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ABSTRACT

Although the growth of Web-based recruitment in recent years is phenomenal, little recruitment research has occurred in the context of the Web. This dissertation examines theoretical and practical issues relating to how the Web’s interactive capability might be leveraged to enhance recruitment outcomes for job seekers and organizations. Specifically, customization of feedback regarding potential fit with organizations and jobs in terms of values, needs, and knowledge, skills, and abilities (KSAs) was examined, as was the opportunity for job seekers to customize the order in which information was presented in position postings. Theories of person-environment fit, similarity-attraction, attraction-selection-attrition, message elaboration, non-compensatory decision making, and information search costs are applicable to this investigation and were used to derive hypotheses at multiple levels of analysis. These hypotheses focused on how customization of information might affect the relationship between job seekers’ actual and perceived fit, as well as how customization might impact job seeker search costs and satisfaction, and applicant pool size and fit.

A 2 (customization of fit feedback) x 2 (customization of the order of information presentation) x 20 (number of position postings; within-subjects) experimental design was used to test the hypotheses. Three hundred and forty eight individuals participated in the study. In Phase 1, participants provided background data regarding values and needs
preferences, KSA levels, and information ordering preferences. During Phase 2, these participants visited a mock Web-based “job board” containing 20 position postings. For each of the postings, they were asked to indicate their perceived fit and were given the opportunity to apply for the position.

Results showed that customized fit feedback acted to strengthen links between actual and perceived fit constructs, whereas customized information ordering did not exhibit significant hypothesized effects. At the individual level of analysis, job seeker search costs (operationalized as time spent browsing position postings) and satisfaction were invariant across conditions. At the organizational level, applicant pool size did not vary across conditions, but applicant pool values and KSA fit were enhanced among organizations providing customized fit feedback. These results are discussed along with study limitations, directions for future research, and practical implications.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION AND STATEMENT OF PROBLEM

Recruitment and retention of human capital by organizations is a key component of overall business strategy and success. Both the academic and popular press recognize the importance of attracting the right people to organizations, while also being able to retain those selected into an organization (Graham, 2000; Taylor & Collins, 2000). Yet, in many areas of recruitment, research lags practice (Barber, 1998). This is especially true in the wake of the phenomenal growth in recruitment conducted over the World Wide Web the last several years. Zottoli and Wanous (2000) state, "As the Internet [Web] is a phenomenon of recent origin, its effectiveness as a recruitment source has yet to be systematically studied" (p. 376).

A recent survey of Industrial-Organizational (I/O) Psychologists found the impact of technology and Web-related trends to be the top two factors presently impacting I/O Psychology (Waclawski, Church, & Berr, 2002). The growth in the use of Web technology in organizational recruitment efforts has resulted in a virtual explosion of information available about both organizations and job seekers (Cappelli, 2001; Cober, Brown, Blumental, Doverspike, & Levy, 2000). Over 90% of organizational Web sites now contain “careers” or “employment” sections designed for recruitment purposes, and Forrester Research projects employer spending on recruiting online will increase from
$105 million in 1998 to $1.7 billion in 2003 (cf. Graham, 2000), and may reach $7.1 billion by 2005 (cf. McManus & Ferguson, 2002). Cost-per-hire reductions are estimated to decrease from $3,295 (traditional advertising) to $377 (online recruiting) (cf. Harris & Dewar, 2000). Moreover, research has shown that Fortune's "Best Companies to Work For" tend to utilize the Web more than the "Largest Companies" to signal corporate characteristics such as a mission statement or degree of work-life balance (Brice & Waung, 2002). Cisco Systems, for example, is a pioneer in the Web-recruitment area, hiring 66% of its people and receiving over 81% of its resumes via the Web. Further, as of 1999, the company had nearly 40% lower cost-per-hire statistics compared to industry norms and a 60% shorter hiring cycle time compared to 1996 (Useem, 1999). Graham (2000) suggests that cost is a primary advantage of Web-based recruitment, along with speed and reach.

In addition to the recruitment information now available on many organizational Web sites, over 35,000 "job boards" such as monster.com claim to have millions of resumes in their databases (Graham, 2000; Sharpe, 2001), and millions of position postings from hundreds of thousands of organizations. Also, due to recent layoffs and ongoing turnover, more workers are searching for employment than has been the case in the past, further increasing the volume of job and job seeker information now available to individuals and organizations. One source notes that 16.8 million unique visitors visited career Web sites in January 2001, an increase of 87% over January 2000 (www.ecompany.com, July 2001). The U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics notes that the typical American worker holds nine different jobs prior to age 32, further illustrating the current volume of job search activity (cf. Noe, Hollenbeck, Gerhart, & Wright, 2003).
The interactive nature of the Web provides a potential advantage over traditional recruitment sources. That is, rather than simply providing static recruitment information for job seekers to passively consume, the Web allows for a “virtual exchange” between job seeker and organization, without any direct interaction between a job seeker and actual organizational representative. In other words, job seekers can provide information about themselves, which can be used by organizations via Web sites to customize feedback to those job seekers. This capability has grown out of the rise of Web technology over the last decade.

Virtual exchange processes do currently exist on several job boards. For example, Resumix (http://enterprise.yahoo.com/resumix) offers a prescreening feature that filters applicants based on responses to a brief online questionnaire. The system essentially ranks and sorts candidates for recruiters. However, such a system does not allow for anonymous job seeker information search. This raises questions about potential social desirability in responses to such a questionnaire, as well as legal concerns over the validity of the screening device being used.

In contrast, anonymous virtual exchange processes might yield greater job seeker control over information. For example, customized (i.e., personally-relevant) information, as well as information that is configured in a way that is preferred by each individual job seeker, is available with Web technology. Customized information refers to information that is provided to a job seeker in response to information the job seeker initially provides about him/herself on a Web site. For example, a job seeker might provide information about organizational values preferences that he or she holds. These initial responses can then be compared to pre-defined responses of organizational
incumbents that reflect the organizational values actually held by an organization, and feedback regarding likely fit between the two values profiles can be provided to the job seeker via the Web site. Such feedback is personally-relevant because it is targeted to individual job seekers rather than passively portrayed to all job seekers in the same manner, as has traditionally been the case with recruitment material.

To date, however, capabilities such as those described above have not been leveraged in organizational recruitment efforts. One exception in terms of providing customized, personally-relevant feedback to job seekers is Texas Instruments Corporation, which currently employs a tool for this purpose. Texas Instruments offers a “fit check” option to job seekers in the careers section of its organizational Web site. Job seekers can anonymously answer a series of thirty-two questions about their values preferences, and receive feedback regarding their likely cultural fit with Texas Instruments, along with an explanation for particular areas of fit or misfit (Texas Instruments Web site, www.ti.com/recruit/docs/fitcheck.shtml). Interestingly, Texas Instruments has a history of providing customized information during the organizational entry process, developing a customized orientation program for new employees back in the 1960s (Gomersall & Myers, 1966).

These relatively new capabilities are able to overcome one of the major hurdles to providing realistic information to job candidates identified by Wanous (1992) -- encouraging job seekers to provide honest information about their wants and needs in order to match this information with what an organization can provide. That is, by making processes such as Texas Instruments' fit feedback tool anonymous, and providing real-time feedback regarding likely fit, realistic information is more easily and
confidentially provided to job seekers. Graham (2000) argues that all Web-based recruitment efforts "should have a confidentiality option available so a job seeker can remain anonymous during the inquiry stage and have the option to learn more about a position without revealing his or her identity " (p. 69). Crispen and Mehler (2002) further suggest that successful companies of the future will need to develop strategies that emphasize the ability for candidates to anonymously self-select organizations, instead of focusing primarily on selection from the organization's point of view.

Web technology has eased the ability to search for job information and apply for jobs by lowering job seeker information search costs (Lievens & Harris, in press). That is, many Web sites provide applicants with the ability to access information that has traditionally been more difficult to obtain (e.g., espoused organizational values, detailed benefits information), and easily apply for jobs by simply sending an electronic resume or filling out an online application. This differs markedly from traditional means of discovering information about organizations, such as doing research in a library or at a job placement center. It also differs from traditional means of applying for jobs, such as mailing a resume or applying for a job in person at an organization. These traditional means of applying to organizations tend to raise opportunity costs for applicants by decreasing the time they could spend in other pursuits or in applying to other companies (Barber & Roehling, 1993). Finally, as mentioned previously, the interactive capability of the Web differentiates it from traditional recruitment sources. Because of these differences, one may consider the Web to be not just another recruitment source to be added to the list of traditional sources, but a fundamentally different type of source with different ramifications for how recruitment might be strategically leveraged by
organizations. Graham (2000) goes as far as to say that the Web has "disrupted the recruiting process that has been in existence since the invention of the printing press" (p. 1). This dissertation presents theoretical and conceptual arguments to support the notion that these types of anonymous self-selection capabilities might benefit job seekers and organizations alike.

Problem Statement and Purpose of the Dissertation

Problem Statement

Whereas Web technology has facilitated the availability of increased information to job seekers and recruiters alike, this expansion of available information has created a dilemma of sorts. Specifically, information is more easily accessible, thus appearing to decrease information search costs (Lievens & Harris, in press); but at the same time, the search costs involved with filtering through an increased number of applicants and jobs have increased (e.g., Graham, 2000). For example, a recent search on monster.com under "HR positions" yielded 2,862 position listings in all geographic regions for a job seeker to view. From a job seeker's perspective, one of the tasks of job searching is attempting to determine one's probable fit with various characteristics of jobs and/or organizations. However, empirical research as well as turnover statistics suggest a disconnect between individuals' actual fit with organizational characteristics and their perceived fit during the organizational entry process (e.g., Cable, Aiman-Smith, Mulvey, & Edwards, 2000; Wanous, 1992). Actual, indirect measures of fit refer to fit that is objectively measured by mathematically comparing the characteristics of one entity (a job or organization) to another entity (a job seeker). Perceived, or direct measures of fit are assessed by asking individuals to indicate the level of subjective fit they perceive with an entity such as an
organization or job (Kristof, 1996). Search costs are incurred in determining an accurate perception of one's actual fit, and developing means to bring actual and perceived fit into closer alignment would likely be valuable to job seekers and organizations alike (e.g., Cable & Turban, 2001).

Graham (2000) notes, "There are now millions of chances to attract millions of job seekers…. However, this also entails a tremendous learning curve" (p. 2), and further suggests that the increased reach offered by Web-based recruitment is both an advantage and disadvantage. For example, a recruiter is likely to have access to more qualified applicants when using the Web as a recruitment source, but will also receive applications from an increased number of undesirable applicants. Finally, she notes "When we contemplate the tons of information available online, we soon realize we need help managing the information overload" (p. 95).

A recent study highlights that work needs to be done to increase the effectiveness of Web-based recruitment. Feldman and Klaas (2002) gathered qualitative data as part of a larger study on Web-based recruitment among MBA graduates looking for jobs, finding that 16% of comments indicated it to be an effective medium, compared to 22% of comments finding it ineffective. The 2001 Electronic Recruiting Index, published by interbiznet.com, forecasted that current-day job boards will soon be primitive as new tools emerge to help job seekers and recruiters. It is thus easy to see the importance from an academic and practitioner standpoint of examining ways to potentially increase efficiency for job seekers and recruiters alike in the realm of Web-based recruitment.

Besides potentially achieving greater information efficiencies (i.e., decreasing search costs) in terms of filtering through either a large number of positions (from the job
seeker’s perspective) or applications (from the recruiters’ perspective), other important outcomes are likely as well. For example, to the extent that organizations can provide more customized (i.e., personally-relevant), accurate information to job seekers, those job seekers are likely to make more informed, better decisions about where to apply. By using the interactive capabilities of the Web, companies can avoid the dilemma of having to provide information that is too general (in order to attract more applicants) or too specific (in order to only attract those that fit) on its Web site (Feldman & Klaas, 2002), but can rather customize the presentation to each individual job seeker. Graham (2000) suggests that 21st century recruitment efforts will involve the provision of more customized services for job seekers and recruiters alike.

In short, decreasing search costs is likely to facilitate better decision making on the part of both parties, leading to enhanced individual and organizational outcomes. More specifically, greater information efficiencies have the potential benefit of streamlining the application process for applicants, but also creating more streamlined, or leaner applicant pools for recruiters. Overall, time and administration costs might be saved if, early in a recruitment process, job seekers are able to accurately self-select out of organizations and jobs with which they would later find themselves not to be a good fit (e.g., Crispen & Mehler, 2002). In other words, job seekers might choose to forego an application process before ever entering the process, saving time and effort on behalf of themselves and recruiters. Also, from a longer-term perspective, facilitating better decision making among job seekers might enhance outcomes such as satisfaction, commitment, and retention of the applicants actually selected for positions. Graham goes as far as to suggest that "organizations that can shorten the hiring cycle and simplify
human resource functions will reap more advantages than just cost savings -- they may be saving their business" (p. 114).

Finally, it is important to note that issues surrounding Web-based recruitment remain relevant regardless of the level of unemployment. More specifically, during periods of high unemployment, organizations might expect to receive more applications from online job seekers. This raises the importance of introducing tools that help create leaner applicant pools in order to decrease information-processing requirements for recruiters. On the other hand, during periods of low unemployment, more jobs are likely to be posted online as organizations vie for scarce talent and workers find that they have an increased ability to move between jobs. Thus, it is perhaps even more important for organizations to attract good workers, while at the same time not losing sight of the importance of looking for a high level of fit between applicant and organization. Doing so might prevent early employee-initiated turnover that might be more prevalent in a period of low unemployment. As Graham (2000) notes in regards to issues related to Web-based recruitment, "It makes you sometimes wonder which of the two evils is worse -- high or low unemployment?" (p. 5).

The issues raised above are relatively new given the magnitude and scope of company and job seeker information available on the Web. Thus, researchers have not yet adequately addressed the implications or potential inherent in this “new” recruitment landscape (Cable & Turban, 2001). Programmatic research is necessary that will help uncover the theoretical and practical implications of increased information availability, and the role of potential information efficiencies in managing this increased information.
Purpose of the Dissertation

This dissertation will contribute to the recruitment and staffing literature in several ways. First, the dissertation will expand upon the study of traditional recruitment constructs -- including actual and perceived measures of person-organization (P-O) and person-job (P-J) fit, and actual application decisions -- by examining them in the context of the World Wide Web. For purposes of this dissertation, P-O fit is defined similarly to Kristof (1996) as the compatibility between people and organizations that occurs when they share similar characteristics. P-J fit is defined as the fit between the abilities of a person and the demands of the job (Edwards, 1991).

Second, the dissertation will examine how organizations might introduce certain efficiencies to the recruitment process via the Web in the wake of the information explosion that has taken place, including the customization of fit information to individual job seekers, as well as customizing the configuration of recruitment messages to enhance search efficiency among job seekers. Specifically, these tools might enhance both efficiency and effectiveness by bringing perceptions of fit with jobs and/or organizations into closer alignment with measures of actual fit. These two means of increasing search efficiency and effectiveness have conceptual and theoretical roots in the literature but have not been directly examined from an academic or practical standpoint.

The third contribution of the dissertation is to develop and empirically test recruitment models at multiple levels of analysis. This answers Barber’s (1998) call for “…research designs that address two different questions about the impact of recruitment. The first focuses on recruitment's effect on the individual… The second approach represents somewhat of a greater departure from current research in that it conceptualizes
recruitment as a set of policies designed to influence organizational recruitment outcomes" (pp. 131-132). In the present study, analyses will be conducted at three levels of analysis, including a decision-level analysis that will take place at the level of each job application decision made by each individual job seeker. An individual level analysis will examine individual outcomes such as satisfaction with a Web-based job board system and timeliness with which job seekers are able to assess Web-based position postings. Finally, an organizational level analysis will utilize the same data as that used in the preceding two sets of analyses, but will take place at the organizational level of analysis and examine outcomes such as applicant pool size and overall applicant pool fit.

Chapter 2 presents a literature review that provides theoretical and empirical rationale for the dissertation. Chapter 3 begins with the introduction of conceptual models at three levels of analysis. Hypotheses based on the models are then proposed. Methods used for testing the hypotheses are described in Chapter 4. Chapter 5 describes the results of the study. Finally, in Chapter 6, the practical and theoretical implications of the study results are discussed, limitations are considered, and several directions for future research as well as practical implications are proposed.
CHAPTER 2
LITERATURE REVIEW

Major Theoretical Approaches that Frame the Dissertation

Although research examining Web-based recruitment is relatively new, there are several well-grounded theoretical premises that lend themselves to this dissertation, including theories of person-environment (P-E) fit (Behling, Labovitz, & Gainer, 1968; Chatman, 1989; Wanous, 1980), similarity-attraction (Byrne, 1971), attraction-selection-attrition (ASA; Schneider, 1987), and elaboration likelihood (Petty & Cacioppo, 1986) and systematic/heuristic (Chaiken & Stangor, 1987) models of persuasion. An information search cost perspective (Cable & Turban, 2001; Stigler, 1961) and theories of non-compensatory versus compensatory decision making (reviewed by Barber, 1998) also will be employed to conceptualize and examine potential efficiencies that might be gained by job seekers and organizations in the context of Web-based recruitment through the provision of customized fit feedback and/or customized configurations of information to job seekers.

Figure 2.1 presents a conceptual diagram that ties these various theoretical perspectives together. The figure suggests that the P-E fit paradigm can be linked on a micro level to the similarity-attraction theory and on a more macro level to the ASA model. Actual fit, perceived fit, and attraction more closely follow from the similarity-
attraction theory. Attraction leads to self-selection according to the ASA, with eventual attrition occurring among those who do not end up fitting into the organization once they enter it. The link between actual and perceived fit is shown in bold in Figure 2.1 to highlight the disconnect between these two constructs and the importance of trying to align them. Realistic job previews (RJPs) are suggested as a means of facilitating this alignment, and customization is suggested as an extension to the RJP concept. In turn, three additional theoretical perspectives (The elaboration likelihood model, non-compensatory decision making, and information search costs) help explain the effects of various forms of customization.

Each of the perspectives introduced above will be discussed in turn, linked to relevant literature, and related to the objectives of this dissertation. The Web-based context of recruitment will then be considered in terms of its interactivity and increased aesthetic variance, and relevant Web-based recruitment research reviewed. Finally, consistent with the multi-level perspective taken in this dissertation, organizational level recruitment research will be discussed.
Person-Environment Fit Research

One of the earliest conceptualizations of person-environment fit was suggested by Barnard (1938), who believed that an individual selects and remains in an organization by choice. Behling et al. (1968) and Wanous (1980) provided two of the earliest examinations of what is today referred to as P-O and P-J fit. For example, Wanous’ (1980, 1992) matching model posits that a match between an individual’s capabilities and the capabilities required by the organization leads to job performance, whereas a match between an individual’s specific job wants, which derive from basic needs, and organizational climates leads to job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Wanous
cites several research studies that support various parts of the matching model, including McClelland and Boyatzis (1982), who found positive effects of a need-culture match, and Morse (1975), who found that those placed in “matched” jobs felt much more competent and able to cope with the demands of the job than those in a control group.

Much of the P-E fit literature can be related to Byrne’s (1971) similarity-attraction theory and Schneider’s (1987) ASA model. The similarity-attraction theory is micro in nature, suggesting attraction among individuals to other individuals or entities that are similar. The ASA model is more macro, suggesting that over time, organizations become more homogenous because people self-select into organizations that appear to exhibit similar characteristics or values. The attrition part of the model suggests that, over time, dissimilar people who happen to gain membership in organizations eventually leave those organizations. In total, whereas both theories essentially suggest that people are attracted to organizations (and, thus, organizational members) that are similar to themselves, they mostly focus on perceived, as opposed to actual fit. Several of the studies that will be reviewed in this chapter draw on these two theoretical perspectives.

**P-E Fit Conceptualizations**

The P-E fit paradigm has recently been called the “paradigm par excellence for psychology” by Dawis (2000; p. 180), who claims that the P-E interaction is the objective reality that psychology seeks to describe and understand. Kristof (1996) provides a recent examination of P-O fit in particular that is similar in nature to the Wanous (1980, 1992) matching model. She notes that P-O fit can be conceptualized as either supplementary or complementary. Supplementary fit refers to congruence between what an individual needs and what an entity such as an organization offers, such that there is
overlap between the two entities. Complementary fit refers to a congruence between what an individual can offer an entity such as an organization in terms of abilities, and what the organization demands in terms of those abilities. That is, fit is complementary if an individual brings something to the organization that can “complete” the organization or “make it whole” by providing something that it needs but doesn’t presently have. From a job seeker’s perspective, Kristof’s (1996) typology is similar to Wanous’ (1992) in suggesting that supplementary fit is most critical in leading to attitudinal outcomes (e.g., attraction), whereas complementary fit is more predictive of individual performance. This dissertation answers calls by researchers to examine both types of fit operationalizations simultaneously (e.g., Barber, 1998).

In addition to only examining one fit dimension at a time, studies examining specific characteristics by which individuals might fit with their environment have tended to focus only on universally desirable characteristics (e.g., fair treatment, opportunities for professional growth). As Edwards (1991) and Tinsley (2000) note, research needs to begin examining characteristics that are not as universally desirable. That is, a large percentage of P-E fit studies have adopted characteristics that most people would find desirable, and have failed to examine situations in which supplies of characteristics such as certain values exceed desires for those values. Rather, supplies often fall short of desires, restricting the range of fit scores examined.

Rynes and Gerhart (1990) similarly lamented the fact that most fit studies had only considered characteristics commonly found across a wide variety of firms. They termed fit on these characteristics nothing more than indications of “general employability”, and conducted a study to attempt to differentiate between general
employability and more firm-specific fit. Using a sample of interviewers across firms, they found that recruiters were more stringent in their evaluation of firm-specific fit rather than general employability. Moreover, firm-specific rather than general evaluations exhibited more variance across interviewers from different firms, and interrater agreement within- rather than across-firms was higher for firm-specific fit for the same applicants. This suggests that shared organizational membership appears to influence assessments of fit to a greater degree than general employability.

O’Reilly, Chatman, and Caldwell (1991) note that P-E fit research has tended to either (a) examine individual difference variables that might predict when certain situational variables will be preferred in a job (e.g., self-esteem; Turban & Keon, 1993), or (b) rely on the analysis of only one fit dimension at a time. For example, Chan (1996) used a P-O fit framework, but only examined cognitive style as a dimension of fit. Although several studies have examined individual difference variables that might predict when certain people might perceive greater fit with certain organizational or job characteristics, other, more direct operationalizations of fit have been developed. For example, Chatman (1989) developed an interactionist perspective of P-O fit, suggesting that many past interactionist models have over-emphasized either the person or situational components, without considering the joint effects of both. Using Q-sort methodology, she developed a profile matching tool, the Organizational Culture Profile (OCP), to match person and organizational characteristics on commensurate dimensions. O’Reilly et al. (1991) stated that the general failure to assess fit along commensurate dimensions has “hindered the development and empirical assessment of coherent theories of person-situation interaction” (p. 490) whereas Tinsley (2000) claims that the failure to
consider person and organizational attributes on commensurate dimensions has led to a potential underestimation of the effects of fit. Additional researchers have similarly called for the use of commensurate dimensions when examining fit (Edwards, 1991; Kristof, 1996).

**Examinations of Specific Fit Dimensions**

In this section, a review of research that has operationalized fit on specific dimensions will be conducted. This will include studies that have considered P-O and P-J fit simultaneously as well as studies examining fit specifically in terms of KSAs, needs or values.

**Joint examinations of P-O and P-J fit.** Saks and Ashforth (1997) note that most P-E fit studies have failed to examine P-J and P-O fit simultaneously (e.g., Dineen, Ash, & Noe, 2002; Judge & Bretz, 1992). A recent exception was research conducted by Kristof-Brown, Jansen, and Colbert (2002). Using a policy-capturing design, they found that P-J fit exhibited the largest effect on satisfaction with the work environment, followed by P-O fit, then person-group (P-G) fit. However, these relationships depended on prior work experience, such that those who had worked for a greater number of companies weighted P-O fit higher and P-J fit lower in importance. They concluded that these three types of fit are distinct, and called on future research efforts to consider multiple types of fit simultaneously, consistent with types of fit that are likely relevant to predicted outcomes. The results of the Kristof-Brown et al. (2002) study are generally consistent with past research, which has tended to demonstrate that P-J and P-O fit each lead to different outcomes (e.g., Saks & Ashforth, 1997; 2002), and suggests that each explains unique variance in outcome variables of interest.
Whereas actual, measured P-O fit has received considerable research attention (e.g., Cable & Judge, 1996; Kristof, 1996; O’Reilly et al., 1991), little work in the recruitment area has addressed the notion of actual P-J fit. Further, the literature consistently suggests that P-O and P-J fit are distinct constructs that tend to lead to different outcomes (e.g., Cable & Judge, 1996; Kristof, 1996; Rynes & Gerhart, 1990). For example, Cable and Judge (1996) found only a moderate correlation between perceived P-O and P-J fit ($r = .35$), indicating that they are distinct constructs. Saks and Ashforth (1997) found that P-J fit perceptions generally were positively related to job satisfaction, organizational commitment and identification, and negatively related to intentions to quit. P-O fit perceptions, however, were only negatively related to intentions to quit and turnover. Also examining P-O and P-J fit simultaneously in a more recent study, Saks and Ashforth (2002) undertook a longitudinal investigation of the relationships between job search behavior, job search intensity, career planning, and perceived P-O and P-J fit prior to organizational entry and four months after entry. P-J fit perceptions demonstrated stronger effects than P-O fit perceptions. Pre-entry P-J fit perceptions mediated the relationship between career planning and post-entry P-J fit perceptions as well as job attitudes (e.g., job satisfaction, intentions to quit). In general, P-O fit exhibited a stronger relationship with organizationally-reference outcomes (e.g., organizational commitment) whereas P-J fit perceptions related more strongly to job-related outcomes such as job satisfaction. These researchers suggest that future research integrate both P-J and P-O fit into single research designs, especially given the strong effects of P-J fit relative to P-O fit in their study.
One study did examine P-O and P-J fit as one construct (Bretz & Judge, 1994). This study examined fit on commensurate dimensions using aspects of KSA, needs, values, and personality fit in one profile, and found links between overall fit and outcomes such as tenure and job satisfaction. Confirmatory factor analysis resulted in a one-factor solution, suggesting that these four forms of fit were not distinct. However, it was not clear how these authors arrived at the 15 scale items ultimately used to represent these four dimensions. Finally, Gati (2000) notes the distinction between demands-abilities fit and needs-supplies fit and calls for more work to examine these two constructs simultaneously.

In addition, most prior work examining P-O and/or P-J fit has done so by considering each in only one dimension, and Barber (1998) recently suggested that “research examining applicants’ attempts to match on multiple aspects would present a more complete picture of the subjective factors process than would research focusing on only one element of matching” (p. 106). For example, Kristof (1996) notes that the most frequently studied dimension of P-O fit is “the congruence between individual and organizational values” (p. 5). Others have operationalized P-O fit as a match in terms of personality (e.g., Bowen, Ledford, & Nathan, 1991; Tom, 1971), goals (e.g., Vancouver & Schmitt, 1991), or needs (e.g., Turban & Keon, 1993; Wanous, 1992). It is likely the case, however, that a global evaluation of P-O fit incorporates more than one dimension, such that several dimensions might be combined into an overall evaluation. Similarly, P-J fit has most frequently been operationalized as the fit between the knowledge, skills and abilities (KSAs) of job seekers and the needed KSAs of organizations. Judge and Cable (1997) also note the haphazard nature with which isolated dimensions of fit have been
studied independently of other dimensions. The literature is thus largely void of investigations that consider the measurement of fit on more than one dimension (Kristof, 1996; for exceptions, see Bretz & Judge, 1994; Bretz, Rynes, & Gerhart, 1993) or the investigation of P-O and P-J fit jointly (e.g., Carless, 2002).

This dissertation contributes to the fit literature by examining three of the five most common dimensions of fit in a single study – KSAs, needs, and values fit. A review of top-rated Web-based job board sites supports the proposition that recruitment information is more likely to contain information pertaining to these three dimensions than it is to contain information about the other two common operationalizations (goal or personality congruence), thus leading to the choice of these three dimensions (Crispen & Mehler, 2002). For example, goal congruence studies have mainly investigated goal congruence between organizational incumbents, rather than between incumbents and job seekers (e.g., Vancouver & Schmitt, 1991). The particular nature of the support for using the three fit dimensions chosen for this study is described in more depth in Chapter 4.

**Research operationalizing fit as KSA congruence.** As previously mentioned, P-O fit has been measured and examined indirectly (actual fit) and directly (perceived fit), and the importance of P-O fit is being recognized more and more by practitioners and academics alike (e.g., Bowen et al., 1991). P-J fit, which often relates to the congruence between KSAs held by an individual to the demands of a job, has received most of its attention in the recruitment literature in terms of perceived rather than actual fit. Instead, actual, objective measurements and uses of P-J fit have been in the form of aptitude and occupational matching tests (e.g., Tinsley, 2000) for purposes of vocational selection by individuals.
Most work examining P-J fit from a recruitment perspective has done so from the perspective of perceived P-J fit on the part of a job seeker or recruiter (Saks & Ashforth, 2002), or actual P-J fit from a needs-supplies perspective rather than a demands-abilities perspective. Also, work related to actual (i.e., measured) P-J fit is found more in the selection literature, which has a goal of objectively determining the best individual-job match based on characteristics of the job and job candidate (e.g., Schmidt & Hunter, 1998). More specifically, whereas research has examined links between actual and perceived P-O fit, research has not addressed possible links between actual, measured indices of P-J fit, and a job seeker’s perception that he/she fits with the characteristics of the job in question. Edwards (1991) reviewed the P-J fit literature and reported only two studies that examined the effects of actual P-J fit from a demands-abilities perspective. However, these two studies examined organizational incumbent satisfaction resulting from such a fit, and not outcomes related to potential applicants to organizations.

Another study employing actual measures of P-J fit, although also not in the recruitment area, is a study by Caldwell and O’Reilly (1990). They constructed actual measures of P-J fit by assessing the KSAs required for jobs and the KSAs held by job incumbents. Specifically, they had organizational representatives perform a Q-sort of KSAs identified by job analysis, and had incumbents Q-sort the degree to which they held the various KSAs into nine categories (Block, 1978). Profile correlation scores representing the degree of actual P-J fit were found to relate to outcomes such as job performance and satisfaction across seven samples.

Wanous (1992) recognized the significance of this study because it was among the first to suggest that a job seeker might actually judge their level of fit between their
perceived capabilities and the capabilities required by the organization, and relate this fit perception to attitudinal outcomes such as attraction. This extended traditional thought which tended to only consider judgments of P-J fit that were made by recruiters for purposes of predicting job performance. Of course, the selection validation literature deals primarily with assessments of the actual, objective match between individual KSAs and job-required KSAs. A thorough review of this literature is beyond the scope of this dissertation, but is well summarized in Schmidt and Hunter’s (1998) meta-analytic investigation of selection practices over the past 85 years.

The Theory of Work Adjustment (Dawis & Lofquist, 1984) is a more formal statement of the idea that to the extent we can formally match individuals with jobs, positive outcomes will occur. This theory postulates a cybernetic relation between individual and occupation in which each affects the other. More broadly, it is consistent with what Wanous (1992) described as the fit between what a job demands and what a person has the ability to provide. As Tinsley (2000) notes, “only a few studies have investigated the relation between the individual’s abilities and the demands of the environment” (p. 150). In one of the few studies to test an actual, objective measure of P-J fit, O’Reilly et al. (1991) conducted job analyses for entry-level accountants. The resulting profile of 60 competencies was correlated with a similar profile provided by each individual job seeker, rendering an actual measure of KSA fit. P-J fit did exhibit independent effects on job satisfaction and intent to leave, but did not impact P-O fit relationships when entered as a control variable. Further, actual P-O and P-J fit scores were not correlated, providing further evidence that these two constructs are independent. O’Reilly and colleagues (1991) conclude by noting that both task competency
congruence and values congruence may be necessary for satisfaction and attachment to an organization.

Research operationalizing fit as needs congruence. Murray’s (1938) needs-press theory viewed needs as congruent if they meshed with the environmental “press”, or what the environment provides for the individual, and was one of the earlier conceptualizations of needs as an aspect on which people could fit with an organization or job. Kristof (1996), following Wanous’ (1980) earlier work, identified needs as a critical aspect of the P-O fit construct. Turban and Keon (1993) undertook an analysis of possible individual difference variables that might moderate the effects of certain organizational characteristics on applicant attraction to firms. They found that both self-esteem and need for achievement acted as moderators, such that, for example, high need for achievement individuals preferred firms that rewarded based on performance rather than seniority, and low self-esteem individuals were more attracted to decentralized and larger firms. Although informative, these studies only indirectly address issues of fit. Specifically, they posit fit between individuals and organizational characteristics that depends on an independently measured individual difference variable. Wanous’ (1980, 1992) and Chatman’s (1989) work more directly approach the issue of fit by calling for the independent measurement of organizational and individual characteristics, and then assessing the match between those two sets of characteristics to arrive at a fit measurement.

Examining reward packages, Cable and Judge (1994) used a policy-capturing design and 171 graduating college students to examine congruence in preferences for pay levels, benefits, individual-based pay, and fixed pay policies. They found that, while
these aspects of rewards were generally more attractive to job seekers, attractiveness levels were heightened by greater levels of fit between hypothesized personality traits such as individualism and locus of control, and compensation system attributes.

Further support for the effects of congruence between individual needs and organizational characteristics was found in two studies by Bretz and colleagues. Bretz, Ash, and Dreher (1989) found weak support for one aspect of their congruence hypotheses, showing that a higher level of orientation towards work (a characteristic that includes need for achievement) was associated with preferences for organizations with individual-based reward systems. Bretz and Judge (1994) found that congruence between preferences for certain reward and promotion systems and the systems portrayed in job descriptions related to probability of accepting an offer. Taken together, the studies reviewed above indicate that needs congruence is an important aspect of P-O fit that relates to recruitment outcomes.

Research operationalizing fit as values congruence. Shared values are seen as a key element of an organization’s culture (e.g., Kristof, 1996). Rokeach (1973) defines a value as “an enduring belief that a specific mode of conduct or end-state of existence is personally or socially preferable to an opposite or converse mode of conduct or end state of existence” (p. 5). Indeed, congruence between profiles of individual and organizational values is an important aspect of overall P-E fit and “may be at the crux of person-culture fit” (O’Reilly et al., 1991, p. 492).

O’Reilly et al. (1991) applied Q-sort methodology to the assessment of actual P-O fit among actual members of organizations in terms of values congruence, finding that P-O fit predicted job satisfaction and organizational commitment a year after it was
measured, and turnover after two years. Vandenberghe (1999) replicated this result in the health care industry.

A series of studies by Cable and Judge (1996; Judge & Cable, 1997) drew upon ASA and similarity-attraction theoretical frameworks and found support for the role of values congruence in overall organizational fit and subsequent outcomes. They note a greater focus on the definition of P-O fit as being similarity in terms of values. In their first study, they found that actual, measured values congruence, and not demographic similarity, related more strongly to perceived P-O fit perceptions. These P-O fit perceptions, in turn, related to job choice intentions, and ultimately actual job choice decisions. Of note, the effect size of the relationship between P-O fit perceptions and job choice intentions was similar to the direct effects of other aspects of jobs such as needs (i.e., rewards) on job choice intentions. On the other hand, P-J fit perceptions in this study did not relate to job choice intentions. This was a surprising result, but is likely due to the fact that the study only looked at job candidates who had already self-selected into organizations’ selection processes. Thus, the range on P-J fit was likely severely restricted if candidates used P-J fit perceptions to make this initial self-selection. In general, Schneider (1987) has discussed the fact that most P-E fit research has a built in restriction in range due to self-selection. That is, in assessing a sample of job seekers or organizational incumbents in terms of their fit, it is likely that a selection effect has previously taken place whereby those job seekers or incumbents have chosen the environment from which the sample is drawn.

In a second study (Judge & Cable, 1997), 182 students provided data regarding their personalities, values preferences, P-O fit perceptions, and attraction to actual
organizations. They found that personality dimensions mapped predictably onto certain dimensions of values identified by O’Reilly et al. (1991). Also, they found that both actual P-O fit (i.e., match between a job seeker’s rating of their own values preferences and those they perceived organizations with which they interviewed as holding) and perceived P-O fit related to attraction. Further, perceived P-O fit mediated the relationship between actual P-O fit and attraction. This result was similar to the result in a study that examined applicant fit as an antecedent to recruiter hiring recommendations (Cable & Judge, 1997). Specifically, applicant-organization values congruence and P-O fit as perceived by interviewers mediated the effects of actual applicant-organizational values congruence on interviewer recommendations to hire.

Judge and Bretz (1992) also looked at the affects of values congruence on job choice decisions. Using a policy-capturing design, they found that the four values dimensions identified on the Comparative Emphasis Scale (Ravlin & Meglino, 1987) were predictive of job choice decisions when they were congruent with a person’s own values profile. These effects materialized above those for other organizational characteristics such as pay level or promotional opportunities.

Adkins, Russell, and Werbel (1994) examined work values congruence in a selection setting, finding that values congruence between an applicant and the organization did not relate to recruiters judgments of P-O fit or general employability. Adkins and colleagues concluded that, if judgments of fit influence selection decisions, it is likely later in the process rather than at the initial stages. This suggests that P-O fit is likely taken into account by recruiters in selection situations, and is likely done so later in the process, a suggestion corroborated by Cable and Judge’s (1997) results. This implies
that, to the extent that job seekers can accurately self-select out of a recruitment process early in that process, they may be saving themselves time and effort, especially if they will not be screened out based on fit until later stages of the selection process.

Finally, using a Web-based recruitment context, Dineen et al. (2002) studied the relationship between level of feedback regarding potential P-O fit with an organization in terms of values congruence, and attraction. A fictitious organizational Web site was created which offered a “fit check” tool to participants assigned to treatment conditions. The fit check offered feedback to job seekers regarding likely fit with the organization. However, following completion of the fit check, fit feedback was provided to participants regardless of their responses to the fit check [either high (80% treatment condition) or low (40% treatment condition) P-O fit feedback was randomly provided]. Control condition participants viewed the same organizational information as treatment condition participants, but were not offered a fit check. Results showed a main effect for fit feedback. That is, participants indicated a level of attraction to the organization consistent with the level of fit feedback provided. Those in the high fit feedback condition indicated the greatest level of attraction, and those in the low fit feedback condition indicated the least attraction, with control condition participants indicating a level of attraction falling between the high and low feedback condition participants. Furthermore, these relationships were fully mediated by participants’ level of perceived P-O fit. Taken together, the studies reviewed above clearly relate values congruence to important recruitment outcomes.
The Relationship Between Actual Fit and Perceived Fit

This section will discuss the nature of the relationship between actual and perceived fit (represented by the bold arrow in Figure 2.1). Although studies have consistently demonstrated a significant positive relationship between actual and perceived fit (e.g., Judge & Cable, 1997), a disconnect between the constructs also exists. Reasons for this disconnect as well as steps that have been taken to better align actual and perceived fit are considered.

The Accuracy of Assessing Perceived Fit in Relation to Actual Fit

Several studies have examined the relationship between actual fit and perceived fit, finding modest relationships between these two constructs. For example, research has demonstrated that perceived fit tends to mediate the effects of actual fit on outcomes such as attraction, or post-entry job attitudes (Dineen et al., 2002; Judge & Cable, 1997; Saks & Ashforth, 2002). Importantly, whereas these two operationalizations (actual and perceived fit) are often correlated, research has shown inconsistencies between them, such that a person's perceived fit is not always an accurate portrayal of their actual fit. In fact, Kristof (1996) suggests that inconsistencies between actual and perceived fit among job seekers are likely to be even greater early in the organizational entry process when information about fit is less salient to job seekers. Thus it is important to investigate means by which such inconsistencies may be lessened during the initial attraction and application stages of the recruitment process.

Interestingly, much of the fit literature has focused on the outcomes of P-O or P-J fit, and has focused much less on the antecedents of fit (Kristof, 1996). Whereas the present study examines actual, indirect measures of fit as antecedents of direct, or
perceived fit, the accuracy with which individuals assess perceived fit in relation to actual fit is moderate at best. This is a considerable problem because it suggests situations in which individuals might make job choice decisions that are suboptimal, and, once in the organization, could lead to decreased satisfaction and commitment, and increased turnover (O’Reilly et al., 1991).

A close examination of Schneider’s (1987) ASA model also suggests the likelihood of a disconnect between actual and perceived fit. Specifically, the model proposes that individuals self-select into organizations based on their level of attraction. Yet, the attrition component of the model suggests that some individuals still leave the organization once they gain entry. A strict theoretical interpretation of the ASA model would suggest that, if individuals are self-selecting based on an initial level of attraction, there should be no attrition component (holding unavoidable turnover due to personal reasons or system shocks constant). Thus, the attrition component of the model suggests that initial attraction is not always assessed in an accurate manner. In turn, this suggests that the fit perceptions that influence initial attraction might not be an accurate portrayal of one’s actual fit with a job or organization.

Many of the problems of inaccuracy between actual and perceived fit can be traced to theorizing by Porter, Lawler, and Hackman (1975) that is reviewed in Wanous (1992). Specifically, these scholars discuss certain "conflicts" between organizations and job seekers with regards to realism versus accuracy in job content or skill profile portrayal. For example, one of the conflicts that exists is between generating a large pool of candidates (through providing more positive, inflated information) and generating a better fitting pool of candidates (through providing more accurate information).
fitting applicant pools refer to pools of applicants that exhibit a higher level of average fit on specified dimensions.

Kristof (1996) suggests that actual fit measured by asking an individual to rate both their own characteristics and the job/organization characteristics will be more closely aligned with perceived fit than actual fit measures consisting of an individual assessment of their own characteristics, and third party assessments of what the job/organizational characteristics are. However, it is likely that the individual level technique is not as accurate as the cross-levels (third party) technique. She also suggests that perceived fit measured early in an organizational entry process is less accurate than such a measurement taken later in the process, especially after socialization. Finally, she suggests that recruitment strategies such as realistic organizational previews illustrating firm-specific values will increase the salience of P-O fit to job seekers.

However, many organizations (and organizational recruiters) continue to overstate and inflate their cultures, resulting in an inaccurate portrayal to job seekers. For example, Cable et al. (2000) suggest that the disconnect between actual and perceived fit largely stems from the ways in which organizations overstate or understate recruitment information in position postings. In support of this suggestion, Cantwell and Aiman-Smith (2002) had students browse a company's Web site and rate the organization's culture. They found that student and incumbent ratings differed significantly for eight of twelve culture dimensions examined. They conclude that job seekers likely do not carefully process information about the culture of an organization, and state "…cultural messages disseminated by organizations may not necessarily reflect the true organizational culture. In addition, the messages may not be received as intended by
potential applicants. These issues indicate that the ability of job applicants to self-select into organizations that share their own beliefs and values may be severely limited" (p. 12). Also, they suggest that inexperienced workers are particularly prone to an inability to adequately assess dimensions of organizational culture via Web sites. This generally follows from Schwab, Rynes, and Aldag (1987), who suggest that the disconnect arises either from cognitive distortion on the part of job seekers or the fact that job seekers are being misled by employers.

Saks and Ashforth (2002) recently found that P-J and P-O fit perceptions changed from pre-entry to four months after entry, and suggest "fit perceptions measured prior to organizational entry may be inaccurate due to the lack of direct experience with the organization and its jobs" (p. 11). Judge and Cable (1997) note that "it is important to investigate the relationship between objective [actual] and subjective [perceived] fit because although both concepts are meant to assess the same basic construct, there are many motivational and cognitive biases that may divorce fit perceptions from an objective [actual] measurement of fit" (p. 368). Barber and Roehling (1993) also found that job seekers tend to make inferences about missing information based on the information that is available in a job advertisement.

Another problem that relates to the disconnect between actual and perceived fit is that several past studies have operationalized actual measurements of fit using individual level measurements instead of cross-levels measurements (Kristof, 1996). That is, in these studies, an individual has rated both his/her own values preferences as well as those they perceive an organization as holding, instead of having organizational incumbents rate the organization's values. If, as suggested above, individuals are often inaccurate in
their judgment of the culture of organizations, then their assessment of organizational values that makes up half of the actual fit index may be flawed. It seems, based on the above evidence, that the assessment of an organization's values preferences would best be accomplished by organizational incumbents or other third parties not prone to a consistency bias in judging organizational and personal values preferences.

Taken together, the evidence presented above suggests that there is likely a considerable disconnect between individuals’ actual and perceived levels of fit during the recruitment process because many organizations are trying to entice job seekers and job seekers are not yet familiar enough with organizations to make accurate fit assessments. In fact, most studies that have found relationships between actual and perceived fit have been conducted using organizational incumbents or participants who had some type of prior interaction with organizational representatives (i.e., recruiter, employees, managers). For example, Judge and Cable (1997) had participants rate perceived P-O fit after they interviewed for jobs. This suggests that commonly-accepted correlation coefficient magnitudes between actual and perceived fit may even be overstated in the context of early stages of recruitment (e.g., during the period prior to actual interaction with organizational representatives). Thus, the problem may be greater than is apparent given the nature of the research that has been conducted to date.

**Efforts to Address the Disconnect Between Actual and Perceived Fit: RJP**

Fortunately, the RJP literature has addressed the disconnect between actual and perceived fit. In particular, RJP are thought to provide an up-front opportunity for job seekers to become more aware of certain aspects of the work environment that they are thinking about entering. RJP serve several purposes, including increasing stress to an
optimal level to facilitate vigilant decision making (cf. Wanous & Reichers, 2000), reducing stress once an individual is employed, facilitating self-selection, providing role clarity, advancing a perception of honesty and caring on the part of the organization, and potentially curbing turnover (e.g., Graham, 2000; Phillips, 1998; Wanous, 1992). They can be said to decrease the costs involved in conducting a job search by decreasing the amount of effort required by job seekers to ascertain information about positions (e.g., Cable & Turban, 2001). They also help alleviate the generation of inferences that are often made to compensate for missing information (e.g., Rynes, Bretz, & Gerhart, 1991), replacing such inferences with concrete, accurate information about the position in question. Finally, they can serve as a signal to job seekers of other organizational characteristics (Spence, 1973). For example, provision of an RJP may signal honesty and candidness to a job seeker in evaluating an organization (Breaugh, 1983).

