SCANNING SOCIAL NETWORKING SITES AS PART OF A HIRING PROCESS

A Thesis

Presented to the

Faculty of the Graduate School of

Angelo State University

In Partial Fulfillment of the

Requirements for the Degree

MASTER OF SCIENCE

by

KEVIN MICHAEL FOWLER

August 2013

Major: Industrial/Organizational Psychology

SCANNING SOCIAL NETWORKING SITES AS PART OF A HIRING PROCESS

by

KEVIN MICHAEL FOWLER

APPROVED:

_____

Kraig Schell, PhD.

_____

Cheryl Stenmark, PhD.

_____

Robert Mowrer, PhD.

_____

Mark Pullin, PhD.

_____

Date Successfully Defended and
Approved by Advisory Committee

APPROVED:

_____

Dr. June Smith Date

Interim Dean of the College of Graduate Studies

ABSTRACT

This study examined the relationship between personality ratings based on Facebook profiles and ratings of favorability for hire (FFH) for mock "applicants". The relationship between the amount of Facebook information available to view and FFH was also explored. Participants viewed screenshots taken from the applicants' Facebook profiles and rated five personality traits and FFH. Descriptive statistics revealed that FFH ratings and final hiring decisions often did not match. Also, it was found that Conscientiousness was correlated with FFH. There was no relationship between available information and the FFH rating. Discussion focuses on ramifications, limitations, and future research directions.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

APPENDICES

Introduction

Employers use a variety of methods to evaluate potential employees. One method that has become more prevalent in recent years is the use of Social Networking sites (SNWs) to form initial impressions of applicants. SNWs are websites that allow users to connect and socialize with others who share common interests, characteristics, beliefs, or friendships. Currently, the largest of these sites are Facebook, YouTube, Twitter, Pinterest, and Google+ (Kallas, 2012). Although SNWs can make it much easier for employers to learn about employees, job applicants can quickly harm their chances of being considered for jobs as a result of negative online portrayals of themselves (Havenstein, 2008; Miller, Parsons, & Lifer, 2010; Prost, 2007). However, very little is known about the manner in which these evaluations are being carried out, and what types of information are being used from these sites (Ivcevic & Ambady, 2012).

Review of the Literature

Social Networking

Boyd and Ellison (2008) define SNWs as online services that allow users to create public or semi-public profiles within a bounded system, create and associate with a list of other users with whom they share a connection, and view and associate with their list of connections and those lists made by others using the service. These forums allow Internet users to connect with others that they may not be able to easily contact using other methods. Unlike the majority of the Internet, most SNWs are pseudo-anonymous (Zhao, Grasmuck, & Martin, 2008) environments that allow users to create online representations of themselves.

While these sites are less anonymous than most others, they still provide a degree of perceived anonymity by allowing users to control most of the information presented. Even still, the illusion of anonymity leads users to share more information, specifically personal and sensitive information (Christofides, Muise, & Desmarais, 2009), than the "real" or physical world might (Brandtzaeg, Luders, & Skjetne, 2010). Although people are slowly becoming more aware of the potential risks associated with indiscriminate information-sharing (Bonds-Raacke & Raacke, 2010), many users remain unconcerned or simply unaware (Brandtzaeg et al, 2010) of these risks.

While the layouts and content focus of these sites vary, the essential purpose of these sites does not. Each site allows individuals to connect with other individuals with whom they share common interests, physical proximities, or other characteristics. These sites commonly contain a visible profile in which a user is able to provide a personal description, a visible list of connections, and a profile picture. SNWs have become the most popular mode of electronic communication, surpassing email and instant messaging services (Murnan, 2002; Judd & Kennedy, 2010), especially during the past decade. One SNW, Facebook, has become "one of the most-trafficked sites in the world" (Facebook, 2011) and is currently the largest SNW in existence (Fowler, 2012).

Facebook is a multimedia SNW that allows users to post text, photos, videos, and games to their own or another user's "Wall". A recent update has changed the Wall into the "Timeline", which adds a chronological aspect to the Wall. Rather than an amorphous

profile, the Timeline contains basic user information, including prior work experience, education, current residence, relationship status, birthday, gender, religious views, political views, contact info, family information. Furthermore, Facebook allows users to edit an "about you" section and a list of favorite quotes. Users can post "status updates", which are usually short, text-based messages about what the user is currently doing or feeling; they can join common-interest groups, instant-message chat with other users, and organize upcoming events, among other things. Users connect to one another by "friending" (in the case of individuals) or "liking" (in the case of businesses or celebrities). Furthermore, users can link other SNW sites to their Facebook accounts, which will post a notification on the user's timeline whenever the user is active on another site. One of the strengths of SNWs is that they allow employers to collect multiple assessments of an applicant's personality, resulting in greater measurement characteristics through aggregation. Facebook can provide a wide array of information about an applicant, including age, appearance, gender, race, nationality, current and past employment, sexual orientation, relationship/marital status, number of children, religious and political views, location, and much more, making it easy to see why it and other such sites are tempting to hiring managers.

The use of personal information derived from applicant profiles is perhaps less of an issue when addressing websites targeted at business professionals such as LinkedIn (in the United States) and Xing (in Europe), since these sites focus on professional qualifications and abilities rather than personal interests and friendships. A LinkedIn or Xing account is clearly intended to be viewed by potential employers, and this reality should lead to lower

expectations of employer/employee privacy regarding this type of website as compared to SNWs, which are typically not intended to be viewed by employers. Since these types of websites are primarily business-oriented and do not focus on personal connections, such sites are usually distinguished as professional networking sites (PNWs). Since it can be expected that the PNW profile was created with the goal of acting as a sort of virtual resume, it is unlikely that these websites will convey the sorts of personal and (from a hiring standpoint) irrelevant information commonly contained within the more socially-focused sites.

Privacy

A key issue relevant to the theoretical aspects of this study is whether or not the contents of an individual's SNW page can be considered private. On one hand, the information is available on the Internet, and most SNW profiles have public aspects that aid in the search for and recognition of users. On the other hand, certain aspects of the profile are usually private, and can only be accessed by those who have been privileged with this information – usually those who have been made 'friends' or 'followers'. Even among these connections, privacy levels can vary. Facebook, for example, allows users to determine who is allowed to view specific aspects of a profile, and these privacy controls have become increasingly complex over time. Thus, many privacy settings are often time-consuming and difficult to maintain, and all but the most general settings are typically ignored.

