	22	22	22	22
Sum_ Pres_Bullet	Pearson Correlation	-0,079	-0,207	-0,305	-0,167	-0,237	-0,172	-0,256
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0,728	0,356	0,167	0,459	0,289	0,445	0,25
	N	22	22	22	22	22	22	22
Sum_ Lead	Pearson Correlation	0,292	0,144	0,021	0,176	0,099	0,096	0,196
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0,188	0,522	0,927	0,434	0,662	0,672	0,383
	N	22	22	22	22	22	22	22
Sum_Team	Pearson Correlation	0,252	0,276	0,116	0,275	0,045	0,209	0,192
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0,259	0,215	0,606	0,216	0,842	0,351	0,392
	N	22	22	22	22	22	22	22
Sum_ Networking	Pearson Correlation	0,168	0,208	0,152	0,162	0,135	-0,031	0,198
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0,454	0,353	0,499	0,471	0,55	0,89	0,378
	N	22	22	22	22	22	22	22
Specialties	Pearson Correlation	0,072	0,139	0,205	0,19	0,184	0,111	-0,046
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0,645	0,375	0,187	0,221	0,237	0,479	0,768
	N	43	43	43	43	43	43	43
Exp_ TaskDes	Pearson Correlation	0,056	0,037	0,16	-0,058	0,142	0,044	0,022
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0,72	0,811	0,306	0,711	0,363	0,781	0,888
	N	43	43	43	43	43	43	43
Exp_ TaskDesk_Leader	Pearson Correlation	0,251	-0,064	-0,089	0,181	-0,032	-0,005	0,095
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0,173	0,732	0,635	0,331	0,866	0,977	0,61
	N	31	31	31	31	31	31	31
Exp_ TaskDes_Resp	Pearson Correlation	0,183	0,219	0,288	0,162	0,35	0,065	0,108
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0,333	0,246	0,123	0,394	0,058	0,735	0,57
	N	30	30	30	30	30	30	30
Exp_ TaskDes_ Addition	Pearson Correlation	-0,119	-0,232	0,038	-0,088	-0,197	-0,119	-0,255
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0,517	0,201	0,837	0,631	0,281	0,515	0,159
	N	32	32	32	32	32	32	32
Exp_ NoJobs	Pearson Correlation	-0,129	-0,12	0,033	-0,028	0,039	-0,217	-0,129
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0,411	0,444	0,834	0,856	0,802	0,163	0,408
	N	43	43	43	43	43	43	43

Exp_ NoParallel Jobs	Pearson Correlation	,040	,066	-,060	,104	,090	-,029	,047
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,802	,678	,706	,513	,571	,854	,766
	N	42	42	42	42	42	42	42
Exp_ NoJobs5 Years	Pearson Correlation	-,072	,034	,080	,001	,083	-,064	,007
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,653	,831	,613	,995	,602	,686	,967
	N	42	42	42	42	42	42	42
Exp_ NoJobs10 Years	Pearson Correlation	-,047	,021	,083	-,031	,077	-,098	-,026
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,769	,895	,602	,845	,630	,538	,870
	N	42	42	42	42	42	42	42
Exp_No Locations	Pearson Correlation	,115	,104	,107	-,141	-,223	-,171	,097
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,480	,521	,511	,386	,166	,290	,552
	N	40	40	40	40	40	40	40
Exp_Pos_NoYears	Pearson Correlation	,172	,081	-,177	,224	,067	-,026	,072
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,283	,614	,268	,159	,679	,870	,653
	N	41	41	41	41	41	41	41
Exp_Pos_Develop-ment	Pearson Correlation	,200	,185	,080	,024	,068	,019	,013
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,210	,246	,618	,880	,673	,906	,934
	N	41	41	41	41	41	41	41
Exp_Pos_ Type	Pearson Correlation	-,190	-,133	,201	-,225	-,046	-,144	-,130
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,235	,409	,207	,157	,777	,370	,417
	N	41	41	41	41	41	41	41
Educ_No Studies	Pearson Correlation	-,105	-,105	-,026	-,075	-,090	-,040	-,153
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,504	,501	,870	,632	,564	,799	,326
	N	43	43	43	43	43	43	43
Educ_ Locations	Pearson Correlation	,096	,174	,028	,219	-,078	,010	,123
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,555	,283	,863	,175	,634	,952	,448
	N	40	40	40	40	40	40	40
Educ_ Degree	Pearson Correlation	,310	-,034	,087	,235	-,030	,146	,087
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,055	,837	,597	,149	,856	,376	,599
	N	39	39	39	39	39	39	39
Educ_ Studies	Pearson Correlation	,230	,052	,124	,238	,110	,002	,141
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,153	,748	,448	,140	,500	,990	,385
	N	40	40	40	40	40	40	40
Clubs_No	Pearson Correlation	,191	,277	,172	,008	,271	,107	,334[*]
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,219	,072	,269	,959	,079	,495	,029
	N	43	43	43	43	43	43	43
Clubs_ Position	Pearson Correlation	,123	,734[*]	,349	,195	,021	,092	,202
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,753	,024	,358	,615	,958	,813	,602
	N	9	9	9	9	9	9	9