The overall effectiveness of RJP's has been questioned on the grounds that "adverse self-selection" may be at work (e.g., Bretz & Judge, 1998). That is, realism in recruitment advertising may have the effect of discouraging more highly qualified applicants at a disproportionate rate if certain types of negative information are presented (such as the presence of a non-supportive organizational culture in the Bretz and Judge study). However, even if this concept is valid, one can still argue that a firm is potentially saving money. For example, if more qualified applicants are going to leave a firm anyway when faced with negative information once on a job (as Schneider’s 1987 ASA framework would suggest), it seems that it would be better for this to occur before devoting resources (e.g., time, money) to the selection, socialization, and training processes of these newcomers. Moreover, most turnover occurs among the newest hires
to an organization (Wanous, 1992). Therefore, even if an organization is able to secure the employment of the most qualified applicants, if those applicants quickly turn over, there is no real value-added.

Greenhaus, Seidel, and Marinis (1983) addressed this issue indirectly in examining the efficacy of the met expectations hypothesis. Specifically, they called into question the belief that met expectations are always desirable, claiming that if an expectation is low, and it is met, this will not lead to job satisfaction. They argued instead that more attention should be given to value attainment (e.g., P-O fit). In two studies, they found that value attainment was more predictive of facet satisfaction than was realistic information. Thus, in terms of adverse self-selection, if highly qualified applicants do not self-select out of a hiring process, they are likely to select out of an organization soon after having been hired. This is potentially more costly in terms of wasted socialization and training expenditures.

Finally in terms of providing realistic information, recruitment sources can vary in the degree to which they provide information that clarifies expectancies of job seekers. Zottoli and Wanous (2000) reviewed research that tended to point towards inside (e.g., referrals) rather than outside (e.g., newspaper) recruitment sources as providing more realistic information to enable job seekers to self-select out of organizations based on P-O or P-J fit information. The Web is a more recent means of providing realistic information to job seekers, and is discussed in the following section.

Customization of Information as an Extension to the RJP Concept

The rise of Web-technology over the last decade has enabled organizations to interact individually with job seekers. Web-based recruitment systems thus represent a
way to introduce a high degree of realism to the recruitment process by enabling the customization of information to the individual job seeker. Yet, research has only begun to examine ways to better capitalize on the Web's interactive capability as job seekers make actual application decisions. This section will address these issues and will specifically discuss the application of three theoretical perspectives to the idea of customization.

As opposed to the recruitment literature, the marketing literature has begun to more directly address the issue of customization. For example, research in the Marketing area has introduced the idea of self-referencing to describe advertisements that make personal references to customers instead of generic messages with no apparent target (e.g., Burnkrant & Unnava, 1995). This research has mostly failed to consider customized messages targeted at individual consumers, however. For example, Burnkrant and Unnava found more in-depth processing among those presented with self-referenced messages (e.g., "you'll feel the difference when you try X product") versus generic messages (e.g., "one will feel the difference..."). However, this effect dissipated when other self-referenced information also was presented. Thus, it appears that there is an optimal amount of personally-relevant information that should be targeted at individuals. Burnkrant and Unnava (1995) suggest that excessive personally-relevant information can actually create distractions that lessen or even reverse beneficial effects of providing a baseline amount of personally-relevant information.

Also in the Marketing literature is the idea of co-production, and potential benefits that might derive from it (e.g., Wind & Rangaswamy, 2000). Co-production refers to the process of the consumer helping to actually design a product. For example,
Levi's Jeans allows customers to customize their pair of Jeans as they are being manufactured. This process has also been called "customerization". Although the Web cannot facilitate the designing of a job for individual job seekers, it can make them an active part of the recruitment process by involving them in the design and portrayal of the recruitment message. For example, by asking a job seeker to indicate his or her preferred order of information presentation, and then presenting recruitment information in that order, a job seeker might feel more in control of the process, increasing satisfaction and buy-in.

Another way that organizations might customize recruitment information to individual job seekers is by providing feedback regarding likely fit with various aspects of the job or organization. Providing customized information about potential fit to job seekers in a Web-based context represents an extension of the RJP concept advanced by Wanous (e.g., 1973; 1980; 1992). However, providing customized information to job seekers via the Web departs from traditional RJPs in several important ways. First, the “preview” offered by providing information such as potential values fit to job seekers is customized to each individual job seeker instead of created once and subsequently offered to the population of job seekers. Second, Web-based “previews” are available prior to any formal contact with organizational representatives. Traditional RJPs are generally only made available following some form of formal contact with organizational representatives. For example, a video RJP could be given to a job seeker when they visit an organization, or mailed to a job seeker in response to an application. Thus, the applicant and organization can still incur considerable costs in terms of applying and processing applications prior to an RJP. Of note, RJPs can now be made available to job
seekers via the Web in an anonymous fashion, such as a preview video offered through the careers section of General Electric’s Web site (www.gecareers.com). However, although available prior to formal contact with organizational representatives, these types of videos are not customized to individual job seekers.

The Elaboration Likelihood and Systematic/Heuristic Models and Customization

The issue of how to better engage decision-makers, and in particular, job seekers, has puzzled researchers for years (e.g., Barber & Roehling, 1993; Breaugh & Starke, 2000), and is beginning to receive attention in the context of the Web (e.g., Cober, Brown, Blumenthal, & Levy, 2001; Dineen et al., 2002). Directly related to this issue is the issue of the disconnect between actual and perceived fit discussed earlier. One set of theories that might be useful in engaging job seekers in the context of the Web in order to better align actual and perceived fit are theories of message elaboration and message processing.

The basic premise of the Elaboration Likelihood Model (ELM; Petty & Cacioppo, 1986) is that individuals will engage in either central or peripheral processing of information in their environment. The systematic/heuristic model of persuasion (Chaiken & Stangor, 1987) is similar to the ELM model, in that two processing routes are proposed. Systematic processing is more careful processing that usually takes place when individuals are both able and motivated to process. In terms of processing the content of most recruitment messages, it is likely that job seekers have the ability to read (listen to, view, etc.) and understand the material. However, the motivation to carefully process likely exhibits greater variance, and can be enhanced when messages are more vivid, clear, or personally-relevant. In terms of personally-relevant messages in
particular, research has suggested that a person attends to such information more readily because they can easily link it to pre-existing information structures from past experiences. Thus, in terms of providing customized fit feedback information to job seekers in a Web-based context, such information should relate to previous experiences of fitting into certain groups or situations such as organizations or jobs.

In general, research has found that more specific or vivid information is viewed more favorably and leads to more "weeding out" of less qualified candidates, making the overall process more efficient. For example, Mason and Belt (1986) found that detailed hypothetical job descriptions tended to weed out unqualified candidates, and job seekers preferred advertisements that were specific with regards to both qualifications and job descriptions. Barber and Roehling (1993) found that vivid or extreme position characteristic information received more attention from job seekers viewing hypothetical position postings than ordinary information. Barber (1998) concludes that, although these studies tend to link information specificity and detail to job seeker attention, replications are needed that also measure actual application decisions.

Breaugh and Starke (2000) suggest that to attract the attention of potential applicants, recruitment messages might provide personally-relevant information as well as unexpected information, concrete language, or information delivered in a face-to-face manner. They note the paucity of research that has addressed these intervening variables, and call for future work to integrate them to a greater extent. Similarly, Barber and Roehling (1993) found that job seekers paid more attention to specific rather than general information. Colarelli (1984) compared a control group to groups receiving RJPs via a brochure and those receiving an RJP via a personal interview. Although finding no
evidence of self-selection differences between groups, he did find that the group receiving an RJP from an interviewer had the lowest turnover rate. He attributed this result to the personal relevance of providing an RJP in a face-to-face manner rather than through a brochure. Phillips’ (1998) meta-analysis of RJP effects demonstrated stronger negative effects of verbal RJP compared to written and videotaped RJP on turnover, and stronger positive effects of videotaped RJP compared to written or verbal RJP on performance. Finally, Gomersall and Myers (1966) found that customized information provided to new employees during orientation resulted in decreases in training time, training costs, absenteeism and material waste.

More recently, Cable and Turban (2001) developed a model of recruitment equity. This model proposes that recruitment equity develops to the extent that job seeker familiarity with organizations, organizational reputation, and organizational image influences job seeker attraction and, ultimately, job search decisions. Importantly, their model suggests that the degree to which job seekers centrally (vs. peripherally) process recruitment information likely influences the effect that organizational information has on these intervening and outcome variables. Taken together, the research reviewed above suggests the link between customization and more careful processing of recruitment information.

Non-Compensatory Decision Making and Customization

Besides presenting more realistic information, another way in which the Web might be used to decrease costs associated with engaging in a job search is to present information in an order that is most preferred by each job seeker. That is, job seekers likely have varying preferences for the order in which information is presented when
making screening decisions (i.e., choosing which organizations to apply to). For example, Job Seeker A might look first for KSA information when screening potential jobs, whereas Job Seeker B might be more interested in values information. Lynch and Horton (1999) suggest that less than 10% of Web site visitors scroll for information beyond what is immediately visible when encountering a Web page. Thus, presenting the most important information first might be a legitimate goal of Web-based recruitment efforts.

Barber (1998) reviewed a series of studies suggesting that job seekers mostly exhibit non-compensatory decision making strategies in screening organizations for application purposes. For example, Rynes, Schwab, and Heneman (1983) found that job seekers generally identify certain necessary conditions required for job consideration. This means that less important attributes may affect attraction or job choice only when more important attributes fall within an acceptable range. Consistent with this line of thought, Rynes et al. (1983) found that job seekers in their study rejected all jobs with a compensation level falling below a certain point. Rynes and Lawler (1983) as well as Barber and Roehling (1993) also found that certain job characteristics such as location and type of job were used in a non-compensatory fashion such that any job falling below a certain threshold in these areas was rejected. Breaugh and Billings (1988) speculated that RJP-type information might have stronger effects if the information is targeted to aspects of the job seen as most important by job seekers. Finally, Osborn (1990) directly studied compensatory versus non-compensatory decision making in a job choice context. He found that more than 88% of his participants held some type of minimum or special requirement on a certain job characteristic when deciding whether to even consider a job.
A few studies have suggested a compensatory view (e.g., Saks, Leek, & Saunders, 1995; Schwoerer & Rosen, 1989), such that the positive aspects of some job characteristics can offset the negatives of other job characteristics when deciding where to apply. However, support for compensatory decision making during the recruitment process is found mostly in the context of job choice rather than job application. For example, the expectancy theory approach to application decisions suggests that there might be tradeoffs among job or organizational characteristics, such that the multiplicative effects of expectancy and attractiveness with regards to one characteristic might make up for a lack of these effects with regards to another characteristic (Barber, 1998). Barber concludes, however, that overall “the usefulness of expectancy theory in explaining job application decisions is discouraging” (p. 47).

Wanous, Keon, and Latack (1983) reviewed expectancy theory research in the context of job choice, finding more supportive results for its application. Wanous (1992) also concluded that a more rational, compensatory view of job choice was appropriate as opposed to a non-programmed view whereby job seekers simply choose based on a limited number of important factors. However, Barber (1998) notes that it might be the case that some job attributes are non-compensatory whereas others are compensatory.

The research reviewed above suggests that non-compensatory decision making may be more likely early in the recruitment process, whereas compensatory decisions are made as finite choices are required. This makes sense when one considers that applications are not mutually exclusive, whereas job choice is. That is, individuals can choose to apply to several organizations, and thus might set up non-compensatory hurdles to guide their decisions at this stage, whereas they might allow certain characteristics to
compensate for one another when making a definitive job choice decision among a reduced set of alternatives later in the process.

Thus, the job screening process might be facilitated when information is presented in such a way as to facilitate non-compensatory decision making. Presenting information in an order preferred by each individual job seeker would likely assist job seekers in making such screening decisions. Less certain is how this might affect outcomes such as P-O and P-J fit, however. For example, a job seeker who is most interested in the benefits mix offered by an organization might screen solely based on their fit with the benefits mix offered by the organization without considering other forms of fit such as values fit. Kristof (1996) suggests that the relationship between a specific form of P-O fit and individual outcomes will be moderated by the importance of the characteristic on which fit is assessed. Thus, in terms of the job seeker interested in the benefits mix, this might have the dual effect of raising the level of needs fit in terms of benefits, while lowering values fit. Presenting information in a preferred, customized configuration is likely to enhance these effects since presenting preferred information first is likely to draw relatively more attention to that information, and relatively less attention to less preferred types of information that are now more easily ignored.

Information Search Costs and Customization

In a review article, Schwab et al. (1987) suggested that recruitment researchers have largely ignored the process by which job seekers actually search for employment alternatives, focusing instead on processes after the job alternatives have been identified. Neoclassical theories of job choice assume that job seekers have perfect information about all alternatives prior to making choices. Thus a job seeker's task is simply to
compare alternatives between opportunities. More recent conceptualizations have relaxed some of these assumptions, instead acknowledging that job search processes incur costs and that job seekers are often unaware of specific characteristics of jobs (e.g., Cable & Turban, 2001; Lievens & Harris, in press).

Focusing exclusively on the Web, it can be said that the Web affords job seekers quick access to considerable information that was previously much harder to obtain. Thus, information search costs have been said to dramatically decrease on the Web (e.g., Cober et al., 2000; Lievens & Harris, in press). However, when a job seeker engages in an actual search for jobs of interest, he/she is faced with a large amount of information about jobs, and a limited time to process that information. For example, in trying to review the 2,862 Human Resources position advertisements on monster.com mentioned in Chapter 1, a job seeker would be faced with trying to remember details about each position and would likely find positions viewed early in this process already filled by the time they were able to review all the remaining positions. In other words, time spent gathering information for one position represents an opportunity cost in terms of being able to spend that time gathering information on other positions.

From the employer's perspective, a similar situation exists in that the ease with which people can now apply for positions via the Web has tended to inundate companies with large volumes of resumes, many from unqualified candidates (Cappelli, 2001). This situation describes the information search and deliberation costs associated with decision making. Namely, gathering more and more information about a decision involves costs in terms of time and effort (Rangan, 2000; Stigler, 1961). Stigler (1961) suggests that a rational decision rule of search is to continue searching until the expected gain from
further search is less than its cost. Of course, an assumption of this model is that individuals (i.e., job seekers) can accurately assess expected gains and potential losses.

Rangan (2000) recognizes search as being undertaken with the aim of identifying potential exchange partners (i.e., employing organizations, or job seekers), and defines it as "activity that involves scanning and transmitting supply-demand signals pertaining to the object of potential exchange" (i.e., a job or the characteristics a job seeker brings to a job; p. 816). He further suggests that search is problematic in that job seekers find it difficult to cost-effectively send [receive] supply-demand signals to [from] potential exchange partners. He also suggests that one way in which search costs are sometimes reduced is through use of one's social network to gather relevant information, and research has supported this suggestion (e.g., Kilduff, 1990).

In addition to search costs as defined by Rangan (2000), another consideration that applies in the context of the present study is deliberation costs, which refer to the evaluation of potential exchange partners (i.e., jobs or job seekers). For example, in the context of Web-based recruitment, a way to decrease deliberation costs might be to provide customized information to job seekers that gives them more precise details about a position and/or organization. This might be especially useful for novice job seekers (e.g., graduating college students) since research has found that novices tend to incur greater search costs, and have a more difficult time differentiating between relevant and irrelevant information than more experienced decision makers (Lebsack & Scherer, 2002).

Such customized information might ostensibly decrease search and deliberation costs by providing a job seeker with information that they would normally have to
expend time and resources to uncover and eventually have to infer their fit from. For example, a visitor to a Web-based job board might expend extra effort by visiting the corporate home page of a company in which he/she is interested in order to find out more information about the corporate values that the company claims are a part of its culture. If customized information about the fit between individual and organizational values was provided to that job seeker via the job board advertisement, however, this extra effort might not be necessary.

Cable and Turban's (2001) model bears this out, suggesting that when more meaning and personal relevance is attached to information during encoding, stronger cognitive links are likely to develop. They further suggest that information gained through direct experience (i.e., experiential sources of information) is more likely to lead to central processing, which in turn should strengthen cognitive links and decrease search and deliberation costs. Overall, the research described above suggests that information search costs are an important consideration in the job search process, and that customization might be introduced to help lower these costs.

The Nature of Web-Based Recruitment and Web-Based Recruitment Research to Date

To this point, P-E fit research has been reviewed, the disconnect between actual and perceived fit examined, and theoretical perspectives related to customization have been discussed. In this section, the focus shifts to a discussion of differences between Web-based and traditional recruitment contexts in general, and a review of Web-based recruitment research in particular.
Fundamental Differences Between Web-Based and Traditional Recruitment Contexts

Web-based recruitment introduces two elements that serve to differentiate it from traditional recruitment media in terms of predicting the strength of the relationship between actual and perceived fit. First, the Web is interactive, meaning that organizations now have the ability to communicate with job seekers prior to job seekers formally entering the staffing process. That is, in the past, communication between organization and job seeker occurred only after an initial contact was made. Now, job seekers can visit Web sites anonymously, provide information about their preferences, and receive customized information from the Web site prior to any contact with organizational representatives. As discussed, the personal relevance of this type of information has the potential to facilitate more central processing of the information, which might enhance the link between actual and perceived fit (Petty & Cacioppo, 1986).

Second, the Web has greatly expanded the degree of aesthetic variance found in recruitment advertisements. That is, traditional recruitment advertisements have been constrained to a certain extent in terms of the aesthetic properties that they could demonstrate (e.g., graphics, sound, color, interactive links, and so forth). For example, there are limited degrees of freedom in presenting a newspaper listing, billboard, or brochure (an exception in terms of traditional media is television advertisements). In contrast, the aesthetics of Web-based position postings can vary greatly, and aesthetic properties of Web sites are receiving increased attention from researchers (e.g., Cober, Brown, Levy, Cober, Kermes, & Baznik, 2002; Scheu, Ryan & Nona, 1999). As the ELM model suggests, these aesthetic properties might act as peripheral cues regarding the attractiveness of an organization. That is, instead of judging fit based on substantive
information about values or KSAs, a job seeker might rely on the graphics or links on a site to determine perceived fit. Thus, greater aesthetic variance might translate into greater peripheral processing, and a resultant weakening of the relationship between actual and perceived fit. Although this dissertation is primarily focused on the interactive nature of the Web rather than the increased aesthetic variance, research addressing both types of issues is reviewed next.

Web-Based Recruitment Research to Date

In addition to the work touched upon throughout the review to this point, other work has begun to specifically examine the role of the Web for recruitment purposes. More broadly, this answers calls by Rynes (1991) who lamented that most job choice models only included job or organizational characteristics as influencing job choice, and not recruitment system characteristics themselves.

Aesthetics. Web site aesthetics issues are beginning to receive attention with regards to Web-based recruitment. Scheu et al. (1999) found that impressions of a company's Web site were positively related to intentions to apply, and that applicant perceptions of organizations changed after visiting their Web site. Similarly, Zusman and Landis (2002) found that higher quality Web sites (e.g., more color, pictures, varied fonts) were found to be more attractive to job seekers than lower quality sites. However, the student participants in this study preferred traditional paper-and-ink recruitment material over Web-based material. However, Cober et al. (2000) claimed that the Web might be used to facilitate more precise impressions of an organization due to its capability to portray considerably more information than traditional sources such as then newspaper recruitment brochures. Cober et al. (2001) also found that aesthetic quality of
Web sites was positively related to the overall evaluation of the site. In addition, Cober et al. (2002) found that aesthetic properties of organizational Web sites explained more variance in pursuit intentions than perceptions of organizational characteristics.

Cober et al. (2001) developed a model that links initial attraction to a Web site to eventual application decisions through engaging interest, satisfying information requirements, and building relationships with job seekers. Cober et al.’s (2001) model suggests that a central part of leveraging the Web, after attracting job seekers to a Web site, is to cognitively engage potential applicants at the site. Engaged applicants, in turn, are thought to more readily apply for jobs through the Web. Cober et al. (2000), although stopping short of suggesting the customization of information to individual job seekers, did further suggest that making messages personally-relevant might be a way to better cognitively engage job seekers via the Web.

Taken together, the research reviewed above provides a somewhat mixed perspective, but does provide a measure of support for the use of the Web as a recruitment source. As Lievens and Harris (in press) point out, aesthetic issues may be more predictive of outcomes such as attraction when a job seeker initially reaches a Web site, and may not persist past that point, and may not facilitate careful processing of information. These types of issues deserve more attention, and the Cober et al. (2001) model of initial attraction is likely a fruitful starting point.

**Interactivity.** Whereas Cober et al. (2000) claimed that a downside to job boards is that advertisements tend to be similar to those found in traditional formal recruitment sources such as newspapers, the present study examines ways to better engage job seekers visiting a job board that is more in line with informal recruitment sources by
providing customized information. In fact, Zottoli and Wanous (2000) suggest that in certain instances, formal or outside sources may be able to provide more realistic information than informal or inside sources. The Web may provide the bridge between formal and informal sources and the degree of realistic information they can provide. More generally, these issues relate to recent work by Cable and Turban (2001), who suggested that experiential, or interactive (vs. informational, or static) recruitment sources are more likely to engage job seekers in centrally processing recruitment information.

In terms of perceived realism, Rozelle and Landis (2002) found that a sample of undergraduate students viewed the Web (which they classified as a formal source) as more realistic in its presentation of information about a university than more traditional sources such as referrals, brochures, or videos about the university. A reason given for this finding was the perceived interactivity of Web sites over other sources such as brochures.

Dineen et al. (2002) took a step towards applying theories of message elaboration to the idea of interactivity and customization to individual job seekers (see Figure 2.2). Dineen et al. examined the effects of providing customized feedback regarding fit to job seekers. Findings indicated that such feedback acts as a guide to job seekers in assessing their overall attraction, such that feedback indicating a higher degree of fit is associated with greater attraction. Self-esteem acted as a moderator such that lower self-esteem individuals tended to “follow” the fit feedback (rather than their objective P-O fit) to a greater degree in assessing attraction when the feedback level was low. Also, agreement with feedback acted as a moderator such that the level of P-O fit feedback was more
predictive of attraction when agreement was high, whereas objective P-O fit was more predictive when agreement was low. This latter finding suggests that job seekers do not necessarily act as passive “consumers” of fit feedback information, but rather judge their agreement with that feedback.

Although customization was found to be a key to predicting attraction in the Dineen et al. (2002) study, a key design aspect of that study that differs from the present study is that feedback levels were manipulated instead of calculated for each participant. That is, inaccurate feedback was purposefully built into the study design by randomly providing feedback indicating a high or low level of fit with the organization, irrespective of participants’ responses to an up front questionnaire that purportedly measured their value preferences. This design aspect made assessments of agreement particularly relevant. This also meant that actual P-O fit differed from levels of P-O fit feedback provided, allowing for an assessment of the independent effects of each of these variables on attraction. The current study more closely mirrors what actual Web-based recruitment practice would suggest; that is, the provision of fit feedback that represents actual fit. Thus, the current study provides an important extension to this previous work.
Organizational Level Recruitment Perspectives

Whereas the preceding discussion has focused on phenomena that is more micro in nature and has demonstrated the importance of such phenomena to recruitment outcomes, researchers have begun to suggest the importance of recruitment processes to the overall strategic mission of the organization. Rynes and Barber (1990) pointed out that most research examining applicant attraction has done so from the perspective of the applicant rather than the organization. Taylor and Collins (2000) made a similar conclusion a decade later, claiming that "research focused around how applicants react to individual recruitment practices, rather than the effects of practices at the organizational
level, seems to us to hold strong negative implications for the practical usefulness of
recruitment research findings" (p. 309).

Williams and Dreher (1992) reviewed arguments supporting a view of Human
Resources practices that extend beyond the individual level of analysis. Such a focus is
thought to lead to a more rapid advancement of the field by linking Human Resources
programs with bottom line organizational outcomes such as performance. They further
argue that a combined approach that takes into account both individual and organizational
level outcomes might have the most impact, an argument echoed by Cable and Turban
sentiment, and adopt a resource-based view of the firm approach to the study of
recruitment (Barney & Wright, 1998). Specifically, they suggest that organizations can
benefit to the extent that they adopt recruitment practices that are rare, inimitable,
valuable, non-substitutable, and exhibit a high degree of organization and integration
with other Human Resource practices.

Organizations that can effectively and accurately customize information to job
seekers might be in a position to advance these types of practices, putting them at a
competitive advantage. For example, according to the conceptual framework offered by
Taylor and Collins (2000), by offering customized information to job seekers, those job
seekers might make more informed application decisions. These more informed
decisions might lead to smaller but better fitting applicant pools, thus enhancing the
efficiency and effectiveness of the recruitment process. As these researchers state, "it is
likely that organizations also can reduce the typical costs of their recruitment programs
by targeting applicant populations who are most likely to fit a given context and thus
remain and succeed in that organization" (p. 318). In addition to outcomes such as firm performance, Taylor and Collins (2000) suggest examining intermediate recruitment outcomes such as applicant pool size, and the KSAs of candidates in the applicant pool.

Other researchers, including Delaney and Huselid (1996) and Huselid (1995), provide evidence linking recruitment's effect to the bottom line. For example, they found that measures such as applicant pool size and staffing selectivity significantly related to an organization's market performance. It is unknown, however, what the upper limit was on applicant pool sizes examined, and the Huselid (1995) study explicitly noted the importance of having a qualified applicant pool even while suggesting that applicant pools should be large. Still other macro-level researchers have suggested that Human Resource practices such as recruitment affect organizational outcomes through more intermediate effects on turnover or productivity.

Wanous’ (1992) work on RJP's suggests that lower turnover in organizations might result from an “inoculation effect”, such that job seekers are inoculated to the environment they will likely face upon entering an organization. Premack and Wanous’ (1985) meta-analytic study found that RJP's tended to lower initial job expectations, and increase self-selection, organizational commitment, job satisfaction, performance, and job survival. Further, recruitment source effect research has suggested that realism might be the linchpin behind decreased turnover associated with certain sources (Zottoli & Wanous, 2000). More broadly speaking, realistic information is likely to lead to realistic expectations about a job or organization one is about to enter. According to the met expectations hypothesis (Porter & Steers, 1973) and meta-analytic evidence that supports this hypothesis (Wanous, Poland, Premack, & Davis, 1992), met expectations are likely
to lead to favorable outcomes such as job satisfaction, organizational commitment, performance, and decreased intent to leave. Although evidence also supports an individual differences approach to recruitment sources effects, the Zottoli and Wanous (2000) review concludes that the realism hypothesis has received the most support. A recent meta-analysis by Phillips (1998) bears this out as well, finding similar relationships between realistic information in the form of RJP’s and voluntary turnover, any kind of turnover, and job performance.

In the current study, it is important to uncover the extent to which an organization’s use of customized, personally-relevant information might lead to important organizational level outcomes such as smaller, better fitting (i.e., leaner) applicant pools in terms of values, needs, and KSAs. Indeed, little research has emerged since Rynes’s (1991) call for more attention to measures of attraction success that go beyond numbers of applicants to more substantive outcomes such as who accepts job offers and at what cost. Recently, however, Carlson, Connerley, and Mecham (2002) presented a framework for assessing recruitment outcomes in terms of applicant quality that should help guide future efforts. Specifically, the authors suggest deriving a quality score for each applicant, and provide suggestions for aggregating these quality scores into an overall applicant pool quality index. One of their suggestions for aggregation has been used previously (e.g., Sackett & Ostgaard, 1994) and involves calculating the mean quality score across the pool of applicants (the other suggestions involve aggregating the quality scores among a subset of the highest scoring applicants).

 Applicant pool size has been studied in one of the few recruitment studies to take an organizational-level approach. Williams and Dreher (1992) examined applicant pool
size, acceptance rates, and time to fill positions as outcome variables, finding that pay level was positively related to acceptance rate and time taken to fill positions, but was unrelated to the number of applicants generated. Benefits level was positively related to applicant pool size, whereas benefits flexibility was negatively related to applicant pool size. These results, although not directly relevant to the focus of the present study, demonstrate the importance of assessing organizational outcomes. Williams and Dreher (1992) further suggest investigations of other organizational-level outcomes such as applicant pool quality.

Traditionally, researchers and practitioners have adopted a "more is better" approach to the evaluation of recruitment outcomes such as number of applicants (e.g., Williams & Dreher, 1992). For example, Rynes and Barber (1990) point out that many prescriptive evaluation models of recruitment include measures examining the number of applications received. That is, applicant yield in terms of number of applicants generated by a particular recruitment source has been viewed as a benchmark of success. Lievens and Harris (in press) identify Web-based recruitment as primarily having a Marketing orientation by which the attraction of more candidates is considered better. Also, from a job seeker perspective, the identification of more job alternatives has traditionally been viewed as a positive state of affairs (e.g., Schwab et al., 1987). Researchers also have traditionally thought that the generation of more alternatives leads to greater optimization of choice.

However, it might be the case that the generation of more alternatives detracts from the careful examination of each of those alternatives. Other researchers have suggested that there might be optimal applicant pool sizes, and reaching these optimal
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levels might carry the benefit of decreased search costs for recruiters as they attempt to review and make decisions based on applicant resumes. Breaugh and Starke (2000) point out that "for a variety of reasons (e.g., the cost of processing applications), several researchers have questioned the wisdom of simply trying to attract a large number of applicants" (p. 409), and Barber (1998) notes that an "optimal" applicant pool size is desirable from an efficiency standpoint. For example, Recruiter A, who has received 100 job applications, may not be able to carefully evaluate each of those applications as well as Recruiter B who has received 60 applications (holding desired hiring cycle time constant). Similarly, from a job seeker perspective, Job Seeker A, who has identified 100 alternatives, may not be able to carefully evaluate each of those alternatives as well as Job Seeker B who has identified 60 alternatives (holding desired time until employment is attained constant). Use of online fit feedback might assist job seekers in paring down alternatives more quickly and in an up-front manner, possibly allowing for a more thorough examination of remaining alternatives. This may result in the job seeker applying to fewer organizations, but making better choices about which organizations to apply to, leading to smaller, but better fitting applicant pools.

Also, counter to the common assumption identified by Lievens and Harris (in press) that Web-based recruitment is all about generating more applicants, Web-based recruitment might have additional functionality beyond simply attracting more and more applicants. Beyond considering issues of applicant pool size, better fitting applicant pools are likely to pave the way for better P-O and P-J fit among those eventually selected for jobs. Based on Wanous' (1980) matching model, these fit outcomes are then
likely to lead to greater productivity and lowered turnover, which, according to
researchers such as Huselid (1995), can affect bottom line organizational success.

As noted above, Carlson et al. (2002) developed arguments and methods for
assessing applicant quality instead of just selection ratios. They note, "…more is not
always better. As the number of applicants increases, so do the costs of administering
recruitment and selection systems. Larger applicant pools have more applicants to track,
correspond with, and screen, raising costs and potentially extending time required to fill
vacant positions" (p. 466). Barber (1998) further points out that cost-effectiveness of
recruitment sources such as the Web is a topic of high priority among practitioners, but
that "recruitment researchers have rarely studied applicant pool characteristics as
dependent variables. This is unfortunate, as applicant pool characteristics have clear
implications for the efficiency of recruitment and the effectiveness of selection" (p. 50).
Given the increase in resume traffic and the ease of applying to jobs over the Web,
applicant pool size and fit are even more important outcome variables in need of study.
Figures 3.1, 3.2, and 3.3 present decision level, individual level, and organizational level conceptual models relating various recruitment constructs to individual and organizational outcomes. The multi-level focus is adopted based on the literature reviewed in the previous chapter, and more specifically because (a) certain phenomena occur each time a job seeker makes an application decision, (b) job seekers have overall individual experiences with job seeking, and (c) organizations realize certain outcomes based on the decisions and experiences of job seekers. Specifically, the decision level model (Figure 3.1) proposes that for each application decision that a job seeker makes, three dimensions of actual fit (KSAs, needs, and values fit) are related to perceived P-J and perceived P-O fit. These relationships are moderated by (a) the degree to which information about fit in terms of KSAs, needs, and values is customized to individual job seekers, and (b) whether or not information is presented in a customized configuration to each job seeker, such that the job seeker can dictate the order in which information about KSAs, needs, and values is presented. In turn, perceived P-J and P-O fit relate to actual application decisions.
The individual level models (Figure 3.2) investigate the effects of customizing fit feedback to individual job seekers as well as customizing the order of information presentation across a series of position postings. These models are developed under the assumption that job seekers have certain overall experiences when engaged in a job search. For example, when a job seeker visits a Web-based job board such as monster.com, that job seeker has a certain type of experience when engaged in his or her search. First, job seeker satisfaction is a commonly-measured outcome variable in online recruitment industry surveys (e.g., Electronic Recruitment Index, 2001), and is thus measured in the present study. A second individual level model also examines the degree to which the customization of fit feedback and/or order of information presentation might decrease job seeker search costs by decreasing the time a job seeker spends viewing job information during his or her job search.
Finally, the organizational level models (Figure 3.3) propose direct relationships between the degree to which an organization customizes fit feedback information to individual job seekers and outcomes including a smaller applicant pool, and a better fitting applicant pool in terms of fit with KSAs, needs and values. Also, a negative relationship between presenting information in a customized configuration to each job seeker and the size of the applicant pool that an organization generates is proposed.
In the sections below, the study hypotheses are developed. The hypotheses are based on the conceptual models proposed at the decision, individual, and organizational levels of analysis (Figures 3.1-3.3). Rationale for each hypothesis, based on the theoretical and empirical work reviewed in previous chapters, is provided.

Decision Level Hypotheses

Relationships Between Actual and Perceived Fit

The relationships between actual, indirect measures of fit and perceived fit have been established in several studies (e.g., Cable & Judge, 1996; Dineen et al., 2002; Judge & Cable, 1997). Actual and perceived fit, in turn, have been linked to the attraction component of Schneider’s (1987) ASA theory (e.g., Dineen et al., 2002). More specific aspects of actual fit, such as KSA, needs, and values congruence have been studied less
than overall measures of P-O or P-J fit, but can be linked to specific aspects of perceived fit. For example, because KSAs refer to characteristics that an individual brings to the work environment, whereas the work environment demands such characteristics, a complementary fit exists (Kristof, 1996) when the KSAs of the person match the KSAs required by the organization. Similarly, supplementary fit occurs when values and needs held by individuals are consistent with those offered by a work environment.

Schneider and other researchers have suggested that actual measures of fit exhibit more distal effects on outcomes, with perceived fit acting in a more proximal manner (e.g., Judge, & Cable, 1997; Kristof, 1996; Schneider, 1987). More broadly, ASA theory posits that an individual’s attraction to an organization is largely based on perceptions of fit, which in turn are based on an individual’s actual fit on various dimensions.

 Whereas relationships are hypothesized between actual KSA fit and perceived P-J fit, and actual values fit and perceived P-O fit that are consistent with past research, needs congruence has been associated with characteristics of both the job and the organization. Thus, an actual measure of needs congruence may relate to a job seeker's perception that they fit with both the job and organization portrayed. For example, in one study, P-J fit was conceptualized as a match between the needs/desires of an individual and what was provided by the job (cf. Carless, 2002). However, because of the way needs are operationalized in this study (i.e., with the organization as the referent), only a link between actual needs fit and perceived P-O fit is suggested, rather than between actual needs fit and perceived P-J fit.

**Hypothesis 1:** Actual fit in terms of KSA congruence will be positively associated with perceived P-J fit.
Hypothesis 2: Actual fit in terms of needs congruence will be positively associated with perceived P-O fit.

Hypothesis 3: Actual fit in terms of values congruence will be positively associated with perceived P-O fit.

Moderating Effects of Customized Fit Feedback

Despite the likelihood that positive relationships exist between actual and perceived measures of fit, research has demonstrated a disconnect between these two constructs, such that fit perceptions are not always entirely consistent with actual, measured fit (e.g., Cable et al., 2000). RJP’s were developed in an attempt to align perceived fit more closely with actual fit (Wanous, 1973), and customization of recruitment information is suggested as an extension to the RJP concept.

Both the ELM (Petty & Cacioppo, 1986) and systematic/heuristic frameworks (Chaiken & Stangor, 1987) described in the previous chapter suggest that messages will be more carefully processed to the extent that they are made personally-relevant to the perceiver. The customization of information to individual job seekers is one means of enhancing the personal relevance of recruitment messages. This type of personal relevance should facilitate more central processing of that information, which should cause it to be attended to to a greater degree (Cable & Turban, 2001). If the information that is being attended to more is information regarding potential levels of actual fit with an organization, it is likely that this information will influence fit perceptions to a greater degree than when it is not customized to job seekers. Thus, customized fit feedback information should serve to strengthen the link between actual and perceived measures of fit.
Carless (2002) found evidence supporting the suggestion that the provision of detailed information regarding P-J and P-O fit would enable applicants to better and more accurately evaluate their fit perceptions. Rynes et al. (1991) found that positive changes in fit perceptions were attributed in part to improved information about job characteristics by nearly half of their sample. Recent research also illustrates the importance of providing customized material to job seekers. Specifically, Dineen et al. (2002) found that the provision of fit feedback to job seekers was related to attraction such that feedback indicating a higher level of fit led to greater attraction, whereas low fit feedback related to lower attraction. Finally, Kristof (1996) suggests that certain recruitment strategies such as realistic previews that illustrate firm-specific values will increase the salience of fit to applicants. This increased salience should lead job seekers to more carefully consider their perceived fit, and create more consistency between indirect and direct measures of fit.

**Hypothesis 4a:** The positive relationship between actual KSA fit and perceived P-J fit will be moderated by the degree to which KSA fit feedback information is customized to the individual. The relationship will be strengthened when customized fit feedback information is provided as compared to when it is not provided.

**Hypothesis 4b:** The positive relationship between actual needs fit and perceived P-O fit will be moderated by the degree to which needs fit feedback information is customized to the individual. The relationship will be strengthened when customized fit feedback information is provided as compared to when it is not provided.
**Hypothesis 4c:** The positive relationship between actual values fit and perceived P-O fit will be moderated by the degree to which values fit feedback information is customized to the individual. The relationship will be strengthened when customized fit feedback information is provided as compared to when it is not provided.

**Moderating Effects of Customized Information Ordering**

Kristof (1996) suggested that the relationship between fit and individual outcome variables would be moderated by the importance weighting of the characteristic on which fit is assessed. By allowing job seekers to configure the order in which information is presented, they are likely to place information that is most relevant to them at the top of their ranking. Because the ELM and systematic/heuristic models suggest that more personally-relevant information is processed more centrally, information seen as most important to job seekers (and thus presented first) should be processed more centrally.

In contrast, if given a choice, job seekers will request that information that is not as relevant to them be presented later in recruitment advertisements. This information, in turn, is less likely to be centrally processed, and instead will most likely be peripherally processed, if processed at all. Centrally processed information (i.e., actual fit information that is relevant to the job seeker) should then be related more strongly to fit perceptions, whereas for more peripherally processed information, a weaker link between actual and perceived fit should exist.

Also, research reviewed in the previous chapter related to non-compensatory decision making (e.g., Rynes, et al., 1983) suggests that job seekers will only consider information that is most important to them when making application decisions. If a
position does not meet a pre-established hurdle on an important dimension, the job seeker will automatically eliminate the position from consideration. Thus, information presented in a customized configuration most likely has non-compensatory dimensions presented first, which in turn will be processed centrally to determine fit. Other dimensions, however, will likely be processed more peripherally, or even ignored, leading to weaker relations between actual and perceived fit on these dimensions.

For example, if a person uses KSA fit as a non-compensatory decision aid, they are likely to rate it as most important to their job search. Thus, it will be placed first in all position postings when customization of information presentation is made available. In turn, job seekers are likely to closely assess their fit on the KSA dimension, leading to a stronger link between actual and perceived KSA fit. The link between actual and perceived fit on other dimensions (i.e., values, needs), however, is likely to be weaker because job seekers are using KSAs as their primary decision aid and may not even be looking at values and needs information, especially when this information is consistently presented after the KSA information. Taken together, this suggests the following three hypotheses:

**Hypothesis 5a:** The provision of recruitment information in a customized versus non-customized configuration will moderate the positive relationship between actual and perceived KSA fit constructs such that when KSA fit is rated as most important by job seekers, the actual/perceived fit relationship will be stronger when the configuration is customized compared to when it is not, whereas when KSA fit is rated as least important, the actual/perceived fit relationship will be weaker when the configuration is customized compared to when it is not.
Hypothesis 5b: The provision of recruitment information in a customized versus non-customized configuration will moderate the positive relationship between actual and perceived needs fit constructs such that when needs fit is rated as most important by job seekers, the actual/perceived fit relationship will be stronger when the configuration is customized compared to when it is not, whereas when needs fit is rated as least important, the actual/perceived fit relationship will be weaker when the configuration is customized compared to when it is not.

Hypothesis 5c: The provision of recruitment information in a customized versus non-customized configuration will moderate the positive relationship between actual and perceived values fit constructs such that when values fit is rated as most important by job seekers, the actual/perceived fit relationship will be stronger when the configuration is customized compared to when it is not, whereas when values fit is rated as least important, the actual/perceived fit relationship will be weaker when the configuration is customized compared to when it is not.

Relationships Between Perceived Fit and Application Decisions

As reviewed in the previous chapter, the similarity-attraction paradigm suggests that when individuals view themselves as fitting the characteristics exhibited or required by a job or organization, they are more attracted to the job or organization (Byrne, 1971). In turn, according to Schneider’s (1987) ASA model, these individuals are more likely to self-select the job or organization by applying for employment. Furthermore, compared to actual fit, perceived measures of fit are better predictors of applicant attitudes, and thus
likely more strongly linked to application decisions (Adkins et al., 1994; Cable & Judge, 1997).

**Hypothesis 6:** Perceived P-J fit will be positively associated with applying to an organization.

**Hypothesis 7:** Perceived P-O fit will be positively associated with applying to an organization.

**Mediating Effect of Perceived Fit**

As previously noted, research has found that individuals’ attraction to an organization varies depending on the fit between the characteristics of the organization and their own characteristics (Barber, 1998). In addition, researchers have suggested that actual fit exhibits more distal effects on outcomes, with perceived fit acting as a more proximal influence (e.g. Judge & Cable, 1997; Kristof, 1996). For example, both Judge and Cable (1997) and Dineen et al. (2002) found that perceived P-O fit mediated the relationship between actual P-O fit and attraction. This follows again from Byrne’s (1971) similarity-attraction and Schneider's (1987) ASA models, which suggest that selection into organizations is largely based on the attraction that results from perceptions of fit, which in turn are based on actual fit. These relationships suggest a mediating effect of perceived fit, such that the influences of an individual’s actual fit on more distal outcomes such as application decisions depend on the individual perceiving a level of fit in their environment.

**Hypothesis 8a:** Perceived P-J fit will mediate the relationship between actual KSA fit and application decisions.
**Hypothesis 8b:** Perceived P-O fit will mediate the relationship between actual needs fit and application decisions.

**Hypothesis 8c:** Perceived P-O fit will mediate the relationship between actual values fit and application decisions.

**Individual Level Hypotheses**

**Customization and Information Search Costs**

Individuals incur information search costs when gathering and processing information in order to make decisions (e.g., Rangan, 2000; Stigler, 1961). In trying to assess attraction levels and, ultimately, to decide whether or not to apply to organizations during a job search, job seekers must search for information about their likely fit with organizations and jobs in question. When a non-compensatory decision making process is used, search costs are related most strongly to trying to attain information about preferred categories of information. For example, in browsing a Web-based job advertisement, job seekers normally must try to infer what their fit would be with the organization or job on multiple dimensions based on the information offered. Information enabling inferences of fit in terms of non-compensatory job or organizational characteristics are particularly more valuable during this process. This highlights the importance of the manner in which information regarding these particular characteristics is presented.

If information about fit is customized to individual job seekers, such that they receive direct information about their potential fit, it is likely that search costs will be decreased and greater search efficiency will result. Similarly, when a job seeker is given the opportunity to customize the order in which information is presented, he or she can
expect to find information in a specific order when browsing multiple position
advertisements. This is likely to facilitate non-compensatory decision making in a more
timely manner, and has the overall likely effect of decreasing costs associated with
searching for jobs to apply to. Thus, in general, search costs prior to making application
decisions should decrease when customized information is provided to job seekers.

**Hypothesis 9a:** Job seeker search costs will be lower when job seekers use a
Web-based recruitment system that provides customized fit feedback information,
compared to when they use one that does not provide customized fit feedback
information.

**Hypothesis 9b:** Job seeker search costs will be lower when job seekers use a
Web-based recruitment system that portrays information in a customized order,
compared to when they use one that does not portray information in a customized
order.

**Hypothesis 9c:** Job seeker search costs will be the lowest when job seekers use a
Web-based recruitment system that provides customized fit feedback information,
and portrays that information in a customized order, compared to when they use
one that provides one but not the other of these features, or neither of these
features.

**Customization and Job Seeker Satisfaction**

In addition to likely gains in search efficiency brought about by decreased search
costs, job seeker satisfaction is an interesting outcome suggested as worthy of study (e.g.,
Crispen & Mehler, 2002; Electronic Recruiting Index, 2001), and should increase when
customized information is presented to job seekers. Specifically, a reduction in
information search costs should simultaneously simplify the job search and application process for job seekers. Also, the provision of customized fit feedback information and/or the customization of the order in which information is presented to each job seeker should enhance the confidence job seekers have in their choices of where to apply while at the same time decreasing search and deliberation costs incurred in the job search (e.g., Rangan, 2000). This enhanced confidence should be associated with greater satisfaction after using a Web-recruitment job board that provides these types of customization, as opposed to one that does not provide such customized information.