An employer screening an applicant's profile may be loosely analogous to an employer dropping by an applicant's home before making the hiring decision. While it may

be possible to predict certain traits by the condition of the applicant's domicile (e.g. conscientiousness, socioeconomic status), this would still be likely to be considered an invasion of privacy by the applicant – even if the employer was given permission to enter. The applicant may not see himself or herself as being in a position to refuse, especially if they want or need the job. In this example, the employer has not done anything illegal, but the applicant was likely to expect their address to be used for mailing and proof-of-residence purposes, not selection purposes. In much the same manner, the applicant might view the search of their SNW profile as a breach of trust – the applicant has provided their name and other personal characteristics that they might be identified during the selection process, not so the employer could look them up on SNW sites.

Legality and Ethicality

Another aspect of SNW use that is theoretically relevant for the current study is the question of whether SNW investigations of job candidates are 1) ethical and/or 2) legal. Just as interview questions and hiring measures must be job-relevant to be legally defensible, the same could be applied to information gained from SNW profiles. However, it is possible for an employer to view an applicant's SNW profile covertly, and an applicant may never know that they were rejected for a job based on the content of their Facebook profile. This means that employers are unlikely to face litigation, even if information derived from an applicant's SNW was used to make an illegal hiring decision. Indeed, debate has begun as to the ethicality and legality of SNW data mining, particularly without informed consent from the

applicant (Brown & Vaughn, 2011; Buchanan & Waring, 2010), but this has not deterred employers from the practice. A recent survey of 300 hiring professionals reported that 91 percent of surveyed employers use some sort of SNW to evaluate applicants, and 69 percent have reported rejecting an applicant because of unacceptable profile content (MacLeod, 2011). Given that SNWs are easily accessible, free, and can provide information about an applicant that may not come up in a traditional interview, it is not difficult to understand why employers might find these sites tempting. However, it remains to be seen whether the information gained from these sites will result in better overall hiring decisions or will inflate the chances of adverse impact.

The legality of using SNWs as a selection measure is questionable at best (Korzeniowski, 2012), and applicant perceptions of the fairness and utility of the practice seem to be quite negative (Miller et al., 2010). Since the majority of content on Facebook is directed at friends, it may be humorous, crude, or satirical, and portray aspects of the individual's character that are not relevant for the workplace. A survey conducted by Miller et al. (2010) showed that students were most comfortable with friends seeing the content of their SNW profiles and least comfortable with their profiles being viewed by potential employers.

Opinions on the use of SNW profiles to screen applicants are mixed. Some authors consider any information that has been made public on the Internet 'fair game' and argue that it can tell an employer a lot about the candidate's personality and judgment (Kluemper & Rosen, 2009). A spokesperson from Facebook, Brandee Barker, said profile checks were

acceptable provided that the employer was part of the applicant's social network and the applicant's privacy settings allowed it (cited in Frauenheim, 2006). Employers typically look for whether an applicant presents him- or herself professionally, whether the applicant is likely to be a good fit with the professional culture of the organization, and to check an applicant's qualifications. Common reasons for rejection are provocative content/photos, alcohol or drug use, and poor communication skills ("Employers", 2012).

However, not all managers and HR professionals agree that SNW profiles are effective, legal and/or useful (Kowske & Southwell, 2006). Steven Rothberg, president of CollegeRecruiter.com, warns employers to shy away from Facebook screening, on the grounds that public knowledge of the practice could negatively influence applicant perceptions of a company, turning an "employer of choice" into an "employer of last resort" (cited in Frauenheim, 2006). Generally, employment lawyers seem to be extremely hesitant to condone SNW searches (Kase, 2012; Frauenheim, 2006) because they perceive them to be indefensible if the organization faces litigation on their use in hiring. While it is more common for an applicant to be rejected than accepted due to information contained on their SNW profile, applicants may theoretically benefit from a more professional profile. The primary reason listed for accepting an employee based on their SNW profile was that the employer 'got a good feel of' the applicant's personality' ("Employers", 2012). Other reasons included that the applicant presented a professional image, was well-rounded and showed a wide range of interests, was well-spoken, and had good things said about them by others ("Employers", 2012).

Employers may be at risk of violating equal employment opportunity (EEO) regulations when using SNW profiles to make hiring decisions, since much of the personal information protected by EEO is easily accessible through most social networks (Frauenheim, 2006). Furthermore, a call has been made to include SNWs under the same protections afforded in the Fair Credit Reporting Act (FCRA), and argues that the search of an applicant's SNW profile can be considered an illegal background check (Davis, 2007). While it might be very common to use information derived from SNWs to make hiring decisions, it is not necessary legal. As stated by Davis (2007):

> "Three basic problems or issues accompany searches of online profiles for employment decisions: (1) inaccurate, irrelevant, or false information leads to unfair employment decisions; (2) lack of accountability and disclosure tempts employers to make illegal employment decisions; and (3) employer searches of an employee's online social life violate an employee's legitimate expectation of privacy." (p. 1).

Impression Management and Fabrication

As applicants become more aware of SNW's presence as a hiring tool, it is expected that they will adapt their online portrayals of themselves accordingly. Research has identified three separate behavioral groups that most Facebook users fall under – communicators, broadcasters, and interactors (Underwood, Kerlin, & Farrington-Flint, 2011). Communicators tend to support a relatively small number of anchored relationships, and focus on single-

person communications with individuals that are already well-liked or well-known. This type of user is uncomfortable with lying, even though their lies tend to be the type of "social oil" lies that support group cohesion and membership maintenance. Broadcasters tend to lack quality communication, and instead focus on self-promotion and self-oriented eyes with the goal of creating an ideal representation of themselves. The high-interaction group seems to be a weaker version of the broadcaster group, while showing lower-quality interactions than the communicator group while lacking the risk-taking and mild social deviance of the broadcaster group. Each of these groups is likely to take a different approach to impression management (IM) when aware that a potential employer might be viewing their profile, with the broadcast group most likely to present a falsely positive image.

Another problematic issue surrounding SNWs is fabrication, or how much of a user's profile is untrue or altered for the purposes of promoting their self-image. While portions of many user's profiles may very well be fabricated, Back et al., (2010) maintain that creating a completely idealized identity on Facebook would be difficult, because "(a) OSN profiles include information about one's reputation that is difficult to control (e.g., wall posts) and (b) friends provide accountability and subtle feedback on one's profile" (p. 372). Instead of being extraneous noise, the activity of friends can actually make a profile more resistant to fabrication. As a person's profile becomes increasingly idealized and fabricated, that person's friends might become increasingly impatient with the deception, even to the point of publicly acknowledging the inaccuracies of the profile, or by simply "de-friending" the individual. Therefore, it is unlikely that the majority of the information contained on an SNW

profile is fabricated, provided that the profile itself is subject-created and being used for the primary purpose of interacting with others. In fact, Anderson, Fagan, Woodnut, and Chamorro-Premuzic (2012) suggest that Facebook users tend to present themselves in a fairly realistic (if slightly exaggerated) manner, rather than creating an overly-idealized persona.