Clubs_ Type	Pearson Correlation	,659	,504	,153	,605	,320	,737[*]	,144
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,054	,167	,694	,084	,402	,023	,712
	N	9	9	9	9	9	9	9
Groups_No	Pearson Correlation	-,149	,029	-,151	-,044	,004	-,075	-,314[*]
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,340	,853	,332	,779	,978	,633	,040
	N	43	43	43	43	43	43	43
Groups_ Type	Pearson Correlation	-,312	-,253	-,279	-,168	-,229	-,341[*]	-,406[*]
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,073	,149	,110	,342	,192	,049	,017
	N	34	34	34	34	34	34	34
Recom_No	Pearson Correlation	,355[*]	,203	,120	,201	,287	,269	,107
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,019	,191	,445	,195	,062	,081	,495
	N	43	43	43	43	43	43	43
AddElem_ Languages	Pearson Correlation	-,023	,120	,019	,121	,056	-,092	,019
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,885	,443	,906	,441	,721	,558	,906
	N	43	43	43	43	43	43	43
AddElem_ LangLevel	Pearson Correlation	,064	,108	,694	,288	-,515	,211	,427
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,919	,863	,194	,638	,374	,733	,474
	N	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
AddElem_Skill	Pearson Correlation	-,057	-,164	,006	,127	-,063	,028	-,184
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,716	,294	,971	,418	,690	,857	,238
	N	43	43	43	43	43	43	43
Links_ Social Media	Pearson Correlation	,182	,067	,013	,246	,162	,124	,071
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,242	,668	,933	,112	,299	,427	,650
	N	43	43	43	43	43	43	43
ContactInfo	Pearson Correlation	,159	,113	-,096	,057	,160	,078	,020
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,308	,469	,538	,715	,306	,618	,900
	N	43	43	43	43	43	43	43
Desired Contact	Pearson Correlation	-,058	-,075	,050	-,103	,119	,222	-,105
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,710	,633	,752	,513	,446	,152	,503
	N	43	43	43	43	43	43	43
Spelling Mistakes	Pearson Correlation	,196	,196	,055	,074	,004	,330[*]	,200
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,208	,208	,727	,639	,979	,031	,198
	N	43	43	43	43	43	43	43
Length_ Paragraphs	Pearson Correlation	-,053	,017	,108	,036	,072	,087	-,161
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,734	,913	,490	,818	,646	,580	,301
	N	43	43	43	43	43	43	43

Length_ Pages	Pearson Correlation	,001	,119	,106	,034	,180	,077	-,159
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,994	,447	,499	,827	,248	,625	,309
	N	43	43	43	43	43	43	43
Grammar Mistakes	Pearson Correlation	,262	,232	,229	,176	,299	,288	,201
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,089	,134	,140	,259	,051	,061	,195
	N	43	43	43	43	43	43	43
Lanugage Use	Pearson Correlation	,762[**]	,719[**]	,723[**]	,610[**]	,714[**]	,727[**]	,816[**]
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000
	N	43	43	43	43	43	43	43
Elements Visible	Pearson Correlation	-,005	,132	,012	,111	,101	,152	-,124
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,974	,397	,941	,479	,518	,329	,428
	N	43	43	43	43	43	43	43
Content_ Ambition	Pearson Correlation	,008	,083	,254	,039	,084	-,151	,029
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,958	,601	,105	,804	,596	,341	,856
	N	42	42	42	42	42	42	42
Job Information	Pearson Correlation	-,042	-,004	,113	-,027	,113	-,088	-,035
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,791	,978	,478	,866	,475	,581	,827
	N	42	42	42	42	42	42	42

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Acknowledgements