Feldman and Klaas (2002) found that a leading cause of Web-based job searching dissatisfaction was lack of relevant information on a company's Web site. In particular, 37% of open-ended comments gathered as part of their study called for "more detailed job descriptions and job specifications so applicants can determine whether their profiles match company needs" (p. 188). Also, signaling theory (Rynes et al., 1991; Spence, 1973) suggests that job seekers pick up on cues provided by their environment, and interpret those cues in certain ways. By providing customized information, job boards may signal that companies wish to be forthright about the nature of their job opportunities and wish to assist job seekers in making better choices. Similarly, the RJP literature suggests that job seekers who receive realistic information about organizations or jobs will experience a vaccination of expectations that facilitates self-selection, engenders perceptions of caring and honesty on the part of the organization, and should help them develop an internal locus of control regarding their job choice decisions (Wanous, 1992). Thus, if a job seeker picks up on the cues suggested by signaling theory that are made
available through the provision of RJs, he/she is likely to be more satisfied with such a recruitment system.

**Hypothesis 10a:** Job seekers will be more satisfied with a Web-based recruitment system that provides customized fit feedback information, compared to one that does not provide customized fit feedback information.

**Hypothesis 10b:** Job seekers will be more satisfied with a Web-based recruitment system that portrays information in a customized order, compared to one that does not portray information in a customized order.

**Hypothesis 10c:** Job seekers will be the most satisfied with a Web-based recruitment system that provides customized fit feedback information, and portrays that information in a customized order, compared to one that provides one but not the other of these features, or neither of these features.

Organizational Level Hypotheses

Customization and Applicant Pool Size

When organizations provide customized fit feedback information or information is presented in a customized order to job seekers, it is likely that those job seekers are better able to utilize that information in making better, more informed decisions. Because, according to a search cost perspective, job seekers would ideally like to minimize the time it takes to job seek (while still trying to maximize their outcomes), they will likely apply to the fewest number of organizations possible, while still remaining confident that they have applied to enough organizations to raise their chances of attaining positive results (e.g., a job offer) to an acceptable level. This perspective explains, in part, the reason why job seekers only apply to a finite number of
organizations, and not the population of organizations. For example, a job seeker on monster.com is not likely to apply to all 2,862 Human Resource positions found on the site, but will instead continue to apply for a subset of those positions until he or she feels comfortable that they have applied to a sufficient number to gain satisfactory employment. The job seeker will likely reach an acceptable level of comfort (in terms of number of applications) more quickly when customized information is provided to that job seeker. That is, compared to traditional position postings, the provision of customized information allows the job seeker to see which positions are the best fit, leading to fewer overall applications made to organizations providing customized information.

In contrast, when information is not customized, job seekers are likely to err on the conservative side and simply apply for positions due to the lack of information (e.g., regarding their fit in terms of KSAs, needs, and values). These latter types of decisions will tend to increase applicant pools in comparison to decisions made in the wake of receiving customized fit information. Supporting this proposition, Cable and Judge (1996) suggested that if recruiters can improve the reality-perception link by providing realistic organizational information, job seekers can self-select in or out of organizations based on accurate perceptions of P-O fit. This is likely to narrow applicant pools to only those job seekers that fit the organization better.

Three additional studies also support this proposition. Premack and Wanous' (1985) meta-analysis found a small but significant relationship between exposure to an RJP and job rejection. Suszko and Breaugh (1986) and Meglino, DeNisi, and Ravlin (1993) also found this effect. Of note, these studies examined actual job offer rejections,
rather than initial attraction. On the other hand, however, researchers also have found no
effects of RJP s on self-selection decisions (Saks & Cronshaw, 1990; Wiesner, Saks, &
Summers, 1991) However, these studies limited job choices to one or two jobs instead of
providing multiple alternatives. It seems, therefore, that the degree of choice a job seeker
has is one determinant of whether or not RJP s have an effect on self-selection, and
therefore smaller applicant pools.

Alternatively, Wanous (1973) and Colarelli (1984) found no discernable self-
selection effect of RJP s. That is, RJP s tended to lower expectations, creating higher job
satisfaction and lowered turnover. However, they did not induce job seekers to withdraw
from a recruitment process. Two explanations are possible for these somewhat surprising
results. First, both of these studies examined self-selection out of an actual job choice,
whereas the present study examines self-selecting out of applying to an organization. Job
seekers that have become involved in a selection process to the point of actually choosing
between jobs likely have incurred greater sunk costs in the process, and are therefore less
likely to turn down a job based on an RJP (Wanous, 1992). In a Web-based recruitment
context, however, sunk costs are minimal at the point of deciding whether to self-select
out of applying to an organization. Second, as Wanous (1973) notes, job market
conditions may have made it difficult for job seekers to withdraw from consideration.
Again, this relates to the availability of alternatives discussed above and is more likely
the case if those job seekers have invested time and effort in the recruitment/selection
process to date.
**Hypothesis 11a:** Organizations providing customized fit feedback information to job seekers via Web-based job boards will have smaller applicant pools compared to organizations not providing customized fit feedback information.

**Hypothesis 11b:** Organizations portraying information in a customized order to job seekers via Web-based job boards will have smaller applicant pools compared to organizations not portraying information in a customized order.

**Hypothesis 11c:** Organizations providing customized fit feedback information, and portraying information in a customized order will have the smallest applicant pools, compared to ones that provide one but not the other of these features, or neither of these features.

**Customization and Applicant Pool Fit**

When organizations provide customized fit feedback information to job seekers, those job seekers are better able to utilize that information in making better, more informed decisions, and it is more likely that such information will be carefully processed (Cable & Turban, 2001; Petty & Cacioppo, 1986). That is, because this customized information relates to the degree of likely fit between job seeker and organization on multiple dimensions, the application decisions made by the job seekers receiving this customized fit information should be better ones in terms of their actual fit with the organization. This is consistent with the macro predictions of Schneider’s (1987) ASA model – namely that individuals will self-select into organizations based on fit, creating greater levels of overall fit in the organization. Thus, overall, better fitting applicant pools for organizations providing this type of information should result in terms of KSAs, needs, and values.
**Hypothesis 12a:** Organizations providing customized fit feedback information to job seekers via Web-based job boards will have better fitting applicant pools in terms of actual KSA fit compared to organizations that do not provide customized fit feedback information.

**Hypothesis 12b:** Organizations providing customized fit feedback information to job seekers via Web-based job boards will have better fitting applicant pools in terms of actual needs fit compared to organizations that do not provide customized fit feedback information.

**Hypothesis 12c:** Organizations providing customized fit feedback information to job seekers via Web-based job boards will have better fitting applicant pools in terms of actual values fit compared to organizations that do not provide customized fit feedback information.
CHAPTER 4

METHODOLOGY

Power Analysis

A priori, a power analysis was conducted for the various hypotheses developed in the previous chapter. For all power analyses, a conventional level of power (.80) at an alpha level of .05 was targeted. Cohen (1988) provides the means to estimate necessary sample sizes based on varying effect sizes. Aguinis, Pierce, and Stone-Romero (1994) developed a means of specifically assessing power for interaction analyses involving a single dichotomous moderator, whereas Liakhovitski and Stone-Romero (2000) developed a power assessment for interaction analyses involving two dichotomous moderators. For purposes of this dissertation, sample sizes are reported to detect both small and medium effects according to Cohen’s (1988) standards. Table 4.1 presents power analysis results for analyses using Cohen’s (1988) procedures. Power analysis results using the Aguinis et al. (1994) and Liakhovitski and Stone-Romero (2000) procedures are described in the text.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>w</th>
<th>u</th>
<th>Effect of set w (ΔR² step 1)</th>
<th>Effect of set u (ΔR² step 2)</th>
<th>f²(d)</th>
<th>N required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1,6,7(^a)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,3(^a)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8(^a)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9(^b),10(^b),11(^c)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12(^c)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>(.20)</td>
<td>620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>(.50)</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) unit of analysis is the individual application decision.

\(^b\) unit of analysis is the individual participant.

\(^c\) unit of analysis is an applicant pool.

Table 4.1: Power analysis results

Decision Level Hypotheses

To test the decision level hypotheses, several analyses will be undertaken. First, Hypotheses 1, 6, and 7 propose regressions of one dependent variable on one independent variable (e.g., perceived P-J fit will be regressed on actual KSA fit). To detect small (f² = .02) and medium (f² = .15) effect sizes according to Cohen’s (1988) standards, the study
needs an \( N \) of 390 (small effects) and 54 (medium effects), respectively. The unit of analysis for these analyses is a single position assessment made by one participant. Because each participant in the study will assess 20 positions, only 20 participants are needed to be able to detect a small effect size for these particular analyses. To test Hypotheses 2 and 3, perceived P-O fit will be regressed on actual needs fit and actual values fit simultaneously. The required sample size for this particular analysis is 482 (to detect a small effect) and 67 (to detect a medium effect). Therefore, 25 participants assessing 20 positions will be needed.

To assess the required sample size for testing interactive effects of customized fit feedback (Hypotheses 4a-4c), the Aguinis et al. (1994) procedure was used. Specifically, Aguinis has developed an online assessment tool based on the Aguinis et al. study that calculates power for designs in which one dichotomous moderator variable is tested (http://carbon.cudenver.edu/~haguinis/mmr). This tool uses estimated correlations from each dichotomized subgroup, and a sample size from each subgroup to estimate power. Thus, using an iterative approach (i.e., continuing to vary inputted sample \( N \) until a .80 level of power was reached) and assuming equal subgroup \( n \)'s, total required \( N \) was determined to be 370 to detect a medium effect and 488 to detect a small effect. Thus, a total of 25 participants are required to detect a small effect.

A regression equation estimated by Liakhovitski and Stone-Romero (2000) was used to iteratively determine required \( N \) to detect small and medium effects for the triple interaction effect with two dichotomous variables proposed in Hypothesis 5. The Liakhovitski and Stone-Romero (2000) approach requires the a priori specification of dependent variable reliability, effect size, sample \( N \), and subgroup proportions for the
two moderator subgroups, and yields power given alpha = .05. For purposes of this
analysis, P-O/P-J fit perception reliability was set to be consistent with past research at
.85 (e.g., Saks & Ashforth, 1997, 2002). Subgroup proportions were assumed equal (0.5
each). Results indicated that an N of 495 will be needed to detect a medium effect,
whereas 843 will be needed to detect a small effect (i.e., 43 participants).

Finally, Hypotheses 8a-8c propose mediating effects of perceived P-J and P-O fit
on the relationships between actual fit indices and application decisions. This scenario is
accounted for by Cohen’s (1988) Case 1 example. Four possible scenarios varying small
and medium effects combinations at step one and two were calculated (see Table 4.1).
As shown, the largest sample needed to detect the mediating effects is 459, or 23
participants making 20 position assessments each. Thus, given that each participant
makes multiple position assessments, overall sample size requirements are low in terms
of number of individuals for the decision level model and there is a high degree of
probability that small effect sizes will be detected.

Individual Level Hypotheses

To analyze Hypotheses 9 and 10, the individual participant is the unit of analysis,
and a 2 x 2 between-subjects ANOVA will be conducted. Results of power analysis
indicate that a total of 32 participants are needed in each cell (a total of 128 participants)
to detect medium effects. However, 193 participants are required in each cell (772 total)
to enable the detection of small effects at the individual level. As further illustration, if
500 individuals participated in the study, the power would be .62 to detect small effects
and .99 to detect medium effects for the individual level models.
Organizational Level Hypotheses

For these hypotheses, the organization is the unit of analysis. To assess the required sample size for Hypothesis 11, the same approach was used as described above for Hypotheses 9 and 10, with the exception that the organization is a within-subjects rather than between-subjects factor. That is, the organizations that were created were used across all four conditions, and varied only in the type of customization they provided. Thus, for each organization created, four separate applicant pools were attained because each organization was used in all four experimental conditions. In other words, 20 companies will actually yield 80 applicant pools for analysis. To assess Hypothesis 11, a 2 x 2 within-subjects ANOVA will be computed. The required sample size per cell is 32 companies to detect a medium interaction effect (128 total) and 193 to detect a small interaction effect. Assuming each participant rates only 20 companies, the power to detect a medium interaction effect would be considerably lower than the .80 cutoff level. Thus, 40 separate companies were created, and sets of 20 companies were run in two separate waves during data collection. That is, one set of 20 companies were used during the first half of the data collection, and the other 20 companies during the second half of the data collection. This procedure yielded 160 separate applicant pools for the organizational level analyses (40 companies across 4 conditions).

To assess required sample size for Hypothesis 12, Cohen’s (1988) procedures for assessing the power of t-tests were used. In particular, Cohen has determined that small effect sizes are $d = .20$ and medium effect sizes are $d = .50$ for t-tests. Entering the appropriate power tables, it was determined that 310 participants per group are required.
to detect a small effect size and 50 per group to detect a medium effect (1-tailed).

Because Hypothesis 12 only assesses whether or not a company provides customized fit feedback, half of the resulting applicant pools generated throughout the study will be associated with companies that provided fit feedback information and half will not. Thus, given that there are a total of 40 companies (in two waves of data collection) represented in 4 conditions each, half of these 160 applicant pool fit figures will come from companies that provide customized fit feedback and half will not. Therefore, because only 50 per group are needed to detect a medium effect, and each group will have 80, this is highly probable. However, power to detect a small effect in testing this hypothesis is only .35, and thus there is less certainty in being able to do so.

Participants

A pilot study took place during the summer of 2002 (N = 38), and three of the pilot study participants volunteered to follow up with a focus group discussion. Five hundred and seventy two students were originally recruited to participate in the main study. Participants in both the pilot and main study were recruited from upper-level undergraduate business courses at a large midwestern university (Human Resource Management, Organizational Behavior, and International Business courses). Many upper-level undergraduate students are close to conducting job searches, and thus represent a valid subject pool since the responses of these individuals are important to organizations. Participants were given the chance to earn extra credit points for participating in both phases of the study, and those choosing not to participate were offered an alternative means of earning the extra credit points (a current-event summary paper). Of the original 572 students, 31 were in more than one of these classes, and thus
were given an alternative means of earning extra credit in the second class once they had already participated for extra credit in the first class (this second alternative involved completing a questionnaire for an unrelated study). Of the eligible students, 453 completed Phase 1, and 389 completed both Phase 1 and 2, a 68% participation rate. Forty-one participants had to be dropped from the study during data cleaning for reasons outlined in Chapter 5 (Table 5.3), leaving a total of 348 participants for the main study.

Of the 348 participants, 26 were from the Human Resource Management class, 121 were from the International Business class, and 201 were from two sections of the Organizational Behavior class. Fifty-one percent were male, 74% were business majors, average age was 22.3 years old, average full time work experience was 1.6 years and average total work experience including part time/summer work was 4.9 years. 90.2% of the sample indicated that they either had a job presently or planned to look for their next full time job within a year. Ethnicities were as follows: 75.0% Caucasian, 4.6% African-American, 2.6% Hispanic/Latino, 14.9% Asian, 2.9% other.

Study Design

A mock Web-based job board, created for purposes of this study, was used in the experimental part of the study. This job board was crafted to closely replicate the style of existing job boards such as monster.com in terms of basic setup and navigation. The primary pages making up the site are shown in Appendix A and a flow chart depicting participants’ movement through the site is illustrated later in the chapter. Participants were randomly assigned to one of four experimental conditions and each viewed 20 position postings, creating an overall 2x2x(20) within- and between-subjects factorial design involving two manipulations (see Figure 4.1). As shown in Figure 4.1, the within-
subjects factor was the position posting. The two between-subjects factors were customization of fit feedback and customization of the order in which information was presented. Each between subjects factor had two levels (i.e., either was or was not customized). Data were collected in two waves, with separate sets of 20 position postings depicted in each wave (see Appendices B and C). That is, each participant viewed either the 20 postings created for Wave 1 or the 20 created for Wave 2.

Figure 4.1: Study conditions (between-subjects) and positions viewed (within-subjects)

Procedure

Data collection took place in two phases. The procedure used in each phase will be discussed in turn. As mentioned above, a pilot test using undergraduate students of
similar educational standing was conducted in the summer of 2002. Of the students who participated in the pilot study, three agreed to participate in a follow up focus group discussion. During this discussion, input regarding the design of the study Web site, the nature of the pre-questionnaire and questionnaires administered during Phase 2, and the clarity of the instructions and overall procedure used in the laboratory was collected by taking notes as focus group participants made comments. The pilot study and the focus group participants’ input were helpful in making several wording changes as well as cosmetic changes to the Web site prior to the main study.

Phase 1

A pre-questionnaire was administered to all participants electronically during Phase 1 (see Appendix D). This took place 3-4 weeks prior to Phase 2 (depending on when an individual was scheduled for a laboratory time) and was completed on participants’ own time during a one-week window. Measures collected on the Phase 1 pre-questionnaire included ethnicity, gender, full- and part-time employment, next anticipated job search, GPA, and comfort with the World Wide Web. Furthermore, values preferences among the values examined in the study, self-reported skill levels of each participant on the KSAs used in the study, benefits mix preferences for the benefits used in the study, and a preferred order of information presentation among needs, values, and KSA dimensions were collected.

Whereas the preference data were collected during Phase 1, participants were told on that questionnaire that this data would be used to “build a personal profile for possible use in Phase 2”. This “profile” referred to individual preferences regarding needs and values as well as self-reported KSA levels. Thus, it was necessary to build in a time lag
in order to prevent carryover effects for those not receiving fit feedback and/or ordered information in Phase 2. That is, during Phase 1, everyone was told that their information could potentially be used to build a personal profile for use in Phase 2, because assignment to conditions was not determined until Phase 2. The purpose of the time lag was to cause those who ultimately did not receive feedback and/or ordered information to forget the original purpose of gathering preference data during Phase 1.

To assess the extent to which the time lag had its desired effect, control condition participants were asked on a questionnaire at the end of Phase 2, “Do you recall the main reason you were asked to provide information about your preferences for certain information or characteristics in the [Web]-based survey you completed several weeks ago?” (1 = yes, 2 = no). If a participant indicated “yes”, they were asked to provide a written description of the reason. Ten percent indicated yes (9 out of 89), but only one of these participants came close to correctly recalling the purpose of gathering preference data during Phase 1. Specifically, this individual stated “they tried to match up our preferences towards the jobs being posted on the Web.” This participant was retained in the dataset, but results were similar when the participant was and was not included.

To introduce participants to the study and direct them to the initial Web-based pre-questionnaire, classes were visited, and the study announced using the protocol found in Appendix E. Also, students were provided with initial instructions that included the Web address for the pre-questionnaire and a consent form to be filled out and returned during one of the next two class meetings (i.e., they were given one week to complete the initial questionnaire). When they returned their consent form (shown in Appendix F), participants who had completed the pre-questionnaire were asked to sign up for a time to
visit a computer laboratory 3-4 weeks later to complete Phase 2. Participants were guaranteed confidentiality of their responses, and two forms of identification were used to match responses from the pre-questionnaire with those made on the Web site used in Phase 2. Specifically, participants were requested to provide the last four digits of their social security numbers as well as their date of birth on both the pre-questionnaire and the laboratory-based part of the experiment.

Phase 2

Phase 2 was the primary part of the study, and involved participants visiting a computer laboratory in groups of up to 24, where the experiment was conducted using the computers available in the lab. This lab is located within the business school complex, consists of 24 Dell Dimension desktops with Microsoft Internet Explorer access, and is used only for experimental or instructional purposes. The computers are arranged in four rows of six, which corresponded to the four study conditions as shown in Figure 4.2.

Upon arriving at the laboratory where the experimental part of the study took place, participants were given a broad overview of the purpose of their participation. This information included some background/preliminary information that described how a local consortium of organizations had decided to form a new job board, and was interested in having students close to graduation and/or current job seekers preview the site and its postings. Participants were told that company names had been changed, but information presented remained the same. Further, participants were told that their names would in no way be divulged to companies. The specific instructions are shown in Appendix G.
Participants were randomly assigned to one of the study conditions (i.e., between-subjects part) by receiving a computer terminal assignment in one of the four rows making up the computer laboratory (see Figure 4.2). When participants entered the room, a paper-and-pencil questionnaire was handed to them for purposes of evaluating the position postings represented on the Web site (see Appendix H). A number between 1 and 24 appeared on the top of these questionnaires, representing the computer terminal a participant was assigned to. These questionnaires were shuffled prior to each laboratory session to ensure random assignment to conditions, and simply handed to participants as they entered the room.
A flow chart outlining the movement of participants through the Web site is shown in Figure 4.3. Once seated at their terminals, and after the background information had been divulged, participants were prompted to enter their terminal number on the introductory page of the Web site, and syntax within the site automatically directed those at terminals 1-6 to condition 1, those at terminals 7-12 to condition 2, those at terminals 13-18 to condition 3, and those at terminals 19-24 to condition 4. As the laboratory schematic in Figure 4.2 suggests, this prevented participants in non-feedback conditions from viewing computer screens of those in feedback conditions, and vice-versa.

The introductory page of the Web site also asked participants to indicate their social security number, date of birth, and college major (all six business majors were listed as options here, along with “my major is outside the business school” and “other”). Participants were asked to indicate their major before exiting the welcome page. This information was then automatically included at the top of all position postings to make them more realistic to participants (see Appendices B and C). Following this page, participants were provided with background information specific to the study condition they were assigned to. The specific background information provided for each condition is described in more detail in the next section and shown in Table 4.2.

Following this background information, participants were asked to complete a “registration code” for the study before proceeding. To complete this code, participants were given a “code sheet” with the last four digits of their social security number and a series of 15 numbers upon entering the room (see Appendix I). They were asked to copy this code into the system. In reality, this code represented values and benefits
preferences, self-rated KSA capabilities, and ordering preferences among the three dimensions of fit taken from the Phase 1 questionnaire. That is, on the Phase 1 questionnaire, participants were asked to rank order 4 values characteristics, 4 benefits characteristics, and 4 KSAs, as well as rank order the relative importance of values, benefits and KSA information in job advertisements. These rankings were simply re-entered into the system at Time 2 under the guise of a study registration code.

Figure 4.3: Flow chart of participants’ movement through the JobLink site

Following submittal of their registration code, participants were linked to the home page for a Web-based job board named JobLink. This home page provided a welcoming statement (see Appendix A) and hyperlinks listing the names of companies offering positions. Within each condition, participants viewed links to 20 position
postings. This addresses a concern raised by P-E fit scholars that samples often only evaluate a single job, company, or industry in assessing fit (e.g., Edwards, 1991). In fact, recently, Collins and Stevens (2002) called on researchers to “…assess the effects of recruitment practices when respondents evaluate multiple options simultaneously” (p. 1121).

The appropriate number of position postings to present was determined by a search of seven of the top 50 job boards as rated by CareerXroads, a well-recognized job board directory (Crispen & Mehler, 2002). The process of choosing these seven job boards was as follows. Of the top 50 job boards, 36 were found to be idiosyncratic to certain geographic regions or occupations, and thus were not examined. Every other job board was selected from those that remained to arrive at the seven ultimately examined. These included America’s Job Bank, CareerBuilder, CareerJournal, FlipDog, Monster.com, Recruiters Online Network, and TopEchelon.

Within each of these seven job boards, the most popular jobs accepted by graduates of the six majors in the College of Business were examined. These jobs were identified in the 1998-2001 Fisher College of Business placement data, obtained through the placement office. Across the six majors, the following seven jobs were found to be the most popular in terms of placements, and were subsequently used (two were selected for marketing majors): insurance sales agents, marketing managers, computer systems analysts, human resource managers, financial analysts, accountants, and transportation managers. Across the 49 possible slots (i.e., 7 job boards x 7 job titles), an average of 19.65 jobs were posted in the Columbus, Ohio geographic region (as of May, 2002). The standard deviation of 30.21 indicates that the number of jobs posted under a certain
category (e.g., accountant jobs in Columbus posted on the Flipdog.com job board, versus financial analyst positions in Columbus posted on the Careerbuilder.com job board) varied widely. Based on this process, 20 position postings were used for each participant in the study, representing the within-subjects part of the experiment.

The order of presentation of the actual position posting hyperlinks for each of the 20 positions from top to bottom of the JobLink home page were randomized within condition across participants. That is, Participant A in Wave 2 might have seen Gratz Enterprises, Rempe & Long, Quinn Inc., Fibbe Inc….Edgewood (20 total), presented in that order, whereas Participant B might have seen Bluewing, GreenCo., Rempe & Long, Neyar….Unymar listed in that order. However, similar to actual job boards, participants were free to view the postings in any order they chose, and not necessarily in the order represented on the home page.

After viewing each individual position posting, participants were asked to answer questionnaire items gauging their perceived P-J and perceived P-O fit with the particular job/organization represented in the position posting. These two measures were administered on a paper-and-pencil questionnaire handed to each participant as they entered the laboratory. There were two reasons for using a paper-and-pencil instrument to collect these measures. First, actual job boards, while presenting chances for applicants to apply, do not generally present questions to applicants regarding their perceived P-J or P-O fit. Thus to do so directly within the site would have decreased the face validity of the job board. Second, using a different medium to gather these measures was thought to lessen common method variance concerns that were potentially at issue.
given that application decisions were being made along with assessments of perceived P-J and P-O fit.

In the present study, at the bottom of each position posting, job seekers were given the opportunity to apply for the position. More specifically, upon clicking each company link, participants were shown a position posting for the company chosen, and were given the chance to apply for the position via a link entitled “Apply for this Position!” This answers calls to assess actual application decisions, rather than simply attitudinal data such as attraction or intention to apply (e.g., Taylor & Collins, 2000).

Application decisions incurred opportunity costs in terms of having to fill out an actual online application blank before proceeding. To enhance realism (and avoid a participant having to fill out the exact same application form each time they applied for a position), three versions of an application form were created and randomly presented to participants whenever they applied for a position. These three forms are shown in Appendix A.

Also, a link to exit the job board was provided on the JobLink home page, but participants were explicitly told not to exit the site until either all 20 positions had been viewed or the hour time period had expired. Although this departs somewhat from actual job boards where applicants can choose only to look at a limited subset of postings, it was necessary in order to gather perceived P-J and P-O fit data on positions that were ultimately rejected as well as those to which participants chose to apply. That is, if a participant had only viewed the first 10 postings, had indicated high perceived P-J and P-O fit with each, applied to each, and then exited the job board, there would have been insufficient perceived P-J and P-O fit data to link to those positions to which the
participant chose not to apply to. Pilot testing revealed a sufficient time period to allow for participants to view all 20 positions (one hour). If a participant did not finish viewing all positions in this allotted time, only the positions that the individual was able to view were included in data analysis.

After completing their browsing of position opportunities, participants were given the chance to exit the job board site. Upon exiting the site, they were taken directly to a concluding questionnaire. This questionnaire measured satisfaction with the job board system.

Participants were asked to remain at their terminals for the duration of the experiment instead of being able to leave the room if they finished before the hour was up. This was done to discourage people from seeing others leave and hurrying through the site to complete their participation more quickly. However, participants were allowed the opportunity to do other work or access other Web sites if they had spare time between finishing the task and the end of the session, although they did not become aware of this opportunity until they had completed the final questionnaire and reached the logout page for the site (see Appendix A).

When the hour was up, a debriefing session took place for the entire group of participants in the session. This was not a full debrief, as participants were still led to believe that the jobs were real jobs being offered by a consortium of local businesses. Although this precluded any ex post assessment of the perceived realism of the site by participants, it did serve to avoid future subject contamination. After the study was complete and all data were gathered, a full debrief was sent to email addresses provided by participants on their original consent forms. This debrief explained the intent of the
study, hypotheses, information about the deception regarding the consortium of businesses and the lack of company realism, and contact information for any questions or concerns (see Appendix J).

**Treatments**

Two treatments created the four experimental conditions shown in Figure 4.1. Below, a discussion of the treatments is presented. The background information given to participants in each study condition is shown in Table 4.2.

**Degree to Which Information About Potential Fit was Customized**

In the non-customized fit information conditions (conditions 1 and 3), the exact same information was presented to all participants in the condition across positions (see Appendix C for an example). In the customized fit feedback information conditions (conditions 2 and 4), information regarding potential fit with the organization and job was customized to each participant, such that each participant was made aware of where they stood on a particular dimension in terms of potential fit (see Appendix B).

The fit figure presented as feedback in these conditions was measured using Spearman’s rank order correlation between individual and organizational characteristic profiles as rated by study participants (individual) and subject matter expert doctoral students (organizational). Consistent with earlier research, this correlation was linearly transformed to a 0-100 scale, and was presented as a percentage (e.g., “80% fit”) to facilitate participant understanding (Dineen et al., 2002). More specific details about this fit feedback measure are provided in the study measures section below.

KSA fit feedback and needs fit feedback levels were operationalized similarly to values fit feedback level. For example, in the non-customized fit information conditions,
KSAs required for the job and the benefits mix was simply described, consistent with traditional job board postings. In customized conditions, however, feedback indicated the degree of likely fit in terms of KSAs or benefit needs (see Appendix B).

**Customization of the Order in Which Information was Presented**

Similar to the customized fit feedback information manipulation, customization of the order in which information was presented was the second treatment given to half of the sample. On the pre-questionnaire, all participants were asked to rank order the importance of the three primary dimensions of fit examined in the study (i.e., needs, values, and KSA fit) in terms of which information they believed was most important in making their application decisions, which they believed to be second most important, and which they believed to be least important. Again, this is most likely the approach that would be taken if this tool were to actually be implemented on an actual job board such as monster.com. More indirect approaches to assessing preferences such as policy capturing are inferior to a direct ranking technique in this case because they would not realistically appear on an actual job board.
| Condition | All conditions started out with: “You will soon enter the homepage for a proposed Internet "job board". This job board will present various position opportunities that you will have a chance to apply to”.

This statement preceded the following manipulated information: |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Prior to entering the job board, please enter the unique identifier number on the handout you picked up when you entered the computer lab.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>When you view these opportunities, you will receive feedback about your potential fit with various aspects of the organizations and jobs listed. This feedback is based on a profile formed from responses you provided on the Internet-based survey you completed several weeks ago. Prior to entering the job board, please enter the unique identifier number on the handout you picked up when you entered the computer lab in order to access your profile information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>When you view these opportunities, you will see information presented in a specified order. The ordering of information is based on a profile formed from responses you provided on the Internet-based survey you completed several weeks ago. Prior to entering the job board, please enter the unique identifier number on the handout you picked up when you entered the computer lab in order to access your profile information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>When you view these opportunities, you will receive feedback about your potential fit with various aspects of the organizations and jobs listed. Also, you will see information presented in a specified order. This feedback and ordering of information is based on a profile formed from your responses to the Internet-based survey you completed several weeks ago. Prior to entering the job board, please enter the unique identifier number on the handout you picked up when you entered the computer lab in order to access your profile information.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2: Manipulated background information provided to participants on the JobLink Web site
In the experimental part of the study, participants in the non-customized configuration conditions (conditions 1 and 2) viewed position postings in which the order of presentation varied randomly for each position. More specifically, to prevent order effects, the order in which the three categories of information about each position was presented was randomized across positions, such that, for example, Participant A might have seen values information, followed by KSA information, followed by benefits information for Edgewood Co., but then might have seen information in the order of benefits, values, KSAs for Gratz Enterprises. Alternatively, Participant B might have seen KSA information followed by benefits and values information for Edgewood Co., and values, benefits, and KSA information respectively for Gratz Enterprises.

For those in customized configuration conditions (conditions 3 and 4), ordering preference information from the pre-questionnaire (re-entered as the study “registration code” on the Web site) was used by the computer to generate customized configurations of information in each of the postings for each participant as they viewed each position. For example, in the customized order of information conditions, if a participant indicated that he/she preferred to see needs (i.e., benefits) information first, followed by values information, with KSA information last, the position postings that he/she viewed were each arranged in this order of information presentation (see Appendix B).

Measures

Determination of the Three Fit Dimensions used in the Study -- KSAs, Needs, and Values

Several facets of information have been suggested for inclusion in Web-based recruitment position postings by practitioners, such as salary, job title, location, and
education level required (Graham, 2000). Many of these were controlled in the present investigation by holding them constant across all the position postings. For example, salary was mentioned as "competitive" across postings, and educational level required was an undergraduate college degree. This is because it is highly unlikely that an organization would advertise certain information, even if it were realistic. For example, there were no position postings in the search of top Web-based job board sites described above that advertised “salaries lower than the industry norm”. Likewise, because the participants consisted of undergraduates nearing graduation, degree requirement was controlled by stating in each position advertisement that candidates would need a “bachelors degree in business or related field”.

In contrast, three other types of information -- values, needs (i.e., benefits), and KSA's -- were manipulated in the various position postings by randomly combining levels of characteristics of each. Evidence from actual job boards supports the choice of these three dimensions of information based on an examination of jobs posted on seven of the top 50 job boards as rated by the most recent edition of CareerXroads (Crispen & Mehler, 2002). Within each of these seven job boards, position postings were examined that were related to the most popular jobs under each major field of study accepted by undergraduates of the Fisher College of Business at The Ohio State University from 1998-2001 (seven jobs in total). Out of these 49 possible categories, 10 did not currently have any jobs listed. Results of examining postings related to the remaining 39 positions showed that 97% portrayed KSA information, 51% portrayed benefits information, and 26% showed values-related information. Only two (5%) had information pertaining to goal congruence, and none had information relating to personality congruence. The
values-related information was consistent with findings reported by Cober et al. (2000, 2001) for organizational Web sites. Specifically, Cober et al. (2000) found that 23% of organizations sampled provided values information on their job sites, and in 2001 reported that a majority of companies sampled had at least some information about benefits and organizational culture on their Web site.

Further evidence of the importance of the need and value dimensions comes from Recruiters Network (www.recruitersnetwork.com), which presents results of a survey that concludes that benefits information is rated as "most important" by 49% of respondents, whereas 58% rate the depiction of a company's culture as "important". More specifically with regards to values information, Williams (2002) states, "A best practice organization interacts with candidates early in the process. They know applicant time is valuable…so they get right to the point by asking whether the applicant would like to measure how he or she would fit the culture" (p. 53). Of note, no mention of either goal or personality congruence is made in any of these sources.

Determination of actual values fit sub-characteristics. Actual values fit was operationalized using a rank order correlation between values preference rankings of participants and company preferences as rank ordered by SMEs. To obtain the rank order correlation, values obtained from the version of the Organizational Culture Profile (OCP) introduced by Cable and Judge (1996) were used (see Appendix K). Cable and Judge’s version of the OCP contains 40 values statements that have been used by researchers to assess organizational culture and/or individuals’ values preferences (e.g., Cable & Judge, 1996; Dineen et al., 2002; Judge & Cable, 1997). However, it is highly unlikely that a typical Web-based job board posting would describe 40 different values held by an
organization. This was confirmed when the content analysis of the 49 position postings was conducted as described above.

Because it was not feasible to include all 40 values from the OCP, it was necessary to assess values fit using a subset of values. There were several criteria to consider in choosing the subset of values to use in this study. For example, it was important to consider values that exhibited neither too high nor too low of a mean importance level, nor a low standard deviation in terms of importance among a pool of job seekers. It was important to choose values that are viewed differently (i.e., exhibit high standard deviations) among a pool of job seekers because values that are uniformly held in high importance by job seekers are likely to be advertised as such by organizations, or not mentioned at all. For example, in data collected by Dineen, Ash, and Noe (2000a), opportunities for professional growth had a relatively high mean importance rating ($M = 3.58$ on a 9-category Q-sort with Category 1 = most characteristic of what you value and Category 9 = least characteristic of what you value) and a standard deviation ($SD = 1.71$) in the bottom third of the distribution of standard deviations across all 40 values among job seekers. In general, an organization is not likely to claim that a value such as "opportunities for professional growth", which is held in high importance across job seekers, is an unimportant part of their corporate culture. Instead they will either claim that it is important, or not mention it at all.

On the other hand, values such as being organized or internally competitive are likely more idiosyncratic to organizations, and were shown to differ among individuals in terms of importance in the Dineen et al. (2000a) data. Thus, these values are likely to be more or less accentuated in recruitment advertisements from company to company. This
approach generally is consistent with Tinsley’s (2000) call for research to examine situations in which the characteristics studied are not all universally desirable, but rather are more likely to generate a wider range of fit scores that include over- and under-supply situations. For example, it is unlikely that an organization would advertise a culture low in fairness. This follows from Rynes and Gerhart (1990), who suggested that most fit research until 1990 had focused mainly on "apple pie" traits such as motivation, leadership, enthusiasm, etc. that would be expected to be prevalent across multiple firms. They recommended studying traits more idiosyncratic across pools of firms.

As another criteria for choosing values to use in this study, values were chosen that (a) were not correlated with each other among a pool of job seekers in terms of importance, and (b) were from different value categories. O’Reilly et al.’s (1991) study found seven categories, or dimensions of culture. Although not feasible to include values from each of these seven culture dimensions, the intention was to include no more than one value from any given culture dimension.

To meet the above criteria, the following approach was taken. First, using prior data collected from 97 undergraduate students similar in educational standing to those students recruited for the present study (Dineen et al., 2000a), the mean ranking for each of the 40 values on the OCP was examined. In order to retain only those values that fell in the middle of the distribution in terms of importance, only those values that were within a standard deviation (SD = .92) of the median importance ranking across the 40 values (Median = 4.77) were retained. Twenty-six of the forty values fell within this cutoff. Next, these 26 values were rank ordered in terms of their standard deviations, in order to retain those with relatively higher standard deviations. A group of at least three
characteristics was desired, and natural breaks in the data were examined in terms of standard deviation values in determining whether three, four, five, or more characteristics should be retained. Although holistic values profiles often contain more than four or five values (e.g., the OCP contains 40 values), values profiles have been described using four values in past recruitment/job choice research. For example, the comparative emphasis scale (CES) contains four values, and has been used in several studies of this nature (e.g., Adkins et al., 1994; Judge & Bretz, 1992). In addition, the competing values instrument (Zammuto & Krakower, 1991) describes cultural values using four characteristics. As mentioned earlier, it is unrealistic for a single position posting to contain descriptions of a large number of organizational values. For example, a position posting on monster.com would not likely contain enough description for a job seeker to evaluate their fit on all 40 of the OCP values. For each of the three primary fit dimensions used in the present investigation (values, KSAs, and needs), four sub-characteristics were eventually retained.

Third, correlations were computed between these 26 values in terms of importance ratings. The four values chosen in this study (a) had moderate means that were within a standard deviation of the median for the overall distribution, (b) were not correlated with each other in terms of importance, (c) were from four different values categories (O'Reilly et al., 1991) and (d) still had the highest standard deviation values possible. These values were being competitive \( (M = 4.57, SD = 2.32, \text{O'Reilly et al.'s (1991) aggressiveness dimension}) \), being people oriented \( (M = 4.01, SD = 2.19, \text{team orientation dimension}) \), being organized \( (M = 4.57, SD = 2.14, \text{attention to detail}) \)
dimension), and holding high performance expectations (M = 4.54, SD = 2.09, outcome orientation dimension).

Determination of actual KSA fit sub-characteristics. A similar procedure as that used to determine actual values fit sub-characteristics was used to determine actual KSA fit sub-characteristics. First, it was necessary to determine a set of KSA characteristics that could be used in the present study across companies. To do so, the Occupational Information Network (O*NET) database was used to determine KSAs that are described across a wide array of occupations (http://online.onetcenter.org). O*NET uses a common language that generalizes across occupations to describe the knowledge, skills, and abilities required for those occupations (Noe et al., 2003), and is appropriate to use in the present study because of its increased use in industry as well as its broad applicability.

A search of the database yielded the 33 knowledge characteristics, 46 skills characteristics, and 52 ability characteristics that make up the O*NET KSA population across all occupations. Next, the placement data from the undergraduate placement office at Fisher College of Business, The Ohio State University, were used to identify the most popular jobs taken by graduates of the business school over the period of 1998-2001. Specifically, the most commonly placed job titles related to each of the undergraduate majors were entered into O*NET to determine the relative importance of each of the 131 KSA characteristics for each of the seven jobs. A cutoff was established such that at least two out of seven of the jobs had to require a 50% importance rating for a particular knowledge, skill, or ability characteristic. That is, for a knowledge, skill, or ability characteristic to be retained for further consideration in the study, it had to exhibit a 50% or greater importance rating across at least two out of seven job titles taken from
the Fisher College of Business undergraduate placement data. This process narrowed the
list of possible KSAs to 11 knowledge characteristics, 30 skill characteristics, and 19
ability characteristics.

The process used from this point forward was similar to the process used to
determine relevant values sub-characteristics for use in the current study. First, a pilot
questionnaire was administered to 65 undergraduate students of similar educational
standing to those included in the main study sample (see Appendix L). The 60 KSAs and
definitions of each KSA were provided, and the students were asked to indicate "The
extent to which I believe I possess this knowledge [skill][ability] is:" (1 = Very Low, 7 =
Very High). Means ranged from 4.11 to 6.07 across the 60 characteristics. The median
of these means across characteristics was 5.32, and the standard deviations ranged from
0.86 to 1.61. At this point, only those KSAs with mean ratings falling within one
standard deviation unit above or below this median level were retained. This resulted in
39 KSAs. These 39 KSAs were then rank ordered in terms of their individual standard
deviations, and the KSAs that (a) were not correlated, (b) represented at least one
knowledge, skill, and ability characteristic, and (c) had the highest possible standard
development while still satisfying (a) and (b) were retained for use in the study. The total
number of characteristics retained was determined by examining breaks between viable
characteristics in terms of standard deviation values. This process resulted in the
following four sub-characteristics: customer and personal service (M = 5.23, SD = 1.40,
knowledge), time management (M = 5.18, SD = 1.57, skill), negotiation (M = 5.17, SD =
1.27, skill), and visualization (M = 5.40, SD = 1.13, ability).
Determination of actual needs fit sub-characteristics. Salary was not included as a need characteristic because, similar to certain values such as opportunity for growth, position postings are unlikely to advertise a "low salary". Instead, salary was listed as "competitive" for each of the jobs in the study to control for this factor. To assess actual needs fit, benefits were selected from the 187 benefits identified by the Society for Human Resource Management (SHRM) annual benefits survey (SHRM, 2002). This benefits survey was administered by SHRM to 2,423 randomly selected SHRM members, 551 of whom responded. The survey asked SHRM members to indicate, for each of the 187 benefits (grouped into eight categories such as family-friendly benefits and health care benefits), whether or not their company offers the benefit. In constructing a questionnaire to administer to a sample of undergraduate students similar in standing to those who participated in the main study, the list of 187 benefits was narrowed (similar to the rationale for narrowing the initial list of 131 KSAs). Specifically, benefits offered by at least one third of companies responding to the SHRM survey were retained (73 benefits). Thus, for example, incentive bonus plans were offered by 61% of companies and were included on the questionnaire, whereas gym subsidies were only offered by 28% of companies and thus were not included. The pilot questionnaire, listing each of the 73 benefits, was administered to 55 undergraduate students of similar academic standing to those included as participants in the main study, asking them to indicate "The extent to which I would like this benefit to be part of a benefits package for a job" (1 = Very low, 7 = Very high). An option of "do not know what this benefit is" was provided because some students might not have been familiar with all the benefits listed (see Appendix M). These particular responses were simply counted as missing data in
computing means and standard deviations. Although all benefits offered by at least one third of responding companies were included on this initial questionnaire, a benefit had to be offered by at least 50% of companies responding to the SHRM survey to ultimately be included in the main study.

The responses provided by the 55 undergraduate students were next subjected to a similar procedure as that used to determine relevant values and KSA characteristics to retain for the main study. Specifically, student mean responses of the extent to which they would like a benefit to be a part of a job benefits package ranged from 2.75 to 6.40 with 5.12 as the median value. Standard deviation values ranged from .87 to 2.06. Taking benefits falling plus and minus one standard deviation from this median value initially narrowed the list to 51 benefits. After ranking these benefits according to their standard deviation values, an optimal set of benefits was determined that (a) were each from a different grouping out of the eight groupings on the SHRM benefits survey, (b) were not correlated with each other, and (c) exhibited the highest standard deviation values while still conforming to (a) and (b). The resulting benefits (with wording slightly adapted for purposes of presentation in the Web-based position advertisements) were specialized insurance coverage (beyond normal health plan) including mental health coverage ($M = 4.55$, $SD = 1.92$, health benefit), paid memberships to professional associations ($M = 4.67$, $SD = 1.52$, personal services benefit), holiday parties and other social events ($M = 4.38$, $SD = 1.75$, other benefit), and dependent care flexible spending account (use of pre-tax dollar to pay child/elder care costs) ($M = 4.70$, $SD = 1.60$, family-friendly benefit). Figure 4.4 provides a summary illustration of the three actual fit dimensions and corresponding sub-characteristics making up the measurement of each.
Perceived P-O Fit

Three of the four items used by Saks and Ashforth (1997; 2002), were used to measure this decision level construct, including, "To what extent are the values of this organization similar to your own values?", "To what extent will this organization fulfill your needs?", and "To what extent is this organization a good match with you?" (5-item Likert scales with 1 = Very small extent and 5 = Very large extent). The fourth item developed by Saks and Ashforth addresses personality fit, and was thus excluded. Saks and Ashforth (1997; 2002) reported an average coefficient alpha of .89 from their use of the scale. Coefficient alpha in the present study was .87.
Perceived P-J Fit

Three of the four items also used by Saks and Ashforth (1997; 2002) were employed. These included, "To what extent do your knowledge, skills, and abilities match the requirements of this job?", "To what extent will this job fulfill your needs?", and "To what extent is this job a good match for you?" (1 = Very small extent, 5 = Very large extent). Saks and Ashforth's (1997; 2002) average coefficient alpha was .87, and coefficient alpha in the present study was .84.

Application Decisions

Participants were given the opportunity to apply to organizations that they found attractive. Specifically, a decision to apply was made by clicking an icon at the bottom of a position posting, and then filling out and submitting the corresponding application blank.

Participant Satisfaction with the Job Board System

A scale measuring overall satisfaction with recruitment processes used by Maurer, Howe, and Lee (1992) was adapted by changing the wording to reflect the job board context of the present study as well as the focus on fit with both jobs and organizations. The specific items for this individual level construct were, "I am satisfied with the information obtained about potential job responsibilities through this job board", "I was satisfied with the information obtained about the organizations represented through this job board", and "relative to other recruitment processes, this process was conducted well" (1 = Strongly disagree, 5 = Strongly agree). In addition, consistent with Bass, Cascio, and O'Connor's (1974) magnitude estimation study that examined adequate scaling distances between Likert scale items, a mid-point anchor falling halfway between equivalent low-
and high-end anchors was chosen. This anchor was $3 = \text{Neutral}$. Coefficient alpha for this scale was .73.