This is not to say that IM does not play an important role in the creation and maintenance of many profiles, just that there might be a limit to how much users are able to misrepresent themselves. A profile might be selective without necessarily being dishonest – users are likely to try to select, frame, and promote those aspects of their personalities that paint them in the most positive light. This is not dissimilar to the types of behaviors presented during face-to-face interviews – Applicants seek to emphasize the attractive parts of their personalities while downplaying the unattractive aspects. In fact, this type of behavior might be indicative of certain personality traits in and of itself (namely conscientiousness and narcissism), although more research needs to be done on this topic. SNW profiles offer users more control over their self-presentation than in face-to-face communication, which may lead to higher levels of IM (Ellison, Heino, & Gibbs, 2006). Furthermore, these profiles can be tailored to selected audiences, such as friends, family members, or employers depending on whom the owner is trying to impress. However, it is important to note that such self-maximizing behaviors are only likely when the primary purpose of the profile is to facilitate professional relationships (as is the case with PNW profiles). Since the primary purpose of most SNW profiles is to create and maintain non-professional relationships, it is unlikely that the information contained therein is significantly

altered, for the reasons listed above. Most SNW users tend to offer surprisingly accurate self-representations, and seem to be uninterested in creating false or idealized identities (Buten, 1996).

Individuals who foresee their profile being viewed by a potential employer may be much more careful about what is available to view on their profile. They may do this in two different ways – either by increasing the difficulty of finding / viewing their profile by changing their privacy settings or creating an alias, or by actively monitoring their profile and selecting what is presented. Moreover, not every applicant will possess a social networking account, especially those who may be older or come from underprivileged areas. It remains to be seen whether privacy or lack of a profile is a good thing for applicants – On one hand, they have ensured that there is no negative information about themselves on these sites, but they have also ensured that there is no positive information. It is possible that a lack of accessible information can harm an applicant's chances of employment. However, an article by Rebecca Tonn in the Colorado Springs Business Journal (2009) suggests that privacy may be safer than publicity, given that applicants are more than twice as likely to be eliminated rather than hired based on information gained from their Facebook pages.

Research on SNWs in Selection

While the amount of research into SNWs has exploded in recent years, and despite the pertinent issues outlined above, very few studies have directly addressed the use of SNWs for hiring purposes. One exception is the work published by Kluemper and colleagues (Kluemper & Rosen, 2009; Kluemper, Rosen, & Mossholder, 2012). Kluemper & Rosen

(2009) show that trained raters were able to accurately predict Big 5 personality traits, intelligence, and global performance using only information derived from users' SNWs. This finding is in concordance with previous studies regarding other-rated personality (Oh, Wang, & Mount, 2011), which demonstrated that observer ratings of personality tend to be associated with higher predictive validities with respect to job performance, generally on the order of about 0.10 for the Big Five traits. However, the quality of these predictions is directly dependent upon the quality of information used to make them. Since social network interactions are likely to show a user's "typical" personality rather than the "maximal" personality commonly shown during job interviews and professional interactions, they can provide a unique type of information to employers (Kluemper & Rosen, 2009).

In a follow-up study, Kluemper et al. (2012) describes the need for "an agreed upon personality structure [and] a reliable rating process." (p. 1145). This study also investigates the relationships between supervisor-rated job performance, perceptions of the individual being a quality hire, and academic success. Like the previous study, raters underwent training before engaging in the rating task. This study found that observers viewing SNW profiles were able to make ratings of personality as accurately as close friends and significant others. Furthermore, favorability for hire (FFH) decisions seem to be drawn by rater's perceptions of agreeableness and conscientiousness, and are significantly correlated with supervisor-rated job performance, indicating that hiring decisions made via SNWs may be job-relevant in some respects (Kluemper, et al., 2012).

While these results may seem promising, there are a number of theoretical and practical issues to consider regarding the use of SNWs in hiring. One of these is the relative lack of control an SNW user has over the content posted to his or her timeline. Friends, pages that the user has liked, and/or celebrities/groups that the user has "subscribed" to, can all post to a user's timeline. While the user can delete unwanted posts from his or her profile, such work is time-consuming and may not always be effective in preventing the information from being viewed by others. Therefore, a SNW user's profile may not represent only the personality of its owner, but also the personality of friends, family, and other contributors. This can make it more difficult to distinguish owner-generated content from non-owner-generated content, and raises the difficult issue of how much one's friends and associates reflect on one's own personality. If an applicant is very cautious and well-spoken on their own profile, but has a number of friends who are foul-mouthed and confrontational, what does this say about the applicant?

Another is the job-relevancy of the personality information being conveyed via SNWs – a person's "home" personality may differ from their "work" personality, as they adopt the appropriate roles to function within their environments. Employers have to consider whether it is really any of their concern if one of their employees enjoys drinking (which is a perfectly legal behavior, provided that the employee is of age) on the weekends. Simply because an employee engages in socially undesirable behavior on their own time does not mean that any of these behaviors affect their work life in any way. Regardless, research has shown that exposure to negative information, such as information regarding

drinking and gambling from non-resume sources, negatively affected evaluations of job applicants (Weathington & Bechtel, 2012).

Hypotheses

Based on the literature reviewed, two specific hypotheses guided the current study. It was expected that applicants' favorability for hire (FFH) will be positively related to raters' assessments of their personalities (H1) for all traits but Neuroticism, which is expected to be negatively related to FFH. Also, it was expected that the amount of information available to view on a given applicant's profile would relate significantly to ratings of FFH (H2).

Method

Participants

Evaluators. Participants were sampled from two populations. First, a sample of undergraduate psychology students from Angelo State University played the role of "inexperienced evaluators" in return for course credit. The original sample consisted of 25 students but 13 students were dropped due to equipment malfunction leaving 12 students (eight women and four men) as the final sample. However, data on which applicant was ultimately selected for hire was unavailable for participants 1, 2, 3, and 9. Eight students reported being less than 20 years of age, three reported being between the ages of 20 and 24, and one reported being between 25 and 29 years old. Six of the participants were white, and six Hispanic. All participants within this group reported possessing a personal Facebook page.