**Job Seeker Search Costs**

Job seeker search costs were operationalized as the timeliness with which participants were able to make their application decisions. An objective measurement implanted into the Web site syntax time stamped the movement of participants through the various Web pages. Specifically, each time a participant clicked into a position posting Web page, the time was stamped to a database along with the name of the company page they had entered. The time and company were then stamped again when the participant clicked out of this page. Search costs were operationalized as the average time a participant spent viewing each position posting, according to these time stamps. This individual level measure served as a proxy measure of job seeker information search costs, because the time it takes to assess organizational information and decide whether or not to apply to organizations is a primary component of overall search costs incurred during the job application process. This was thought to be the most relevant component of overall search costs to assess for purposes of this study, although other costs normally exist during the process (e.g., monetary and feedback seeking costs).

**Applicant Pool Size**

Applicant pool size was operationalized as an application rate to each of the organizations created for the study for each experimental condition. This operationalization accounted for slight differences in sample size per condition by creating an index representing the total number of applications made to a given organization (in each of the four study conditions) divided by the total number of applications that could have been
made to that organization (based on the number of participants who actually viewed that organization).

**Applicant Pool Fit**

Consistent with the technique developed by Carlson et al. (2002), mean levels of actual fit for each applicant pool that resulted from the culmination of participant application decisions across organizations were calculated. Specifically, fit for the organizations represented in the study was an organizational level construct computed as an average of the actual fit indices for each participant who applied to a given organization within each of the three fit dimensions. That is, overall applicant values fit for each applicant pool was measured, and differences in overall applicant pool values fit for each company across conditions were examined. Similarly, differences in applicant pool KSA fit and needs fit for the 40 total positions across the four study conditions were measured.

**Analysis Strategy**

**Approach to the Measurement of Fit**

Actual fit scores were calculated using a Spearman rank order correlation (Kendall, 1970), given by:

\[ r_s = 1 - \frac{6 \sum_{i=1}^{N} d_i^2}{N^3 - N} \]

where \( d_i = X_i - Y_i \), or the sum of differences in ranks across characteristics, and \( N \) = the number of characteristics assessed (four for each of the primary fit dimensions in the present study). Specifically, participants in the primary study, on the pre-questionnaire, were asked to rank the four KSAs adopted for the study from 1-4 in the order in which
they felt they could demonstrate the KSA. A similar approach was taken to gather rank orders of values and benefits preferences. As described earlier, position postings were created for the experiment with varying levels of these KSAs required by each organization, as well as varying levels of values and benefits offered. Prior to the experimental phase of the study, three subject matter expert (SME) doctoral students were asked to rank order the KSAs, values, and benefits from 1-4 as they appeared to be portrayed in each position posting created. Consistent with Siegel (1956), sufficient interrater agreement among these SMEs was established by computing Kendall’s coefficient of concordance ($W$), used in assessing the degree of association among $k$ rank orders:

$$W = \frac{s}{(1/12)k^2(N^3 - N)},$$

where $s$ = the sum of squares of the observed deviations from $R_j$, which represents the sum of ranks for each ranked item across assessors, $k$ = the number of sets of ranks (i.e, the number of judges), and $N$ = the number of entities assessed (e.g., four values, four KSAs). Across all 120 possible rank orders (40 companies x 3 sets of ranks each), $W$’s ranged from .91 to 1.00 and the average $W$ was .99 indicating sufficient SME agreement in rankings. This approach is consistent with calls to use aggregate individual level perceptions to form measures of organizational characteristics for use in computing profile correlations to operationalize actual, or measured fit (Kristof, 1996). Three Spearman rank order correlations (representing KSA, needs, and values fit) were then computed for each person for each position in the experiment, using individual rank
orders of personal characteristics and SME rank orders of organizational characteristics (averaged across SMEs).

In testing the study models, the Spearman rank order correlation measure served as the measure of actual fit for each of the three fit dimensions (i.e., needs, values, and KSAs fit). Resulting correlation coefficients were transformed using Fisher's \( r \) to \( z \) transformation in order to correct for any skewness in the distribution of correlation coefficients (e.g., Adkins et al., 1994). Because the \( r \) to \( z \) transformation is undefined when \( r = 1.00 \), but \( z \) is 2.99 when \( r = .995 \), \( z \) was set at 3.00 [-3.00] for \( r \)’s of 1.00 [-1.00].

**Decision Level Analyses**

Path analysis was used to test the various links proposed in the decision level model. A similar type of analysis was recently used to study P-O and P-J fit perceptions longitudinally in the context of job search (Saks & Ashforth, 2002). Prior to conducting path analysis, perceived P-O and P-J fit items were subjected to a confirmatory factor analysis. These two constructs have not often been examined simultaneously in prior research, and research that has examined them has tended to find high correlations between them (e.g., Saks & Ashforth, 2002 found a .80 correlation between perceived P-O and P-J fit pre-organizational entry). Further, some have suggested that these two constructs might not be distinct (e.g., Werbel & Gilliland, 1999), although Saks and Ashforth (1997) found confirmatory factor analytic evidence of two distinct factors. Moderation effects in the decision level model were assessed by creating interaction terms in a final step with the dummy coded moderating variables (i.e., no customized fit information = 0, customized fit information = 1 for the first set of moderation hypothesis
tests; no customized order of presentation = 0, customized order of presentation = 1 for the second set of moderation hypothesis tests).

Because data were collected in groups of 20 observations per participant (within-subjects part of the design), non-independence of residuals was a concern. This form of residual dependence, termed clustering by Cohen, Cohen, West, and Aiken (2003), “occurs when the data are collected in groups or other clusters” (p. 134), and can cause standard errors of OLS regression coefficients to be negatively biased. This issue also applies to logistic regression procedures, and brings about a situation in which significance can be overestimated (i.e., alpha inflation). A statistical estimate of the amount of clustering among study variables used as dependent variables is provided by the intraclass correlation coefficient (ICC(1); James, 1982), given by:

\[
ICC(1) = \frac{MS_{\text{treatment}} - MS_{\text{error}}}{MS_{\text{treatment}} + (n-1)MS_{\text{error}}}
\]

According to a review of several studies conducted by James (1982), an ICC level of greater than .12 indicates sufficient within-group variance compared to between-group variance to conclude that there is a noticeable group-level (i.e., participant-level) effect. Specifically, James (1982) found a median ICC(1) of .12 across these group-level studies. Across the dependent variables assessed as part of the decision level model (two perceived fit constructs and application decisions), ICCs were .21 (perceived P-J fit), .14 (perceived P-O fit) and .08 (application decisions). Thus, it appeared that participant effects were influencing the perceived P-J and P-O fit measures, whereas application decisions did not appear to be as affected by participant effects.
Therefore, because data clustering was deemed to be an issue for the fit perception measures, a procedure suggested by Cohen et al. (2003) and used by Rynes, Weber, and Milkovich (1989), Rotundo and Sackett (2002), and Dineen, Noe, and Wang (2002) was employed to overcome this problem. Specifically, a dummy variable was created for each participant in the sample, and entered in the first step of all OLS regression equations to partial out variance attributable to the idiosyncratic effects of individual respondents. Finally, because one of the dependent variables (application decisions) was dichotomous (applied or did not apply) logistic regression analysis was used to test the effects of perceived P-J and P-O fit on application decisions. Even though the ICC for application decisions was below the threshold level suggested by James (1982), a subject number variable was created and used as a categorical covariate in Block 1 to partial out any data clustering effects and compare results to an analysis that did not include this covariate.

Notably, an additional benefit of partialing out subject effects in the first step with dummy variables (OLS regression) or a subject number covariate (logistic regression) is that individual differences were automatically controlled for in all analyses. Thus variables such as comfort with the World Wide Web, gender, and so forth that were originally measured as part of the study were automatically controlled for by this procedure. Also, any effects attributable to the particular wave of companies a participant viewed (i.e., any differences in effects between the waves) were controlled through use of the procedure.

To test the mediation hypotheses, an extension of Baron and Kenny’s original (1986) approach introduced by Kenny, Kashy, and Bolger (1998) was used. According
to this procedure, a variable acts as at least a partial mediator when (a) the independent variable is significantly related to the dependent variable, (b) the independent variable is significantly related to the proposed mediator, and (c) the mediator significantly affects the dependent variable. In this third step, both the mediator and independent variable should be entered as predictors, because correlations between the mediator and dependent variable may be caused by the original independent variable. Entering both variables serves to control the effects of the independent variable in assessing the effects of the mediator on the dependent variable. Finally, to demonstrate full mediation, a fourth step (d) is necessary. This involves testing that the relationship between the independent and dependent variable becomes non-significant when controlling for the effects of the proposed mediator. A series of OLS and logistic regression analyses accomplished these tests.

**Individual Level Analyses**

A series of 2 x 2 ANOVAs were used to assess mean differences between the four study conditions in terms of job seeker search costs and job seeker satisfaction with the job board. Planned comparisons were used to assess whether or not job seeker satisfaction increased, and/or job seeker search costs decreased, with the introduction of customized fit feedback, customized order of information presentation, and both, to position postings.

**Organizational Level Analyses**

A similar 2 x 2 ANOVA was used to test the organizational level model with applicant pool size as the dependent variable (operationalized as an application rate). Thus, the unit of analysis for this analysis was each applicant pool generated. In
assessing applicant pool fit as a dependent variable, t-tests were conducted separately for each of the three fit dimensions (values, KSAs, and needs). Mean levels of actual values, KSA, and needs fit among applicant pools were compared between conditions where customized fit feedback information was provided and conditions where it was not.
CHAPTER 5

RESULTS

The purpose of this chapter is to report the results of tests of the hypotheses generated in Chapter 3. Before reporting these primary results, results from preliminary data analysis are reported, including descriptive statistics, data-entry error rate, and scale dimensionality and reliability checks.

Preliminary Analysis

Descriptive Statistics

Table 5.1 presents means, standard deviations, correlations, and scale reliabilities for primary study variables at the decision level of analysis. Table 5.2 presents descriptive statistics and correlations for variables at the organizational level of analysis. Only two variables included in the analysis were assessed at the individual level of analysis; these were satisfaction with the Web site (M = 3.12, SD = .80, coefficient alpha = .73) and average time spent engaged in browsing the position postings (M = 79.02 seconds per position posting, SD = 20.92). The correlation between these two variables was .12 (p < .05).

Data Checks and Cleaning

With the exception of P-O and P-J fit perception data, all other data were entered electronically through syntax on the Web-based pre-questionnaire and main study Web
site. In order to proceed through these sites, participants were required to fill out all items (i.e., a reminder to fill out all responses was given and participants could not move forward in the site without doing so). Thus missing data were contained to the paper-and-pencil P-O and P-J fit perception questionnaire completed by each participant during the laboratory session. One exception to this was a participant who did not complete any of the final questionnaire on the main study Web site, and thus was not included in analyses examining satisfaction with the information provided on the site.

Despite the automated nature of the data entry, the accuracy of all data was ensured by taking the following steps. First, the raw data downloaded from the study Web site was scanned for completeness and coherence. As mentioned earlier, 41 participants had to be dropped from the study at this step, mostly because of an error that affected 28 out of the 389 cases (see Table 5.3). The nature of this error was such that the system failed to encode the terminal number entered by the participant, and tracing of the Web site syntax revealed that these participants were being sent to Condition 2 as a default condition. However, these participants received background information that was consistent with appropriate background information for Condition 3, thus confounding the treatment manipulation for these participants. Unfortunately, this problem did not appear during pilot testing. Fortunately, however, the problem was easily recognizable in the downloaded data because there was no study condition listed for affected participants; thus the problem was limited to these 28 participants.

Second, all scale ranges were analyzed to ensure that data fell within the correct parameters. Next, the total amount of missing data among the primary study variables was assessed, and it was discovered that 0.3% of the data were missing (161 out of
54,984 possible data points). This missing data were of two types. First, ten participants failed to view all 20 position postings within the allotted time period, and thus were missing P-O and P-J fit perception data for the positions they did not view. In total, 17 out of a possible 6,960 position postings (348 participants x 20 position posting each) were not viewed, rendering missing P-O and P-J fit perception data for these 17 positions. These 17 observations were removed from analyses involving P-O and P-J fit perceptions by listwise deletion. The other type of missing data from remaining cases appeared to be random failures to complete all required P-O and P-J fit perception items for a given position (e.g., a participant might have completed only two of the three P-O fit perception items for a given position). Of a possible 41,658 data points for P-O and P-J fit perceptions (6,943 responses x 6 items each), 56 were missing in a random fashion (0.1%), and scales were simply created as averages of available items. One person did not respond to the three satisfaction items, bringing the total missing data points to 161. Finally, data from 38 out of the 348 participants (11%) were randomly selected and subjected to a thorough accuracy check. Out of 5,264 possible data points for these individuals, three were found to be incorrect, representing a 99.9% accuracy rate. These errors were corrected. Overall, there was an extremely high level of complete data and accuracy in the dataset.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Received customized fit feedback (=1)</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received information in a customized order (=1)</td>
<td>51.10</td>
<td>28.37</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual KSA fit (0-100%)</td>
<td>49.01</td>
<td>29.34</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual needs fit (0-100%)</td>
<td>50.17</td>
<td>28.85</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual values fit (0-100%)</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived P-J fit</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived P-O fit</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application decisions (1 = applied)</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.1: Means, standard deviations, scale reliabilities, and correlations among decision level study variables

Note. N = between 6939 and 6960.

- Dummy coded conditions and binary application decision variable.
- Scale alpha reliabilities.
- Point biserial representing correlation between a dichotomous and continuous variable.
- Phi coefficient representing correlation between two dichotomous variables.

* p < .05; ** p < .01.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Application rate</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Applicant pool KSA fit</td>
<td>59.88</td>
<td>13.53</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Applicant pool needs fit</td>
<td>53.81</td>
<td>18.91</td>
<td>.43**</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Applicant pool values fit</td>
<td>59.55</td>
<td>13.01</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.20*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.2: Means, standard deviations, and correlations among organizational level study variables

Note. N = 160.

* p < .05; ** p < .01.
Table 5.3: Participants excluded from the final sample and reasons for their exclusion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Participants Excluded</th>
<th>Reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Participants entered their registration code (i.e., their preference data) incorrectly, and thus received customized information that was inaccurate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Participants only completed perceived P-O and P-J fit items for the positions for which they applied, instead of for all positions as instructed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Researcher unable to locate correct participation codes for these participants once they entered the lab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Control condition participants were in a position in the lab to inadvertently see manipulations of people next to them due to intermittent system malfunction (see next category)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Web site malfunction caused these participants to be placed in conditions not consistent with manipulated information provided at the beginning of the site.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scale Dimensionality and Reliability

Pilot study data were analyzed in terms of alpha reliability, with coefficient alphas ranging from .71 to .88. Confirmatory factor analysis using AMOS statistical software was conducted on pilot study P-O and P-J fit perception data because some research has called into question the distinction between these two constructs (e.g., Bretz & Judge, 1994). Results suggested two correlated yet distinct factors with hypothesized factor loadings ranging from .677 to .986. Specifically, a chi-squared difference test between a one- and two-factor model showed a significant decrease in model fit for the one-factor model compared to the two factor model (\( \chi^2 \) difference = 768.20, \( df = 1, p < .01, \) RMSEA = .07, NFI = .99 for the two-factor model). Overall, the pilot study data suggested that the scales were useable in the main study.
The main study data were similarly analyzed, with corresponding results. Specifically, coefficient alphas ranged from .73 to .87. Confirmatory factor analysis of the six fit perception items again showed significantly better model fit for a two-factor rather than one-factor solution ($\chi^2$ difference = 5601.98, $df = 1$, $p < .01$, RMSEA = .08, NFI = .99 for the two-factor model). Loadings for hypothesized factors ranged from .646 to .987. Finally, once actual fit scores were tabulated across positions for each participant, these fit scores (tabulated as correlation coefficients) were converted to $z$ scores using Fisher’s $r$ to $z$ transformation.

Tests of Hypotheses

Main Effects of Actual Fit on Perceived Fit (Hypotheses 1-3)

Hypotheses 1-3 predicted that actual, measured fit constructs would relate to P-O and P-J fit perceptions. More specifically, actual fit in terms of KSAs was predicted to relate to P-J fit perceptions (Hypothesis 1), whereas both actual needs fit and actual values fit were predicted to relate to P-O fit perceptions (Hypotheses 2-3 respectively). All three of these hypotheses were supported. Tables 5.4 to 5.6 illustrate the results of the regression analyses used to investigate these hypotheses. For these particular tests, three approaches to analysis were taken to ensure robustness of results. First, tests using the entire dataset (i.e., all four study conditions; Tables 5.4 to 5.6) were conducted. However, prior research has demonstrated these effects in the absence of any manipulations such as fit feedback or ordering of information. It was possible that, in testing these particular hypotheses, the effects among participants in the manipulation conditions (conditions 2-4) could have been inflated. That is, it was important to assess the relationship between actual and perceived fit in the absence of manipulations.
designed to enhance the relationship. Thus, these tests were also conducted using only those in the control condition (condition 1). Third, these latter two sets of tests were re-run with the inclusion of the other two fit constructs as controls when testing the third fit construct. For example, in testing the effects of actual KSA fit on P-J fit perceptions, the effects of actual values and actual needs fit were partialled out before assessing the influence of actual KSA fit (Tables 5.7 to 5.9).

For the entire sample, there was a significant relationship between actual KSA fit and perceived P-J fit ($\beta = .35, \Delta R^2 = .11, p < .01$) after controlling for the effects of clustered responses by entering the participant dummy variables in the first step. The relationship between actual needs fit and perceived P-O fit was also positive and significant after inclusion of the dummy variables ($\beta = .19, \Delta R^2 = .03, p < .01$), as was the relationship between actual values fit and perceived P-O fit ($\beta = .32, \Delta R^2 = .10, p < .01$). Second, the results using only those participants from condition 1 were also significant, although the effect sizes (range: .01 to .02) were of smaller magnitude in each case. Correlations were .15 (actual KSA fit and perceived P-J fit), .13 (actual needs fit and perceived P-O fit), and .10 (actual values fit and perceived P-O fit) among condition 1 participants.
Table 5.4: Regression results of the relationship between actual KSA fit and perceived P-J fit (Hypothesis 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>β</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>ΔR²</th>
<th>F change</th>
<th>F overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 1:</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>347,6594</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>6.228**</td>
<td>6.228**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dummy variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2:</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>1,6593</td>
<td>.11**</td>
<td>1175.420**</td>
<td>10.694**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual KSA fit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The purpose of including the dummy variables was to partial out the total variance explained by the combined idiosyncratic response tendencies of participants. Individual betas for each of the 347 dummy variables are not relevant to the hypothesis test and thus are not included in the table.

** p < .01.
Table 5.5: Regression results of the relationship between actual needs fit and perceived P-O fit (Hypothesis 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Dummy variables</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$\Delta R^2$</th>
<th>$F$ change</th>
<th>$F$ overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 1:</td>
<td>Dummy variables</td>
<td>$a$</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>347,6592</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td>4.144**</td>
<td>4.144**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2:</td>
<td>Actual needs fit</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>1,6591</td>
<td>.03**</td>
<td>288.378**</td>
<td>5.141**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The purpose of including the dummy variables was to partial out the total variance explained by the combined idiosyncratic response tendencies of participants. Individual betas for each of the 347 dummy variables are not relevant to the hypothesis test and thus are not included in the table.

** $p < .01$. 

** $p < .01$. 
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Table 5.6: Regression results of the relationship between actual values fit and perceived P-O fit (Hypothesis 3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 1: Dummy variables</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>ΔR²</th>
<th>F change</th>
<th>F overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 2: Actual values fit</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>1,6591</td>
<td>.10**</td>
<td>920.313**</td>
<td>7.353**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.6: Regression results of the relationship between actual values fit and perceived P-O fit (Hypothesis 3)

* The purpose of including the dummy variables was to partial out the total variance explained by the combined idiosyncratic response tendencies of participants. Individual betas for each of the 347 dummy variables are not relevant to the hypothesis test and thus are not included in the table.

** p < .01.

Next, the results when partialling out effects of the other two actual fit constructs are presented in Tables 5.7 to 5.9 and suggest that each actual fit construct predicts perceptions of P-J and P-O fit over and above the effects of the other two fit constructs. Finally, consistent with Figure 3.1, actual values and actual needs fit were entered as simultaneous predictors of perceived P-O fit, with similar results (see Table 5.10). Of note, results were similar when dummy variables representing participant effects were and were not included in the first step of all of the above regression analyses. Taken together, Hypotheses 1-3 were supported.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>ΔR²</th>
<th>F change</th>
<th>F overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1:</td>
<td>Dummy variables</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>347,6594</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>6.228**</td>
<td>6.228**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:</td>
<td>Actual needs fit</td>
<td>.15**</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>2,6592</td>
<td>.03**</td>
<td>135.230**</td>
<td>7.220**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Actual values fit</td>
<td>.10**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:</td>
<td>Actual KSA fit</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>1,6591</td>
<td>.12**</td>
<td>1246.264**</td>
<td>12.120**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.7: Effects of actual KSA fit on perceived P-J fit, controlling for actual values and needs fit

* The purpose of including the dummy variables was to partial out the total variance explained by the combined idiosyncratic response tendencies of participants. Individual betas for each of the 347 dummy variables are not relevant to the hypothesis test and thus are not included in the table.

** p < .01.
Table 5.8: Effects of actual needs fit on perceived P-O fit, controlling for actual KSA and values fit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$\Delta R^2$</th>
<th>F change</th>
<th>F overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 1:</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>347,6592</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td>4.144**</td>
<td>4.144**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dummy variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2:</td>
<td>.11**</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>2,6590</td>
<td>.11**</td>
<td>517.625**</td>
<td>7.732**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual KSA fit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual values fit</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 3:</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>1,6589</td>
<td>.04**</td>
<td>363.484**</td>
<td>9.173**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual needs fit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The purpose of including the dummy variables was to partial out the total variance explained by the combined idiosyncratic response tendencies of participants. Individual betas for each of the 347 dummy variables are not relevant to the hypothesis test and thus are not included in the table.

** p < .01.
Table 5.9: Effects of actual values fit on perceived P-O fit, controlling for actual KSA and needs fit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Actual values fit</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$\Delta R^2$</th>
<th>$F$ change</th>
<th>$F$ overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 1: Dummy variables</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>347,6592</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td>4.144**</td>
<td>4.144**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2: Actual KSA fit</td>
<td>.12**</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>2,6590</td>
<td>.05**</td>
<td>201.049**</td>
<td>5.523**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual needs fit</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 3: Actual values fit</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>1,6589</td>
<td>.10**</td>
<td>993.047**</td>
<td>9.173**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The purpose of including the dummy variables was to partial out the total variance explained by the combined idiosyncratic response tendencies of participants. Individual betas for each of the 347 dummy variables are not relevant to the hypothesis test and thus are not included in the table.

** $p < .01$. 
Table 5.10: Simultaneous entry of actual needs and actual values fit as predictors of perceived P-O fit

a The purpose of including the dummy variables was to partial out the total variance explained by the combined idiosyncratic response tendencies of participants. Individual betas for each of the 347 dummy variables are not relevant to the hypothesis test and thus are not included in the table.

** p < .01.

Moderating Effect of Fit Feedback on the Relationship Between Actual and Perceived Fit (Hypotheses 4a-4c)

Hypotheses 4a-4c predicted that when feedback regarding likely fit with an organization is provided to job seekers, the relationship between actual and perceived fit constructs will be strengthened. That is, the relationship between actual and perceived fit will be relatively weaker in the absence of fit feedback and relatively stronger in the presence of fit feedback. These hypotheses were supported. The results of hierarchical moderated regression analyses are presented in Tables 5.11 to 5.13. First, there was an
interaction of actual KSA fit and the provision of KSA fit feedback on perceived P-J fit ($\beta = .29$, $\Delta R^2 = .04$, $p < .01$). The form of this interaction effect is shown in Figure 5.1 and suggests that the slope of the relationship between actual KSA fit and perceived P-J fit is steeper when KSA fit information is provided to job seekers. This means that the provision of fit feedback serves to strengthen the link between actual KSA fit and perceived P-J fit, such that those receiving feedback are able to relate their perceptions to their actual measured fit to a greater degree. Correlational evidence further illustrates the nature of this result. Specifically, the correlation between actual KSA fit and perceived P-J fit was .15 in non-feedback conditions, but increased to .53 in feedback conditions. In addition, examination of Figure 5.1 suggests that the effect is relatively greater when actual KSA fit is lower. That is, compared to no feedback, fit feedback appears to lower perceptions of P-J fit among individuals having a low actual KSA fit to a greater degree than it raises perceptions of P-J fit among individuals having a high actual KSA fit.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 1: Dummy variables</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$\Delta R^2$</th>
<th>F change</th>
<th>F overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>347,6594</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>6.228**</td>
<td>6.228**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2: Actual KSA fit $^b$</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>1,6593</td>
<td>.11**</td>
<td>1175.420**</td>
<td>10.694**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 3: Actual KSA fit x fit feedback</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>1,6592</td>
<td>.04**</td>
<td>428.213**</td>
<td>12.582**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.11: Regression results showing the interaction of actual KSA fit and fit feedback on perceived P-J fit (Hypothesis 4a)

$^a$ The purpose of including the dummy variables was to partial out the total variance explained by the combined idiosyncratic response tendencies of participants. Individual betas for each of the 347 dummy variables are not relevant to the hypothesis test and thus are not included in the table.

$^b$ Feedback condition (received or did not receive fit feedback) would normally be entered as a main effect in Step 2 prior to being included in the interaction analysis. However, its main effects are accounted for in Step 1, which controls for the idiosyncratic effects of each participant using the dummy variable approach to clustered data (Cohen et al., 2003).

** $p < .01$. 
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Figure 5.1: Interaction of fit feedback and actual KSA fit on perceived P-J fit

Note. Because effects were equivalent with and without participant dummy variables, this graph was constructed from a regression that did not include the dummy variables.

Second, there was an interaction between actual needs fit and the provision of needs fit feedback information on perceived P-O fit such that the relationship between actual needs fit and perceived P-O fit was enhanced among participants who received fit feedback, compared to those who did not receive fit feedback ($\beta = .05$, $\Delta R^2 = .001$, $p < .01$). Once again, correlational evidence substantiates this result, with a .16 correlation between actual needs fit and perceived P-O fit in non-feedback conditions and a .22 correlation between these constructs in feedback conditions. This particular result, while statistically significant, exhibited only a very small effect size as shown by the low $R^2$ value and illustration provided in Figure 5.2.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>β</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>ΔR²</th>
<th>F change</th>
<th>F overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dummy variables</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>347,6592</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td>4.144**</td>
<td>4.144**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual needs fit</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>1,6591</td>
<td>.03**</td>
<td>288.378**</td>
<td>5.141**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fit b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 3:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual needs fit</td>
<td>.05**</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>1,6590</td>
<td>.001**</td>
<td>9.837**</td>
<td>5.161**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x fit feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.12: Regression results showing the interaction of actual needs fit and fit feedback on perceived P-O fit (Hypothesis 4b)

a The purpose of including the dummy variables was to partial out the total variance explained by the combined idiosyncratic response tendencies of participants. Individual betas for each of the 347 dummy variables are not relevant to the hypothesis test and thus are not included in the table.

b Feedback condition (received or did not receive fit feedback) would normally be entered as a main effect in Step 2 prior to being included in the interaction analysis. However, its main effects are accounted for in Step 1, which controls for the idiosyncratic effects of each participant using the dummy variable approach to clustered data (Cohen et al., 2003).

** p < .01.
Finally, the relationship between actual values fit and perceived P-O fit was moderated by the provision of fit feedback information such that the relationship was strengthened in feedback conditions ($\beta = .24$, $\Delta R^2 = .03$, $p < .01$). Results are presented in Table 5.13 and the form of this interaction effect (see Figure 5.3) shows that the relationship between actual values fit and perceived P-O fit was strengthened among those receiving fit feedback, compared to those not receiving fit feedback. Correlations were as follows: in non-feedback conditions the relationship between actual values fit and perceived P-O fit was .14; in feedback conditions the relationship was .48. Similar to the interaction involving KSA fit, Figure 5.3 suggests that compared to no feedback, fit feedback appears to lower perceptions of P-O fit among individuals having a low actual
values fit to a greater degree than it raises perceptions of P-O fit among individuals having a high actual values fit.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 1:</th>
<th>( \beta )</th>
<th>( R^2 )</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>( \Delta R^2 )</th>
<th>F change</th>
<th>F overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dummy variables</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>347,6592</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td>4.144**</td>
<td>4.144**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual values fit</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>1,6591</td>
<td>.10**</td>
<td>920.313**</td>
<td>7.353**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 3:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual values fit x fit feedback</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>1,6590</td>
<td>.03**</td>
<td>270.848**</td>
<td>8.408**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.13: Regression results showing the interaction of actual values fit and fit feedback on perceived P-O fit (Hypothesis 4c)

\( a \) The purpose of including the dummy variables was to partial out the total variance explained by the combined idiosyncratic response tendencies of participants. Individual betas for each of the 347 dummy variables are not relevant to the hypothesis test and thus are not included in the table.

\( b \) Feedback condition (received or did not receive fit feedback) would normally be entered as a main effect in Step 2 prior to being included in the interaction analysis. However, its main effects are accounted for in Step 1, which controls for the idiosyncratic effects of each participant using the dummy variable approach to clustered data (Cohen et al., 2003).

** \( p < .01 \).
Figure 5.3: Interaction of fit feedback and actual values fit on perceived P-O fit

Note. Because effects were equivalent with and without participant dummy variables, this graph was constructed from a regression that did not include the dummy variables.

Notably, similar to tests of Hypotheses 1-3, results were similar when participant dummy variables were and were not entered in the first step of the three moderated hierarchical regression equations outlined above. Taken together, these results provide support for Hypotheses 4a-4c, and suggest that the provision of fit feedback information to job seekers can bring perceptions of fit more in line with actual, measured fit.

Moderating Effects of Information Order Customization on Relationships Among Actual Fit and Fit Dimension Importance in Predicting Fit Perceptions (Hypotheses 5a-5c)

Hypotheses 5a-5c predicted triple interaction effects of (a) actual fit (b) importance of fit dimensions to job seekers and (c) whether or not fit dimension information is presented in a customized order to job seekers, on perceptions of fit. The form of these predicted interactions was such that the relationship between the most
favored actual fit construct and perceived fit was predicted to be strengthened when the order of information presentation is customized compared to when it is not, whereas the relationship between the least favored actual fit construct and perceived fit was predicted to be weakened when the order of information presentation is customized compared to when it is not. For example, if a participant prefers KSA fit information above the other two types of fit information, and prefers needs information least, it was predicted that the relationship between actual KSA fit and perceived P-J fit would be strengthened if information about the three fit dimensions was customized to the participant (i.e., they saw KSA fit information first), whereas it was predicted that the relationship between actual needs fit and perceived P-O fit would be weakened in customized ordering conditions (i.e., they saw needs fit information last).

The following steps were taken to test these hypotheses. First, a dummy variable was created for each fit construct, with 1’s assigned if that particular fit construct was the favorite of a particular participant and 0’s if it was not the favorite. Thus if Participant A had ranked values first in terms of importance, the values dummy variable had 1’s next to the 20 observations of that particular participant. Next, for each hypothesis test, cases were selected in which a fit construct had been ranked as either 1 (most important), or 3 (least important). That is, for each analysis, participants who had ranked a particular fit construct as “second most important” were eliminated to provide a cleaner test of the difference between the most and least important fit constructs. The dummy variable for the fit construct being tested was then used as a measure of whether it had been ranked as most or least important (1 = most important; 0 = least important), and was entered as appropriate into the interaction terms. Next, the analysis was run by first entering (a) the
dummy variable representing whether or not a participant was in a customized order condition, (b) the dummy variable representing whether the fit construct in question was the most or least important to that person and (c) actual fit scores for that person for the fit dimension being tested across the 20 observation per subject. In the second step, the three 2-way interaction terms were entered and in the third step, the three-way interaction term (order customization x most/least preferred fit dimension x actual fit) as a predictor of perceived fit. Of note, unlike for Hypotheses 1-4, participant dummy variables were not included in the first step of these analyses. This is because the purpose of including these dummy variables is to partial out any idiosyncratic subject effects that might influence the overall regression model. However, for these particular tests, subject effects were an inherent part of the model (i.e., fit dimension preference data), and thus should not be partialled out.

Overall, these hypotheses did not receive support at the $p < .05$ level of significance. The relationship between actual KSA fit and perceived P-J fit was not enhanced when KSA fit was judged to be the most important fit dimension and when fit information was presented to job seekers in a customized order, and was not weakened when KSA fit was judged to be the least important fit dimension and information was presented in a customized order ($\beta = .11, \Delta R^2 = .00, p > .05$). A similar result was found with values fit ($\beta = -.05, \Delta R^2 = .00, p > .05$) and needs fit ($\beta = -.02, \Delta R^2 = .00, p > .05$).

**Relationships Between Perceived Fit and Application Decisions (Hypotheses 6-7)**

Logistic regression analysis was used to investigate the relationship between perceived fit and application decisions in two ways. Both perceived P-J fit and perceived P-O fit were found to be related to application decisions, supporting Hypotheses 6 and 7.
First, consistent with Figure 3.1, perceived P-O and P-J fit were entered jointly into the regression after entering a subject number as a covariate in the first block. In using logistic regression, the Cox and Snell $R^2$ operates similarly to $R^2$ in a linear regression model in terms of variance explained. Unlike in linear regression, however, logistic coefficients cannot be interpreted as simply the amount of change in a dependent variable for each unit increase in the related independent variable. Rather, $B$ coefficients in logistic regression represent the degree to which the log odds of the event occurring change for each unit increase in the independent variable. The interpretation of the log odds is facilitated by transforming it to an odds ratio, accomplished by raising the constant $e$ to the power of $B$ (Pampel, 2000). The odds ratio then represents the probability that $y = 1$ divided by the probability that $y = 0$ (i.e., the probability that a person will apply to an organization divided by the probability that a person will not apply).

The chi-squared statistic for the second block was significant ($\chi^2 = 4214.29$, $df = 2$, $p < .01$). The Cox and Snell $R^2$ was .52, and both perceived P-J fit ($B = 3.15$, odds ratio = 23.34, $p < .01$) and perceived P-O fit ($B = 2.96$, odds ratio = 19.20, $p < .01$) were significant predictors of application decisions. The odds ratio indicates the change in odds for a case when the value of the independent variable changes by a unit of one. For example, if perceived P-J fit increases by one standard deviation unit, the odds of someone applying to an organization increase by a factor of 23.34 (Pampel, 2000). The Wald $\chi^2$ statistic is reported in Tables 5.14 to 5.16. This statistic has been criticized for its reduced power, but this reduction becomes insignificant with larger samples (Harrison, 2002) and tends to make analyses more conservative. Second, analyses were
run in which the effects of one type of perceived fit were assessed while first entering the other as a covariate. Both perceived P-J fit ($\chi^2 = 1351.07, p < .01$) and perceived P-O fit ($\chi^2 = 1472.60, p < .01$) remained significant predictors of application decisions after first entering the other as a covariate, suggesting independent effects of each fit perception construct. Again, similar results were found regardless of whether a subject number covariate was or was not entered in the first block of these logistic regression equations.

Perceived Fit as a Mediator of the Relationship Between Actual Fit and Application Decisions (Hypotheses 8a-8c)

The results of previous hypotheses tests have already demonstrated relationships between actual fit and perceived fit across all three fit dimensions, satisfying Kenny et al.’s (1998) second step in demonstrating mediation. The current hypotheses tests carried out Kenny et al.’s first, third, and fourth steps to examine perceived fit constructs as either full or partial mediators of the relationships between actual fit constructs and application decisions. To demonstrate a partial mediation effect, two additional steps beyond the demonstration of a relationship between actual and perceived fit are necessary. First, actual fit must relate directly to application decisions. Second, when entered simultaneously with actual fit as a predictor of application decisions, perceived fit must be significantly related to applications. Finally, to demonstrate full mediation, the relationship between actual fit and application decisions must become non-significant after controlling for the effects of perceived fit (i.e., the mediator; Baron & Kenny, 1986).

Two sets of analyses were conducted to test these hypotheses. First, relationships involving each actual fit construct were examined in isolation. Next, the mediating
effects of perceived P-O fit when simultaneously considering actual needs and values fit were examined. For these sets of analyses, the participant variable was not entered as a covariate because (a) previous analyses have demonstrated that inclusion of the participant variable did not change any of the results and (b) the low ICC value for application decisions described earlier suggests that clustering is not problematic for analyses involving application decisions.

All three actual fit constructs were significantly related to application decisions, satisfying Kenny et al.’s (1998) first step ($B = .37$, odds ratio $= 1.44$, $p < .01$ for actual values fit; $B = .32$, odds ratio $= 1.37$, $p < .01$ for actual needs fit; and $B = .41$, odds ratio $= 1.50$, $p < .01$ for actual KSA fit). Next, perceived fit constructs significantly predicted application decisions when entered simultaneously with actual fit constructs, satisfying Kenny et al.’s (1998) third step ($B = 1.88$, odds ratio $= 6.58$, $p < .01$ for perceived P-O fit with simultaneous entry of actual needs fit; $B = 1.91$, odds ratio $= 6.72$, $p < .01$ for perceived P-O fit with simultaneous entry of actual values fit; $B = 1.90$, odds ratio $= 6.67$, $p < .01$ for perceived P-J fit with simultaneous entry of actual KSA fit). Thus, given that Kenny et al.’s (1998) first three steps were satisfied for all three fit dimensions, there were at least partial mediation effects.

To test for full mediation, a fourth step analyzed whether the relationship between actual fit constructs and application decisions became non-significant when controlling for the effects of perceived fit. Results provided support for Hypotheses 8a and 8c, and partial support for Hypothesis 8b. As shown in Table 5.14, the effect of actual KSA fit on application decisions became non-significant when controlling for the effects of perceived P-J fit, ($B = .03$, odds ratio $= 1.04$, $p > .10$), indicating full mediation of the
relationship between actual KSA fit and application decisions by perceived P-J fit.

Second, Table 5.15 shows that perceived P-O fit fully mediated the effects of actual values fit on applications decisions ($B = .01$, odds ratio = 1.01, $p > .10$). However, Table 5.16 shows that the direct effects of actual needs fit on application decisions remained significant even after first entering perceived P-O fit as a covariate. Thus, although perceived P-O fit partially mediated the relationship between actual needs fit and application decisions, it did not fully mediate this relationship. When assessing actual values and needs fit simultaneously, a similar pattern of results held.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>Odds Ratio</th>
<th>Wald Statistic</th>
<th>Model $\chi^2$</th>
<th>Cox and Snell $R^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 1: Perceived P-J fit</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>6.75</td>
<td>1319.48**</td>
<td>2191.97**</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2: Perceived P-J Fit</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>1245.67**</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual KSA fit</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.14: Mediating effects of perceived P-J fit on the relationship between actual KSA fit and application decisions (Hypothesis 8a)

** $p < .01$.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 1:</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>Odds Ratio</th>
<th>Wald Statistic</th>
<th>Model $\chi^2$</th>
<th>Cox and Snell R$^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceived P-O fit</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>6.74</td>
<td>1364.31**</td>
<td>2358.94**</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 2:</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>Odds Ratio</th>
<th>Wald Statistic</th>
<th>Model $\chi^2$</th>
<th>Cox and Snell R$^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceived P-O fit</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>6.72</td>
<td>1298.51**</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual needs fit</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.15: Mediating effects of perceived P-O fit on the relationship between actual values fit and application decisions (Hypothesis 8c)

** $p < .01$. 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 1:</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>Odds Ratio</th>
<th>Wald Statistic</th>
<th>Model $\chi^2$</th>
<th>Cox and Snell R$^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceived P-O fit</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>6.74</td>
<td>1364.31**</td>
<td>2358.94**</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 2:</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>Odds Ratio</th>
<th>Wald Statistic</th>
<th>Model $\chi^2$</th>
<th>Cox and Snell R$^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceived P-O fit</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>6.58</td>
<td>1320.42**</td>
<td>28.52**</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual needs fit</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>28.28**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.16: Mediating effects of perceived P-O fit on the relationship between actual needs fit and application decisions (Hypothesis 8b)

** $p < .01$. 
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Job Seeker Search Costs (Hypotheses 9a-9c)

Hypotheses 9a-9c predicted that when customized information regarding likely fit with a job or organization is provided to job seekers, or fit dimension information is presented in a customized order, job seeker search costs should be lower than when customization is not provided. Results of ANOVA failed to support these hypotheses.

To test these hypotheses, objective time data were gathered from the Web site, mapping the total amount of time participants spent within the position postings within the site. In total, 16,320 timestamps were assessed (i.e., each time one of the 348 participants clicked into or out of a position advertisement, the time was stamped into the dataset next to their subject number, company number, and study condition). Time spent on a given position advertisement was interpretable if an even number of time stamps were assigned to a given position number. That is, an even number of time stamps for a given position advertisement indicated that a participant had clicked into and out of that position using the links provided on the site.

However, some position time stamps appeared in the generated dataset in odd groupings (i.e., 3 or 5). This indicated that, despite being asked during the session to use only the links provided in the site and not the “back” button on their browser, some participants used the back button, generating non-interpretable time stamp data for some of the positions they viewed. For example, if Participant A had time stamps of 1:30:23, 1:31:35, 1:33:21, and 1:33:56 next to Quinn Inc., it could be determined that this participant entered Quinn at 1:30:23, left the page at 1:31:35, reentered the page at 1:33:21, and left again at 1:33:56, spending a total of 1:47 on that company page.
However, if Participant B only had time stamps of 1:30:23, 1:31:35 and 1:33:21 for Quinn Inc., it was impossible to determine the amount of time Participant B spent viewing that position posting. Thus, in cleaning the time data, sets of odd time stamps totaling 238 stamps (1%) were eliminated, leaving 16,082 time stamps arranged into even sets of stamps for each position. This included data from one participant that had to be completely eliminated because it was apparent that this individual had used their back button throughout the session.

Next, the total amount of time spent within position advertisements on the site was calculated for each participant by summing the differences between corresponding pairs of time stamps. This total was then divided by the total number of companies viewed. For example, if Participant A only was able to view 18 out of the 20 positions, their total time spent was divided by 18 to arrive at an index that represented the average amount of time spent in a position posting for a given participant. Similarly, if a position from Participant B’s time stamps had been eliminated due to uneven numbers of time stamps (described above), then their total time was divided by \( n - 1 \) companies to arrive at their index of average time spent viewing a position posting. Across participants, the average amount of time spent on each individual position posting was 1 minute and 19 seconds (SD = 21 seconds).

To test Hypotheses 9a-9c, average amount of time spent per position page was assessed for individuals in the four study conditions using ANOVA, and planned comparisons between (a) those receiving fit feedback (conditions 2 and 4) and those not receiving fit feedback (conditions 1 and 3), (b) those receiving information in a customized order (conditions 3 and 4) and those not receiving information in a
customized order (conditions 1 and 2), and (c) those receiving fit feedback and receiving information in a customized order (condition 4), and all others (conditions 1-3) were conducted. The omnibus $F$ failed to reach significance, and mean time data across conditions revealed that participants spent an equivalent amount of time per position posting regardless of the study condition in which they had been placed, $F(3, 343) = .071, p > .10$, cell means (in seconds) = 79.59 for condition 1, 78.59 for condition 2, 78.40 for condition 3, and 79.46 for condition 4. None of the planned comparisons were significant, failing to support Hypothesis 9a, $t(343) = .015, p > .10$, Hypothesis 9b, $t(343) = -.070, p > .10$, and Hypothesis 9c, $t(343) = .231, p > .10$.

**Job Seeker Satisfaction (Hypotheses 10a-10c)**

Hypotheses 10a-10c predicted that when customized information regarding likely fit with a job or organization is provided to job seekers, or fit dimension information is presented in a customized order, job seeker satisfaction with their experience browsing the job board will be enhanced compared to when customized information is not provided. Results of ANOVA failed to support these hypotheses.

An omnibus $F$ test was run to compare average levels of job seeker satisfaction across the four conditions. In addition, planned comparisons between (a) those receiving fit feedback (conditions 2 and 4) and those not receiving fit feedback (conditions 1 and 3), (b) those receiving information in a customized order (conditions 3 and 4) and those not receiving information in a customized order (conditions 1 and 2), and (c) those receiving fit feedback and receiving information in a customized order (condition 4), and all others (conditions 1-3) were conducted. The omnibus $F$ failed to reach significance, and mean satisfaction data across conditions revealed that participants indicated an
equivalent amount of satisfaction regardless of the study condition in which they had been placed, \( F(3, 343) = .21, p > .10, \) cell means = 3.10 for condition 1, 3.13 for condition 2, 3.17 for condition 3, and 3.09 for condition 4. None of the planned comparisons were significant, failing to support Hypothesis 10a, \( t(343) = -.297, p > .10, \) Hypothesis 10b, \( t(343) = .169, p > .10, \) and Hypothesis 10c, \( t(343) = -.487, p > .10. \)

**Applicant Pool Size (Hypotheses 11a-11c)**

Hypotheses 11a-11c predicted that organizations offering fit feedback information to job seekers and/or customizing the order in which information about fit is presented to job seekers would experience reduced applicant pools compared to organizations not offering such information. These hypotheses were not supported.

To generate applicant pools for each of the companies created for purposes of this study, the following steps were taken. First, applications were stamped into an electronic dataset once subjects submitted their application on the Web site. These stamps listed the subject number and the company they had applied to. Applications totaled 1,768 across participants (\( M = 5.08, \ SD = 3.06. \) Next, these applications were sorted according to (a) company and (b) condition such that for each of the 40 companies in the study in each of the four study conditions, the total number of applications was tabulated (yielding 160 total applicant pools). Finally, these applicant pool figures were converted to application rates (i.e., percentages) to enable equivalent comparisons across study conditions because of slight variations in subjects per condition (e.g., 43 participants were in Condition 1 in Wave 1, whereas 42 participants were in Condition 3 in Wave 2). These percentages were calculated as the total number of applications to a given company in a given condition divided by the total number of possible applications that could have been made...
to that company (i.e., the total number of participants in a given wave and condition who actually viewed that company). Average application rate was .25 (SD = .11) across the 160 applicant pools.

Using the application rates for each of the 160 applicant pools generated, ANOVA with planned comparisons was conducted between (a) those receiving fit feedback (conditions 2 and 4) and those not receiving fit feedback (conditions 1 and 3), (b) those receiving information in a customized order (conditions 3 and 4) and those not receiving information in a customized order (conditions 1 and 2), and (c) those receiving fit feedback and receiving information in a customized order (condition 4), and all others (conditions 1-3). The omnibus F failed to reach significance, and mean application rate data across conditions revealed that participants applied to companies at an equivalent rate regardless of the study condition in which they had been placed, F(3, 156) = .682, p > .10, cell means = .27 for condition 1, .25 for condition 2, .24 for condition 3, and .26 for condition 4). None of the planned comparisons were significant, failing to support Hypothesis 11a, t(156) = -.022, p > .10, Hypothesis 11b, t(156) = -.766, p > .10, and Hypothesis 11c, t(156) = .242, p > .10.

Applicant Pool Fit (Hypotheses 12a-12c)

Hypotheses 12a-12c examined whether or not differences existed across study conditions in terms of overall applicant pool fit for the 40 companies used. Because participants viewed these 40 companies across four study conditions, a total of 160 total applicant pools were again available for analysis. To create an overall measure of applicant pool fit for these 160 applicant pools, the actual fit indices for each participant who had applied to a given company within a given condition were averaged (Carlson et
al., 2002). For example, to assess applicant pool values fit, actual values fit across participants who had applied to each of the companies within each of the study conditions was averaged. Average applicant pool fit across the entire sample of 160 pools was 59.55% (SD = 13.01) for values fit, 53.81% (SD = 18.91) for needs fit, and 59.88% (SD = 13.53) for KSA fit.

Because these analyses involved a mean comparison between two groups, independent samples t-tests were used to assess mean differences in applicant pool fit when companies provided or did not provide fit feedback information. Results provided support for Hypotheses 12a and 12c, but failed to support Hypothesis 12b. Specifically, organizations that provided fit feedback information to job seekers had better fitting applicant pools in terms of values fit, t (158) = 2.95, p < .01, d = .47. The mean applicant pool values fit in feedback conditions was 62.52% whereas it was 56.59% in non-feedback conditions. Also, organizations providing feedback had better fitting applicant pools in terms of KSA fit, t (158) = 3.11, p < .01, d = .49, M (feedback conditions) = 63.12%, M (non-feedback conditions) = 56.64%. On the other hand, organizations providing fit feedback information did not significantly differ from those not providing fit feedback information in terms of their overall applicant pool needs fit (M = 55.78% for feedback conditions and M = 51.84% for non-feedback conditions, t (158) = 1.32, p > .10.

Table 5.17 presents an overview of the hypotheses and results presented above. In Chapter 6, these findings are discussed.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Actual fit in terms of KSA congruence will be positively associated with perceived P-J fit</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Actual fit in terms of needs congruence will be positively associated with perceived P-O fit</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Actual fit in terms of values congruence will be positively associated with perceived P-O fit</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a</td>
<td>The relationship between actual KSA fit and perceived P-J fit will be moderated by the degree to which KSA fit feedback information is customized to the individual. The relationship will be strengthened when customized fit feedback information is provided as compared to when it is not provided.</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b</td>
<td>The relationship between actual needs fit and perceived P-O fit will be moderated by the degree to which needs fit feedback information is customized to the individual. The relationship will be strengthened when customized fit feedback information is provided as compared to when it is not provided.</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4c</td>
<td>The relationship between actual values fit and perceived P-O fit will be moderated by the degree to which values fit feedback information is customized to the individual. The relationship will be strengthened when customized fit feedback information is provided as compared to when it is not provided.</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5a</td>
<td>The provision of recruitment information in a customized versus non-customized configuration will moderate the relationship between actual and perceived KSA fit constructs such that when KSA fit is rated as most important by job seekers, the actual/perceived fit relationship will be stronger when the configuration is customized compared to when it is not, whereas when KSA fit is rated as least important, the actual/perceived fit relationship will be weaker when the configuration is customized compared to when it is not.</td>
<td>Not Supported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.17: Summary of study hypotheses and findings
Table 5.17 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>The provision of recruitment information in a customized versus non-customized configuration will moderate the relationship between actual and perceived needs fit constructs such that when needs fit is rated as most important by job seekers, the actual/perceived fit relationship will be stronger when the configuration is customized compared to when it is not, whereas when needs fit is rated as least important, the actual/perceived fit relationship will be weaker when the configuration is customized compared to when it is not</th>
<th>Not Supported</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5c</td>
<td>The provision of recruitment information in a customized versus non-customized configuration will moderate the relationship between actual and perceived values fit constructs such that when values fit is rated as most important by job seekers, the actual/perceived fit relationship will be stronger when the configuration is customized compared to when it is not, whereas when values fit is rated as least important, the actual/perceived fit relationship will be weaker when the configuration is customized compared to when it is not</td>
<td>Not Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Perceived P-J fit will be positively associated with applying to an organization</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Perceived P-O fit will be positively associated with applying to an organization</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8a</td>
<td>Perceived P-J fit will mediate the relationship between actual KSA fit and application decisions</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8b</td>
<td>Perceived P-O fit will mediate the relationship between actual needs fit and application decisions</td>
<td>Partially Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8c</td>
<td>Perceived P-O fit will mediate the relationship between actual values fit and application decisions</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9a</td>
<td>Job seeker search costs will be lower when job seekers use a Web-based recruitment system that provides customized fit feedback information, compared to when they use one that does not provide customized fit feedback information</td>
<td>Not Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9b</td>
<td>Job seeker search costs will be lower when job seekers use a Web-based recruitment system that portrays information in a customized order, compared to when they use one that does not portray information in a customized order</td>
<td>Not Supported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Continued
Table 5.17 continued

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9c</td>
<td>Job seeker search costs will be the lowest when job seekers use a Web-based recruitment system that provides customized fit feedback information, and portrays that information in a customized order</td>
<td>Not Supported</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10a</td>
<td>Job seekers will be more satisfied with a Web-based recruitment system that provides customized fit feedback information, compared to one that does not provide customized fit feedback information</td>
<td>Not Supported</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10b</td>
<td>Job seekers will be more satisfied with a Web-based recruitment system that portrays information in a customized order, compared to one that does not portray information in a customized order</td>
<td>Not Supported</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10c</td>
<td>Job seekers will be the most satisfied with a Web-based recruitment system that provides customized fit feedback information, and portrays that information in a customized order</td>
<td>Not Supported</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11a</td>
<td>Organizations providing customized fit feedback information to job seekers via Web-based job boards will have reduced applicant pools compared to organizations not providing customized fit feedback information</td>
<td>Not Supported</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11b</td>
<td>Organizations portraying information in a customized order to job seekers via Web-based job boards will have reduced applicant pools compared to organizations not portraying information in a customized order</td>
<td>Not Supported</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11c</td>
<td>Organizations providing customized fit feedback information, and portraying information in a customized order will have the smallest applicant pools</td>
<td>Not Supported</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12a</td>
<td>Organizations providing customized fit feedback information to job seekers via Web-based job boards will have better fitting applicant pools in terms of actual KSA fit compared to organizations that do not provide customized fit feedback information</td>
<td>Supported</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12b</td>
<td>Organizations providing customized fit feedback information to job seekers via Web-based job boards will have better fitting applicant pools in terms of actual needs fit compared to organizations that do not provide customized fit feedback information</td>
<td>Not Supported</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12c</td>
<td>Organizations providing customized fit feedback information to job seekers via Web-based job boards will have better fitting applicant pools in terms of actual values fit compared to organizations that do not provide customized fit feedback information</td>
<td>Supported</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 6
DISCUSSION

This chapter provides a discussion of the findings and relates them to the original objectives of the dissertation. The chapter begins with an overview of the findings, and includes a discussion of their theoretical implications. Next, the limitations of the study and suggestions for future research are presented. The chapter concludes with practical implications of the study results.

Overview of Findings

The use of the World Wide Web for recruitment purposes has increased greatly in recent years, and research has not adequately addressed the potential theoretical and practical implications of leveraging Web technology in various ways to enhance outcomes for individual job seekers and organizations. Consistent with the original purposes stated in Chapter 1, this dissertation extends past work that has begun to investigate Web-based recruitment (e.g., Cober et al., 2001; Dineen et al., 2002; Feldman & Klaas, 2002; Scheu et al., 1999) in several ways. First, it investigated several relationships previously studied in contexts other than the Web. Second, it drew upon past theory and research to suggest two ways in which organizations might leverage Web technology to provide customized information to job seekers. Third, it assessed
relationships at three levels of analysis (job application decision level, individual and organizational levels).

The study findings suggest that job seekers are able to relate their actual, measured level of fit with organizations on three fit dimensions (values, needs, and KSAs) to their perceptions of P-O and P-J fit. This is consistent with prior research that has consistently found this pattern of results in non-Web-based (e.g., Judge & Cable, 1997) as well as Web-based contexts (e.g., Dineen et al., 2002). Also consistent with previous research studies, job seekers’ perceptions of both P-O and P-J fit related to actual application decisions, and fit perceptions fully mediated the effects of actual, measured fit on application decisions with regards to values and KSA fit, and partially mediated the effects of actual needs fit on application decisions. However, this is the first known study to establish these latter two sets of relationships in a Web-based context, making it an important extension of previous work. In addition, the fact that relationships between actual fit, perceived fit, and applications were similar to those found in prior research suggests that the Web site used in this study exhibited a degree of external validity, and that participants were spending a reasonable amount of time (M = 79.02 seconds) evaluating position advertisements.

**Customized Fit Feedback as a Conduit for Enhanced Actual – Perceived Fit Relationships**

Whereas the finding that actual fit relates to perceived fit is consistent with past research and theory and extends that past work to include Web-based contexts, the Web also offers some means of potentially enhancing the link between actual and perceived fit. Specifically, Web technology allows for the customization of recruitment information to individual job seekers, a capability previously unavailable to recruiters.
using traditional media such as newspapers or billboard advertisements. In fact, the Web might be considered to be a fundamentally different recruitment source because of this capability. According to theories of message elaboration (Petty & Cacioppo, 1986) and systematic/heuristic information processing (Chaiken & Stangor, 1987), such customized information is likely to be more centrally processed due to its personal relevance and related to attitudinal or perceptual outcomes (such as perceived fit) to a greater degree.

This dissertation built on these precepts by introducing customized fit information as a treatment condition. This fit information was customized to individual participants such that they received feedback based on responses to a pre-questionnaire. The feedback indicated their likely fit with the positions they viewed on three dimensions. Results were consistent with theory in that the provision of this fit feedback enhanced the link between actual and perceived measures of fit. It is likely that participants in feedback conditions were elaborating on the customized information provided to them, and relating this information more directly to perceptions of fit. The ELM model suggests that personally-relevant information is more carefully processed, which appears to be the case in the present study.

Specifically, the link between actual KSA fit and perceived P-J fit was enhanced in the presence of customized fit feedback, as were the links between actual needs fit and perceived P-O fit, and actual values fit and perceived P-O fit. Effect sizes for the links between actual KSA and values fit, and fit perceptions (P-J and P-O respectively) were noticeably stronger than the effect size for the interaction of actual needs fit and fit feedback on perceived P-O fit. This would seem to indicate that the provision of
feedback regarding likely fit with the benefits provided by an organization does not really change a job seekers’ ability to relate their actual needs fit to their perceived P-O fit.

There are several possible explanations for the lower observed effect size for the needs fit interaction with fit feedback, compared to the effect size involving KSA and values fit interactions. First, the manner in which benefits information was portrayed on the Web site might have made the relative offering of benefits by the companies more salient to job seekers than other types of information such as values or KSAs. More specifically, benefits mix characteristics were assigned percentage values representing the overall percentage of the benefits mix offered by the organization (see Appendices B and C). Thus, the receipt of feedback regarding likely fit might not have made as much difference when the information was already fairly salient to job seekers.

Second, recent research by Cable and DeRue (2002) has suggested that employees develop perceptions of three different types of fit, including P-O fit, needs-supplies fit, and demands-abilities fit. They suggest that, whereas past work has tended to focus on two dimensions of perceived fit (P-O and P-J; e.g., Saks & Ashforth, 2002) future work should concentrate on discriminating among these three types of fit. While these three types of fit map onto the three dimensions of actual fit selected for use in this study (values, needs, and KSAs, respectively), they do not map cleanly onto the two fit perception measures used in this study (i.e., P-J and P-O fit). The Cable and DeRue (2002) study, along with the lower effect size for the needs fit interaction described above, suggest that the P-O fit perception measure might have been better conceptualized as two distinct constructs (i.e., P-O fit, or values fit, and needs-supplies fit). It is
important to note that a key difference between the Cable and DeRue (2002) study and the current study is that Cable and DeRue used organizational incumbents as their sample, rather than job seekers. Thus, it remains to be determined whether job seekers are able to make as fine-grained a differentiation among these three perceived fit dimensions as incumbents, especially when they have little experience with or information about the organizations with which they are seeking employment.

Nonetheless, Cable and DeRue’s (2002) results suggest that each of the three dimensions of fit be assessed in terms of perceptions with a separate scale. That is, instead of relating both actual needs and values fit to perceived P-O fit, as was done in this study, future research might be better served by relating actual needs fit to perceived needs-supplies fit, actual values fit to perceived P-O fit (operationalized only in terms of values), and actual KSA fit to perceived demands-abilities fit.

Third, the nature of the fit perception questionnaire may have caused participants to relate actual values fit more closely than actual needs fit to perceived P-O fit. This is because, of the three items that assessed perceived P-O fit, the first was a question about how well the values of the organization match the participants’ values (see Appendix H). The second question then assessed the extent to which the organization would likely fulfill needs. Thus, in an effort to appear consistent, participants might have tended to answer the needs-related question similarly to the values-related question, and, if their actual needs fit was different than their actual values fit, this might in part explain why actual values fit was related more strongly than actual needs fit to perceived P-O fit.

Finally, by operationalizing needs in terms of a benefits mix, the range of needs was likely not fully covered. For example, challenge, opportunity for advancement or a
need for achievement may be specific needs of individuals, but are not typically included in a benefits mix and were not part of the position descriptions in the current study.

Thus, participants may have been looking for other characteristics in addition to benefits to assess needs fit.

Looking more closely at the form of the interactions involving actual fit and fit feedback, it is interesting to note the differences between the feedback and non-feedback conditions at low and high levels of actual fit (see Figures 5.1 and 5.3). The interaction plots suggest that there is greater distance between those in feedback and non-feedback conditions in terms of fit perceptions when actual fit is one standard deviation below the mean, as compared to when it is one standard deviation above the mean. More specifically, it appears that fit feedback is a relatively better aid to those who exhibit a low actual fit with an organization (in terms of KSAs and values), than it is to those who exhibit a high actual fit. This nuance in the present findings relates to findings revealed by a reanalysis of data collected by Dineen, Ash, and Noe (2000b). These data compared the effects of false feedback regarding P-O fit and actual P-O fit on attraction. Results of correlational analysis showed that actual P-O fit related more strongly to attraction in the high fit feedback condition ($r = .34, p < .01$) than it did in the low fit feedback condition ($r = .17, p > .10$). This suggests that in the low fit feedback condition participants were attending less to their actual fit, and were likely attending more to the false (negative) feedback being provided.

The fact that fit feedback seems to make a larger difference for those with low actual fit than it does for those with high actual fit also relates to theory and research
involving the negativity and extremity biases (e.g., Fiske, 1980; Herr, Kardes, & Kim, 1991; Skowronski & Carlston, 1989). These biases suggest that individuals attend to information that is negative and/or extreme to a greater degree than positive information. The effects are enhanced to an even greater degree when cues are self-diagnostic (Skowronski & Carlston, 1989; Yawny, 2000). In addition, Ahluwalia, Unnava, and Burnkrant (2001) suggest that negative information, because it is more useful in categorizing for consumer decisions, is given greater weight than positive information.

A low level of fit feedback might be considered both negative (because it suggests that an individual would not fit with an organization or job), and extreme (because it is not common for recruitment messages to contain negative information). Indeed, when a person has a high actual fit in terms of KSAs or values, they seem to be able to relate this level of fit to their perceptions to a similar degree regardless of whether fit feedback is provided. When actual fit is low, however, the feedback provided to the job seeker on the Web site is also low by definition. That is, when positive levels of explicit fit feedback are provided to job seekers, they may not attend to this information as much because it is not perceived to be as useful or differentiating than negative feedback, which might explain why fit perceptions did not vary as much between those in fit and non-fit feedback conditions who had a high level of actual fit. When negative levels of fit feedback are provided, however, individuals appear to exhibit a negativity and/or extremity bias in attending to this information to a greater degree. This is consistent with the greater variance in fit perceptions between those in fit and non-fit feedback conditions who had a low level of actual fit.
In general, the findings outlined thus far support Schneider’s (1987) ASA model and Byrne’s (1971) similarity-attraction theory in suggesting that individuals select themselves into organizations that are attractive based on perceptions of fitting in with organizational incumbents or with the demands of the job or benefits offered. Key extensions of this dissertation include the examination of these issues in a Web-based context and the merging of traditional and Web-based recruitment research with research and theory in the area of cognitive information processing.

To date, the ASA and similarity-attraction theories have largely relied on the assumption that people make inferences about their level of fit based upon widely available information provided to a population of job seekers about an organization or job. That is, people are attracted to organizations and jobs that appear to have people or characteristics similar to what the job seeker stands for, needs, and can demonstrate. This dissertation extends these theoretical perspectives by suggesting that when organizations are able to make the information provided to job seekers personally-relevant through customization, they likely facilitate deeper processing of that information, creating stronger links between what an organization actually offers or stands for and what a job seeker perceives. That is, personal relevance essentially replaces the inferences associated with prior work that has drawn on these theoretical perspectives with concrete information that is customized to the individual job seeker.

Also from a theoretical perspective, the present results extend work that has begun specifically in the realm of Web-based recruitment. Specifically, they provide further support for the suggestion that the Web represents not just a new recruitment source in need of study, but a fundamentally different recruitment medium with a
different set of theoretical principles underlying its use. Dineen et al. (2002) provided an initial examination of the issue of customization, and drew upon the systematic/heuristic framework (Chaiken & Stangor, 1987) to show that customized fit feedback related to attraction in predicted directions. This study also considers the ELM model (Petty & Cacioppo, 1986), and in doing so extends previous Web-based recruitment work that, while informative, has only tended to examine issues of aesthetics (e.g., Scheu et al., 1999; Zusman & Landis, 2002).

Customization of the Order in Which Information is Presented

Aside from assessing the effects of customizing information regarding likely fit to job seekers, this dissertation also examined the customization of the order in which information on the three dimensions of fit was presented to job seekers. Specifically, as opposed to when the order in which information is presented is not customized, the study proposed that when job seekers are given the opportunity to receive information in a customized order, they will tend to link their actual fit to fit perceptions to a greater degree on dimensions that are most important to them. Moreover, they will link their actual fit to fit perceptions to a lesser degree on dimensions that are least important to them.

Although non-significant findings are reported in Chapter 5, it is noteworthy that one of the three triple interaction hypothesis tests approached significance in the expected direction. Specifically, the relationship between actual KSA fit and perceived P-J fit was enhanced when KSA fit was judged to be the most important fit dimension and when fit information was presented to job seekers in a customized order, whereas it was weakened when KSA fit was judged to be the least important fit dimension and information was...
presented in a customized order ($\beta = .11$, $\Delta R^2 = .001$, $p < .06$). An additional post-hoc analysis was conducted to further explore this relationship. In particular, instead of looking at how actual KSA fit relates to P-J fit perceptions under the various circumstances hypothesized, the degree to which order customization and most/least preferred fit dimensions might moderate the direct relationship between actual fit constructs and application decisions was examined using logistic regression analysis.

In doing so, the triple interaction of (a) order customization (b) whether KSA fit was the most or least important fit dimension and (c) actual KSA fit was discovered to be significantly related to application decisions ($\chi^2 = 7.98$, df = 1, $p < .01$, Cox and Snell $R^2 = .03$, odds ratio = 1.80). Thus, if the interaction of ordered information, importance of KSA fit, and actual KSA fit increases by one standard deviation unit, the odds of someone applying to an organization increase by a factor of 1.80 (Pampel, 2000). More specifically, the relationship between actual KSA fit and perceived P-J fit approached significance (and, post hoc, the relationship between actual KSA fit and application decisions was significant) and was stronger when (a) KSAs were the most important fit dimension to the job seeker and (b) order customization was made available to the job seeker. Alternatively, when order customization was made available, but KSAs were the least important fit dimension to the job seeker, the actual KSA – perceived P-J fit (actual KSA – application decisions) link was weaker than it was when no order customization was made available.

There are two possible explanations for why the results of these hypotheses tests were not stronger for KSA fit and did not manifest for values or needs fit. First, the nature of the Web site design was such that in browsing each page and making
application decisions, participants were forced to browse from the top to bottom of each page because the icons to either (a) apply or (b) not apply and return to the home page were located at the bottom of each page (instead of to the side or at the top, for example). Thus, even if certain dimensions of fit were less important to job seekers, they still were forced to view this information, at least in passing. Lynch and Horton (1999) suggested that Web visitors in general establish hurdles and do not usually scroll beyond what is immediately visible when entering a site. However, they did not specifically discuss site setup and how placing hyperlinks to exit the page at the bottom (as was done in the present study) might influence these results.

Also, the position information related to the least important fit dimension, because it was presented last in customized ordering conditions, was likely the last piece of information regarding fit that a job seeker viewed before making fit perception assessments and application decisions. For example, if values were the least important fit dimension to Job Seeker A, and Job Seeker A was in a customized ordering condition, then that job seeker consistently viewed values fit information just prior to the application hyperlink (i.e., at the bottom of each position posting). There is the possibility that a recency effect could be occurring (Greene, 1986), such that last-viewed information could have been influencing fit perceptions and application decisions and effectively canceling out hypothesized effects, even though the job seeker had originally indicated this particular dimension of fit to be less important.

In terms of compensatory and non-compensatory theories of decision making, it is logical that the moderated relationship between actual KSA fit and P-J fit perceptions only approached significance, whereas the moderated relationship between actual KSA
fit and application decisions (examined post-hoc) was significant at a conventional level and exhibited a greater effect. This is because individuals’ fit perceptions might not be subject to the setting of hurdles to the same extent as their application decisions. That is, a person may still view all of the information presented (whether preferred or not) in assessing fit, and may only establish hurdles when making actual application decisions. Thus, in terms of KSA fit, it is likely that individuals still assessed their P-J fit perceptions by evaluating the KSAs needed by the organization regardless of whether they preferred to view KSA information or not. However, in deciding whether or not to actually apply for the job, they may have discounted or even ignored KSA information if it was not preferred, in line with non-compensatory hurdles. Although this logic is supported by the post-hoc results involving KSA fit, questions remain with regards to why a similar effect was not found with values or needs fit.

On balance, compared to the support found for the customization of fit feedback, there is not as much support for the benefits of customizing the order in which information is presented. This fails to provide support for a non-compensatory decision making perspective, and instead supports a compensatory decision making perspective. However, Barber (1998) took a more middle-ground approach in suggesting that some job characteristics are likely compensatory and others non-compensatory. In light of the present results and Barber’s theorizing, it appears that KSA information exhibits a greater tendency to be non-compensatory, whereas tradeoffs in terms of values and/or benefits might be possible among job seekers, suggesting a compensatory view of these fit dimensions. Of course, future research will need to demonstrate stronger support for these suggestions before more firm conclusions can be made. This research should also
address the possibility of individual differences among job seekers in terms of whether they tend to employ non-compensatory hurdles, and if so, for which fit dimensions.

Individual Level Outcomes

This dissertation, while assessing individual fit perceptions and application decisions made across a series of positions by job seekers, also assessed two outcomes at the individual level of analysis. Specifically, results of hypothesis tests examining potential differences among treatment conditions in terms of job seeker search costs (operationalized as the time job seekers spent viewing the position postings) and job seeker satisfaction with the job board as a whole failed to reach significance.

Job seeker search costs. First, the results of analyses using objective time stamp data that tracked the exact time job seekers spent in position posting pages failed to uncover any differences among conditions. This was surprising if one considers the potential for fit feedback information to decrease search costs incurred by job seekers by providing them with direct information with which to make better decisions. Stigler (1961), and more recently, Rangan (2000) and Lievens and Harris (in press) all suggest the presence of these costs, and suggest that better information provided to job seekers is likely to decrease them.

To further investigate potential reasons why overall job seeker search costs did not differ by condition, post-hoc analyses that examined the time spent on the first versus the last position posting individuals viewed were conducted. Indeed, participants in fit feedback conditions actually had more total information to consume than participants in non-feedback conditions. That is, non-feedback condition participants simply read the information available about the position, whereas feedback condition participants read
this same information and also received information regarding likely fit on the three primary dimensions of fit. Therefore, it is possible that participants in the feedback conditions spent some time early on trying to figure out how accurate the feedback information was by comparing it to what was written about the position represented. Thus, it is also possible that feedback condition participants spent more time at first than non-feedback condition participants viewing position postings, but that over time, this difference disappeared. In fact, over time, those receiving feedback might end up taking less time to view advertisements once they are familiar with the fit feedback and have decided that it is being presented accurately. Thus, longitudinally, the original hypothesis might receive a measure of support.

To conduct a post-hoc analysis to investigate this possibility, the time stamp data for each participant for the first position they viewed and the last position they viewed were analyzed. Using this time stamp data representing the first and last position a participant viewed, a moderated hierarchical regression analysis revealed a significant interaction of position (first or last) and feedback condition (received or did not receive fit feedback), as shown in Figure 6.1 ($\beta = .19$, $\Delta R^2 = .01$, $p < .01$). Specifically, the illustrated means show that the difference in time spent browsing the first and last position posting for those in non-feedback conditions was 83.27 seconds, whereas the mean difference between the first and last position posting for those in feedback conditions was 114.73.
Figure 6.1: Average time spent on the first and last position viewed

This post-hoc analysis helps explain the null results of Hypotheses 9a and 9c. Specifically, tests of these hypotheses failed to find any mean differences between conditions when average time spent viewing position postings was collapsed across the entire session. However, the procedure used to calculate time spent by people in different conditions appears to have masked an important effect. That is, whereas there were no differences in overall average time spent, there were differences in time spent early in the session versus late in the session, and these differences reversed themselves among conditions, creating a crossed interaction. This suggests that those receiving fit feedback information might carefully process that information at first, weighing it against the other information presented about the positions and causing them to spend a longer time on earlier-viewed position postings. However, over time, these individuals are able to more
efficiently use this fit feedback information to decrease their search costs to the extent that by the end of the session, they are spending slightly less time per position posting than those who do not receive feedback. Specifically, the ratio between feedback and non-feedback condition participants in terms of time spent was 1.21 for the first position posting and .89 for the last position posting.

Thus, while the provision of fit feedback might not provide a job seeker a time advantage at first (and may even increase the time they initially spend browsing position postings), over time the fit feedback does appear to more sharply decrease job seeker search costs in terms of time spent to a point slightly lower than those not receiving fit feedback. A possible reason why the time difference is less between the two conditions for the last position viewed (compared to the first position viewed) might have been due to the constrained nature of the one-hour laboratory session. That is, there was a built in time deadline such that participants may have artificially slowed down or sped up their browsing towards the end as they sensed the approaching deadline (or realized that they had plenty of time left and were not able to leave early). In essence, the “costs” perceived by participants in the study could have been little more than the hour of time they were required to be in the laboratory. The results of this post hoc analysis suggest that future research should continue to investigate search cost dynamics over time. Future investigations should also broaden the measurement of search costs to include other potential costs incurred by job seekers in trying to discern the characteristics of organizations, such as monetary costs and potential costs related to feedback seeking behavior.
Job seeker satisfaction. Job seeker satisfaction also did not exhibit any differences across conditions, counter to predictions suggested by the RJP and signaling literatures (Spence, 1973; Wanous, 1992). These literatures suggest that job seekers interpret cues in their environment and make inferences about organizations based on these cues. For example, realistic information is thought to enhance perceptions of caring and honesty on the part of the organization towards the job seeker, ostensibly leading to greater satisfaction with the recruitment process among job seekers.

One explanation for this result is that this study differed from research that has been conducted on signaling and RJP's. That is, the realistic information in this study was self-diagnostic as opposed to broadly and similarly provided to all job seekers. For example, a traditional RJP presents information about a job that all potential job seekers are likely to experience, and presents the same information to each job seeker (e.g., a video clip of a “day in the life” of a forklift operator at a General Electric warehouse). On the other hand, customized fit feedback is self-diagnostic in that it presents realistic information about potential fit that is targeted to the individual job seeker and sets him/her apart from everyone else (e.g., forklift operator A’s benefits preferences may be a low match with what the organization offers, whereas forklift operator B’s benefits preferences are a high match). If this information is negative (as it was for some of the positions for every participant in the present study, based on the study design) and the job seeker realizes that not everyone is receiving similar negative information, the job seeker may feel as if he or she is somehow being singled out and, instead of caring and concern, may perceive that the organization is not interested in them as a potential employee. Perhaps the psychological mechanisms underlying signaling and RJP’s change in a Web-
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based environment where these RJP s are customized to individual job seekers. Future research needs to investigate more comprehensively job seeker attributions and reactions to fit feedback.

A post hoc analysis was also conducted to further investigate why satisfaction had not exhibited differences across fit feedback conditions. In addition to the primary study variables measured for purposes of this dissertation, a measure of the agreement level of participants in conditions who had received fit feedback had also been assessed on the concluding questionnaire. This measure consisted of two questions originally used by Dineen et al. (2002) (“Overall, to what extent did you agree with the evaluations of your fit provided by the site?” and “How accurate do you feel the assessments of fit were?” 1 = not accurate at all; 3 = neutral; 5 = extremely accurate; coefficient alpha = .87). These items appeared after the satisfaction items on the concluding questionnaire. Given that the correlation between participant satisfaction and agreement with fit feedback among participants in fit feedback conditions was .41 (p < .01), the post hoc analysis investigated whether lower agreement with fit feedback could make individuals relatively less satisfied with their experience on the Web site than those who did not receive any fit feedback, whereas higher agreement might cause individuals to be relatively more satisfied with their experience than those not receiving any fit feedback (which would be consistent with Hypotheses 10a and 10c).

To conduct this analysis, a categorical variable was created representing (a) those in non-feedback conditions, (b) those in feedback conditions who indicated low agreement with the fit feedback (median level of agreement, 3.00), and (c) those in feedback conditions who indicated high agreement with the fit feedback. Next, ANOVA
was conducted to examine differences in mean satisfaction levels among these three
groups of participants. Results were supportive of the suggestion that agreement exhibits
a moderating effect, such that when agreement with fit feedback was low, satisfaction
tended to be lower than when no feedback was provided at all. On the other hand, when
agreement with feedback was high, satisfaction tended to be higher than when no
feedback was provided. Specifically, the omnibus $F$ test was significant, $F (2, 334) = 9.92, p < .01$, and Tukey’s HSD post-hoc comparisons revealed significant differences
among all three categories of individuals. As illustrated in Figure 6.2, the satisfaction
cell means were 3.14 for those in non-feedback conditions, 2.88 for those in feedback
conditions who indicated lower agreement with the fit feedback provided to them, and
3.42 for those in feedback conditions who indicated higher agreement with the fit
feedback. Because these three cells had unequal N’s, the harmonic mean was used in
calculating these post-hoc mean differences.
Thus, similar to analyses conducted post-hoc to Hypotheses 9a-9c, this analysis uncovered an important moderating effect that was masked by the straight comparison of mean satisfaction levels among the four study conditions. It suggests that the original hypothesis regarding fit feedback and satisfaction does receive support, but only if fit feedback is provided in such a way to engender sufficient agreement with that feedback.

In addition, this post-hoc finding relates to the Dineen et al. (2002) finding that agreement moderates the joint relationship of (a) P-O fit feedback level and (b) actual P-O fit on attraction. Specifically, Dineen et al. found that when agreement with feedback was higher, the feedback, rather than one’s actual P-O fit, was more predictive of attraction, whereas when agreement was lower, actual P-O fit, rather than fit feedback level, was more predictive of attraction. In the present study, it appears that agreement

Figure 6.2: The effect of agreement with fit feedback on overall satisfaction levels
with feedback once again plays an important moderating role, this time in predicting one’s satisfaction with their experience on a job board that provides fit feedback.

Finally, it was also initially surprising that job seekers who received information in a customized order were not more satisfied overall than job seekers who were not recipients of order customization (Hypothesis 10b). However, in light of the results of Hypotheses 5a-5c, this tends to make some sense. Recall that these findings tended to cast doubt on the non-compensatory perspective of decision making for values and needs fit dimensions, instead lending more support to a compensatory perspective on these dimensions. On the other hand, results related to KSA fit did more closely follow a non-compensatory decision making pattern. These mixed findings are consistent with Barber’s (1998) suggestion that some job characteristics may be compensatory and others non-compensatory. They further suggest that, due to the fact that two of the three fit dimensions followed more of a compensatory pattern, ordering of information may have been less important, as job seekers still needed to view all of the information in order to assess P-O fit perceptions and make applications decisions. As a result, if customized ordering was less important, it follows that satisfaction would not differ as much whether customized ordering was offered or not.

Organizational Level Outcomes

The design of this dissertation also allowed for organizational level outcomes to be assessed, including applicant pool size and applicant pool fit in terms of the three fit dimensions examined.

**Applicant pool size.** Potential differences in applicant pool size across conditions were examined. Specifically, it was posited that organizations providing customized fit
feedback information and/or information presented in a customized order would experience smaller applicant pools overall than organizations not providing these types of customization. For this analysis, an index representing application rate was created to serve as a proxy for applicant pool size and equalize comparisons across conditions. Results revealed no significant differences in application rate across conditions.

The rationale for the hypothesis regarding applicant pool size was that individuals receiving customized information would be able to make finer-grained application decisions because they would possess better, more relevant information with which to make those decisions. According to an information search cost perspective (Stigler, 1961), individuals were predicted to apply to the fewest positions possible while still maintaining enough confidence in their chances of ending up in the “right” organization. Also, the RJP literature has suggested that self-selection likely results from realistic previews, such that the provision of realistic information might cause people to reject job opportunities (e.g., Premack & Wanous, 1985). This seemed even more likely in the present context given that the RJP s provided were provided prior to applications being made (whereas traditional RJP s are offered after applications are made), and thus job seekers had not incurred any sunk costs in the process. However, a key difference between traditional RJP s and the RJP s in the present study is that traditional RJP s focus mostly on unfavorable information (or, at least, do not usually focus on highly positive information) whereas the fit feedback provided in this study varied from highly negative (e.g., 10% fit) to highly positive (e.g., 90% fit). Thus effects might have cancelled out, causing application rates among feedback-providing organizations to converge with application rates among non-feedback-providing organizations.
In addition to this possibility, four other issues may have led in part to the failure to find support for this hypothesis. First, the study design was such that participants did not actually have a long-term stake in their applications. Thus, there may not have been a sense of urgency in trying to conserve time or energy in the application process because they had to be in the lab for the entire session anyway. Stronger opportunity costs (e.g., being allowed to leave the laboratory immediately after participation was complete versus receiving an award for applying to an appropriate number of jobs to have the best chance of selection) might have made the job board simulation more realistic.

Another explanation is that participants did not have a stake in following up on their applications. That is, the costs involved in applying to one organization versus 18 organizations were contained to the additional time it took to fill out additional application blanks during the hour-long session. Additional costs normally associated with additional applications (e.g., more time spent in follow up, networking, finding out additional information about the company’s financials and so forth) were exactly the same once the participant left the computer laboratory (i.e., zero).

Third, the very issues that were thought to drive satisfaction with the site might have offset effects of decreased search costs described in developing this hypothesis. More specifically, despite the lack of support for hypotheses suggesting greater job seeker satisfaction, participants may have still viewed the fit feedback information as evidence of honesty and caring on the part of organizations providing it, and in turn may have been more willing to apply to such organizations irregardless of the level of fit feedback received. If this is true, it would represent an extension of the RJP literature because RJP research to date has mostly considered RJPs that are broadly made available
to a pool of job seekers, rather than customized to individual job seekers. As noted earlier, research needs to continue to uncover the key differentiating aspects of traditional and customized RJPs, as there are likely fundamentally different psychological mechanisms at work.

Related to this, it is also possible that the acceptable level of fit with an organization might have been lowered when fit feedback information was provided. For example, Participant A might have thought that 50% fit was good enough to apply when they were explicitly provided this type of information in the form of fit feedback. This is a likely explanation based on an examination of the correlation matrix for the decision level variables (Table 5.1). Of particular interest are the negative correlations between fit feedback condition and perceived (a) P-O and (b) P-J fit (point biserial $r$'s -.07 and -.14, respectively, both $p < .01$). That is, when participants received fit feedback, they tended to indicate lower levels of perceived P-O and P-J fit overall, compared to participants who did not receive fit feedback (mean levels of perceived P-O and P-J fit in feedback conditions were 3.02 and 3.09, whereas they were 3.16 and 3.34 in non-feedback conditions). Importantly, overall levels of actual fit were not significantly different between feedback and non-feedback condition participants (as should be the case when participants are randomly assigned to conditions). One would predict that, based on the results of Hypotheses 6 and 7, these lower fit perceptions in feedback conditions would lead to decreased numbers of applications in those conditions. However, application rates were invariant among feedback and non-feedback conditions.

This suggests that, despite lower perceptions of fit among participants receiving fit feedback, these participants continued to apply to organizations at the same rate as
those not receiving feedback, and thus exhibited a lower threshold for allowing fit perceptions to influence application decisions. That is, on average, individuals who received fit feedback were willing to apply to organizations at a similar rate despite lower perceptions of fit than individuals in non-feedback conditions. This suggests that the simple receipt of feedback itself appears to have counteracted any effects based on search cost predictions by actually increasing the total number of applications made by individuals in feedback conditions. That is, search cost considerations were likely related to a lower application rate in feedback conditions, but fit threshold issues simultaneously related to a higher application rate.

Taken together, these two competing effects might have had the overall effect of canceling each other out, yielding the null result found in testing Hypothesis 11. Indeed, had the search cost perspective not held at all, there would likely have been significantly higher application rates in feedback conditions versus non-feedback conditions. In general, individuals’ “thresholds of fit” likely differ such that, for example, one person may view 50% fit feedback more favorably than another. The need to investigate the issue of “what fit means” to different people will be discussed further in the future research section.

**Applicant pool fit.** At the organizational level, applicant pool fit was also examined. Overall, it appears that good application decisions in terms of fit can be enhanced by the provision of customized fit feedback information. These more optimal application decisions can reap benefits for individuals and organizations alike. Specifically, applicant pool fit in terms of values and KSAs was enhanced when organizations provided customized fit feedback information to job seekers, as opposed to
when they did not. This makes sense in light of the support for Hypotheses 4a and 4c. That is, given that the provision of fit feedback tends to bring perceptions of fit more in line with actual, measured fit, and given the fact that perceptions appear to predict application decisions (Hypotheses 6 and 7), it follows that organizational applicant pools should tend to be better fitting overall when customized fit feedback is provided to job seekers. Many recruitment studies have focused on individual level outcomes without examining implications for organizational outcomes (e.g., Barber & Roehling, 1993; Dineen et al., 2002). The design of this study allowed for a merging of these two perspectives, and this set of findings at multiple levels of analysis is a break from tradition and a contribution to our understanding of micro- as well as macro-level phenomena.

**Study Limitations**

There are several limitations to the present study that merit attention. These limitations include issues related to generalizability, the nature of the actual fit constructs, potential for common method variance, and omitted data. In this section, these limitations are described and their implications for the findings and conclusions of the study are discussed.

**Generalizability Issues**

First, the study was conducted in a laboratory context using fictitious organizations created for the study. This introduced several issues that might limit the generalizability of the results. For example, the study participants had no real stake in the process of assessing and applying for the positions represented on the Web site. That is, because participants who were involved in actual job searches were not specifically
recruited to view Web-based position postings, there was no inherent motivation for participants to choose the “right” positions to apply for because they knew that they would not actually be contacted by the organizations and would not interview with or end up working at the organizations.

There was also a limited amount of information provided to participants about the positions depicted on the site. For example, no industry or financial data were presented, nor any salary data or contact information. Some if not all of this sort of information is usually depicted on actual Web-based job boards, and, although participants were asked to assume any missing information was constant across positions viewed, the degree to which additional information was not used due to time restraints and control purposes likely detracted from the overall realism of the site. It might be the case that by letting other characteristics vary (instead of holding them constant), some of the effects found could have been attenuated. For example, fit feedback might not exhibit as much of an effect if salary is listed as low [high]. That is, individuals might be less likely [more likely] to apply to an organization advertising a low [high] salary, regardless of whether feedback regarding likely fit with KSAs is provided.

Also, participants evaluated the position postings in a public setting (in a computer laboratory in groups of 24 participants). It is more likely the case, however, that actual job seeking takes place in a more private environment (e.g., at home, or in a cubicle), rather than in a controlled public setting such as that provided for the study. The participants were limited to upper-level undergraduate students, and thus the generalizability of these results to other populations of job seekers (e.g., middle-level managers, or elderly persons looking for part-time work) may be questionable. Finally,
the organizations created were not “real” organizations. While several steps were taken
to ensure the realism of the position postings (e.g., presenting categories of information
that are consistent with material on actual job boards, sharp graphics, user-friendly
navigation, and so forth), the fact that they were not real detracts from overall study
generalizability.

It is important to note that had actual position postings been used, the level of
experimental control would have likely been compromised. For example, participants
might have recognized company names from actual company postings, and based their
judgments on information not related to the Web-based postings themselves (e.g.,
customer experience, general reputation, etc.). It is also important to note that, while
generalizability may be an issue in this study, the strength of the controlled nature of the
study was in its ability to compare effects across experimental conditions. Thus the real
issue wasn’t as much directed at “where, or among who” the hypothesized effects would
manifest, but rather “if” the effects would manifest in the first place. Controlled
experimental studies provide an appropriate environment for this type of research
question. In fact, researchers are starting to recognize that the balance in fit research may
have swung to the side of too many field studies, and some have claimed that there
"should be more controlled laboratory studies on fit to support the conclusions of the
field studies, and to facilitate the refinement of the measurement of fit" (Posthuma,

Construct Operationalizations

Actual fit. The three fit dimensions (values, needs, and KSAs) were carefully
chosen to be consistent with the types of dimensions presented on actual Web-based job
boards. A content analysis of seven of the top fifty live job boards was conducted to establish the face and content validity of these dimensions. Furthermore, the choice of specific fit characteristics within each of these primary dimensions was based on commonly accepted lists of characteristics (e.g., SHRM benefits survey, O*NET, and the OCP). Extensive pilot data collection also ensured that the characteristics used in the study exhibited differing preference levels among the pool of participants, meeting calls made by researchers to do so (e.g., Rynes & Gerhart, 1990; Tinsley, 2000).

Despite these steps, the actual fit measures were based on only a subset of the characteristics needed to fully capture the construct space. For example, the OCP identifies 40 work values that are thought to represent organizational culture (Cable & Judge, 1996; 54 values in the original version of the OCP; O’Reilly et al., 1991). The measure of actual values fit contained four values from the OCP, but was unable to capture the full domain of values that would be needed to more accurately measure overall fit on this dimension. Of course, it is highly unlikely that any job board position advertisement could adequately capture the full domain of fit on dimensions such as values. That is, a position advertisement is not likely to mention where an organization stands on all 40 of the OCP values.

Aside from the number of characteristics captured by the fit measures, a rank order correlation approach was used to measure fit, such that fit was essentially represented as a set of squared difference terms. While several other researchers have similarly used an ipsative approach to the measurement of fit (e.g., Adkins et al., 1994; Cable & Judge, 1996), others have pointed out the deficiencies of such an approach and have suggested the use of polynomial regression to more cleanly separate the person and
organization/job effects (Edwards, 1993). In this study, for example, Participant A might have held competition as her highest value, with organization a close second, but people-orientation a distant third. The rank order correlation approach treats all these differences as equally spaced, and treats positive and negative discrepancies as being equivalent in their effects, decreasing the reliability of the measure.

**Search costs.** The time spent by job seekers viewing position advertisements was used as a proxy measurement of the search costs incurred in gathering information to make application decisions to organizations. Although the time a job seeker spends engaged in this information search is an important aspect of overall job seeker search costs, and detracts from the consideration of other opportunities (Barber & Roehling, 1993), time is not the only type of search cost involved in job seeking. For example, monetary costs are often involved, or costs in terms of having to ask organizational incumbents about organizational/job characteristics (i.e., similar to feedback seeking behavior). Thus, the measure of search costs was deficient in terms of its coverage of the construct space. Nonetheless, it did capture a key element of overall search costs given the context and purpose of the study.

**Potential for Common Method Variance**

Common method variance might have been a problem among the perceived fit measures and application decisions. Participants were asked to indicate their perceptions of P-O and P-J fit as they browsed the position listings on the site. At the same time, each of these position listings offered application opportunities at the bottom of the page. Steps were taken to avoid common method variance by presenting the perceived P-O and P-J fit measures on a paper-and-pencil questionnaire rather than directly on the site
(which would have been the same medium as the application decision measure), and the P-O and P-J fit scales were perceptual Likert scales whereas application decisions were measured objectively by clicking on a link to apply to the organization. Despite these varying methods, it was still not feasible to assess fit perceptions and application decisions at two different points in time, as actual job seekers form assessments of fit as they browse position advertisements, and make application decisions based on these assessments.

**Omitted Data**

Data from 41 participants had to be eliminated during data cleaning for the purposes outlined in Table 5.3. As shown in Table 5.3, most of these cases had to do with an unexplained fault in the operation of the site that rendered 28 participants’ data unusable as a result of receiving manipulated background information for a non-fit feedback condition, yet receiving fit feedback scores once in the site.