The "experienced evaluator" group was drawn from local residents with management and hiring experience in the San Angelo area. The original sample consisted of five managers but one was dropped due to equipment malfunction leaving four managers (two women and two men) as the final sample. Two reported being between 50 and 54 years of age, one reported being between 55 and 59 years of age, and one reported being between 60 and 64 years of age. Three of the participants were white, and one Native American / Alaskan Native. Only two had personal Facebook pages, although three out of four reported having a business Facebook page. As an incentive, $100 was awarded to members of this group through a raffle

consisting of two $50 gift certificates to local restaurants, as well as a summary of the results of the study with recommendations on how to apply these findings to their own organizations.

Applicants. The applicant group was comprised of six individuals, all of whom possess personal Facebook pages. Members of this group were selected from among the researcher's personal acquaintances based on demographic characteristics and by the privacy settings of their Facebook profiles in an attempt to create a pool of "applicants" that was both diverse and displayed a wide range of visibility levels. Visibility of Facebook profiles was rated by the researcher on the amount of data available to be viewed by the general public. Applicant 1 is an African-American male with a high-visibility Facebook profile. Applicant 2 is an African-American female with a high-visibility profile. Applicant 3 is a Hispanic male with a medium-visibility profile. Applicant 4 is a white female with a medium-visibility profile. Applicant 5 is a white male with a low-visibility profile. Applicant 6 is an Asian female with a low-visibility profile. Applicants were offered a summary of the results of the study, as well as suggestions on how to manage their profile to make them more "hirable".

Materials

Facebook profiles. Screenshots of Facebook profiles were procured from six individuals for use in this study. While the applicants were aware that screenshots were being captured from their profiles, they were asked not to make any significant changes in or

change the privacy settings of the profiles from the time that they agreed to participate in the study to the time the screenshots were taken – usually a period of a few hours. In this way, applicants were not allowed to perform any major "maintenance" of the profiles in an attempt to present the best possible image. Identifying information (such as last name) about the applicant and other individuals visible on the screenshots was blacked out to help protect privacy. Screenshots were taken in such a way that all publicly visible information was available to view. However, this required that some information be presented twice on two separate screenshots, due to overlap.

Personality assessments. The Neo-IPIP scale (Goldberg et al., 2006), a public-domain measure of Big Five traits similar to those in the NEO-PI-R (Costa & McCrae, 2008) was used to obtain self-report measures of personality from the applicants. Reported reliabilities for each subscale are as follows: Neuroticism ($\alpha = 0.86$), Extraversion ($\alpha = 0.86$), Openness to Experience ($\alpha = 0.82$), Agreeableness ($\alpha = 0.77$), Conscientiousness ($\alpha = 0.81$) (Goldberg et al., 2006). To reduce the amount of time needed to take the study, five one-item scales (one per trait) based on the Big Five trait measures above were constructed for use by raters. Each item includes a complete description of the trait and a semantic differential scale so that the evaluators were able to rate the personality of the applicant quickly. Each trait was scored using a 15-point semantic differential scale, with a rating of 1 being the lowest and 15 the highest (Appendix E).

Facebook profile assessments. Favorability for hire (FFH) was rated using a 15-point semantic differential scale (Appendix H) with the intent of measuring the evaluator's

likelihood of hiring the applicant based on their Facebook profile. The rater's familiarity with the applicant was measured using a 3-point scale (Appendix K).

Procedure

After signing in and completing an informed consent form (Appendix C), participants were calibrated using the Tobii T120 eye-tracking monitor [1]. Participants were then read the task instructions (Appendix A) and completed the demographics form (Appendix G). Each participant then viewed all of the screenshots for a given applicant, and then were given descriptions of each Big 5 personality trait (Appendix E) before being asked to rate the applicant they had just viewed on that trait. Screenshots were presented in a counterbalanced order, were only available to be only be viewed once by each participant, and could be advanced manually by the participant (participants could not backtrack to revisit a previously viewed page). A supplementary sheet of paper with the same descriptions of the Big 5 personality traits as presented within the study was available to each participant for reference. After rating an applicant for personality, participants then rated the applicant for FFH and estimated the applicant's level of academic achievement (Appendix I) [2]. After rating all applicants, participants completed the exit survey (Appendix J), which allowed participants to select which applicant they would wish to hire. After completing the task, the participant

[1] The original proposal included hypotheses that utilized eye-tracking data. Because of unexpected data contamination, the gaze data was not usable and therefore had to be removed from the thesis project.
[2] In the original proposal, academic achievement was identified as a potential independent variable. Due to unexpected data contamination, it could not be included in the final analytical procedures and had to be removed.

was thanked for their time and given course credit (if a student) or entered into the raffle (if a manager).

Results

Because only four managers were sampled in this study, all forthcoming analyses were conducted on the entire sample, grouping inexperienced and experienced evaluators together. Preliminary descriptive analyses sought to uncover patterns in ratings for each applicant. Table 1 displays mean participant ratings of personality, favorability for hire (FFH), and the number of times each applicant was chosen as the final "hire" at the end of the study. Also included are interrater reliabilities, calculated for ratings of all participants on the variables of FFH, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, Extraversion, Neuroticism, and Openness to Experience, using an intraclass correlation coefficient (ICC(2)). A two-way random model intraclass correlation (ICC(2)) was calculated for all five personality traits and the FFH measure, treating both raters and applicants as random factors.

The relationship between self and other ratings of personality was also analyzed as part of the description of the sample. Applicants' self-reported personality scores, measured using the IPIP Big Five scales, were mathematically converted into a 15-point scale (such as the one used by the raters) for each trait and the rater means were subtracted from the converted self-reported scale score. These deviations are reported in Table 2 to provide an idea of the agreement between raters and the applicants on these variables. Table 2 also gives a complete comparison of mean personality ratings and self-report ratings, as well as individual trait deviations and absolute mean deviations. Individual traits within some applicants show deviations as large as six points (within a 15-point scale) while absolute mean differences range from 1.28 to 3.05.

Table 1

Mean Big 5 Personality and FFH scores, Times Chosen for Final Hire, and Intraclass Correlations

Applicant	O	C	E	A	N	FFH	HIRED
A1	8.56	6.50	8.13	7.50	10.25	5.69	1
A2	9.73	10.0	12.50	10.38	6.31	10.88	4
A3	8.98	8.19	8.56	8.0	8.13	8.0	1
A4	13.06	9.75	11.63	10.06	5.81	9.88	1
A5	10.37	11.06	8.63	8.81	6.0	11.56	1
A6	6.81	7.38	7.12	7.50	6.69	7.81	4
ICC(2)	0.89	0.83	0.89	0.76	0.82	0.90	

Note: A = Applicant. O = Openness to Experience. C = Conscientiousness. E = Extraversion. A = Agreeableness. N = Neuroticism. FFH = Favorability for Hire. HIRED = Times chosen for final hire. Scores are reported on a 15-point scale. All ICC(2) measures significant at $p < .01$.