Consultation with Webmasters in the technology support department of the business school failed to uncover the exact cause, but fortunately these cases were able to be identified (and remaining cases could be identified as unaffected), given that the study condition number was absent from electronic data associated with those who (unknowingly) experienced the fault. However, these 28 cases represented seven percent of the 389 original participants, a considerable number. Also of concern was the fact that two additional participants had to be eliminated due to a possible compromise of manipulated information (e.g., a person in a non-fit feedback condition sitting next to a person who had the system fault and was therefore receiving the fit feedback inadvertently).
Future Research Directions

Several interesting areas emerge either directly or indirectly from this dissertation as future lines of research. Some have already been suggested throughout the preceding sections, but several others merit discussion. Recruitment research in general has been the target of criticism by several scholars who bemoan that it has not sufficiently kept pace with practice (Barber, 1998; Taylor & Collins, 2000). This is perhaps most glaring in light of the recent surge in the practice of Web-based recruitment. Research in the areas discussed below may help reduce the gap between academic research and the practice of Web-based recruitment.

Optimal Amount of Information

Research is needed that examines optimal amounts of information in position postings/Web sites. According to the information search cost perspective developed earlier, there is a tradeoff between having unlimited information at one's disposal, and being able to sort through that information in a timely and efficient manner. Traditionally, position postings have been relatively brief, especially in the context of newspaper advertisements, because such advertisements are usually expensed per line or character. Web technology, on the other hand, allows for unlimited information to be presented, since "cyberspace" is essentially an unlimited resource. Thus, with more information to sort through, there is likely an optimal level of information that would be both informative yet allow job seekers to successfully navigate the large numbers of position postings that might be available.

Barber (1998) reviewed several studies that suggest a “more is better” conclusion with regards to providing organizational information to job seekers. For example,
Gatewood, Gowan, and Lautenschlager (1993) found a strong positive correlation between the total amount of content coded information in recruitment advertisements and probability of responding to the advertisement. However, their study only presented increased positive information, and did not include negative or more realistic information about organizations. Barber (1998) concludes her review by noting that these studies may contain a restriction in range on the amount of information examined. That is, none of the studies presented an unusually large amount of information. She suggests that "the possibility of information overload should be considered" (p. 41).

The capabilities available to recruiters given the growth of Web technology necessitate a reexamination of the issues raised by Barber (1998). Specifically, Web “space” is not marketed the same way as traditional recruiting space. Monster.com recruitment postings are a good example. Instead of paying for recruitment postings by the letter or word, as would be done with newspaper advertisements, for example, a Web-based recruitment posting is usually sold by the posting, or one overall price for the whole posting. For instance, a single 60-day monster.com position posting currently costs $305 (www.monster.com). Thus, within upper limits established by individual job boards, a company is essentially free to put as much or as little information as they wish into a posting for the same price. This is even more prevalent on organizational Web sites. For example, the employment section of organizational Web sites routinely spans across several Web pages (e.g., General Electric’s and Proctor & Gamble’s career sections span over 30 pages each).

These conditions give rise to the possibility that information overload might be an important issue, and some researchers are beginning to recognize this possibility (e.g.,
Cober et al., 2000). Past research has suggested information overload to be a viable phenomenon (e.g., Miller, 1956) even though recruitment research has not yet found this to be the case. However, as Barber (1998) suggests, past research may have restricted the range of information magnitude such that inordinately large amounts of information have not been adequately studied. Thus it is important to understand how different amounts of information in a Web-based recruitment context might influence job seeker perceptions and behavior.

**Link Between Web-Based Recruitment Practices and Organizational Image**

The issues raised in this dissertation may have especially important ramifications for organizations that do not have a strong organizational image, and researchers should make these types of firms a focal point of future investigations. For example, smaller firms (i.e., with less than 500 employees) and/or firms that are just starting out (i.e., entrepreneurial firms) are less likely to have an established organizational image in the minds of most job seekers, and thus are less likely to be familiar to job seekers. Cable and Turban (2001) suggest that central processing of recruitment information is relatively more likely to the extent that a job seeker lacks prior employer knowledge.

This relates to Wanous' (1992) conjecture that the type of job might matter in terms of the importance of RJPs, with more unknown types of jobs being more prime candidates for the technique. For example, Turban and Greening (1996) found that corporate social performance related to corporate image, which in turn was related to attraction. Of particular note, these researchers eliminated from their analyses firms that were unfamiliar to two thirds or more of their sample. This raises the question of what effect not having a well-known image can have on attraction. However, Gatewood et al.
(1993) found that firms can put forth a recruitment image that is separate from their corporate image, and thus should be able to recruit even in the absence of a strong corporate image.

Clearly these differing conclusions leave this area open for future research. The issue also potentially makes the customization of recruitment information even more vital to organizations without an established image, in that such information can serve as an educational tool for job seekers that might otherwise just apply to these types of organizations haphazardly. On the other hand, some organizations already have an established image, and thus customization, while still potentially useful, might be relatively less useful than it would be for organizations without an established image (e.g., smaller organizations). In addition, unlike larger firms, smaller firms often do not have dedicated recruitment teams or departments. This makes it especially important to maintain a reasonable number of resumes and/or applications instead of having to sort through a large influx of resumes, many of which are from unqualified people. Even though the current study failed to find differences in application rates among those who received and did not receive customized recruitment information, future research should continue to investigate ways for smaller organizations with smaller Human Resource infrastructures to create smaller, leaner applicant pools.

Appropriate Measurement of Fit

More research is needed with regards to the measurement of fit so that the measurement of constructs such as P-O and P-J fit can become more precise. Cable and DeRue (2002) have made recent strides in this area by breaking fit perceptions into three different facets (person-organization, needs-supplies, and demands-abilities fit).
However, this measurement work needs to be complemented by other work that deals specifically with the nature of congruence and how congruence is determined. Considerable controversy still exists in the literature between what appear to be three primary ways of measuring fit, or congruence. The present study used a profile matching (i.e., rank order correlation) technique, a technique that has received criticism. For example, Edwards (1993) and Tinsley (2000) note that profile similarity indices confound the components of difference scores, such that one cannot discern the actual difference between profile elements.

Although it is somewhat fortunate that such similarity indices tend to provide conservative tests of fit hypotheses (e.g., Tinsley, 2000), future research should integrate Edwards' (1993) polynomial regression approaches for profile similarity indices in addressing P-E fit issues. Studies that compare and contrast the two methods and the results arrived at under each would be particularly useful. Lutrick and Moriarty (2002) have made some initial inroads in the area, finding that indirect measures of fit explained variance above direct measures. In introducing a tool that provides fit feedback to job seekers such as that proposed the present study, it is vital that firms have the means at their disposal to accurately measure fit scores, so as to provide the most accurate feedback possible to those job seekers.

The Meaning of Fit to Job Seekers

In addition to appropriately measuring fit, it is important for researchers to more fully uncover the phenomenology of fit, or what fit “means” to different people. This is a relatively untapped area of fit research, although some work has begun (e.g., Cable, 2002). It becomes necessary to explore, though, especially when organizations
contemplate providing feedback regarding likely fit to job seekers. For example, feedback indicating a 50% fit is likely to mean different things to different people, such that this type of feedback might be seen as favorable by one individual and unfavorable by another. There are likely to be individual difference variables that might help explain interpretations of fit. Work in the area of negative and positive affectivity might be a fruitful avenue to explore (e.g., Lam, Yik, & Schaubroeck, 2002). For example, Lam et al. found that, among people receiving favorable performance appraisal feedback, the resulting positive attitudes of those with high negative affectivity persisted for a shorter period of time than the positive attitudes of those with low negative affectivity. In the context of Web-based recruitment where fit feedback is provided, it might be the case that people with higher levels of negative affectivity sense that a 50% fit is not very good, whereas a person with high positive affectivity may sense a measure of potential in such a situation.

The individual difference approach to interpreting fit in the context of Web-based recruitment has begun to receive research attention. For example, Dineen et al. (2002) found that those with lower self-esteem attended to fit feedback indicating a low fit more than to feedback indicating a high fit with an organization. This work was consistent with Brockner’s (1988) Behavioral Plasticity Hypothesis that suggests that lower self-esteem individuals are more behaviorally malleable in the face of negative information that is self-diagnostic. In general, researchers should continue to investigate the effect of individual differences and expand the scope of individual differences examined (e.g., Big 5 personality characteristics, feedback seeking behavior, comfort with the Web, prior Web-based application experience) in the context of Web-based recruitment.
Demographic Differences in Applicant Pools

With regards to the Web, some researchers have suggested that a "digital divide" exists whereby traditionally "privileged" groups enjoy more widespread access to the Web, and thus might be more represented in applicant pools generated through the Web (e.g., Kuhn & Skuterud, 2000). Although some studies have suggested that the digital divide has been overstated in some areas such as ethnicity and gender, age effects have also been found (e.g., Malos, 2002; McManus & Ferguson, 2002).

In discussing the potential benefits of Web-based recruitment, therefore, a cautionary note is in order. This is especially true when extolling the benefits of “better-fitting” applicant pools, as the present work suggests. That is, better-fitting is desirable only to the extent that applicant pools remain demographically equivalent and diverse. Also, some fit researchers have suggested the potential benefits of fit earlier in a company life cycle, and drawbacks later in the cycle (e.g., Powell, 1998). Thus it will be important for future research to show that the provision of fit information or information presented in a customized configuration help make applicant pools leaner with respect to values, needs, and KSAs, but not in terms of demographic characteristics. Similarly, it will be necessary to examine possible gender effects in future efforts, as well as to investigate to see which of the three dimensions of fit -- values, KSAs, or needs -- is related most strongly to longer-term outcome variables, and what this might depend on.

Although future research in actual settings is needed to fully explore these issues, the present data did not indicate any notable gender or ethnicity effects. In a post-hoc analysis, applicant pools were examined in terms of male, female, caucasian, and non-caucasian representation. Significant correlations among all groups in terms of
applications to the forty companies in the study were found. For example, the
correlation among applicant pools in terms of caucasians and non-caucasians was .64 (p <
.01), whereas it was slightly less (.40, p < .01) between males and females. That is, if
more caucasians tended to apply to Quinn Inc. and less caucasians tended to apply to
Gratz Enterprises, then more non-caucasians also tended to apply to Quinn, and less to
Gratz, and so forth.

The Relationship Between Use of the Web to Recruit and Outcomes Such as
Performance and Turnover

Zottoli and Wanous (2000) recently undertook a review of the literature on
recruitment source effects. They found that there was no evidence in the literature of
studies of Web-based recruitment source effects. For example, largely unknown is the
degree to which individuals recruited via the Web might perform at a higher or lower
level or remain in the organization longer than those recruited via other means. Zottoli
and Wanous (2000) reviewed evidence suggesting that inside recruitment sources (e.g.,
referrals) led to greater employee tenure than did outside sources (e.g., newspaper). This
might suggest that Web-based recruitment is still less desirable than more internal
sources. One of the explanations for why referrals result in greater new hire tenure was
that they convey more information (magnitude) and more realistic information early in
the recruitment process. This is now possible via Web-based recruitment, and these
authors suggest that realistic information portrayed through previously unsuccessful
sources might increase the potency of these sources.

Also with regards to Web-based recruitment, and the introduction of fit feedback
tools such as that proposed in this dissertation, research needs to move towards
implementation in actual organizations and actual job boards. This will allow for longer term outcomes such as performance and turnover to be assessed. Also in need of assessment will be organizational recruitment expenditures in terms of dollars and time. Results of this dissertation suggest time efficiencies for recruiters to the extent that better fitting applicant pools might be generated early in the recruitment process; however, this conclusion will need more careful testing in actual environments.

Similarly, in terms of job seeker time efficiencies, the time spent by job seekers in pursuit of applications to organizations was similar whether or not they received customized recruitment information. The key appears to relate to the measurement period, such that initially it appears that fit feedback adds to search costs by providing extra information for the job seeker to digest, but in the long run such information can be of aid to the job seeker in making better application decisions. Of course, a useful extension to this work and to the search cost perspective in general would be to actually track a job seeker throughout the recruitment process after receiving fit feedback. For example, given that participants in this sample did end up making better application decisions in terms of fit when provided with fit feedback information, it would be interesting to track search costs over an extended period of time as job seekers followed up on their applications and ultimately accepted a position.

Indeed, it is likely that those making better application decisions up front (i.e., feedback condition participants in the present study) will spend less time pursuing “dead end” opportunities, but rather will efficiently spend their time pursuing those opportunities that present the best chance of them getting a good job (i.e., one in which they are a good fit with the organization/job). That is, if an individual applies only to
companies that they would end up being a good fit with, they will likely spend less time overall in their job pursuit before landing a suitable position, whereas if they apply to several companies that they would not end up being a good fit with, they may spend a significant amount of time interviewing with “lemon companies” only to find out late in the recruitment process (either through self-selection or rejection) that they were not a good fit with that company after all. And, in the even longer-term, costs of potential turnover and subsequent additional job search costs might be avoided to the extent that optimal decisions are made the first time around. If, on the other hand, an individual happens to gain entry to a company that they are not a good fit with, these longer-term costs likely will come to pass.

Web-Based Recruitment under Varying Labor Market Conditions

The results from this study should be examined under varying labor market conditions. For example, in a laboratory context, information about the scarcity or abundance of jobs could be provided as a means of facilitating a job market manipulation. In addition, the success of Web-based recruitment practices should be tracked over time and through labor market fluctuations. In terms of providing customized information to job seekers, research should examine the extent to which job seekers will attend to such information in a difficult job market. That is, if faced with a shortage of jobs, will job seekers still self-select out of organizations because they receive feedback indicating that they would be a poor fit, or will they go ahead and apply anyway under the premise that "any job is better than no job at all"?

In terms of self-selection, the results of the study suggest a greater “self-selection out” rather than “self-selection in” effect. That is, the fit check tool appeared to be more
successful in encouraging those who were not a good fit to perceive a relatively lower level of fit (which in turn related strongly to application decisions), rather than encouraging those who were a good fit to perceive a higher level of fit than those not receiving feedback (see Figures 5.1 and 5.3). This is consistent with the negativity bias reviewed by Skowronski and Carlston (1989).

Perhaps, then, it is the case that the effectiveness of the fit check varies in different types of labor markets. That is, the fit check might have more utility during periods of higher unemployment and greater availability of job seekers, rather than during a period when talent is scarcer and organizations are trying to encourage people to self-select into the organization to a greater degree. In other words, it may be more effective in discouraging applicants who do not fit from applying than it is in encouraging those who do fit to apply.

Alternative Means of Developing Greater Fit: Negotiated Versus Matched Staffing Models and Job Seeker Training

Research that examines other ways to decrease information search costs and increase applicant pool fit during the staffing process is needed. In this section, two potential avenues of research that depart from the traditional approach of focusing on organizational improvements to recruitment efforts are discussed. Specifically, ideas related to a "matched" versus "negotiated" model of selection are introduced, and the possibility of job seeker training is discussed.

Broadly speaking, most staffing systems operate under what can be termed a "negotiated" model of selection. Under this model, job seekers interact with individual organizations, with both sides finding out information about potential fit with the other.
At varying times and with varying windows of opportunity, job offers are made, and decisions about whether to take a job or forego opportunities to hire certain people in hopes of finding "something or someone better" must be made.

In contrast, a matched model of selection follows a matching algorithm to simultaneously match job seekers with jobs. Whereas this model is used by certain organizations for internal selection purposes, and is used by organizations such as sororities and fraternities at universities, it is perhaps best known as a model used by graduating medical students to gain residency jobs. Specifically, the application process for medical residents is similar to the negotiated model. However, candidates visit organizations (hospitals) during a pre-set time window of about 3-4 months. During this time, no job offers can be made/accepted between any parties. On a pre-set day after this four-month time window, all job seekers and all organizations must submit preference rankings of each other. These rankings are simultaneously assessed, and job seekers are matched with jobs. Thus, under this system, all parties are better informed about available job seekers and jobs when they submit their rankings. Empirical questions that arise from the use of either a “matched” or “negotiated” system include whether (a) greater outcomes in terms of P-O and P-J fit manifest under one or the other system, (b) greater efficiencies in terms of decreased administrative time, costs, and so forth result, and, (c) more favorable reactions from job seekers and organizational representatives manifest under either system (e.g., satisfaction).

In addition to alternative staffing models on a macro level, a final area of research that is beginning to emerge relates career development and training principles to the notion of training job seekers to be better at job seeking. The idea here is that, instead of
trying to improve recruitment practices as a means of enhancing applicant pool fit, organizations and/or career counselors might be able to train job seekers to be better consumers of recruitment information. For example, job seekers may be trained in how to assess fit, and what to look for in terms of values or overall organizational culture. This represents a “job-seeker-focused” approach to improving recruitment outcomes, and work has begun in this area (e.g., Alan Saks, personal communication, August 2002).

Practical Implications

Perhaps the clearest practical implication of this study is the recommendation that practitioners aim to try to customize recruitment messages to individual job seekers in a Web-based context. As mentioned previously, this capability was largely unavailable to recruiters prior to the introduction of the Web, but it is now a possibility in all recruitment efforts. By gathering information from job seekers up front, and comparing that information to information about the organization, messages can be customized to the preferences of job seekers, which can lead to better decisions about where to apply. And, as shown in this study, these better decisions, while not necessarily saving the job seeker time, can be made in an equivalent amount of time compared to when the message is not customized.

The fact that job seekers receiving customized information did not take significantly less time than those not receiving customized information was surprising from a theoretical standpoint, but may be reassuring from a practical standpoint. Indeed, had job seekers simply accepted feedback blindly without consuming the actual information provided about the positions, it might have raised concerns about the extent to which the job seekers were really making conscious choices versus simply taking at
face value the information provided. This study demonstrated that job seekers are able
to spend an equivalent amount of time consuming the information, but in the end make
better application decisions in terms of fit with the assistance of the customized fit
feedback. As O’Reilly et al. (1991) and others have demonstrated, this bodes well not
only for the near future in terms of initial organizational entry, but also for the longer
term in terms of outcomes like organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and turnover.

In fact, the benefits to customization seem to flow in both directions, creating a
“win-win” situation of sorts for job seeker and organizational recruiter. That is, job
seekers are apt to make better decisions about where to apply without incurring any
additional time expenditure, and organizations gain better fitting applicant pools, without
any increase in the size of those applicant pools. This translates into better job prospects
to follow up on for the job seeker and leaner applicant pools for organizations.

Although the benefits of providing customization in terms of potential fit with the
job/organization in terms of values, benefits, or KSAs should be clear, it is also critical
that this customized information be accurate. To the degree that inaccuracy exists, (a) job
seekers may make application decisions that are not in the best interest of either party, (b)
job seekers may experience disagreement with the feedback provided and become more
dissatisfied with the process than if they had received no feedback at all, or (c) both.
Thus, organizations are likely to reap the benefits of a system such as this to the degree
that they have the competence to accurately self-assess themselves.

In this regard, some dimensions of fit may be easier to assess than other. For
example, KSAs might easily be assessed through a thorough job analysis, and benefits
mix characteristics are also likely to be easier to assess. On the other hand,
organizational values tend to be more difficult to assess. In terms of determining what the organization values in order to provide accurate feedback regarding potential applicant values fit, an organization can excel if it can accurately assess its organizational culture. In fact, the ability to self-assess in an accurate and efficient manner may provide an organization with a competitive advantage from the standpoint of rareness and inimitability (Barney & Wright, 1998). As a start, organizations should seek the advice of experts in measuring organizational characteristics, and especially less clear characteristics such as values.

Along with the ability to self-assess, organizations need to be able to assess at the appropriate organizational level. That is, there may not be one overall set of values for a given company, and it is even less likely that there is one overall set of KSAs or benefits with which to match job seekers. Rather, these dimensions of fit likely vary by organizational level or unit, such that, for example, the values in one geographic area or division of the company may be different than others. In turn, it might be necessary to develop separate fit feedback tools for specific units within the organization, rather than one overall tool. For example, Texas Instruments has one such tool on its corporate Web site; however, given the size and scope of Texas Instruments, this tool may be too broad to really provide accurate feedback regarding values fit to people in varying parts of that organization. It is therefore important to uncover appropriate “clusters” within the organization where sub-cultures exist or certain batteries of KSAs are needed. Social networks analysis (e.g., Brass, 1995) or symbolic interactionist approaches to measuring culture or climate (Joyce & Slocum, 1984) are potential avenues to pursue in terms of determining the appropriate level of analysis for fit characteristics.
Another key from a practical standpoint may lie in making fit feedback tools anonymous, such that job seekers can truly experience the tool as intending to assist them, and not as some type of assessment tool that could be used to their detriment. Organizations should proactively make job seekers aware of the anonymous nature of the tool, in order for job seekers to provide the most honest personal preference information, which in turn can be turned around to provide accurate feedback to the job seeker. If a fit feedback tool is not made anonymous, organizations risk having job seekers attempt to “put their best foot forward” in order to appear socially desirable in an attempt to gain entry to the organization. This is especially likely in a difficult job market where jobs are not plentiful.

On the other hand, there does not appear to be any value-added to customizing the order in which job seekers view recruitment information, although future research should continue to investigate the issue based on the result involving KSAs that approached significance with P-J fit perceptions as the dependent variable, and was statistically significant with application decisions as the dependent variable. It does appear that, at least for KSA fit, the link between actual KSA fit and application decisions is strengthened when KSAs are the most important fit dimension for a job seeker and the order in which information is presented is customized, whereas the link is weakened when KSAs are the least important dimension and order is customized. Because this is a post hoc finding, future research efforts will need to examine it more closely.

Conclusion

The growth of Web-based recruitment over the past few years has ushered in a new frontier of job seeking and organizational recruiting that has implications on both
research and practical fronts. This dissertation provides an investigation of how customization can be leveraged in organizational recruitment efforts to reach job seekers in new and more effective ways. The study, while addressing some important issues, also uncovered several additional issues in need of research attention. It is hoped that this future work will continue to build on the initial steps taken in this dissertation to inform theory and assist the efforts of practicing managers.
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APPENDIX A

STUDY WEB SITE PAGES
(NOT INCLUDING POSITION POSTINGS)
Thank you for participating in this part of the Internet-based recruitment project. To begin your participation, please answer the following questions.

As a reminder, all information that you provide during this project will be kept strictly confidential and will not actually be shared with organizations represented.

Make sure you use the links provided throughout the site, and not the "back" button on your browser!

1. Please indicate your date of birth (mm/dd/yy):

2. Please enter the last four digits of your social security number:

3. Enter the number of the computer terminal you are sitting at (1 to 24) here:

4. Please indicate your major:
   - (accounting)
   - (finance)
   - (marketing)
   - (logistics)
   - (human resources)
   - (information systems)
   - (my major is outside the business school)
   - (other)

Submit
STUDY WEB SITE: REGISTRATION PAGE FOR CONDITION 1

You will soon enter the homepage for a proposed Internet "job board". This job board will present various position opportunities that you will have a chance to apply to.

Because the job board is not "active" yet, your name or application information will not actually be divulged to organizations represented.

Prior to entering the job board, please enter the unique identifier number on the handout you picked up when you entered the computer lab.

Enter your registration code below:

(A) ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4
(B) ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4
(C) ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4
(D) ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4
(E) ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4
(F) ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4
(G) ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4
(H) ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4
(I) ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4
(J) ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4
(K) ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4
(L) ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4
(M) ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4
(N) ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4
(O) ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4

Submit and Proceed to Job Board
You will soon enter the homepage for a proposed Internet "job board". This job board will present various position opportunities that you will have a chance to apply to.

When you view these opportunities, you will receive feedback about your potential fit with various aspects of the organizations and jobs listed. This feedback is based on a profile formed from responses you provided on the Internet-based survey you completed several weeks ago.

Because the job board is not "active" yet, your name or application information will not actually be divulged to organizations represented.

Prior to entering the job board, please enter the unique identifier number on the handout you picked up when you entered the computer lab in order to access your profile information.

**Enter your registration code below:**

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(A)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(B)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(D)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(E)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(F)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(G)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(H)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(I)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(J)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(K)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(L)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(M)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(O)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
You will soon enter the homepage for a proposed Internet "job board". This job board will present various position opportunities that you will have a chance to apply to.

When you view these opportunities, you will see information presented in a specified order. The ordering of information is based on a profile formed from responses you provided on the Internet-based survey you completed several weeks ago.

Because the job board is not "active" yet, your name or application information will not actually be divulged to companies represented.

Prior to entering the job board, please enter the unique identifier number on the handout you picked up when you entered the computer lab in order to access your profile information.

Enter your registration code below:

(A) □ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4
(B) □ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4
(C) □ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4
(D) □ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4
(E) □ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4
(F) □ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4
(G) □ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4
(H) □ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4
(I) □ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4
(J) □ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4
(K) □ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4
(L) □ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4
(M) □ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4
(N) □ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4
(O) □ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4
You will soon enter the homepage for a proposed Internet "job board". This job board will present various position opportunities that you will have a chance to apply to.

When you view these opportunities, you will receive feedback about your potential fit with various aspects of the organizations and jobs listed. Also, you will see information presented in a specified order. This feedback and ordering of information is based on a profile formed from your responses to the Internet-based survey you completed several weeks ago.

Because the job board is not "active" yet, your name or application information will not actually be divulged to companies represented.

Prior to entering the job board, please enter the unique identifier number on the handout you picked up when you entered the computer lab in order to access your profile information.

Enter your registration code below:

(A) C1 C2 C3 C4
(B) C1 C2 C3 C4
(C) C1 C2 C3 C4
(D) C1 C2 C3 C4
(E) C1 C2 C3 C4
(F) C1 C2 C3 C4
(G) C1 C2 C3 C4
(H) C1 C2 C3 C4
(I) C1 C2 C3 C4
(J) C1 C2 C3 C4
(K) C1 C2 C3 C4
(L) C1 C2 C3 C4
(M) C1 C2 C3 C4
(N) C1 C2 C3 C4
(O) C1 C2 C3 C4

Submit and Proceed to Job Board
Welcome to JobLink. This is the homepage for our proposed job board. Please browse the following position opportunities, answering questions on the paper survey you were given by the researcher for each position and applying for positions that you find attractive. There is no expectation for the number of positions you might apply for -- simply apply to those you find more attractive than others.

Available Positions

Block Enterprises
Hethorn Co.
Ultra Inc.
Veymar Inc.
Calhoun Fuller
Braden Inc.
Lynam Co.
Fairworth Enterprise
Luminis Inc.
Exanex Co.
GuxCorp
Kumbar Ltd.
Yodik Corp.
Premier Enterprises
Nova Company
Jacors Inc.
Dancor Industries
Williams Co.
Herci Inc.
Fadink Inc.

After you have viewed all of the positions above and made decisions about whether or not to apply to each, you may exit JobLink.
Welcome to JobLink. This is the homepage for our proposed job board. Please browse the following position opportunities, answering questions on the paper survey you were given by the researcher for each position and applying for positions that you find attractive. There is no expectation for the number of positions you might apply for -- simply apply to those you find more attractive than others.

Available Positions

- Bluewing Inc.
- Lewis Enterprises
- Gratz Enterprise
- Edgwood Co.
- Berling Enterprise
- Green Co.
- Filber Inc.
- Kalavanda Co.
- Quinn Inc.
- Kempes & Long
- Nakling Inc.
- Brolley Inc.
- Newland Inc.
- Keleorp
- Unparer Co.
- Trish Inc.
- Rock Inc.
- Dinner Industries
- Servar Inc.
- Gobler Inc.
- Vetter Corp.
Application Form

Thank you for your interest in this position! Please fill out this application form before continuing.

*consistent with the nature of this project, no information will actually be sent to this organization.

1. Please indicate the last (or current) position you have held:

   Position: __________

   Years worked there: __________

2. What date will you be available to start a new position?

   __________

   Submit Application

   Return to position listings
**Application Form**

Thank you for your interest in this position! Please fill out this application form before continuing.

*Consistent with the nature of this project, no information will actually be sent to this organization.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th align="left">1. Please indicate the last (or current) position you have held:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td align="left">Position: [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td align="left">Years worked there: [ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. Do you have any geographic restrictions?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐ yes ☐ no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. What date will you be available to start a new position?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Apply]

[Return to company listings]
Application Form

Thank you for your interest in this position! Please fill out this application form before continuing.

*consistent with the nature of this project, no information will actually be sent to this organisation.

1. Please indicate the last (or current) position you have held:
   Position:

2. List 2-3 of your primary responsibilities in this previous/current position:

3. Do you have any geographic restrictions?
   - yes   - no

4. What date will you be available to start a new position?

Apply!

Return to company linkages
Thank you for your application! Click below to return to the position listings.

Return to Position Listings
Thank you for viewing the position postings. The purpose of this survey is to gather information about your experience on the JobLink Internet site. Please answer the questions below, then click on the button provided to exit the study.

Please click on the appropriate number after each question or fill in the items requested below:

1. I am satisfied with the information I was able to obtain about potential job responsibilities using this job board.

2. I was satisfied about the information obtained about the organizations represented through this job board.

3. Relative to other job/organization information sources, this information source was set up well.

4. The companies represented on this job board can generally be counted on to provide people with good employment if people choose to work for them.

5. The companies represented on this job board are generally reliable companies.

6. People cannot generally count on their employment experience at these companies to be good.
7. To what extent have the companies represented on this job board been candid in the information provided to you?

- 1. To a small extent
- 2. Neutral
- 3. To a large extent

8. To what extent have the companies represented on this job board seemed to tailor their communications to individuals’ specific needs?

- 1. Strongly disagree
- 2. Slightly disagree
- 3. Neutral
- 4. Slightly agree
- 5. Strongly agree

9. When browsing this job board, I felt:

- 1. Happy
- 2. Neutral
- 3. Frustrated
- 4. Stressed
- 5. Not interested

10. What degree of stress did you experience while browsing this job board?

- 1. No stress
- 2. Slight stress
- 3. Moderate stress
- 4. A great deal of stress

11. When browsing this job board, I felt:

- 1. Happy
- 2. Neutral
- 3. Frustrated
- 4. Stressed
- 5. Not interested

12. Please indicate how many months and years of work experience you have (including full- and part-time work):

   years: [ ] months: [ ]

13. Out of the work experience indicated in #12, how much of it was full-time work experience?

   years: [ ] months: [ ]

14. How much experience would you say you have had browsing Internet job boards?

- 1. No experience
- 2. A small amount of experience
- 3. A moderate amount of experience
- 4. A great deal of experience
15. How familiar would you say you are with Internet job boards in general?

- 1. Not at all familiar
- 2. Moderately familiar
- 3. Very familiar

16. Prior to coming to this computer lab today, how many jobs would you say you’ve applied for online in total?
(Please provide a number): 

17. Do you recall the main reason you were asked to provide information about your preferences for certain information or characteristics in the Internet-based survey you completed several weeks ago?

- Yes
- No

18. If you answered “yes” to #17, please provide that main reason in the space below:

If you care to do so, please use the following space to provide any additional comments about your experience on the JobLink Internet site:

Your comments:
15. How familiar would you say you are with Internet job boards in general?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>Moderately</td>
<td>Very</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>familiar</td>
<td>unfamiliar</td>
<td>familiar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. Prior to coming to this computer lab today, how many jobs would you say you’ve applied for online in total?

(Please provide a number):  

17. Overall, to what extent did you agree with the evaluations of your fit provided by the site?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Strongly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>disagree</td>
<td>agree</td>
<td>disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. How accurate do you feel the assessments of fit were?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Extremely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>accurate</td>
<td>accurate</td>
<td>accurate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. Prior to today, had you ever visited an Internet site for job searching purposes and received feedback regarding what your potential fit might be?

○ Yes
○ No

20. If you answered “yes” to #19, please provide the name of the Internet site(s) and/or the Internet address(es) if you recall it/them:

If you care to do so, please use the following space to provide any additional comments about your experience on the JobLink Internet site:

Your comments:
15. How familiar would you say you are with Internet job boards in general?

- 1. Not at all familiar
- 2. Moderately familiar
- 3. Very familiar

16. Prior to coming to this computer lab today, how many jobs would you say you've applied for online in total?

(Provide a number): [ ]

If you care to do so, please use the following space to provide any additional comments about your experience on the JobLink Internet site:

[Comments field]

Submit responses and exit
Thank you for participating in this research project.

Your participation is complete; however, please remain at your terminal. Once the session is over, the researcher will conduct a debrief at which point you will have the opportunity to ask any questions. In the meantime, you may quietly do other work, read, or browse other Internet sites.
APPENDIX B

WAVE 1 POSITION POSTINGS
(CONDITION 4 REPRESENTED)
Block Enterprises is an industry leader, and our human resource associates are among the best in the business. We encourage you to explore our opportunities and see if we might be the place for you.

Corporate Values:

It appears that your fit with the values of this organization is: 40%

At Block Enterprises, you can expect to have high expectations placed upon you—this is a highly valued part of our culture. Also, if you want to excel and compete with others to be the best, this is the place for you. Of course, to create the type of environment where you can flourish, given the intensely challenging standards we set, we also place importance upon treating our people well. We also believe that a little disorganization is good in promoting healthy progress, and you can expect this as part of the environment.

Compensation and Benefits:

It appears that your fit with the benefits offering of this organization is: 90%

Block Enterprises offers salaries that are highly competitive with the industry. In addition, we offer a standard vacation and health care package and a specialized mix of benefits that will ensure that your needs inside and outside of work are met. Specifically, we offer the following benefits, broken down by percentage of the mix:

- Specialized insurance coverage (beyond normal health plan) including mental health coverage (40%)
- Holiday parties and other social events (20%)
- Paid memberships to professional associations (10%)
- Dependent care flexible spending account (use of pre-tax dollars to pay child/elder care costs) (10%)

Skills and Abilities:

It appears that your fit with the skills required by this job is: 50%

In terms of skills and abilities, we are looking for several important characteristics in our associates including a bachelors degree in a business or related field. While several characteristics are important, we highlight the following and give you an idea of the extent to which you might be asked to use each in your new job:

- First, time management is of top importance given the autonomy you can expect to experience on the job.
- Second, we consider the degree to which our candidates can visualize problems well to be important.
- We also consider customer and personal service to be linked to success during times when you are in contact with customers.
- Finally, negotiating is of lower importance but still somewhat useful from time to time.

Apply for this Position
Return to the JobLink Homepage
Hethorn is a leader in the industry, and our human resource associates are among the best in the business. We encourage you to explore our opportunities and see if we might be a good place for you!

Corporate Values:

It appears that your fit with the values of this organization is: 90%

At Hethorn, you can expect to have high expectations placed on you; this is our number one value. Also, we value a high degree of organization as a key to success.

While we expect a lot from our associates, we believe you will find a people-orientation that permeates our environment, though this sometimes must give way to stakeholder interests.

Finally, you will find the work challenging, but we do not place as high a value upon competition as we do upon collaboration.

Compensation and Benefits:

It appears that your fit with the benefits offering of this organization is: 80%

Hethorn offers salaries that are highly competitive with the industry. In addition, we offer a standard vacation and health care package and a specialized mix of benefits that will ensure that your needs inside and outside of work are met. Specifically, we offer the following benefits, broken down by percentage of the mix:

- Holiday parties and other social events (40%)
- Specialized insurance coverage (beyond a normal health plan) including mental health coverage (30%)
- Paid memberships to professional associations (20%)
- Dependent care flexible spending account (use of pre-tax dollars to pay child/elder care costs) (10%)

Skills and Abilities:

It appears that your fit with the skills required by this job is: 90%

In terms of skills and abilities, we are looking for several important characteristics in our associates including a bachelor's degree in a business or related field. While several characteristics are important, we highlight the following and give you an idea of the extent to which you might be asked to use each in your new job:

- First, time management is the most important skill you need given the autonomy you'll experience on the job.
- Second, we consider not only outsiders, but also insiders to be customers, so customer and personal service is also looked for.
- Third, you may occasionally be called on to negotiate, so, while not required, this skill can be useful.
- Finally, we may consider the degree to which our candidates can visualize problems, although this is not necessary in starting your new position.
Corporate Values:

It appears that your fit with the values of this organization is: 50%

At Ultra, people are our number one priority, and you'll know this from the first day on board. At the same time, our performance expectations are high, although we want you to feel comfortable getting used to our culture and make steady progress. You'll find our environment to be friendly and relatively non-competitive, a plus in the eyes of most of our associates. We also feel that a degree of disorganization in the work environment leads to less rigidity and greater bottom line success.

Compensation and Benefits:

It appears that your fit with the benefits offering of this organization is: 50%

Ultra offers salaries that are highly competitive with the industry. In addition, we offer a standard vacation and health care package and a specialized mix of benefits that will ensure that your needs inside and outside of work are met. Specifically, we offer the following benefits, broken down by percentage of the mix:

- Dependent care flexible spending account (use of pre-tax dollars to pay child/elder care costs) (40%)
- Specialized insurance coverage (beyond normal health plan) including mental health coverage (30%)
- Paid memberships to professional associations (20%)
- Holiday parties and other social events (10%)

Skills and Abilities:

It appears that your fit with the skills required by this job is: 30%

In terms of skills and abilities, we are looking for several important characteristics in our associates including a bachelor's degree in a business or related field. While several characteristics are important, we highlight the following and give you an idea of the extent to which you might be asked to use each in your new job:

- First, you can expect to spend a good bit of time negotiating in various ways, and we highlight negotiating skills as particularly important for our new associates.
- Second, we take a hard look at the degree to which our candidates can visualize problems well.
- We consider not only outsiders, but also insiders to be customers, so customer and personal service is also looked for.
- Finally, time management is a plus, but not necessary since schedules are arranged in advance.
Corporate Values:

It appears that your fit with the values of this organization is: 80%

At Veymar, people are our number one priority, and you'll sense this from day one. You'll find our environment to be competitive, a plus in the eyes of most of our associates. You'll also find our performance expectations to be moderate, as we want you to feel comfortable getting used to our culture and make steady progress. We also feel that a degree of disorganization in the work environment leads to less rigidity and greater bottom line success.

Compensation and Benefits:

It appears that your fit with the benefits offering of this organization is: 80%

Veymar offers salaries that are highly competitive with the industry. In addition, we offer a standard vacation and health care package and a specialized mix of benefits that will ensure that your needs inside and outside of work are met. Specifically, we offer the following benefits, broken down by percentage of the mix:
- Paid memberships to professional associations (40%)
- Employee group life insurance (100%)
- Employee group health insurance (100%)
- Federal/state tax dollars to pay child/elder care costs (50%)
- Holiday parties and other social events (20%)
- Specialized insurance coverage (beyond normal health plan) including mental health coverage (20%)

Skills and Abilities:

It appears that your fit with the skills required by this job is: 50%

In terms of skills and abilities needed to do the job, we are looking for the following important characteristics in our associates, beyond a bachelor's degree in business or related field:
- First and foremost, we consider customer and personal service skills to be a premium, and you will need to the degree that you can demonstrate these
- Second, most of your time is your own, so time management is important. The ability to handle multiple problems will also help you to a degree in your new position, as will negotiating skills, though to a lesser extent given our climate.
Corporate Values:

It appears that your fit with the values of this organization is: **40%**

At Calhoun-Fuller, people are our number one priority, and this is apparent from day one.
We also feel that maintaining an organized, coherent work environment leads to better line success.
Our performance expectations are high, but not overbearing — we want you to feel comfortable getting used to our culture and make steady progress.
You'll find our environment to be friendly and non-competitive, a plus in the eyes of most of our associates.

Compensation and Benefits:

It appears that your fit with the benefits offering of this organization is: **30%**

Calhoun-Fuller offers salaries that are highly competitive with the industry. In addition, we offer a standard vacation and health care package and a specialized mix of benefits that will ensure that your needs inside and outside of work are met. Specifically, we offer the following benefits, broken down by percentage of the mix:
- Paid memberships to professional associations (40%)
- Holiday parties and other social events (20%)
- Specialized insurance coverage (beyond normal health plan) including mental health coverage (20%)
- Dependent care flexible spending account (use of pre-tax dollars for child/elder care costs) (10%)

Skills and Abilities:

It appears that your fit with the skills required by this job is: **20%**

In terms of skills and abilities, we are looking for several important characteristics in our associates including a bachelor’s degree in a business or related field. While several characteristics are important, we highlight the following and give you an idea of the extent to which you might be asked to use each in your new job:
- First, you can expect to spend a good bit of time negotiating in various ways, and we highlight negotiating skills as particularly important for our new associates.
- Second, we consider not only insiders, but also outsiders to be customers, so customer and personal service is also looked for.
- Time management is somewhat important given the autonomy you can expect to experience on the job.
- Finally, to a lesser extent, we consider the degree to which our candidates can visualize problems well.
Braden Inc.

Braden is an industry leader, and our human resource associates are among the best in the business. We encourage you to explore our opportunities and see if Braden might be the place for you!

Corporate Values:

It appears that your fit with the values of this organization is: 30%

At Braden you can expect to have high expectations placed upon you, as this is valued highly by our associates. Also, if you want to excel and compete with others to be the best, this is the place for you.

Of course, to create the type of environment where you can flourish given the intensely challenging standards we set, we place a degree of importance on the degree of organization in our environment, although a little disorganization is seen as a healthy way to grow.

Compensation and Benefits:

It appears that your fit with the benefits offering of this organization is: 90%

Braden offers salaries that are highly competitive with the industry. In addition, we offer a standard vacation and health care package and a specialized mix of benefits that will ensure that your needs inside and outside of work are met. Specifically, we offer the following benefits, broken down by percentage of the mix:

- specialised insurance coverage (beyond normal health plan) including mental health coverage (40%)
- holiday parties and other social events (20%)
- paid memberships to professional associations (20%)
- dependent care flexible spending account (use of pre-tax dollars to pay child/elder care costs) (10%)

Skills and Abilities:

It appears that your fit with the skills required by this job is: 10%

In terms of skills and abilities, we are looking for some very important characteristics in our associates including a bachelor's degree in a business or related field. While several characteristics are important, the following are highlighted and give you an idea of the extent to which you might be asked to use each in your new job:

First, you will succeed to the extent that you can effectively visualize problems as they occur and quickly make sense out of possible solutions.

Handed down, this most important to your performance.

Second, you'll succeed to the extent that you can effectively negotiate not only with outside sources, but also your co-workers.

Third, customer and personal service is a plus, as you can expect to interact from time to time with customers as part of your job. You'll find that your time is already pretty structured for you, so time management is less important but still a plus.

Apply for this Position.
Corporate Values:

It appears that your fit with the values of this organization is: **90%**

At Loranicle, people are our number one priority. Behind this, we value compassion and promote it inside and outside the company. We also feel that maintaining an organized, coherent work environment leads to bottom line success, although a little chaos every now and then is healthy as well. Finally, you'll find that our performance expectations are not overbearing—we want you to feel comfortable getting used to our culture and make steady progress.

Compensation and Benefits:

It appears that your fit with the benefits offering of this organization is: **90%**

Loranicle offers salaries that are highly competitive with the industry. In addition, we offer a standard vacation and health care package and a specialized mix of benefits that will ensure that your needs inside and outside of work are met. Specifically, we offer the following benefits, broken down by percentage of the mix:

- Specialized insurance coverage (beyond) normal health plan including mental health coverage (40%)
- Holiday parties and other social events (50%)
- Paid memberships to professional associations (20%)
- Dependents' care flexible spending account (use of pre-tax dollars to pay child/elder care costs) (10%)

Skills and Abilities:

It appears that your fit with the skills required by this job is: **40%**

In terms of skills and abilities, we are looking for several important characteristics in our associates including a bachelor's degree in a business or related field. While several characteristics are important, we highlight the following and give you an idea of the extent to which you might be asked to use each in your new job:

- First, you can expect to spend a good bit of time negotiating in various ways, and we highlight negotiating skills as particularly important for our new associates.
- Second, we consider not only outsiders, but also insiders to be customers, so customer and personal service is also very appealing to us.
- We take an interest in the degree to which our candidates can visualize problems well.
- Finally, time management is a plus, but not necessary since schedules are arranged in advance.
Corporate Values:

It appears that your fit with the values of this organization is: 60%

- At Farworth, our top value and driver of success is our degree of workplace organization. A highly coherent workplace is a must, and associates are expected to live up to this standard.
- Second, we take care of our people, and you can expect to be treated as a valued employee and professional at all times.
- Third, we enjoy a moderate amount of competition, although you will have the chance to excel in our environment and in the industry through collaboration with others as well.
- Finally, we do not believe in setting performance expectations at a high level, especially early in the employment relationship. We want you to acculturate yourself and learn things right.

Compensation and Benefits:

It appears that your fit with the benefits offered of this organization is: 60%

Farworth offers salaries that are highly competitive with the industry. In addition, we offer a standard vacation and health care package and a specialized mix of benefits that will ensure that your needs inside and outside of work are met. Specifically, we offer the following benefits, broken down by percentage of the mix:
- Dependent care flexible spending account (use of pre-tax dollars to pay child/elder care costs) (40%)
- Holiday parties and other social events (30%)
- Specialized insurance coverage (beyond normal health plan) including mental health coverage (20%)
- Paid memberships to professional associations (10%)

Skills and Abilities:

It appears that your fit with the skills required by this job is: 50%

In terms of skills and abilities needed to do the job, we are looking for the following important characteristics in our associates, beyond a bachelor's degree in business or related field:
- First and foremost, we consider customer and personal service skills to be a premium, and you will excel to the degree that you can demonstrate these.
- Second, you will often be called on to negotiate with internal and external stakeholders, making this skill an important one.
- Next, the ability to visualize problems will be somewhat useful in your new position.
- Finally, although time management can help, it is less of a concern given the free-flowing nature of work at this company.

Apply for this Position
Return to the Job Search Homepage
Luminis is an industry leader, and our human resource associates are the best out there. We encourage you to scroll down and see if Luminis might be the place for you!

Corporate Values:

It appears that your fit with the values of this organization is: 90%

- At Luminis, we thrive on intense competition. You’ll have the chance to excel in our competitive internal environment, and, in collaboration with others, you’ll compete with other industry players.
- Of course, to be competitive, you must be highly organized, and we pride ourselves on our degree of workplace organization.
- Although we value our people, we realize that our other primary stakeholders must take priority, and everyone sacrifices to that end.
- Finally, we do not believe in setting performance expectations at a high level, especially early in the employment relationship. We want you to grow yourself and learn things right.