Table 2

Mean Personality Ratings Compared to Self-Reported Applicant Personality Scores

Applicant/Trait	Rater Mean	Rater SD	Self-Report	Deviation
Applicant 1 – Absolute Mean Deviation				**3.05**
O	8.56	3.33	13.80	-5.24
C	6.50	3.36	7.20	-0.70
E	8.13	3.48	13.20	-5.07
A	7.50	3.89	8.70	-1.20
N	10.25	2.77	7.20	3.05
Applicant 2 – Absolute Mean Deviation				**1.76**
O	9.73	3.42	14.70	-4.97
C	10.00	3.03	10.20	-0.20
E	12.50	1.93	11.40	1.10
A	10.38	2.28	11.40	-1.02
N	6.31	3.09	7.80	-1.49
Applicant 3 – Absolute Mean Deviation				**2.54**
O	8.94	2.35	11.10	-2.16
C	8.19	1.83	7.50	0.69
E	8.56	3.58	12.00	-3.44
A	8.00	2.37	11.40	-3.40
N	8.13	3.36	5.10	3.03

Note: Scores are reported on a 15-point scale.

Table 2 (cont.)

Mean Personality Ratings Compared to Self-Reported Applicant Personality Scores

Applicant/Trait	Rater Mean	Rater SD	Self-Report	Deviation
Applicant 4 – Absolute Mean Deviation				**1.28**
O	13.06	2.20	13.20	-0.14
C	9.75	3.28	12.60	-2.85
E	11.63	2.13	12.00	-0.37
A	10.06	2.11	12.00	-1.94
N	5.81	3.54	6.90	-1.09
Applicant 5 – Absolute Mean Deviation				**1.89**
O	10.37	1.71	12.00	-1.63
C	11.06	2.65	14.10	-3.04
E	8.63	2.47	11.10	-2.47
A	8.81	1.94	10.50	-1.69
N	6.0	2.10	5.40	0.60
Applicant 6 – Absolute Mean Deviation				**3.04**
O	6.81	3.76	12.90	-6.09
C	7.38	2.39	10.20	-2.82
E	7.12	2.83	8.10	-0.98
A	7.50	2.00	8.70	-1.20
N	6.69	2.44	10.80	-4.11

Note: Scores are reported on a 15-point scale. A = Agreeableness. C = Conscientiousness. E = Extraversion. N = Neuroticism. O = Openness.

The first hypothesis was that ratings of favorability for hire (FFH) would be positively correlated to raters' assessments of applicants' personalities with the exception of Neuroticism. To test this, bivariate correlations were run on the variables of FFH, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, Extraversion, Neuroticism, and Openness to Experience (see Table 3). Correlations between personality variables and FFH were relatively stable. Generally positive correlations were found for the variables of FFH, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, Extraversion, and Openness to Experience, while Neuroticism (the only variable listed to be negatively scaled)

Table 3

Correlations Between FFH and Personality Ratings

FFH	AGR	CON	EXT	NEUR	OPEN
A1	0.60	0.80*	0.56	-0.57	0.35
A2	0.55	0.48	0.18	-0.71*	0.49
A3	0.46	0.68*	0.24	-0.61	0.50
A4	0.51	0.63*	0.55	-0.19	0.32
A5	0.68*	0.91*	0.21	-0.31	0.67*
A6	0.76*	0.67*	0.40	0.30	0.18

Note: A = Applicant. AGR = Agreeableness. CON = Conscientiousness. EXT = Extraversion. NEUR = Neuroticism. OPEN = Openness. * = significant at $p < .008$. N = 16.

showed a generally negative pattern of correlations, with the exception of Applicant 6. Given the number of tests, alpha was set at $p < .008$ within each applicant (a Bonferroni correction), and despite this conservative criterion, some correlations remained significant, particularly with respect to Conscientiousness.

Secondly, it was expected that the amount of information available to view on a given applicant's profile would relate significantly to ratings of FFH. Table 4 shows mean FFH scores within visibility level groups, which were defined as the number of pages available to view without notifying the applicant to request "friend" status. To determine if the differences in visibility were associated with differences in FFH ratings a repeated-measures analysis of variance (ANOVA) was run across all raters . This test was found to be significant (F (5, 75) = 10.30, p <.001). A full list of pairwise comparisons may be found in Appendix L. A second repeated-measures ANOVA was run using average FFH scores from within each privacy group to determine if visibility levels had an effect on FFH scores. The results of this analysis failed to reach an acceptable significance level (F (2, 30) = 1.45, p = .25). Within visibility groups (i.e., averaging across the two applicants in each condition), the high-visibility applicants were rated lowest (M = 8.28, SD = 2.11) compared to the medium-visibility applicants (M = 8.94, SD = 2.83) and the low-visibility applicants (M = 9.69, SD =1.71).

Table 4

FFH Ratings by Level of Visibility

Visibility	High		Medium		Low		
Participant	A1	A2	A3	A4	A5	A6	Mean
1	10	11	10	9	*12*	8	10.00
2	4	5	6	4	*14*	11	7.33
3	8	*13*	9	9	12	8	9.83
9	8	8	*9*	*9*	*9*	4	7.83
13	2	***13***	10	*13*	*13*	8	9.83
14	***12***	11	8	*12*	9	8	10.00
17	5	10	8	10	*13*	**8**	9.00
18	9	*11*	9	8	10	**8**	9.16
19	1	*15*	1	3	10	**8**	6.33
20	3	**11**	8	*14*	13	8	9.50
24	3	**9**	12	*14*	12	9	9.83
25	1	11	5	5	***15***	8	7.50
26	6	***15***	8	13	8	4	9.00
28	7	8	**8**	8	8	*9*	8.00
29	7	*15*	10	12	13	**8**	10.83
30	5	8	7	***15***	14	8	9.50
Mean	5.69	10.88	8.00	9.88	11.56	7.81	
SD	3.15	2.78	2.42	3.57	2.18	1.63	

Note: A = Applicant. **Bolded** numbers represent applicant chosen for final hire, while *italicized* numbers represent highest FFH ratings. When a number is both **bolded** and *italicized*, the highest-rated applicant was chosen for final hire. Total number of final hires does not equal total number of raters due to missing data. Data on final choice of hire was unavailable for participants 1,2,3, and 9.

Post hoc observations of the data. Upon further inspection of the data, a *post hoc* interest emerged from the comparisons of FFH scores and each rater's ultimate hiring decision. Interestingly, participants showed a marked disparity between which applicant was given the highest FFH score immediately after rating and which applicant was ultimately chosen for hire at the end of the measure. In only 5 of 12 (42%) cases was the applicant rated the highest on FFH (or tied for the highest rating with another applicant) ultimately chosen for hire. The two most popular applicants for final hire were Applicant 2, with an average FFH score of 10.88, and Applicant 6, with a lower average FFH score of 7.81, even though Applicant 6 was never assigned the highest FFH score by any rater. Similarly, Applicant 5 had the highest average FFH score of 11.56, but was chosen as the final hire only once. This effect is just as visible in the experienced evaluator group as the inexperienced evaluator group, with a mismatch occurring in three out of four cases (75%) and five out of eight cases (63%), respectively.

Discussion

The purpose of this study was to examine how individuals connect publicly-viewable Facebook data to perceptions of the person's personality and favorability for hiring, with the intention that the findings might be applicable to selection practices in organizations. Despite the small sample size, results indicated that raters were fairly similar in their perceptions of the Facebook data, but made quite different decisions about hiring the applicants. Raters reported no familiarity with any of the applicants, removing any likelihood of a familiarity bias.

The first hypothesis examined the relationship between the rated favorability for hire (FFH) and the rated personalities across applicants. Personality variables were relatively stable in their correlations with FFH. This comes as no surprise, given that personality tests are widely used in the selection process (Heller, 2005; Rothstein & Goffin, 2006; Ryan & Sackett, 1987). The highest relationship was found for the trait of Conscientiousness, which has been shown to provide predictive validity across occupations, and is generally considered to be the most valid and robust personality trait in predicting job performance (Barrick & Mount, 1991; Mount & Barrick, 1995). The second-highest correlation was found for Agreeableness, which has been shown to be a much weaker overall predictor of performance (Barrick & Mount, 1991). However, while Agreeableness may not contribute a high level of predictive validity to task performance , or the core tasks of the job as spelled out in the job description, it has been shown to be a strong predictor of contextual performance – more voluntary activities that make it easier for core tasks to be performed (Van Scotter & Motowidlo, 1996). Less highly correlated were the traits of Extraversion and Openness to

Experience. While these traits may translate into positive organizational outcomes such as training proficiency and an increase in sales abilities (Barrick & Mount, 1991), on Facebook these traits may be displayed through less desirable actions such as partying or drug use. Finally, mostly negative correlations were found between Neuroticism and FFH, with the exception of applicant 6, with a positive correlation of 0.30 (possibly due to the lack of personality cues on this applicant's profile). This is consistent with the findings that this trait is detrimental to job performance (Barrick & Mount, 1991). In sum, the findings of this study partially support the first hypothesis; that applicants' favorability for hire would be correlated with ratings of personality.

The second hypothesis examined the relationship between the amount of information publicly visible and the FFH rating. It was hypothesized that applicants with a greater amount of information publically available to view would receive higher FFH ratings than their low-visibility counterparts. It was found that there were significant differences between mean FFH scores between applicants. Significant mean differences ($p < .008$) were found between applicants 1 and 2, applicants 1 and 5, and applicants 5 and 6. However, this reveals only that there were significant mean differences between applicants, and not whether visibility had any effect on FFH ratings.

To further test the relationship between visibility levels and FFH, applicants were divided into high-, medium-, and low-visibility categories based on the amount of information available for non-friends to view. Contrary to expectations, a trend in the opposite direction was observed, primarily due to the low mean score for Applicant 1 and the

high mean score for Applicant 5. However, this trend was not statistically significant. As such, support for the second hypothesis was not found. One reason for this null result may have been statistical power (16 ratings x 2 applicants per condition). Furthermore, the division of profiles into visibility groups was somewhat arbitrary and based on number of visible pages, which assumes the amount of information across applicants within each visibility level is constant. This, of course, is likely a problematic assumption. Future studies should examine the same relationship with a more exact definition of information content to separate the visibility groups.

As noted previously, the relationship between the FFH ratings given to each applicant while taking the measure were not predictive of which applicant was chosen for final hire at the end of the measure. In only five of the 12 available cases (42%) was the applicant with the highest FFH scores chosen as final hire. Within the non-manager group, participants were evenly split – four out of eight chose at the end of the study to hire the applicant that they had rated most highly during the study itself. Within the manager group, only one of four participants chose for final hire the applicant that was rated most highly during the measure. Paradoxically, this suggests that the applicants rated as most favorable for hire during the applicant review process may not always be hired.

Upon further examination, a noticeable preference among raters was found for applicants 2 and 6. Applicant 2 is an African-American female with a high-visibility profile, who graduated from Angelo State University in 2011 (although none of the participants in this study reported any familiarity with her). She has over 800 friends, is usually laughing or

portraying humorous poses in photographs, and tends to post humorous status reports. Applicant 6 is an Asian female with a low-visibility profile. The only information available to view is her first name, profile picture (in which she is featured with two other girls, making it impossible to know which is her), that she joined Facebook in 2010, and the fact that she is of Korean heritage and currently lives in Gyeongsan, a city in the south of the Korean peninsula. No information is given on her education or work history, and ratings of her personality were tightly clustered around the middle score – neither high nor low. However, she was chosen for final hire as often as Applicant 2, whose ratings of personality and FFH were higher overall. Furthermore, this effect was not confined to the non-manager group: Two of the experienced hiring managers chose Applicant 6 as final hire, despite both of these individuals giving her a rating of 8 on FFH and a rating of 15 (the highest possible) to Applicant 2. This indicates that something other than personality, education, and work history may be the most critical piece of information when making hiring decisions based only on FB data. Given that the primary manner in which Applicant 6 differed from her competitors was her Asian heritage, it may very well be possible that racial stereotypes (in this case, the stereotype that the majority of people of Asian descent are smart and hardworking) were possible for her popularity.