Compensation and Benefits:

It appears that your fit with the benefits offering of this organization is: 30%

Luminis offers salaries that are highly competitive with the industry. In addition, we offer a standard vacation and health care package and a specialized mix of benefits that will ensure that your needs inside and outside of work are met. Specifically, we offer the following benefits, broken down by percentage of the mix:
- Holiday parties and other social events (40%)
- Paid memberships to professional associations (30%)
- Dependent care flexible spending account (10%)
- Specialized insurance coverage (beyond normal health plan) including mental health coverage (20%)

Skills and Abilities:

It appears that your fit with the skills required by this job is: 30%

In terms of skills and abilities needed to do the job, we are looking for the following important characteristics in our associates, beyond a bachelor's degree in business or related field.
- First and foremost, we consider customer and personal service skills to be a premium, and you will excel to the degree that you can demonstrate these.
- Second, you will often be called on to negotiate with internal and external stakeholders, making this skill an important one.
- Next, the ability to visualize problems will be somewhat useful in your new position.
- Finally, although time management can help, it is less of a concern given the demanding nature of work at this company.
Kranter is an industry leader, and our human resource associates are among the best. We encourage you to scroll down and explore our opportunities to and see if Kranter might be the place for you!

Corporate Values:

At Kranter, people are our number one priority, and you'll sense this from day one.
We also feel that maintaining an organized, coherent work environment leads to bottom line success.
Our performance expectations are high, but not overbearing – we want you to feel comfortable getting used to our culture and make steady progress.
You'll find our environment to be friendly and non-competitive, a plus in the eyes of most of our associates.

Compensation and Benefits:

Kranter offers salaries that are highly competitive with the industry. In addition, we offer a standard vacation and health care package and a specialized mix of benefits that will ensure that your needs inside and outside of work are met. Specifically, we offer the following benefits, broken down by percentage of the mix:
- Dependent care flexible spending account (use of pre-tax dollars to pay child/elder care costs) (40%)
- Holiday parties and other social events (25%)
- Specialized insurance coverage (beyond) normal health plan including mental health coverage (20%)
- Paid memberships to professional associations (15%)

Skills and Abilities:

In terms of skills and abilities, we are looking for several important characteristics in our associates including a bachelor's degree in a business or related field. While several characteristics are important, we highlight the following and give you an idea of the extent to which you might be asked to manifest in your new job:
- First, you can expect to spend a good bit of time negotiating in various ways, and we highlight negotiating skills as particularly important for our new associates.
- Second, time management is important given the autonomy you can expect to experience on the job.
- We consider not only outsiders, but also insiders to be customer service oriented, and personal service is also looked for.
- Finally, to a greater extent, we consider the degree to which our candidates can visualize problems well.
GenCorp is an industry leader, and our human resource associates are terrific. Take a look at our opportunities and see if GenCorp might be the place for you!

Corporate Values:

It appears that your fit with the values of this organization is: 40%

At GenCorp, people are our number one priority, and you'll know this from day one.
We also feel that maintaining an organized, coherent work environment leads to bottom line success.
Our performance expectations are high, but not overbearing -- we want you to feel comfortable getting used to our culture and make steady progress.
You'll find our environment to be friendly and non-competitive, a plus in the eyes of most of our associates.

Compensation and Benefits:

It appears that your fit with the benefits offering of this organization is: 10%

GenCorp offers salaries that are highly competitive with the industry. In addition, we offer a standard vacation and health care package and a specialized mix of benefits that will ensure that your needs inside and outside of work are met. Specifically, we offer the following benefits, broken down by percentage of the mix:
- Dependent care flexible spending account (use of pre-tax dollars to pay child/elder care costs) (40%)
- Paid memberships to professional associations (20%)
- Holiday parties and other social events (20%)
- Specialized insurance coverage (beyond) normal health plan including mental health coverage (10%)

Skills and Abilities:

It appears that your fit with the skills required by this job is: 50%

In terms of skills and abilities needed to do the job, we are looking for the following important characteristics in our associates, beyond a bachelors degree in business or related field:
First and foremost, we consider customer and personal service skills to be a premium, and you will excel to the degree that you can demonstrate these.
Second, most of your time is your own, so time management is important.
The ability to realize problems will also help you to a degree in your new position,
and negotiating skills, though to a lesser extent given our climate.

Apply for this Position
Return to the JobLink Homepage
Yodzis Corp.

You'll find Yodzis to be a leader in the industry, and our human resource associates are among the best. We encourage you to explore our opportunities and see if we might be the place for you!

Corporate Values:

It appears that your fit with the values of this organization is: **100%**

At Yodzis you can expect to have high expectations placed on you, this is our number one value. While we expect a lot out of our associates, we think you will find a people-orientation that permeates our environment. Also, we value a moderate degree of organization as a key to success. Finally, you will find the work challenging, but we do not place as high a value upon competition as we do upon collaboration.

Compensation and Benefits:

It appears that your fit with the benefits offering of this organization is: **70%**

Yodzis offers salaries that are highly competitive with the industry. In addition, we offer a standard vacation and health care package and a specialized mix of benefits that will ensure that your needs inside and outside of work are met. Specifically, we offer the following benefits, broken down by percentage of the mix:

- Specialized insurance coverage (beyond normal health plan) including mental health coverage (40%)
- Paid memberships to professional associations (30%)
- Holiday parties and other social events (20%)
- Dependent care flexible spending account (use of pre-tax dollars to pay child/elder care costs) (10%)

Skills and Abilities:

It appears that your fit with the skills required by this job is: **100%**

In terms of skills and abilities, we are looking for several important characteristics in our associates including a bachelors degree in a business or related field. While several characteristics are important, we highlight the following and give you an idea of the extent to which you might be asked to use each in your new job:

- First, time management is the most important skill you need given the autonomy you'll experience on the job.
- Second, you can expect to spend a good bit of time negotiating in various ways, and we highlight negotiating skills as particularly important for our new associates.
- We consider not only ourselves, but also others to be customers, so customer and personal service is also looked for, though to a lesser extent.
- Finally, we consider the degree to which our candidates can visualize problems, although this is not necessary in starting your new position.
Premier is an industry leader, and our human resource associates are among the best in the business. We encourage you to explore our opportunities and see if Premier might be the place for you!

Corporate Values:

It appears that your fit with the values of this organization is: 90%

At Premier, we thrive on intense competition. You'll have the chance to excel in our competitive internal environment, and, in collaboration with others, you'll compete with other industry players. Of course, we also have an orientation towards our people, and you can expect to be treated as a highly valued employee and professional. As a company on the move, we set performance expectations high, but you might not always find the workplace to be highly organized... fast-moving, free-flowing ideas thrive in an environment that demonstrates a bit of chaos!

Compensation and Benefits:

It appears that your fit with the benefits offering of this organization is: 10%

Premier offers salaries that are highly competitive with the industry. In addition, we offer a standard vacation and health care package and a specialized mix of benefits that will ensure that your needs inside and outside of work are met. Specifically, we offer the following benefits, broken down by percentage of the mix:

- Paid memberships to professional associations (40%)
- Holiday parties and other social events (50%)
- Dependent care flexible spending account (use of pre-tax dollars to pay child/elder care costs) (20%)
- Specialized insurance coverage (beyond normal health plan) including mental health coverage (10%)

Skills and Abilities:

It appears that your fit with the skills required by this job is: 90%

In terms of skills and abilities, we are looking for several important characteristics in our associates including a bachelors degree in a business or related field. While several characteristics are important, we highlight the following and give you an idea of the extent to which you might be asked to use such in your new job:

- First, you can expect to spend a good bit of time negotiating in various ways, and we highlight negotiating skills as particularly important for our new associates.
- Second, time management is important given the autonomy you can expect to experience on the job.
- We consider not only ourselves, but also others to be customers, so customer and personal service is also looked for.
- Finally, we consider the degree to which our candidates can visualize problems well.
NOVA COMPANY

Nova is a leader in the industry, and our human resource associates are among the best out there. We encourage you to explore our opportunities and see if Nova might be the place for you.

Corporate Values:

It appears that your fit with the values of this organization is: 80%

- At Nova, we thrive on intense competition. You'll have the chance to excel in our competitive internal environment, and, in collaboration with others, you'll compete with other industry players.
- Of course, to be competitive, you must be highly organized, and we pride ourselves on our degree of workplace organization.
- Being a company on the move, we also set performance expectations fairly high.
- Although we value our people, we realize that our other primary stakeholders must take priority, and everyone sacrifices to that end.

Compensation and Benefits:

It appears that your fit with the benefits offering of this organization is: 40%

Nova offers salaries that are highly competitive with the industry. In addition, we offer a standard vacation and health care package and a specialized mix of benefits that will ensure that your needs inside and outside of work are met. Specifically, we offer the following benefits, broken down by percentage of the mix:

- Holiday parties and other social events (40%)
- Dependent care flexible spending account (use of pre-tax dollars to pay child/elder care costs) (30%)
- Paid membership to professional associations (20%)
- Specialized insurance coverage (beyond normal health plan) including mental health coverage (10%)

Skills and Abilities:

It appears that your fit with the skills required by this job is: 20%

In terms of skills and abilities, we are looking for several important characteristics in our associates, including a bachelor's degree in a business or related field. While several characteristics are important, we highlight the following and give you an idea of the extent to which you might be asked to perform in your new job:

- First, you can expect to spend a good part of your time negotiating in various ways, and we highlight negotiating skills as particularly important for our new associates.
- Second, time management is important given the autonomy you can expect to experience on the job.
- Next, we consider the degree to which you are able to visualize problems well.
- Finally, customer service skills might be useful from time to time although not as important as the other skills above.
At Jacors, we take pride in being an industry leader, and our human resource associates are among the best in the business. We encourage you to explore our opportunities and see if you might like working here!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corporate Values:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>It appears that your fit with the values of this organization is: 70%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- At Jacors, our top value and driver of success is our degree of workplace organization. A highly coherent workplace is a must, and associates are expected to live up to this standard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Second, we thrive on competition. You'll have the chance to excel in our competitive internal environment, and, in collaboration with others, you'll compete with other industry players.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Of course, although the above must be placed above the individual, we take care of our people, and you can expect to be treated as a valued employee and professional.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Finally, we do not believe in setting performance expectations at a high level, especially early in the employment relationship. We want you to evaluate yourself and learn things right.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compensation and Benefits:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>It appears that your fit with the benefits offering of this organization is: 40%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Jacors offers salaries that are highly competitive with the industry. In addition, we offer a standard vacation and health care package and a specialized mix of benefits that will ensure that your needs inside and outside of work are met. Specifically, we offer the following benefits, broken down by percentage of the mix:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Paid memberships to professional associations (15%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Specialized insurance coverage (beyond) normal health plan including mental health coverage (30%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Holiday parties and other social events (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Dependent care flexible spending account (use of pre-tax dollars to pay child/career care costs) (10%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skills and Abilities:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>It appears that your fit with the skills required by this job is: 30%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- In terms of skills and abilities needed to do the job, we are looking for the following important characteristics in our associates, beyond a bachelor's degree in business or related field:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- First and foremost, we consider customer and personal service skills to be a premium, and you will excel to the degree that you can demonstrate those.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Second, you will often be called upon to negotiate with internal and external stakeholders, making this skill an important one.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Next, the ability to visualize problems will be somewhat useful in your new position.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Finally, although time management can help, it is less of a concern given the free-flowing nature of work at this company.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Danford Industries

Danford is among the industry leaders, and our human resource associates are among the best in the business. Please take time to explore our opportunities and see if Danford might be the place for you!

Corporate Values:

It appears that your fit with the values of this organization is: 70%

At Danford, people are our number one priority, and you'll sense this from day one. We also feel that maintaining an organized, coherent work environment leads to bottom line success. You'll find our environment to be friendly, with little competition, a plus in the eyes of most of our associates. Finally, you'll find that our performance expectations are not overbearing -- we want you to feel comfortable getting used to our culture and make steady progress.

Compensation and Benefits:

It appears that your fit with the benefits offering of this organization is: 60%

Danford offers salaries that are highly competitive with the industry. In addition, we offer a standard vacation and health care package and a specialized mix of benefits that will ensure that your needs inside and outside of work are met. Specifically, we offer the following benefits broken down by percentage of the min:
- Specialized insurance coverage (beyond normal health plan) including mental health coverage (40%)
- Paid memberships to professional associations (10%)
- Dependents are eligible for spending account (use of pre-tax dollars to pay child/elder care costs) (20%)
- Holiday parties and other social events (10%)

Skills and Abilities:

It appears that your fit with the skills required by this job is: 100%

In terms of skills and abilities, we are looking for several important characteristics in our associates including a bachelor's degree in a business or related field. While several characteristics are important, we highlight the following and give you an idea of the extent to which you might be asked to use each in your new job:
- Time management is the most important skill you need given the autonomy you'll experience on the job.
- Decided, you can expect to spend a good bit of time negotiating in various ways, and we highlight negotiating skills as particularly important for our new associates.
- We consider not only candidates, but also insiders to be customers, so customer and personal service is also looked for, though to a lesser extent.
- Finally, we consider to the degree to which our candidates can visualize problems, although this is not necessary in starting your new position.
### Corporate Values:

It appears that your fit with the values of this organization is: **70%**

- At Williams, we thrive on intense competition. You'll have the chance to excel in our competitive internal environment, and, in collaboration with others, you'll compete with other industry players.
- We value our people, but also realize that our other primary stakeholders must take priority, and everyone sacrifices to that end.
- Finally, we feel that a degree of disorganization is healthy and we promote such an environment for the sake of continued evolution.

### Compensation and Benefits:

It appears that your fit with the benefits offering of this organization is: **50%**

Williams offers salaries that are highly competitive with the industry. In addition, we offer a standard vacation and health care package and a specialized mix of benefits that will ensure that your needs inside and outside of work are met. Specifically, we offer the following benefits, broken down by percentage of the mix:

- Paid membership to professional associations (30%)
- Specialized insurance coverage (beyond normal health plan) including mental health coverage (20%)
- Independent care flexible spending account (use of pre-tax dollars to pay child/older care costs) (10%)

### Skills and Abilities:

It appears that your fit with the skills required by this job is: **50%**

In terms of skills and abilities needed to do the job, we are looking for the following important characteristics in our associates, beyond a bachelors degree in business or related field:

First and foremost, we consider customer and personal service skills to be a premium, and you will excel to the degree that you can demonstrate these.

Second, most of your time is your own, so time management is important. The ability to prioritize problems will also help you to a degree in your new position, as will negotiating skills, though to a lesser extent given our climate.
Corporate Values:

It appears that your fit with the values of this organization is: **10%**

At Herlo, our top value and driver of success is our degree of workplace organization. A highly coherent workplace is a must, and associates are expected to live up to this standard. Second, we tend to set high performance expectations and will hold you to those expectations as a way of enhancing your success. Third, we care about our people, and though stakeholder interests must sometimes trump individual interests, you’ll feel valued. Finally, we value collaboration and not competition in our environment.

Compensation and Benefits:

It appears that your fit with the benefits offering of this organization is: **0%**

Herlo offers salaries that are highly competitive with the industry. In addition, we offer a standard vacation and health care package and a specialized mix of benefit that will ensure that your needs inside and outside of work are met. Specifically, we offer the following benefits, broken down by percentage of the mix:

- Paid memberships to professional associations (5%)
- Dependent care flexible spending account (use of pre-tax dollars to pay child/elder care costs) (30%)
- Holiday parties and other social events (20%)
- Specialized insurance coverage (beyond) normal health plan including mental health coverage (10%)

Skills and Abilities:

It appears that your fit with the skills required by this job is: **20%**

In terms of skills and abilities needed to do the job, we are looking for the following important characteristics in our associates, beyond a bachelor's degree in business or related field:

First and foremost, we consider customer and personal service skills to be a premium, and you will want to the degree that you can demonstrate these.

Second, the ability to visualize problems will also help you to a degree in your new position.

Third, much of your time is scheduled already, but time management is still somewhat important. Negotiating skills might be of help, but to a lesser extent given our climate.
Corporate Values:

It appears that your fit with the values of this organization is: 10%

At Radnif you can expect to have high expectations placed upon you, this is our number one value. Also, we value a high degree of organization in the work environment as a key to success. While you will find the work challenging and rewarding, we do not place as high a value upon competition. Finally, it is important to understand that, while our people are important to us, we must place stakeholder interests above any individual interests.

Compensation and Benefits:

It appears that your fit with the benefits offering of this organization is: 50%

Radnif offers salaries that are highly competitive with the industry. In addition, we offer a standard vacation and health care package and a specialized mix of benefits that will ensure that your needs inside and outside of work are met. Specifically, we offer the following benefits, broken down by percentage of the mix:
- Holiday parties and other social events (10%)
- Paid memberships to professional associations (10%)
- Specialized insurance coverage (beyond) normal health plan including mental health coverage (10%)
- Dependent care flexible spending account (use of pre-tax dollars to pay child/elder care costs) (10%)

Skills and Abilities:

It appears that your fit with the skills required by this job is: 50%

In terms of skills and abilities, we are looking for several important characteristics in our associates including a bachelors degree in a business or related field. While several characteristics are important, we highlight the following and give you an idea of the extent to which you might be asked to use each in your new job:
- First, you can expect to spend a good bit of time negotiating in various ways and we highlight negotiating skills as particularly important for our new associates.
- Second, we take a hard look at the degree to which our candidates can visualize problems well.
- Third, time management is a plus, but not necessary since schedules are arranged in advance.
- Finally, although customer service is needed in other areas, your job will not involve interaction with customers.
APPENDIX C

WAVE 2 POSITION POSTINGS
(CONDITION 1 REPRESENTED)
Compensation and Benefits:

Green offers salaries that are highly competitive with the industry. In addition, we offer a standard vacation and health care package and a specialized mix of benefits that will ensure that your needs inside and outside of work are met. Specifically, we offer the following benefits, broken down by percentage of the mix:

- Dependent care flexible spending account (use of pre-tax dollars to pay child/elder-care costs) (10%)
- Specialized insurance coverage (beyond normal health plan) including mental health coverage (50%)
- Holiday parties and other social events (20%)
- Paid memberships to professional associations (10%)

Skills and Abilities:

In terms of skills and abilities, we are looking for several important characteristics in our associates including a bachelors degree in a business or related field. While several characteristics are important, we highlight the following and give you an idea of the extent to which you might be asked to use each in your new job:

- First, you can expect to spend a good bit of time negotiating in various ways, and we highlight negotiating skills as particularly important for our new associates.
- Second, time management is important given the autonomy you can expect to experience on the job.
- Next, we consider the degree to which our candidates can visualize problems well.
- Finally, customer service skills might be useful from time to time although not as important as the other skills above.

Corporate Values:

At Green, we thrive on intense competition. You'll have the chance to excel in our competitive internal environment, and, in collaboration with others, you'll compete with other industry players.

Of course, we also have an orientation towards our people, and you can expect to be treated as a highly valued employee and professional.

Also, we value a moderate degree of organization as a key to success.

Finally, we do not believe in setting performance expectations at a high level, especially early in the employment relationship. We want you to acclimate yourself and learn things right.
Welcome to Lewis. We are an industry leader, and our accounting associates are superb. We encourage you to explore our opportunities and see if Lewis might be the place for you.

Skills and Abilities:

In terms of skills and abilities needed to do the job, we are looking for the following important characteristics in our associates, beyond a baccalaureate degree in business or related field:

- First and foremost, you will succeed to the extent that you can effectively visualize problems as they occur and quickly make sense out of possible solutions.
- Second, time management is important given the autonomy you can expect to experience on the job.
- We consider not only insiders, but also insiders to be customers, so customer and personal service is also looked for, though to a lesser extent.
- Finally, negotiating is of lesser importance but still somewhat useful from time to time.

Corporate Values:

- At Lewis, our top value and driver of success is our degree of workplace organization. A highly coherent workplace is a must, and associates are expected to live up to this standard.
- Second, we thrive on competition. You’ll have the chance to excel in our competitive internal environment, and, in collaboration with others, you’ll compete with other industry players.
- Of course, although the above must be placed above the individual, we take care of our people, and you can expect to be treated as a valued employee and professional.
- Finally, we do not believe in setting performance expectations at a high level, especially early in the employment relationship. We want you to assimilate yourself and learn things right.

Compensation and Benefits:

Lewis offers salaries that are highly competitive with the industry. In addition, we offer a standard vacation and health care package and a specialized mix of benefits that will ensure that your needs inside and outside of work are met. Specifically, we offer the following benefits, broken down by percentage of the mix:

- Dependent care flexible spending account (use of pre-tax dollars to pay child/elder care costs) (40%)
- Paid memberships to professional associations (40%)
- Holiday parties and other social events (20%)
- Specialized insurance coverage (beyond normal health plan) including mental health coverage (10%)
Edgewood is an industry leader, and our accounting associates are among the best in the business. We encourage you to explore our opportunities and see if Edgewood might be the place for you!

Compensation and Benefits:

Edgewood offers salaries that are highly competitive with the industry. In addition, we offer a standard vacation and health care package and a specialized mix of benefits that will ensure that your needs inside and outside of work are met. Specifically, we offer the following benefits, broken down by percentage of the total:

- Specialized insurance coverage (beyond normal health plan) including mental health coverage (20%)
- Holiday parties and other social events (20%)
- Dependent care flexible spending account (use of pre-tax dollars to pay child/elder care costs) (20%)
- Paid memberships to professional associations (10%)

Corporate Values:

At Edgewood, you can expect to have high expectations placed upon you, as this is valued highly by our associates. While we expect a lot out of our associates, we think you will find a people-orientation that permeates our environment. You'll also find our environment to be friendly and relatively non-competitive, a plus in the eyes of our associates. Finally, we feel that a degree of disorganization in the work environment leads to profitability and greater bottom line success.

Skills and Abilities:

In terms of skills and abilities, we are looking for several important characteristics in our associates including a bachelor's degree in a business or related field. While several characteristics are important, we highlight the following and give you an idea of the extent to which you might be asked to use them in your new job:

- First and foremost, we consider customer and personal service skills to be a premium, and you will be asked to the degree that you can demonstrate these.
- Second, you will often be called on to negotiate with internal and external stakeholders, making this skill an important one.
- Third, time management is a plus, but not necessary since schedules are arranged in advance.
- Finally, we consider the degree to which our candidates can visualize problems, although this is not necessary in starting your new position.
Compensation and Benefits:
Fibbe offers salaries that are highly competitive with the industry. In addition, we offer a standard vacation and health care package and a specialized mix of benefits that will ensure that your needs inside and outside of work are met. Specifically, we offer the following benefits, broken down by percentage of the mix:
- Paid memberships to professional associations (50%)
- Specialized insurance coverage (beyond normal health plan) including mental health coverage (30%)
- Holiday parties and other social events (20%)
- Dependents care flexible spending account (use of pre-tax dollars to pay child/adult care costs) (10%)

Skills and Abilities:
In terms of skills and abilities, we are looking for several important characteristics in our associates including a bachelor's degree in a business or related field. While several characteristics are important, we highlight the following and give you an idea of the extent to which you might be asked to use each in your new job:
- First, time management is of top importance given the autonomy you can expect to experience on the job.
- Second, we consider the degree to which our candidates can visualize problems well to be important.
- We also consider customer and personal service to be linked to success during times when you are in contact with customers.
- Finally, negotiating is of lesser importance but still somewhat useful from time to time.

Corporate Values:
At Fibbe people are our number one priority, and you'll sense this from day one.
You'll find our environment to be competitive, a place in the eyes of most of our associates.
You'll also find our performance expectations to be moderate, as we want you to feel comfortable getting used to our culture and make steady progress.
We also feel that a degree of disorganization in the work environment leads to less rigidity and greaterbottom line success.

Apply for this position!
Return to the Job Bank Homepage
Corporate Values:
At Nolting, you can expect to have high expectations placed upon you — this is a highly valued part of our culture. Also, if you want to excel and compete with others to be the best, this is the place for you.
Next, we value a moderate degree of organization as a key to success.
Finally, although we value our people, we realize that our other primary stakeholders must take priority, and everyone sacrifices to that end.

Compensation and Benefits:
Nolting offers salaries that are highly competitive with the industry. In addition, we offer a standard vacation and health care package and a specialized mix of benefits that will ensure that your needs inside and outside of work are met. Specifically, we offer the following benefits, broken down by percentage of the mix:
- Holiday parties and other social events (40%)
- Paid memberships to professional associations (30%)
- Disability care flexible spending account (use of pre-tax dollars to pay child/elder care costs) (20%)
- Specialized insurance coverage (beyond normal health plan) including mental health coverage (10%)

Skills and Abilities:
In terms of skills and abilities, we are looking for several important characteristics in our associates including a bachelor's degree in a business or related field. While several characteristics are important, we highlight the following and give you an idea of the extent to which you might be asked to use each in your new job:
- First, you can expect to spend a good deal of time negotiating in various ways, and we highlight negotiating skills as particularly important for our new associates.
- Second, we consider not only outsiders, but also insiders to be customers, so customer and personal service is also looked for.
- Third, time management is a plus, but not necessary since schedules are arranged in advance.
- Finally, we consider the degree to which our candidates can visualize problems, although this is not necessary in starting your new position.
Skills and Abilities:
In terms of skills and abilities, we are looking for several important characteristics in our associates including a bachelor's degree in a business or related field. While several characteristics are important, we highlight the following and give you an idea of the extent to which you might be asked to use each in your new job:
- First, time management is of top importance given the autonomy you can expect to experience on the job.
- Second, we consider not only outsiders, but also insiders to be customers, so customer and personal service is also looked for.
- Third, you’ll be called on to negotiate not only with outside sources, but also your co-workers.
- Finally, we consider the degree to which our candidates can visualize problems, although this is not necessary in starting your new position.

Corporate Values:
- At Brock, our top value and driver of success is our degree of workplace organization. A highly coherent workplace is a must, and associates are expected to live up to this standard.
- At the same time, our performance expectations are high, although we want you to feel comfortable getting used to our culture and make steady progress.
- Of course, to create the type of environment where you can flourish given the intensely challenging standards we set, we also place importance upon treating our people well.
- You’ll find our environment to be friendly and non-competitive, a plus in the eyes of most of our associates.

Compensation and Benefits:
Brock offers salaries that are highly competitive with the industry. In addition, we offer a standard vacation and health care package and a specialized mix of benefits that will ensure that your needs inside and outside of work are met. Specifically, we offer the following benefits, broken down by percentage of the mix:
- Dependent care flexible spending account (use of pre-tax dollars to pay child/elder care costs) (30%)
- Paid memberships to professional associations (30%)
- Holiday parties and other social events (20%)
- Specialised insurance coverage (beyond normal health plan) including mental health coverage (10%)
Skills and Abilities:

In terms of skills and abilities, we are looking for several important characteristics in our associates including a bachelor’s degree in a business or related field. While several characteristics are important, we highlight the following and give you an idea of the extent to which you might be asked to use each in your new job:

- First, you can expect to spend a good bit of time negotiating in various ways, and we highlight negotiating skills as particularly important for our new associates.
- Second, time management is important given the autonomy you can expect to experience on the job.
- We consider not only customers, but also insiders to be customers, so customer and personal service is also looked for.
- Finally, we consider the degree to which our candidates can visualize problems well.

Corporate Values:

- At Rempe & Long, our top value and driver of success is our degree of workplace organization. A highly coherent workplace is a must, and associates are expected to live up to this standard.
- Second, we thrive on competition. You’ll have the chance to excel in our competitive internal environment, and, in collaboration with others, you’ll compete with other industry players.
- Our performance expectations are high, but not overbearing — we want you to feel comfortable getting used to our culture and make steady progress.
- Although we value our people, we realize that our other primary stakeholders must take priority, and everyone sacrifices to that end.

Compensation and Benefits:

Rempe & Long offers salaries that are highly competitive with the industry. In addition, we offer a standard vacation and healthcare package and a specialized mix of benefits that will ensure that your needs inside and outside of work are met. Specifically, we offer the following benefits, broken down by percentage of the plan:

- Dependent care flexible spending account (up to $5000 to pay child/elder care costs) (50%)
- Specialized insurance coverage (beyond normal health plan) including mental health coverage (30%)
- Paid memberships to professional associations (50%)
- Holiday parties and other social events (10%)
Skills and Abilities:

In terms of skills and abilities, we are looking for some very important characteristics in our associates including a bachelor's degree in a business or related field. While several characteristics are important, the following are highlighted and give you an idea of the extent to which you might be asked to use each in your new job.

- First and foremost, you will succeed to the extent that you can effectively visualize problems as they occur and quickly make sense out of possible solutions.
- Second, time management is important given the autonomy you can expect to experience on the job.
- We consider not only outsiders, but also insiders to be customers, so customer and personal service is also looked for, though to a lesser extent.
- Finally, negotiating is of lesser importance but still somewhat useful from time to time.

Corporate Values:

At Kelcorp you can expect to have high expectations placed upon you — this is a highly valued part of our culture. Also, if you want to socialize and compete with others to be the best, this is the place for you.

Of course, to create the type of environment where you can flourish given the intensely challenging standards we set, we also place importance upon treating our people well.

We also believe that a little disorganization is good in promoting healthy progress, and you can expect this as part of the environment.

Compensation and Benefits:

Kelcorp offers salaries that are highly competitive with the industry. In addition, we offer a standard vacation and health care package and a specialized rate of benefits that will ensure that your needs inside and outside of work are met. Specifically, we offer the following benefits, broken down by percentage of the mix:

- Dependents care flexible spending account (use of pre-tax dollars to pay child/elder care costs) (10%)
- Specialized insurance coverage (beyond normal health plan) including mental health coverage (20%)
- Paid memberships to professional associations (20%)
- Holiday parties and other social events (10%)
Corporation Values:

At Neyland, our top value and driver of success is our degree of workplace organization. A highly coherent workplace is a must, and associates are expected to live up to this standard.

At the same time, our performance expectations are high, although we want you to feel comfortable getting used to our culture and make steady progress.

Of course, to create the type of environment where you can flourish given the intensely challenging standards we set, we also place importance upon treating our people well.

You'll find our environment to be friendly and non-competitive, a plus in the eyes of most of our associates.

Compensation and Benefits:

Neyland offers salaries that are highly competitive with the industry. In addition, we offer a standard vacation and health care package and a specialized mix of benefits that will ensure that your needs inside and outside of work are met. Specifically, we offer the following benefits, broken down by percentage of the total:

- Paid memberships to professional associations (40%)
- Holiday parties and other social events (30%)
- Specialized insurance coverage (beyond normal health plans) including mental health coverage (50%)
- Dependent care flexible spending account (use of pre-tax dollars to pay child/elder care costs) (150%)

Skills and Abilities:

In terms of skills and abilities needed to do the job, we are looking for the following important characteristics in our associates, beyond a bachelor's degree in business or related field:

- First, time management is of top importance given the autonomy you can expect to experience on the job.
- Second, we take a hard look at the degree to which our candidates can visualize problems well.
- Third, you'll be called on to negotiate not only with outside sources, but also your co-workers.
- Finally, although customer service is needed in other areas, your job will not involve interaction with customers.

Apply for this position!

Return to the JobBank homepage.
Bluewing is an industry leader, and our accounting associates are among the best. We encourage you to scroll down and explore our opportunities to and see if Bluewing might be the place for you!

Corporate Values:

- At Bluewing, our top value and driver of success is our degree of workplace organization. A highly coherent workplace is a trust, and associates are expected to live up to this standard.
- Second, we take care of our people, and you can expect to be treated as a valued employee and professional at all times.
- Our performance expectations are high, but not overbearing -- we want you to feel comfortable getting used to our culture and make steady progress.
- You'll find our environment to be friendly and non-competitive, a plus in the eyes of most of our associates.

Compensation and Benefits:

Bluewing offers salaries that are highly competitive with the industry. In addition, we offer a standard vacation and health care package and a specialized mix of benefits that will ensure that your needs both inside and outside of work are met. Specifically, we offer the following benefits, broken down by percentage of the salary:

- Holiday parties and other social events (15%)
- Specialized insurance (beyond normal health plan) including mental health coverage (10%)
- Paid memberships to professional associations (5%)
- Dependents care flexible spending account (use of pre-tax dollars to pay child/elder care costs) (10%)

Skills and Abilities:

In terms of skills and abilities, we are looking for several important characteristics in our associates: Including a bachelor's degree in a business or related field. While several characteristics are important, we highlight the following and give you an idea of the extent to which you might be asked to use such in your new job:

- First, you can expect to spend a good bit of time negotiating in various ways, and we highlight negotiating skills as particularly important for our new associates.
- Second, time management is important given the autonomy you can expect to experience on the job.
- Next, we consider the degree to which our candidates can visualize problems well.
- Finally, customer service skills might be useful from time to time although not as important as the other skills above.

Apply for this Position
Return to the JobLink Homepage
Corporate Values:
- At Pinner, we thrive on intense competition. You'll have the chance to excel in our competitive internal environment, and, in collaboration with others, you'll compete with other industry players.
- Being a company on the move, we also set performance expectations at a high level.
- Finally, although we value our people, we realize that our other primary stakeholders must take priority, and everyone sacrifices to that end.

Skills and Abilities:
In terms of skills and abilities, we are looking for several important characteristics in our associates including a bachelor's degree in a business or related field. While several characteristics are important, we highlight the following and give you an idea of the extent to which you might be asked to use each in your new job:
- First, time management is the most important skill you'll need given the autonomy you'll experience on the job.
- Second, you can expect to spend a good bit of time negotiating in various ways, and we highlight negotiating skills as particularly important for our new associates.
- We consider not only outsiders, but also insiders to be customers, so customer and personal service is also looked for, thought to a lesser extent.
- Finally, we consider the degree to which our candidates can visualize problems, although this is not necessarily in starting your new position.

Compensation and Benefits:
Pinner offers salaries that are highly competitive with the industry. In addition, we offer a standard vacation and health care package and a specialized mix of benefits that will ensure that your needs inside and outside of work are met. Specifically, we offer the following benefits, broken down by percentage of the mix:
- Specialized insurance coverage (beyond normal health plan) including mental health coverage (30%)
- Dependents' care flexible spending account (tax-free to pay child/adolescents' care) (20%)
- Paid memberships to professional associations (20%)
- Holiday parties and other social events (10%)
Yetter Corp.

Yetter is a leader in the industry, and our accounting associates are among the best out there. We encourage you to explore our opportunities and see if Yetter might be the place for you!

Corporate Values:

- At Yetter, we thrive on intense competition. You'll have the chance to excel in our competitive internal environment, and, in collaboration with others, you'll compete with other industry players.
- Being a company on the move, we also set performance expectations at a high level.
- We value our people, but also realize that our other primary stakeholders must take priority, and everyone sacrifices to that end.
- Finally, we feel that a degree of disorganization is healthy and we promote such an environment for the sake of continued evolution.

Compensation and Benefits:

Yetter offers salaries that are highly competitive with the industry. In addition, we offer a standard vacation and health care package and a specialized mix of benefits that will ensure that your needs inside and outside of work are met. Specifically, we offer the following benefits, broken down by percentage of the mix:

- Specialized insurance coverage (beyond normal health plan) including mental health coverage (50%)
- Dependent care flexible spending account (use of pre-tax dollars to pay child/elder care costs) (50%)
- Holiday parties and other social events (20%)
- Paid memberships to professional associations (10%)

Skills and Abilities:

In terms of skills and abilities, we are looking for several important characteristics in our associates including a bachelors degree in a business or related field. While several characteristics are important, we highlight the following and give you an idea of the extent to which you might be asked to use each in your new job:

- First and foremost, we consider customer and personal service skills to be a premium, and you will excel to the degree that you can demonstrate these.
- Second, you'll take a hard look at the degree to which our candidates can visualize problems well.
- Third, you'll be called on to negotiate not only with outside sources, but also your co-workers.
- Finally, you'll find that your time is already pretty structured for you, so time management is less important but still a plus.
Neyar is an industry leader, and our accounting associates are among the best in the business. We encourage you to explore our opportunities and see if Neyar might be the place for you.

Corporate Values:
- At Neyar, our top value and driver of success is our degree of workplace organization. A highly coherent workplace is a must, and associates are expected to live up to this standard.
- At the same time, our performance expectations are high, although we want you to feel comfortable getting used to our culture and make steady progress.
- Of course, to create the type of environment where you can flourish given the intensely challenging standards we set, we also place importance upon treating our people well.
- You'll find our environment to be friendly and non-competitive, a plus in the eyes of most of our associates.

Compensation and Benefits:
Neyar offers salaries that are highly competitive with the industry. In addition, we offer a standard vacation and health care package and a specialized mix of benefits that will ensure that your needs inside and outside of work are met. Specifically, we offer the following benefits, broken down by percentage of the role:
- Dependent care flexible spending account (use of pre-tax dollars to pay child/elder care costs) (10%)
- Paid memberships to professional associations (30%)
- Specialized insurance coverage (beyond normal health plan) including mental health coverage (30%)
- Holiday parties and other social events (10%)

Skills and Abilities:
In terms of skills and abilities, we are looking for some very important characteristics in our associates including a bachelor’s degree in a business or related field. While several characteristics are important, the following are highlighted and give you an idea of the extent to which you might be asked to use each in your new job:
- First, time management is of top importance given the autonomy you can expect to experience on the job.
- Second, you will often be called on to negotiate with internal and external stakeholders, making this skill an important one.
- Next, the ability to visualize problems will be somewhat useful in your new position.
- Finally, although customer service is needed in other areas, your job will not involve interaction with customers.

Apply for the Position
Return to the JobLink Homepage
Gratz is an industry leader, and our accounting associates are among the best in the business. We encourage you to explore our opportunities and see if Gratz might be the place for you!

Skills and Abilities:

In terms of skills and abilities, we are looking for several important characteristics in our associates including a bachelors degree in a business or related field. While several characteristics are important, we highlight the following and give you an idea of the extent to which you might be asked to use each in your new job:

- First, you can expect to spend a good bit of time negotiating in various ways, and we highlight negotiating skills as particularly important for our new associates.
- Second, we take a hard look at the degree to which our candidates can visualize problems well.
- Third, true management is a plus, but not necessary since schedules are arranged in advance.
- Finally, although customer service is needed in other areas, your job will not involve interaction with customers.

Corporate Values:

At Gratz, people are our number one priority, and you'll know this from day one.

- We also feel that maintaining an organized, coherent work environment leads to bottom line success.
- Our performance expectations are high, but not overbearing -- we want you to feel comfortable getting used to our culture and make steady progress.
- You'll find our environment to be friendly and non-competitive, a plus in the eyes of most of our associates.

Compensation and Benefits:

Gratz offers salaries that are highly competitive with the industry. In addition, we offer a standard vacation and health care package and a specialized mix of benefits that will ensure that your needs inside and outside of work are met. Specifically, we offer the following benefits, broken down by percentage of the mix:

- Paid memberships to professional associations (50%)
- Holiday parties and other social events (30%)
- Dependent care flexible spending account (use or pre-tax dollars to pay child/elder care costs) (10%)
- Specialized insurance coverage (beyond normal health plan) including mental health coverage (10%)
Kakwanda is an industry leader, and our accounting associates are terrific. Take a look at our opportunities and see if Kakwanda might be the place for you!

Skills and Abilities:
In terms of skills and abilities needed to do the job, we are looking for the following important characteristics in our associates, beyond a bachelor's degree in business or related field:
First and foremost, you will succeed to the extent that you can effectively visualize problems as they occur and quickly make sense out of possible solutions.
Second, we consider not only our associates, but also insiders to be customers, so customer and personal service is also looked for.
Time management is somewhat important given the autonomy you can expect to experience on the job, as is negotiating skills, though to a lesser extent.

Compensation and Benefits:
Kakwanda offers salaries that are highly competitive with the industry. In addition, we offer a standard vacation and health care package and a specialized mix of benefits that will ensure that your needs inside and outside of work are met. Specifically, we offer the following benefits, broken down by percentage of the costs:
- Dependent care flexible spending account (use of pre-tax dollars to pay child/elder care costs) (30%)
- Paid memberships to professional associations (30%)
- Specialized insurance coverage (beyond normal health plan) including mental health coverage (20%)
- Holiday parties and other social events (10%)

Corporate Values:
At Kakwanda, you can expect to have high expectations placed upon you, as this is valued highly by our associates.
While we expect a lot out of our associates, we think you will find a people-orientation that promotes our environment.
You'll also find our environment to be friendly and relatively non-competitive, a plus in the eyes of our associates.
Finally, we feel that a degree of decentralization in the work environment leads to less rigidity and greater bottom-line success.
You'll find Reister to be a leader in the industry, and our accounting associates are among the best. We encourage you to explore our opportunities and see if we might be the place for you!

Compensation and Benefits:
Reister offers salaries that are highly competitive with the industry. In addition, we offer a standard vacation and health care package and a specialized suite of benefits that will ensure that your needs inside and outside of work are met. Specifically, we offer the following benefits, broken down by percentage of the mix:

- Specialized insurance coverage (beyond normal health plan) including mental health coverage (10%)  
- Dependent care flexible spending account (use of pre-tax dollars to pay child/elder care costs) (10%)  
- Paid memberships to professional associations (10%)  
- Holiday parties and other social events (10%)

Skills and Abilities:
In terms of skills and abilities, we are looking for several important characteristics in our associates, including a bachelor’s degree in a business or related field. While several characteristics are important, we highlight the following and give you an idea of the extent to which you might be asked to use each in your new job:

- First, you can expect to spend a good bit of time negotiating in various ways, and we highlight negotiating skills as particularly important for our new associates.
- Second, we take a hard look at the degree to which our candidates can visualize problems well.
- Third, time management is a plus, but not necessary since schedules are arranged in advance.
- Finally, although customer service is needed in other areas, your job will not involve interaction with customers.

Corporate Values:
At Reister you can expect to have high expectations placed on you; this is our number one value. While we expect a lot out of our associates, we think you will find a people-orientation that permeates our environment. Also, we value a moderate degree of organization as a key to success.

Finally, you will find the work challenging, but we do not place as high a value upon competition as we do upon collaboration.

Apply for this Position
Return to the Job and Homepage
Compensation and Benefits:

Tresh offers salaries that are highly competitive with the industry. In addition, we offer a standard vacation and health care package and a specialized mix of benefits that will ensure that your needs inside and outside of work are met. Specifically, we offer the following benefits, broken down by percentage of the mix:

- Dependent care flexible spending account (use of pre-tax dollars to pay child/elder care costs) (40%)
- Holiday parties and other social events (30%)
- Specialized insurance coverage (beyond normal health plan) including mental health coverage (10%)
- Paid memberships to professional associations (10%)

Corporate Values:

- At Tresh, we thrive on intense competition. You'll have the chance to excel in our competitive internal environment, and, in collaboration with others, you'll compete with other industry players.
- Being a company on the move, we also set performance expectations at a high level.
- Next, we value a moderate degree of organization as a key to success.
- Finally, although we value our people, we realize that our other primary stakeholders must take priority, and everyone sacrifices to that end.

Skills and Abilities:

In terms of skills and abilities, we are looking for some very important characteristics in our associates, including a bachelor's degree in a business or related field. While several characteristics are important, the following are highlighted and give you an idea of the extent to which you might be asked to use each in your new job:

- First, time management is of top importance. Given the autonomy you can expect to experience on the job.
- Second, you will often be called on to negotiate with internal and external stakeholders, making this skill an important one.
- Next, it's your ability to communicate problems will be somewhat familiar in your new position.
- Finally, although customer service is needed in other areas, your job will not involve interaction with customers.

Apply for this Position
Return to the Tresh Inc. Homepage
We pride ourselves on leading the industry, and our accounting associates are among the best you'll find. We encourage you to explore our opportunities and see if Quinn might be the place for you!

Corporate Values:
- At Quinn, we thrive on intense competition. You'll have the chance to excel in our competitive internal environment, and, in collaboration with others, you'll compete with other industry players.
- Of course, to be competitive, you must be highly organized, and we pride ourselves on our degree of workplace organization.
- Although we value our people, we realize that our other primary stakeholders must take priority, and everyone sacrifices to that end.
- Finally, we do not believe in setting performance expectations at a high level, especially early in the employment relationship. We want you to assess yourself and learn things right.

Skills and Abilities:
In terms of skills and abilities needed to do the job, we are looking for the following important characteristics in our associates, beyond a bachelors degree in business or related fields:
- First, time management is of top importance given the autonomy you can expect to experience on the job.
- Second, you will often be called on to negotiate with internal and external stakeholders, making this skill an important one.
- We consider not only customers, but also vendors to be customers, so customer and personal service is also looked for, though to a lesser extent.
- Finally, we consider the degree to which our candidates can visualize problems, although this is not necessary in starting your new position.

Compensation and Benefits:
Quinn offers salaries that are highly competitive with the industry. In addition, we offer a standard vacation and health care package and a specialized mix of benefits that will ensure that your needs inside and outside of work are met. Specifically, we offer the following benefits, broken down by percentage of the mix:
- Dependent care flexible spending account (use of pre-tax dollars to pay child/elder care costs) (40%)
- Paid memberships to professional associations (30%)
- Holiday parties and other social events (20%)
- Specialized insurance coverage (beyond normal health plan) including mental health coverage (10%)
Unymar is an industry leader, and our accounting associates are among the best in the business. We encourage you to scroll down and see if Unymar might be the place for you!

Compensation and Benefits:

Unymar offers salaries that are highly competitive with the industry. In addition, we offer a standard vacation and health care package and a specialized mix of benefits that will ensure that your needs inside and outside of work are met. Specifically, we offer the following benefits, broken down by percentage of the mix:

- Holiday parties and other social events (30%)
- Paid memberships to professional associations (30%)
- Specialized insurance coverage (beyond normal health plan) including mental health coverage (20%) and dependent care flexible spending account (use of pre-tax dollars to pay child/elder care costs) (10%)

Corporate Values:

- At Unymar, our top value and driver of success is our degree of workplace organization. A highly coherent workplace is a must, and associates are expected to live up to this standard.
- Second, we thrive on competition. You'll have the chance to excel in our competitive internal environment, and, in collaboration with others, you'll compete with other industry players.
- Of course, although the above must be placed above the individual, we take care of our people, and you can expect to be treated as a valued employee and professional.
- Finally, we do not believe in setting performance expectations at a high level, especially early in the employment relationship. We want you to acclimate yourself and learn things right.