While one of the initial goals of this study was to examine the eye-tracking patterns of managers vs. non-managers while using Facebook to evaluate applicants, a number of limitations made such a comparison impossible. Obtaining experienced hiring managers proved much more difficult to recruit for the study than was initially expected, and the final

manager sample consisted of only four managers. Compounding this problem was a difficulty in obtaining usable eye-tracking data from the Tobii system. Due to limitations within the data collection software, the Tobii system failed to record data for roughly half of the participants sampled. Although some of this was recovered by watching the eye-tracking videos, the majority of these participants did not have survey data or video recorded, and could not be used. This problem further limited the sample to 12 students and four managers, too small to support a truly comparative analysis. Because of this, the data could not be split between managers and non-managers. The same problem led to a failure to collect sufficient data on predicted academic achievement, one of the intended independent variables in the initial study.

The selection of the applicant group from among the researcher's personal acquaintances is another limitation of this study – simply by sharing this common characteristic, the applicant sample may have been less than optimal. Future studies may wish to select a more diverse applicant pool, as all applicants included in this study attended college at one point, shared geographical ties to the area in which this study was conducted, and were all roughly the same age. Factors such as having children, visible disabilities, and other information that might have affected choice of hire were not represented through this sample.

Another limitation of this study was the use of single-point estimate personality scales. These scales gave each participant a thorough description of the personality trait being measured, and allowed the participant to rate the applicant viewed on a scale of 1-15. This

was done in order to reduce the amount of time needed to take the study. Because each participant was required to rate all six applicants, taking even the shortened version of the IPIP featuring ten items per construct would have resulted in 300 personality items as compared to the 30 required for the single-point tests. However, this made it impossible to determine reliability coefficients for individual participants, and made it necessary to rely purely on inter-rater reliabilities.

Future studies may wish to limit the number of applicants available for evaluation, as the disparity between FFH ratings and final applicant hired may indicate an inability on the part of participants to remember details about all 6 applicants. It is possible that the number of applicants in this study might have resulted in the choice of the most memorable applicant, not necessarily the most highly rated. Reducing the number of applicants would also allow the use of multi-item scales when rating applicant personality, increasing the reliability of these measurements while keeping time needed to take the study within reasonable limits. In order to more accurately test the relationship between visibility and FFH, the same applicants' Facebook profile could be presented in high- and low-visibility conditions, controlling for the quality of information while manipulating the quantity.

While this study attempted to determine the manner in which personality and privacy settings affected hiring decisions made via Facebook, much more research is needed into this topic. Not only are the number of social networks available for perusal numerous, both the type of information presented and the manner of presentation will differ between applicants and sites. It is predicted that while some general trends may be identifiable when rating

applicants based on information gleaned from SNWs, the utility of these sites will be marginal at best, and employers may be better served by more traditional selection measures for both practical and legal reasons.

References

Anderson, B., Fagan, P., Woodnut, T., & Chamorro-Premuzic, P. (2012). Facebook psychology: Popular questions answered by research. *Psychology of Popular Media Culture, 1*, 23-27.

Back, M., Stopfer, J., Vazir, S., Gaddis, S., Schmukle, S., Egloff, B., & Gosling, S. (2010). Facebook profiles reflect actual personality, not self-idealization. *Psychological Science, 21*, 372-374.

Barrick, M. R., & Mount, M. K. (1991). The Big Five personality dimensions and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology, 44*, 1–26.

Boyd, D.M., & Ellison, N.B. (2008). Social network sites: Definition, history, and scholarship. *Journal of Computer-mediated Communication, 13*, 210-230.

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

Buchanan, R.F., & Waring, R.L. (2010). Social networking web sites: The legal and ethical aspects of pre-employment screening and employee surveillance. *Journal of Human Resources Education, 4,* 14-23.

Buten, J. (1996). Personal homepage survey. Available from http://www.asc.upenn.edu/usr/sbuten/phpi.htm.http://www.nicola.doering.de/Hogrefe/buten/www.asc.upenn.edu/usr/sbuten/phpi.htm

Bonds-Raacke, J., & Raacke, J. (2010). MySpace and Facebook: Identifying dimensions of uses and gratifications for friend networking sites. *Individual Differences Research, 8*, 27–33.

Brandtzaeg, P. B., Luders, M., & Skjetne, J. H. (2010). Too many Facebook 'friends'? Content sharing and sociability versus the need for privacy in social network sites. *International Journal of Human-Computer Interaction, 26*, 1006–1030.

Christofides, E., Muise, A., & Desmarais, S. (2009). Information disclosure and control on Facebook: Are they two sides of the same coin or two different processes? *CyberPsychology & Behavior, 12*, 341–345.

Costa, P. T., Jr., & McCrae, R. R. (2008). The Revised NEO Personality Inventory. In G.J. Boyle, G. Matthews, & D.H. Saklofske (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of personality theory and assessment* (Vol. 2), pp. 179-198. London; SAGE.

Davis, D. C. (2007). MySpace Isn't Your Space. *bepress Legal Series*, 1943.

Ellison, N., Heino, R., & Gibbs, J. (2006). Managing impressions online: Self-presentation processes in the online dating environment. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication, 11,* 415–441.

"Employers are scoping out job candidates on social media – But what are they finding?" (2012). *Careerbuilder.* Infographic retrieved from http://www.careerbuilder.com/JobPoster/Resources/page.aspx?pagever=2012SocialMedia&template=none&sc_cmp2=JP_Infographic_2012SocialMedia

Facebook. (2011, April 28). Facebook factsheet. Retrieved from http://www.facebook.com/press/info.php?factsheet.

Fowler, G. (2012). Facebook: One billion and counting. *The Wall Street Journal,* Oct. 4, 2012. Retrieved from http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10000872396390443635404578036164027386112.html

Frauenheim, E. (2006). "Caution advised when using social networking web sites for recruiting, background checking", *Workforce Management, Vol. 24.* Retrieved from http://www.workforce.com/article/20061114/NEWS02/311149993/caution-advised-when-using-social-networking-web-sites-for-recruiting-background-checking#

Goldberg, L. R., Johnson, J. A., Eber, H. W., Hogan, R., Ashton, M. C., Cloninger, C. R., & Gough, H. C. (2006). The International Personality Item Pool and the future of public-domain personality measures. *Journal of Research in Personality, 40,* 84-96.

Havenstein, H. (2008). Employers using social networks in hiring process. *Computerworld*. Retrieved from http://computerworld.co.nz/news.nsf/care/63C6E9BE6A2CD920CC2574C90003ADDD

Heller, M. (2005). Court ruling that employer's integrity test violated ADA could open door to litigation. *Workforce Management, 84*, 74–77.

Ivcevic, Z. & Ambady, N. (2012). Personality impressions from identity claims on Facebook. *Psychology of Popular Media Culture 1*, 38-45.