Skills and Abilities:

In terms of skills and abilities, we are looking for several important characteristics in our associates including a bachelor's degree in a business or related field. While several characteristics are important, we highlight the following and give you an idea of the extent to which you might be asked to use each in your new job:

- First, time management is of top importance given the autonomy you can expect to experience on the job.
- Second, we consider not only outsiders, but also insiders to be customers, so exceptional personal and customer service is also looked for
- Next, the ability to visualize problems will be somewhat useful in your new position.
- Finally, negotiating is of lesser importance but still somewhat useful from time to time.

Apply for this position
Return to the Unymar Homepage
Beyling Enterprise

Beyling is an industry leader, and our accounting associates are among the best you'll find anywhere. We encourage you to explore our opportunities and see if Beyling might be the place for you.

Corporate Values:

At Beyling, people are our number one priority, and you'll sense this from day one. You'll find our environment to be competitive, a plus in the eyes of most of our associates. You'll also find our performance expectations to be moderate, as we want you to feel comfortable getting used to our culture and make steady progress. We also feel that a degree of disorganization in the work environment leads to less rigidity and greater bottom line success.

Compensation and Benefits:

Beyling offers salaries that are highly competitive with the industry. In addition, we offer a standard vacation and health care package and a specialized set of benefits that will ensure that your needs inside and outside of work are met. Specifically, we offer the following benefits, broken down by percentage of the total:

- Specialized insurance coverage (beyond normal health plan) including mental health coverage (30%)
- Paid memberships to professional associations (30%)
- Holiday parties and other social events (20%)
- Dependent care flexible spending account (use of pre-tax dollars to pay child/elder care costs) (10%)

Skills and Abilities:

In terms of skills and abilities needed to do the job, we are looking for the following important characteristics in our associates, beyond a bachelors degree in business or related field:

- First and foremost, you will succeed to the extent that you can effectively visualize problems as they occur and quickly make sense out of possible solutions.
- Second we consider not only outsiders, but also insiders to be customers, so customer and personal service is also looked for.
- Third, you'll be called on to negotiate not only with outside sources, but also your co-workers.
- Finally, you'll find that your time is already pretty structured for you, so time management is less important but still a plus.
APPENDIX D

STUDY PRE-QUESTIONNAIRE
Research Study Pre-Survey

Thank you for participating in this research study. The purpose of this survey is to determine how you feel about different job and organizational qualities, as well as your job skills. You will also be asked to provide some background information.

In the second phase of this study you will visit the computer laboratory in 345 Mason Hall, where you will be asked to take part in an exercise involving an internet job board. There will be an opportunity to sign up for a time to do so when you return your consent form by the due date.

All of your responses will be kept completely confidential. Your participation in this research project is completely voluntary, and you may withdraw from participating at any time and for any reason.

Part 1

Please answer the following background questions:

(these first two questions will be used to match your responses to those you make during the second part of the study)

1. Please indicate your date of birth (mm/dd/yy):

2. Please enter the last four digits of your social security number:

3. What is your ethnic background?
   - □ African American/Black
   - □ Hispanic/Latino
   - □ Caucasian/White
   - □ Asian
   - □ Native American/American Indian
   - □ Pacific Islander
   - □ Other (please specify) 

4. What is your gender?
   - □ Male
   - □ Female

5. Are you currently employed full-time (40 or more hours a week)?
   - □ Yes
   - □ No
6. Whether or not you are currently employed, in approximately how many months do you anticipate searching for your next full-time job?

- [ ] Already have a job or accepted a job and no plans to look for another one
- [ ] Currently searching for a new full-time job
- [ ] Within the next month
- [ ] Within the next six months
- [ ] Within a year
- [ ] Other (please specify):

7. What is your GPA?

8. How comfortable would you say you are using Internet-based applications?

   - [ ] Not at all comfortable
   - [ ] Moderately comfortable
   - [ ] Extremely comfortable

9. Please rate your level of comfort with browsing Internet applications:

   - [ ] Not at all comfortable
   - [ ] Moderately comfortable
   - [ ] Extremely comfortable

10. Through which class did you hear about participating in this study?

    Please check ALL that apply:

    - [ ] MHR 701
    - [ ] MHR 660
    - [ ] BA 555
    - [ ] Other (Please list here):

---

**Part 2**

In these next two parts (Parts 2 & 3), you will be asked to rank order your preferences for certain types of information or characteristics. Your responses will be used to build a personal job profile that may be used in Phase 2 of this study as you view job advertisements.

Advertisements for jobs might contain a variety of information. This information often falls into certain categories. In particular, the following three categories of information are often found in job advertisements:

- Information about the values that an organization believes in.
- Information about the benefits package you might expect to receive as an employee.
- Information about the knowledge, skills and abilities you might be expected to demonstrate on the job.
When you view job advertisements, this information is often presented in a different order depending on the job advertisement you are viewing, yet you probably have a certain preference for which type of information you would like to see first, second, and third when viewing job advertisements.

Below three different types of information are listed. Using the following scale, please indicate which type of information you prefer to see first, second, and third (last) in a job advertisement using:

1st = I'd prefer to see this type of information first out of the three;  
2nd = I'd prefer to see this type of information second out of the three;  
3rd = I'd prefer to see this information last out of the three.

Please ensure that there are no ties between types of information!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1st</th>
<th>2nd</th>
<th>3rd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Information about the values the organization believes in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Information about the benefits package</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Information about required knowledge, skills, and abilities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Part 3**

Listed below are three sets of four characteristics. Read the directions and make rankings as indicated.

**Set 1: Values.** Using the scale below, rank order all four of the items below from 1st to 4th in terms of the degree to which you personally value each. Ensure that you use each number (1st-4th) only once, and that there are no ties between characteristics!

Use this scale:

1st = Most valued  
2nd = Second most valued  
3rd = Third most valued  
4th = Least valued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1st</th>
<th>2nd</th>
<th>3rd</th>
<th>4th</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Being competitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Being people-oriented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Being organized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Having high performance expectations placed on you</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Set 2: Benefits.** Using the scale below, rank order all four of the items below from 1st to 4th in terms of the importance you place on them being included as part of a benefits package you might receive while working for a company. Ensure that you use each number (1st-4th) only once, and that there are no ties between characteristics!
Use this scale:
1st = Most important
2nd = Second most important
3rd = Third most important
4th = Least important

1st 2nd 3rd 4th
☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ Specialized insurance coverage (beyond normal health plan) including mental health coverage
☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ Holiday parties and other social events
☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ Dependent care flexible spending account (use of pre-tax dollars to pay child/elder care costs)
☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ Paid memberships to professional associations

Set 3: Knowledge, skills, and abilities. Using the scale below, rank order all four of the items below from 1st to 4th in terms of the degree of confidence you would have in adequately demonstrating each on a job. Ensure that you use each number (1st-4th) only once, and that there are no ties between characteristics!

Use this scale:
1st = Most confident
2nd = Second most confident
3rd = Third most confident
4th = Least confident

1st 2nd 3rd 4th
☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ Time management
☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ Negotiation
☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ Customer and personal service
☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ Visualization

Part 4

Please read the directions and rate each question as indicated.

Set 1: Values. Indicate from 1-7 how much you value each characteristic listed below using the scale provided.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Do not value at all</th>
<th>Value moderately</th>
<th>Value extremely highly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Being competitive:</td>
<td>☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ 6 ☐ 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being people oriented:</td>
<td>☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ 6 ☐ 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being organized:</td>
<td>☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ 6 ☐ 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Set 2: Knowledge, skills and abilities
Please rate from 1-7 the degree of confidence you would have in being able to adequately demonstrate on a job each of the following knowledge, skills, and abilities:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No confidence</th>
<th>A moderate amount of confidence</th>
<th>An extreme amount of confidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time management</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer and personal service</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visualization</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Set 3: Benefits
How important is it to you (from 1-7) that each benefit listed below be part of a benefits package you receive while working for a company?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefit</th>
<th>Not at all important</th>
<th>Moderately important</th>
<th>Extremely important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Holiday parties and other social events</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialized insurance coverage (beyond normal health plan) including mental health coverage</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent care flexible spending account (out of pre-tax dollars to pay child/child care costs)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paid memberships to professional associations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Part 5
The next set of questions asks you about your attitudes toward yourself and your approach to learning. Read each statement and indicate how you feel about it by selecting one response on the scale next to each statement.
1. I feel that I am a person of worth, at least on an equal level with others.  
   | Strongly disagree | Neutral | Strongly agree |
   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

2. I feel that I have a number of good qualities.  
   | Strongly disagree | Neutral | Strongly agree |
   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

3. All in all, I am inclined to feel that I am a failure.  
   | Strongly disagree | Neutral | Strongly agree |
   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

4. I am able to do things as well as most other people.  
   | Strongly disagree | Neutral | Strongly agree |
   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

5. I feel I do not have much to be proud of.  
   | Strongly disagree | Neutral | Strongly agree |
   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

6. I take a positive attitude towards myself.  
   | Strongly disagree | Neutral | Strongly agree |
   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

7. On the whole, I am satisfied with myself.  
   | Strongly disagree | Neutral | Strongly agree |
   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

8. I wish I could have more respect for myself.  
   | Strongly disagree | Neutral | Strongly agree |
   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

9. I certainly feel useless at times.  
   | Strongly disagree | Neutral | Strongly agree |
   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

10. At times I think I am no good at all.  
    | Strongly disagree | Neutral | Strongly agree |
    | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

11. I am willing to select a challenging work assignment that I can learn a lot from.  
    | Strongly disagree | Neutral | Strongly agree |
    | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

12. I often look for opportunities to develop new skills and knowledge.  
    | Strongly disagree | Neutral | Strongly agree |
    | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

13. I enjoy challenging and difficult tasks at work where I’ll learn new skills.  
    | Strongly disagree | Neutral | Strongly agree |
    | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

14. For me, development of my work ability is important enough to take risks.  
    | Strongly disagree | Neutral | Strongly agree |
    | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

15. I prefer to work in situations that require a high level of ability and talent.  
    | Strongly disagree | Neutral | Strongly agree |
    | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
Part 6

Below is a list of words that describe different personal characteristics.

Read each characteristic. Using the scale provided, indicate in the space provided how accurately that characteristic describes you. Consider yourself as you see yourself at the present time, not as you wish to be in the future. Consider your typical self, as compared with other persons you know of the same sex and of roughly your same age. You may use the “tab” key to move through the fields.

Please type a “0” (zero) in boxes next to any words that you do not know or understand.

Here is an example:

9   Careful:
If you were to type a 9 in the box for careful, you would be indicating that you feel that it is extremely accurate to describe yourself as careful.

1=extremely inaccurate description of me
9=extremely accurate description of me
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extremely inaccurate</th>
<th>Very inaccurate</th>
<th>Quite inaccurate</th>
<th>Slightly inaccurate</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Slightly accurate</th>
<th>Quite accurate</th>
<th>Very accurate</th>
<th>Extremely accurate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active</td>
<td>Extraverted</td>
<td>Negligent</td>
<td>Trustful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeable</td>
<td>Fearful</td>
<td>Nervous</td>
<td>Unadventurous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxious</td>
<td>Freethink</td>
<td>Organized</td>
<td>Unchangeable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artistic</td>
<td>Generous</td>
<td>Philosophical</td>
<td>Uncooperative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Articulate</td>
<td>Hypochondriac</td>
<td>Philosex</td>
<td>Uncreative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astigmatic</td>
<td>Harsh</td>
<td>Practical</td>
<td>Understanding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolsy</td>
<td>Helpful</td>
<td>Prompt</td>
<td>Understandable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bright</td>
<td>High-strung</td>
<td>Quiet</td>
<td>Unemotional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Careful</td>
<td>Imaginative</td>
<td>Relaxed</td>
<td>Unemotional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Careless</td>
<td>Imperceptive</td>
<td>Reserved</td>
<td>Unemotional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extremely inaccurate</th>
<th>Very inaccurate</th>
<th>Quite inaccurate</th>
<th>Slightly inaccurate</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Slightly accurate</th>
<th>Quite accurate</th>
<th>Very accurate</th>
<th>Extremely accurate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cold</td>
<td>Imperceptible</td>
<td>Bode</td>
<td>Unimaginative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complex</td>
<td>Impractical</td>
<td>Selfish</td>
<td>Unaggressive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientious</td>
<td>Inconsistent</td>
<td>Sillish</td>
<td>Unanalytical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Considerate</td>
<td>Inefficient</td>
<td>Shallow</td>
<td>Unintelligent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative</td>
<td>Inhibited</td>
<td>Shy</td>
<td>Unkind</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative</td>
<td>Innovative</td>
<td>Simple</td>
<td>Uncollective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daring</td>
<td>Insecure</td>
<td>Sloppy</td>
<td>Unorganized</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deep</td>
<td>Intellectual</td>
<td>Steady</td>
<td>Unphilosophical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demanding</td>
<td>Introverted</td>
<td>Sympathetic</td>
<td>Unsympathetic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disorganized</td>
<td>Introverted</td>
<td>Systematic</td>
<td>Unsystematic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extremely inaccurate</th>
<th>Very inaccurate</th>
<th>Quite inaccurate</th>
<th>Slightly inaccurate</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Slightly accurate</th>
<th>Quite accurate</th>
<th>Very accurate</th>
<th>Extremely accurate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distrustful</td>
<td>Irritable</td>
<td>Talkative</td>
<td>Unlikable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diffident</td>
<td>Jealous</td>
<td>Temperamental</td>
<td>Verbal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional</td>
<td>Kind</td>
<td>Thorough</td>
<td>Vigorous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ennuiotic</td>
<td>Moody</td>
<td>Tad</td>
<td>Warm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excitable</td>
<td>Neret</td>
<td>Touchy</td>
<td>Wistful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX E

STUDY ANNOUNCEMENT AND SOLICITATION
Script for initial introduction of study and recruitment of participants:

Hello, I am Brian Dineen, a Ph.D. student in Management and Human Resources here at the Fisher College of Business. The reason I am speaking to you today is to offer you a chance to participate in some research I am conducting. If you choose to participate both parts of this research project, you will earn five points of extra credit in this class. If you choose not to participate in the research project, or do not participate in the second part of the study, but would still like to have the opportunity to earn five points extra credit, you will have the chance to write a 3-page current event summary about a topic related to Human Resources or general management instead.

Many of you are probably starting to look towards getting a job, or perhaps are already in the process of getting a job. Our research involves the use of the World Wide Web for recruitment purposes, and we are interested in your responses to both a survey as well as an exercise to be run on the Web. Thus your involvement in this project will consist of (a) filling out an online survey that I will provide an address for to those of you who are interested today, and (b) signing up for and showing up to a computer laboratory located in 345 Mason Hall for the part of the study that will take place using the Web. Your total time involvement is estimated to be 15 minutes to do the up-front survey and one hour to participate in the laboratory part of the study.

I want to make sure you understand that participation in this study is purely voluntary, and you can withdraw from the study at any time and for any reason without penalty. I will ask you to sign a consent form that is attached to the sheet containing instructions and a Web address for the first survey. Please return this consent form during one of the next two class meetings. This consent form indicates that you are aware of and agree to your involvement in the study.

Are there any questions I can answer at this time? [address any questions]. I will go ahead and hand out the initial instructions and Web address for the first online survey. You will note that I have provided you with a contact phone number and email. Feel free to contact me at any time if questions arise. Again, thank you for your time today. I will be back at the next class meeting to collect the consent forms and allow you to sign up for a time to complete part two. [hand out instruction sheets/consent forms].

Script to be used when asking participants to sign up for laboratory times:

[have sheets with times posted in the front of the classroom, and make this announcement at the end of class].

Hello. I am Brian Dineen, the Ph.D. student conducting the study concerning Web-based recruitment. I am here today to talk to those of you who have completed the first online survey about signing up for a time to visit the laboratory in 345 Mason Hall in order to carry out the second part of the study. I have posted sheets up front [point to sheets] with
various times over the next 3 weeks for you to participate in the second part of the study. Again, your participation in this second part should take about one hour. Also I want to remind you that your participation in this study is completely voluntary, and you may withdraw at any time and for any reason without penalty. In an orderly fashion, those of you who completed the first online survey and have a consent form filled out, please come forward and sign up for a time. Once you have signed up for a time, please take a “reminder card” with you that reminds you of the time and place to show up. Thank you for your cooperation.
APPENDIX F

CONSENT FOR PARTICIPATION FORM
CONSENT FOR PARTICIPATION IN SOCIAL AND BEHAVIORAL RESEARCH

Protocol title: Examination of Web-Based Recruitment Issues (*actual title of study not used here, as it suggests the manipulations)

Protocol number: 02B0149

Principal Investigators: Raymond A. Noe & Brian R. Dineen

I consent to my participation in research being conducted by Raymond A. Noe and Brian R. Dineen of The Ohio State University and their assistants and associates.

The investigator(s) has explained the purpose of the study, the procedures that will be followed, and the amount of time it will take. I understand the possible benefits, if any, of my participation.

I know that I can choose not to participate without penalty to me. If I agree to participate, I can withdraw from the study at any time, and there will be no penalty.

I have had a chance to ask questions and to obtain answers to my questions. I can contact the investigators at 042 Fisher Hall, 292-4589 or bdineen@aol.com. If I have questions about my rights as a research participant, I can call the Office of Research Risks Protection at (614) 688-4792.

I have read this form or I have had it read to me. I sign it freely and voluntarily. A copy has been given to me.

Print the name of the participant:

______________________________________________________

Date: ___________________________ Signed: ___________________________

___________________________________

(Principal Investigator or his/her authorized representative)

HS-027 (Rev. 05/01)
(To be used only in connection with social and behavioral research.)
APPENDIX G

INSTRUCTIONS GIVEN TO PARTICIPANTS UPON ARRIVAL AT THE LABORATORY
Hello, and thank you once again for participating in this project. As you enter the computer laboratory, I will hand you a survey that you will use as you go through the Web site you will visit. On the top right hand corner of this survey you will find a number. Please sit at the terminal number corresponding to this number. There are post-it notes with terminal numbers at each terminal. Before you proceed to your terminal, please pick up a small registration sheet located on the ledge to your left as you enter the room. The last four digits of your social security number are located at the top of this sheet, and you will use the registration code once you start. Once you get to your terminal, please refrain from starting until I provide you with some background information and instructions. [allow participants to enter room, handing out shuffled stack of surveys as they do]

[Once everyone is seated at their randomly assigned computer terminals with a P-O/P-J fit perception survey and registration code sheet]

Today, you will be asked to view several job advertisements posted on a Web-based job board. A local consortium of businesses has pooled their efforts and is in the process of developing a Web-based job advertisement board. Before they publish this board and begin actually posting jobs on the Web, they are looking for students to visit the board as if they were looking to search for jobs, and apply to jobs that appear attractive. Of note, these position advertisements are not necessarily meant to be comprehensive, but instead represent a sampling of information about each position. For example, there is no financial or industry data presented, so please assume that any information you don’t find is similar across all positions you view. Also assume you will achieve a bachelor’s degree in the near future.

It is critical that you participate in this task as you would if you were actually looking to apply for jobs via the Web. However, no information will actually be divulged to companies, and company names have been changed.

You will use the registration code once you get to the second page of the site, and you will use the survey I handed you when you entered the room to evaluate the various position advertisements on the site. I need you to visit and evaluate all 20 positions listed on the home page for the site using your survey. However, you may choose to apply to as many or as few of these positions as you wish. In general, apply to those that seem relatively more attractive than others based on the information provided. Base your decisions on the information provided, not on missing information. Also, you may view the positions in any order, and return to positions you have already viewed. However, please do not use the back button on your browser, but rather only use the links provided in the site.
There is no pre-defined time in which to complete your viewing of the Web site, and you will have up an hour to do so. After you are finished and have logged out, please remain seated at your terminal until the hour time period is up. Some may finish earlier than others; do not be concerned about this -- just be patient and wait until the time is up. Once the hour is up, we will gather again as a group and I will provide you with some additional information before you leave the computer lab.

Are there any questions? If questions arise while you are in the site, please raise your hand and I will come to your terminal to answer them. Also, I may walk around the room from time to time to ensure everyone’s Web access is working properly.

[allow them to begin]
APPENDIX H

P-O AND P-J FIT PERCEPTIONS QUESTIONNAIRE
For identification purposes, please provide your:

Date of Birth (mm/dd/yy): ____/____/____

Last four digits of your social security number: ____ ____ ____ ____

Reminder: All information submitted throughout this study will be kept strictly confidential.

Please use this survey as you browse the job advertisements posted on the Internet site, JobLink. For each position listed on the site, please fill in the name of the organization offering the position, and answer the questions that follow:

Company: (please fill in company name): __________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very small extent</th>
<th>Very large extent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. To what extent do your knowledge, skills and abilities match the requirements of this job?
   1. To what extent will this job fulfill your needs?
   3. To what extent is this job a good match for you?
   4. To what extent are the values of this organization similar to your own values?
   5. To what extent will this organization fulfill your needs?
   6. To what extent is this organization a good match with you?

Company: (please fill in company name): __________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very small extent</th>
<th>Very large extent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. To what extent do your knowledge, skills and abilities match the requirements of this job?
   1. To what extent will this job fulfill your needs?
   3. To what extent is this job a good match for you?
   4. To what extent are the values of this organization similar to your own values?
   5. To what extent will this organization fulfill your needs?
   6. To what extent is this organization a good match with you?

Company: (please fill in company name): __________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very small extent</th>
<th>Very large extent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. To what extent do your knowledge, skills and abilities match the requirements of this job?
   1. To what extent will this job fulfill your needs?
   3. To what extent is this job a good match for you?
   4. To what extent are the values of this organization similar to your own values?
   5. To what extent will this organization fulfill your needs?
   6. To what extent is this organization a good match with you?

296
1. To what extent do your knowledge, skills and abilities match the requirements of this job?  
   - Very small extent 1 2 3 4 5
2. To what extent will this job fulfill your needs?  
   - Very small extent 1 2 3 4 5
3. To what extent is this job a good match for you?  
   - Very small extent 1 2 3 4 5
4. To what extent are the values of this organization similar to your own values?  
   - Very small extent 1 2 3 4 5
5. To what extent will this organization fulfill your needs?  
   - Very small extent 1 2 3 4 5
6. To what extent is this organization a good match with you?  
   - Very small extent 1 2 3 4 5
Company: (please fill in company name): __________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very small extent</th>
<th>Very large extent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. To what extent do your knowledge, skills and abilities match the requirements of this job?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. To what extent will this <strong>job</strong> fulfill your needs?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. To what extent is this <strong>job</strong> a good match for you?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. To what extent are the values of this <strong>organization</strong> similar to your own values?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. To what extent will this <strong>organization</strong> fulfill your needs?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. To what extent is this <strong>organization</strong> a good match with you?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Company: (please fill in company name): __________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very small extent</th>
<th>Very large extent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. To what extent do your knowledge, skills and abilities match the requirements of this job?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. To what extent will this <strong>job</strong> fulfill your needs?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. To what extent is this <strong>job</strong> a good match for you?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. To what extent are the values of this <strong>organization</strong> similar to your own values?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. To what extent will this <strong>organization</strong> fulfill your needs?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. To what extent is this <strong>organization</strong> a good match with you?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Company: (please fill in company name): __________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very small extent</th>
<th>Very large extent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. To what extent do your knowledge, skills and abilities match the requirements of this job?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. To what extent will this <strong>job</strong> fulfill your needs?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. To what extent is this <strong>job</strong> a good match for you?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. To what extent are the values of this <strong>organization</strong> similar to your own values?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. To what extent will this <strong>organization</strong> fulfill your needs?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. To what extent is this <strong>organization</strong> a good match with you?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. To what extent do your knowledge, skills and abilities match the requirements of this job? 1 2 3 4 5
2. To what extent will this job fulfill your needs? 1 2 3 4 5
3. To what extent is this job a good match for you? 1 2 3 4 5
4. To what extent are the values of this organization similar to your own values? 1 2 3 4 5
5. To what extent will this organization fulfill your needs? 1 2 3 4 5
6. To what extent is this organization a good match with you? 1 2 3 4 5
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Very small extent</th>
<th>Very large extent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. To what extent do your knowledge, skills and abilities match the requirements of this job?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. To what extent will this job fulfill your needs?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. To what extent is this job a good match for you?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. To what extent are the values of this organization similar to your own values?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. To what extent will this organization fulfill your needs?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. To what extent is this organization a good match with you?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Company: (please fill in company name): __________________________

1. To what extent do your knowledge, skills and abilities match the requirements of this job? | 1 2 3 4 5 |                   |
2. To what extent will this job fulfill your needs? | 1 2 3 4 5 |                   |
3. To what extent is this job a good match for you? | 1 2 3 4 5 |                   |
4. To what extent are the values of this organization similar to your own values? | 1 2 3 4 5 |                   |
5. To what extent will this organization fulfill your needs? | 1 2 3 4 5 |                   |
6. To what extent is this organization a good match with you? | 1 2 3 4 5 |                   |

Company: (please fill in company name): __________________________

1. To what extent do your knowledge, skills and abilities match the requirements of this job? | 1 2 3 4 5 |                   |
2. To what extent will this job fulfill your needs? | 1 2 3 4 5 |                   |
3. To what extent is this job a good match for you? | 1 2 3 4 5 |                   |
4. To what extent are the values of this organization similar to your own values? | 1 2 3 4 5 |                   |
5. To what extent will this organization fulfill your needs? | 1 2 3 4 5 |                   |
6. To what extent is this organization a good match with you? | 1 2 3 4 5 |                   |

Company: (please fill in company name): __________________________

1. To what extent do your knowledge, skills and abilities match the requirements of this job? | 1 2 3 4 5 |                   |
2. To what extent will this job fulfill your needs? | 1 2 3 4 5 |                   |
3. To what extent is this job a good match for you? | 1 2 3 4 5 |                   |
4. To what extent are the values of this organization similar to your own values? | 1 2 3 4 5 |                   |
5. To what extent will this organization fulfill your needs? | 1 2 3 4 5 |                   |
6. To what extent is this organization a good match with you? | 1 2 3 4 5 |                   |
Company: (please fill in company name): __________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very small extent</th>
<th>Very large extent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>To what extent do your knowledge, skills and abilities match the requirements of this job?</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>To what extent will this job fulfill your needs?</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>To what extent is this job a good match for you?</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>To what extent are the values of this organization similar to your own values?</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>To what extent will this organization fulfill your needs?</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>To what extent is this organization a good match with you?</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thank you for filling out this survey. Please turn it in to the researcher (Brian Dineen) before leaving the room.
Please enter the following code when asked.

You must enter the numbers exactly as shown or the researcher may not be able to identify you for extra credit purposes!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SS#</th>
<th>9318</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(A)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(B)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(D)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(E)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(F)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(G)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(H)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(I)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(J)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(K)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(L)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(M)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(O)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Initial Debriefing Immediately Upon Completion of the Laboratory Session:
(Read to participants as a group prior to them leaving the laboratory):

I would like to take this opportunity to thank you for your participation in today’s study. The work that you have completed and the information you have provided is much appreciated, and will help us better understand the use of the Web for recruitment purposes. Further, it provides us with valuable information about your preferences for jobs in general.

Because there are more students who will be participating in this study, I cannot go into specifics at the present time as to the specific setup and expected results. However, I will be providing you with a detailed debriefing, which will be sent to your email address that you provided on the consent form you signed earlier in the quarter. To help preserve the integrity of this study, I ask that you not discuss the nature of your activities today with anyone, until the entire study is complete and you receive my debriefing email. [4 weeks maximum]. Before I dismiss you, I would like to address any questions or concerns any of you may have [scan participants for possible signs of distress]. Are there any questions or concerns? [handle questions]. If there are no more questions, you are free to go, and thank you again for your participation.

Debrief Script Sent Via Email to all Participants Once the Study was Complete:

You have participated in a study that assesses the impact of customizing recruitment information to job seekers. The reason I am contacting you is to reveal in more detail the specific nature of that study and provide you with a mechanism to answer any questions you may have.

The study that you participated in is part of my doctoral dissertation entitled, “The effects of customizing recruitment information to individual job seekers in a Web-based recruitment context: A multi-level investigation.” Web-based recruitment is growing in popularity, and it is important to discover and investigate means by which we might be able to improve its efficiency and effectiveness as a tool for organizations and job seekers alike. Web-based recruitment can take place through a company’s private site (such as Delta Airlines or Microsoft) or through common job boards such as www.monster.com.

Among the various ways that job boards in particular might be enhanced as a tool for job seekers and organizations, the degree to which information presented in job board advertisements is customized to individual job seekers is in need of study. For example, it might be the case that job seekers will more fully integrate customized information into their job application decisions. If customized information pertains to job seekers’ potential fit with an organization, and job seekers integrate this information and pay more attention to it, they might make better application decisions in terms of their potential fit with the organizations they choose to apply to. Thus, time and energy on the part of job
seekers and organizations might be saved if job seekers decide not to apply to organizations with which they would not likely be a good fit anyway. Providing this information in an anonymous fashion is beneficial because it encourages honest responses from job seekers and is not used in any detrimental fashion by organizations – it is simply provided for the benefit of the job seeker.

For purposes of the study, a job board called JobLink was created by the researchers. Although you were initially led to believe that a local consortium of businesses created this Web site and were looking for students to test it, no such consortium exists in reality. It was necessary to tell you about a consortium in order for the jobs on the job board to appear more realistic to you in assessing them. Also, the jobs depicted on this Web site were not real jobs, but were developed solely for purposes of this study by the researchers. In addition, you were placed into one of four experimental conditions, depending on which computer terminal you chose to sit at. These conditions are explained below.

The four experimental conditions for this study were (a) received no customized information about fit, and did not have the chance to indicate and view information in a preferred order of information presentation, (b) you received customized information regarding your likely fit with the organizations on the job board, but did not have the chance to indicate and view information in a preferred order of information presentation, (c) you did not receive customized fit information, but did have the chance to indicate and view information in a preferred order of information presentation, and (d) you received customized information regarding your likely fit with the organizations on the job board, and also had the chance to indicate and view information in a preferred order of information presentation.

It is hypothesized that those of you who received information regarding likely fit with organizations indicated a level of perceived fit that was more consistent with your measured fit. Measured fit was based on a correlation between your preferences you indicated on the first survey of the study, and the characteristics offered by each job. Those able to receive information in a preferred order likely attended more to the information presented first, and thus demonstrated a stronger link between measured and perceived fit on these dimensions than on dimensions presented second or third. Also, perceived fit was hypothesized to link to actual application behavior, and those receiving customized fit information and/or information in a preferred order were thought to be more satisfied with the job board as a whole. Finally, organizations offering customized fit feedback were thought to end up with smaller, but better fitting applicant pools.

The results of this study will be tabulated in the near future. Knowledge from this study will aid recruiters in the future who must design Web-based job boards and job advertisements. If you are interested in learning about the results of this study, you can email me at dineen.3@osu.edu or call me at 292-4589. I would be happy to answer any questions you may have about the study, or the topic of Web-based recruitment. Thank you very much.
APPENDIX K

ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE PROFILE INSTRUMENT
Below, you will find 40 characteristics that could be used to describe what you personally value. Please scan through the list considering each characteristic and thinking:

**How characteristic is this attribute of me?**

The characteristics are:

1. Being results oriented
2. High performance expectations
3. Being people oriented
4. Being reflective
5. High pay for good performance
6. Not being constrained by many rules
7. Being distinctive
8. Praise for good performance
9. Having a clear guiding philosophy
10. Having a good reputation
11. Paying attention to detail
12. Being competitive
13. An emphasis on quality
14. Being socially responsible
15. Achievement orientation
16. Sharing information freely
17. Enthusiasm for the job
18. Being aggressive
19. Being team oriented
20. Being innovative
21. Security of employment
22. Working long hours
23. Being highly organized
24. Being supportive
25. Confronting conflict directly
26. Being rule oriented
27. Developing friends at work
28. Taking individual responsibility
29. Opportunities for professional growth
30. Being quick to take advantage of opportunities
31. Fairness
32. Decisiveness
33. Autonomy
34. Risk Taking
35. Informality
36. Being calm
37. Adaptability
38. Tolerance
39. Stability
40. Being analytical

Now, using each descriptor **ONLY ONCE**, please answer the following questions.

(Write the number on the lines below, instead of the word):

Which 2 descriptors are the **most** characteristic of what you value? ___  ___ (Scratch these 2 off the list!)
Which 2 descriptors are the **least** characteristic of what you value? ___  ___ (Scratch these off the list)

Of the remaining descriptors, which 3 are **more** characteristic of what you value? _____ _____ _____
Of the remaining descriptors, which 3 are **less** characteristic of what you value? _____ _____ _____

(Scratch these 6 off the list now, too.)

Of the remaining descriptors, which 4 are **more** characteristic of what you value? ___  ___  ___  ___
Of the remaining descriptors, which 4 are **less** characteristic of what you value? ___  ___  ___  ___

(Scratch these 8 off the list now, too.)

Of the remaining descriptors, which 7 do you value **more**? ___  ___  ___  ___  ___  ___  ___
(Scratch these 7 off the list now, too.)

Of the remaining descriptors, which 7 do you value **less**? ___  ___  ___  ___  ___  ___  ___

There should be a few characteristics remaining - this is OK.
APPENDIX L

KSA PILOT QUESTIONNAIRE
Thank you for completing this survey. The purpose of the survey is to determine students’ levels of knowledge, skills, and ability (KSA) in various areas. Please do not write your name on the survey, since your responses are anonymous. When you turn in your survey, the instructor will tear off the front sheet and separate it from your survey in order to give you extra credit points for participation.

Definitions of each of the KSAs are provided under each one. For each knowledge, skill, or ability, please indicate the extent to which you believe you possess that KSA. To receive extra credit, you must turn in the survey in class by June 5th, or bring it to the instructor’s office prior to that time.

**Skills**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skills</th>
<th>The extent to which I believe I possess this skill is:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Critical Thinking</strong></td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5  6  7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using logic and analysis to identify the strengths and weaknesses of different approaches</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reading Comprehension</strong></td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5  6  7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding written sentences and paragraphs in work related documents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Problem Identification</strong></td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5  6  7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifying the nature of problems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Information Gathering</strong></td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5  6  7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowing how to find information and identifying essential information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Management of Personnel Resources</strong></td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5  6  7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivating, developing, and directing people as they work, identifying the best people for the job</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Idea Generation</strong></td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5  6  7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generating a number of different approaches to problems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The extent to which I believe I possess this skill is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skill</th>
<th>Very low</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Very high</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Solution Appraisal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification of Key Causes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Perceptiveness</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idea Evaluation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Management</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Planning</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systems Perception</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Listening</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Solution Appraisal
Observing and evaluating the outcomes of a problem solution to identify lessons learned or redirect efforts.

Identification of Key Causes
Identifying the things that must be changed to achieve a goal.

Social Perceptiveness
Being aware of others' reactions and understanding why they react the way they do.

Coordination
Adjusting actions in relation to others' actions.

Idea Evaluation
Evaluating the likely success of an idea in relation to the demands of the situation.

Time Management
Managing one's own time and the time of others.

Implementation Planning
Developing approaches for implementing an idea.

Systems Perception
Determining when important changes have occurred in a system or are likely to occur.

Active Listening
Listening to what other people are saying and asking questions as appropriate.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skill</th>
<th>The extent to which I believe I possess this skill is:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Product Inspection</strong></td>
<td>Very low  2  3  4  5  6  7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspecting and evaluating the quality of products</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Judgment and Decision Making</strong></td>
<td>Very low  2  3  4  5  6  7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weighing the relative costs and benefits of a potential action</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Active Learning</strong></td>
<td>Very low  2  3  4  5  6  7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working with new material or information to grasp its implications</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monitoring</strong></td>
<td>Very low  2  3  4  5  6  7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessing how well one is doing when learning or doing something</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negotiation</strong></td>
<td>Very low  2  3  4  5  6  7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bringing others together and trying to reconcile differences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Systems Evaluation</strong></td>
<td>Very low  2  3  4  5  6  7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Looking at many indicators of system performance, taking into account their accuracy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Learning Strategies</strong></td>
<td>Very low  2  3  4  5  6  7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using multiple approaches when learning or teaching new things</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Visioning</strong></td>
<td>Very low  2  3  4  5  6  7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing an image of how a system should work under ideal conditions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operations Analysis</strong></td>
<td>Very low  2  3  4  5  6  7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyzing needs and product requirements to create a design</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Information Organization</strong></td>
<td>Very low  2  3  4  5  6  7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finding ways to structure or classify multiple pieces of information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The extent to which I believe I possess this skill is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skill</th>
<th>Very low</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Very high</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Persuasion</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synthesis/Reorganization</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifying Downstream Consequences</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management of Financial Resources</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment Selection</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Knowledge

The extent to which I believe I possess this knowledge is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge</th>
<th>Very low</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Very high</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration and Management</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**The extent to which I believe I possess this knowledge is:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The extent to which I believe I possess this knowledge is:</th>
<th>Very low</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Very high</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Computers and Electronics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of electric circuit boards, processors, chips, and computer hardware and software, including applications and programming</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Language</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of the structure and content of the English language including the meaning and spelling of words, rules of composition, and grammar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel and Human Resources</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of policies and practices involved in personnel/human resource functions. This includes recruitment, selection, training, and promotion regulations and procedures; compensation and benefits packages; labor relations and negotiation strategies; and personnel information systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and Training</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of instructional methods and training techniques including curriculum design principles, learning theory, group and individual teaching techniques, design of individual development plans, and test design principles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales and Marketing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of principles and methods involved in showing, promoting, and selling products or services. This includes marketing strategies and tactics, product demonstration and sales techniques, and sales control systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics and Accounting</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of economic and accounting principles and practices, the financial markets, banking, and the analysis and reporting of financial data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Mathematics
Knowledge of numbers, their operations, and interrelationships including arithmetic, algebra, geometry, calculus, statistics, and their applications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Law, Government and Jurisprudence
Knowledge of laws, legal codes, court procedures, precedents, government regulations, executive orders, agency rules, and the democratic political process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Clerical
Knowledge of administrative and clerical procedures and systems such as word processing systems, filing and records management systems, stenography and transcription, forms design principles, and other office procedures and terminology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Customer and Personal Service
Knowledge of principles and processes for providing customer and personal services including needs assessment techniques, quality service standards, alternative delivery systems, and customer satisfaction evaluation techniques

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Abilities
#### Oral Comprehension
The ability to listen to and understand information and ideas presented through spoken words and sentences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
The extent to which I believe I possess this ability is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ability</th>
<th>Very low</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Very high</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Near Vision</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written Expression</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech Clarity</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deductive Reasoning</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speed of Closure</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem Sensitivity</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Expression</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Near Vision*
The ability to see details of objects at a close range (within a few feet of the observer)

*Written Expression*
The ability to communicate information and ideas in writing so others will understand

*Speech Clarity*
The ability to speak clearly so that it is understandable to a listener

*Deductive Reasoning*
The ability to apply general rules to specific problems to come up with logical answers. It involves deciding if an answer makes sense.

*Speed of Closure*
The ability to quickly make sense of information that seems to be without meaning or organization. It involves quickly combining and organizing different pieces of information into a meaningful pattern

*Problem Sensitivity*
The ability to tell when something is wrong or is likely to go wrong. It does not involve solving the problem, only recognizing there is a problem.

*Oral Expression*
The ability to communicate information and ideas in speaking so others will understand
The extent to which I believe I possess this ability is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ability</th>
<th>Very low</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Very high</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Selective Attention</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The ability to concentrate and not be distracted while performing a task over a period of time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Originality</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The ability to come up with unusual or clever ideas about a given topic or situation, or to develop creative ways to solve a problem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written Comprehension</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The ability to read and understand information and ideas presented in writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Ordering</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The ability to correctly follow a given rule or set of rules in order to arrange things or actions in a certain order. The things or actions can include numbers, letters, words, pictures, procedures, sentences, and mathematical or logical operations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech Recognition</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The ability to identify and understand the speech of another person</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluency of Ideas</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The ability to come up with a number of ideas about a given topic. It concerns the number of ideas produced and not the quality, correctness, or creativity of the ideas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number Facility</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The ability to add, subtract, multiply, or divide quickly and correctly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The extent to which I believe I possess this ability is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very low</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Very high</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category Flexibility</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The ability to produce many rules so that each rule tells how to group (or combine) a set of things in a different way.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Visualization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The ability to imagine how something will look after it is moved around or when its parts are moved or rearranged</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inductive Reasoning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The ability to combine separate pieces of information, or specific answers to problems, to form general rules or conclusions. It includes coming up with a logical explanation for why a series of seemingly unrelated events occur together.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mathematical Reasoning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The ability to understand and organize a problem and then to select a mathematical method or formula to solve the problem</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When people evaluate job advertisements (i.e., job postings), they look at various pieces of information about the job. This information can include information about the cultural values held by the organization, the benefits offered (NOT including salary information), and/or the knowledge, skills, and abilities (KSAs) needed to perform the job effectively. When you evaluate a job advertisement, you probably have some kind of preference for seeing this type of information.

Please rank order these three types of information from 1 to 3 in order of their importance to you as you evaluate a job advertisement and decide whether or not to apply for a job (1 being highest, or most important, 3 being lowest, or least important):

1. ______ organizational culture/organizational values information
2. ______ benefits information (NOT including salary information)
3. ______ knowledge, skills, and abilities requirement information

Thanks again for filling out the survey!
APPENDIX M

BENEFITS PILOT QUESTIONNAIRE
Thank you for completing this survey. The purpose of the survey is to determine the degree to which you would like to have certain benefits be a part of a benefits package in a job. Please do not write your name on the survey, since your responses are anonymous. When you turn in your survey, the instructor will tear off the front sheet and separate it from your survey in order to give you extra credit points for participation.

For each benefit listed below, please indicate the extent to which you believe you would like that benefit to be part of a benefits package for a job. If you do not know what a particular benefit is, please circle "????". To receive extra credit, you must turn in the survey in class by June 8th, or bring it to the instructor's office prior to that time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The extent to which I would like this benefit to be part of a benefits package for a job is:</th>
<th>Very low</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Very high</th>
<th>Do not know what this benefit is</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Casual dress day (one per week)</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>????</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional memberships</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>????</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization-sponsored sports teams</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>????</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Club memberships</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>????</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional development opportunities (Seminars, courses, conferences, etc.)</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>????</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual dress day (every day)</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>????</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life insurance</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>????</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mail order prescription program</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>????</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-term care insurance</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>????</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplemental health accident insurance</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>????</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health care premium flexible spending account</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>????</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaccinations on-site (e.g., flu shot)</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>????</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefit</td>
<td>Very low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Very high</td>
<td>Do not know what this benefit is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dental insurance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental health insurance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vision insurance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prenatal program</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health screening programs (high blood pressure, etc.)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contraceptive coverage</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well-baby program</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee assistance program</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prescription program coverage</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMO (health maintenance organization health care)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infertility treatment coverage</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incentiv plan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellness program, resources and information</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPR training/first aid</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intensive care insurance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worklife newsletter/column</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical flexible spending accounts</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiropractic insurance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPO (preferred provider health care)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The extent to which I would like this benefit to be part of a benefits package for a job is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefit</th>
<th>Very low</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Very high</th>
<th>Do not know what this benefit is</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Defined contribution retirement plan                                  | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |       |           | ????
| On-site parking                                                       | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |       |           | ????
| Laptop for travel/personal use                                        | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |       |           | ????
| Payroll deductions (e.g., flexible spending account, 401K, etc.)      | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |       |           | ????
| Direct deposit                                                        | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |       |           | ????
| Incentive bonus plan                                                  | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |       |           | ????
| Shift premiums                                                        | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |       |           | ????
| Sign-on bonus                                                         | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |       |           | ????
| Educational assistance                                                | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |       |           | ????
| Credit union                                                          | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |       |           | ????
| Defined benefit retirement plan                                       | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |       |           | ????
| Employee discounts on company services                                | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |       |           | ????
| Automobile allowance/expenses                                         | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |       |           | ????
| New hire referral bonus                                               | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |       |           | ????
| Matching charitable contributions                                     | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |       |           | ????
| Stock options                                                         | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |       |           | ????
| Travel accident insurance                                             | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |       |           | ????
### The extent to which I would like this benefit to be part of a benefits package for a job is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefit</th>
<th>Very low</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Very high</th>
<th>Do not know what this benefit is</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employee keeps frequent flyer miles</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paid long distance calls to home while on travel</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flextime</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent care flexible spending account</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family leave above required FMLA leave</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telecommuting on a part-time basis</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compressed work weeks</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relocation benefits</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floating holidays (other than personal days)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paid holidays</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paid personal days (aside from sick and vacation days)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paid military leave (beyond what law requires)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paid jury duty</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paid bereavement leave</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paid sick leave</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-term disability</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short-term disability</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The extent to which I would like this benefit to be part of a benefits package for a job is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefit</th>
<th>Very low</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Very high</th>
<th>Do not know what this benefit is</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paid time off plan (sick, vacation, personal days all in one plan)</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>?????</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paid vacation</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>?????</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holiday parties</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>?????</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer picnic</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>?????</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company purchased tickets for sporting or cultural events</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>?????</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ice cream socials</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>?????</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halloween parties</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>?????</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme days</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>?????</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When people evaluate job advertisements (i.e., job postings), they look at various pieces of information about the job. This information can include information about the cultural values held by the organization, the benefits offered (NOT including salary information), and/or the knowledge, skills, and abilities (KSA's) needed to perform the job effectively. When you evaluate a job advertisement, you probably have some kind of preference for seeing this type of information.

Please rank order these three types of information from 1 to 3 in order of their importance to you as you evaluate a job advertisement and decide whether or not to apply for a job (1 being highest, or most important, 3 being lowest, or least important):

- [ ] organizational culture/organizational values information
- [ ] benefits information (NOT including salary information)
- [ ] knowledge, skills, and abilities requirement information

THANKS AGAIN FOR FILLING OUT THE SURVEY!