Judd, T., & Kennedy, G. (2010). A five-year study of on-campus Internet use by undergraduate biomedical students. *Computers and Education, 55*, 1564–1571.

Kallas, P. (2012). Top 10 social network sites by market share of visits (August 2012). Retrieved from http://www.dreamgrow.com/top-10-social-networking-sites-by-market-share-of-visits-august-2012/

Kase, A. (2012, March). Can your employer demand your Facebook password? *Labor and Employment.* Retrieved 4/18/2013 from http://blogs.lawyers.com/2012/03/can-your-employer-demand-your-facebook-password/

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

Kluemper, D.H., Rosen., P.A., & Mossholder, K.W. (2012). Social networking websites, personality ratings, and the organizational context: More than meets the eye? *Journal of Applied Social Psychology 42,* 1143–1172.

Korzeniowski, P. (2012). Laws evolving on employer use of social media sites. *Investors News Daily.* Retrieved 4/18/2013 from http://news.investors.com/technology/060812-614235-maryland-law-blocks-employers-from-personal-social-media.htm?p=full

Kowske, B. & Southwell, M. (2006). E-screening proves 'E-resistible': But at what cost? *Human Resource Executive Online.* Retrieved from http://www.hreonline.com/HRE/view/story.jhtml?id=6835642

MacLeod, I. (2011). 91% of employers use social media to scan applicants. *The Drum.* Retrieved from http://www.thedrum.com/news/2011/10/24/91-employers-use-social-media-screen-applicants

Miller, R., Parsons, K., & Lifer, D. (2010). Students and social networking sites: The posting paradox. *Behaviour & Information Technology, 29*, 377-382.

Mount, M., & Barrick, M. (1995). The big five personality dimensions: Implications for research and practice in human resources management. *Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management, 13*, 153-200.

Murnan, C. (2002). Expanding communication mechanisms: They're not just e-mailing anymore. *Special Interest Group on University and College Computer Services,* 5, 267–272.

Oh, I.S., Wang, G., & Mount, M.K. (2011). Validity of observer ratings of the five-factor model of personality traits: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 96*, 762-773.

Prost, M., 2007. Checking out candidates online. *Human Resource Executive Online.* Retrieved from http://www.hreonline.com/HRE/view/story.jhtml?id=17008309

Rothstein, M. G., & Goffin, R. D. (2006). The use of personality measures in personnel selection: What does current research support? *Human Resource Management Review, 16*, 155–180.

Ryan, A. M., & Sackett, P. R. (1987). A survey of individual assessment practices by I/O psychologists. *Personnel Psychology, 40*, 455–488.

Tonn, R. (2009). Employers 'unfriend' job seekers who use Facebook. *Colorado Springs Business Journal.* Nov. 19, 2009.

Underwood, D., Kerlin, L., & Farrington-Flint, L. (2011) The lies we tell and what they say about us: Using behavioral characteristics to explain Facebook activity. *Computers in Human Behavior, 27*, 1621-1626.

Weathington, B., & Bechtel, A. (2012). Alternative sources of information and the selection decision making process. *Institute of Behavioral and Applied Management.* 108-120.

Zhao, S., Grasmuck, S., & Martin, J. (2008). Identity construction on Facebook: Digital empowerment in anchored relationships. *Computers in Human Behavior, 24*, 1816–1813.

APPENDIX A

Task Instructions

Greetings, and welcome to the Angelo State University psychology lab. My name is _____, and I will be administering your study today.

Today, you will be playing the role of a hiring manager. You have an open position in your company, and must choose between a set of 5 applicants. However, the only information you have about these applicants is their Facebook profiles. Based on these profiles, you must attempt to rate their personality and level of academic achievement, and then finally choose which applicant you will choose to hire.

You will be conducting this study on a Tobii T120 eye-tracking monitor. This machine will track your eye movements and fixations, as well as saccades (very fast eye movements used to move from one point on the screen to another). Please inform the experimenter if you have any uncorrected vision issues, or are otherwise unable or unwilling to participate in the study.

Now, we will calibrate the eye-tracking software. This may require several attempts, so please be patient. Also, please refrain from making large head movements during the course of the survey: While the monitor can compensate for most smaller head movements, larger movements can require us to recalibrate.

Now that we've calibrated, please listen to these instructions:
You will be shown a series of screenshots from each applicant's Facebook page in a random order. To move through these screenshots, please press the space bar on the keyboard in front of you. However, you will not be able to return to a screenshot after you have left it, so please make sure that you have reviewed each one thoroughly. Once you have viewed all of the screenshots, you will be asked to rate the applicant you have just viewed on their personality. A series of questions will appear on the screen, please answer each one as accurately as possible. You will also be asked to rate the academic achievement of the applicant on a scale of 1-10: 1 being the LOWEST and 10 being the HIGHEST. After you have answered all of these questions, you will be shown the next set of screenshots.

While the amount of time needed to take the study varies from person to person, we estimate that most people will take roughly one hour. However, take as much time as you need to answer completely and accurately. If you have any questions about these instructions, please ask your experimenter. Otherwise, you may begin the task by pressing the space bar.

APPENDIX B

Informed Consent Form: Applicants

Angelo State University

Institutional Review Board (IRB)

Consent to Participate in an IRB-Approved Research Event

Project Title: Scanning social networking sites as part of a hiring process:
An eye-tracking study

Investigator Name/Department: Kevin Fowler / Industrial Organizational Psychology

Investigator Phone: (325) 812 6468

You are being asked to participate in a research event conducted with the approval of the Angelo State University Institutional Review Board (and if applicable, other relevant IRB committees). In order to participate, you are required to give your consent by reading and signing this document.

The investigator will explain to you in detail the purpose of the project, the procedures to be used, and the potential benefits and possible risks of participation. You may ask any questions you have at any time before the project begins. A basic explanation of the project is written below. Please read and, should you decide to participate, sign this form in the presence of the person who explained the project to you. Upon request, you will be given an unsigned copy of this form for your records.

Refusal to participate in this study will have no effect on any future services you may be entitled to from the University. Anyone who agrees to participate in this study is free to withdraw from the study at any time without penalty. I understand also that it is not possible to identify all potential risks in an experimental procedure, and I believe that reasonable safeguards have been taken to minimize both the known and potential but unknown risks.

APPENDIX B (cont.)

1. Nature and Purpose of the Project

The purpose of the project is to examine the differences between the eye paths of managers and non-managers when viewing social networking profiles as part of a hiring process. Furthermore, the accuracy of predictions of personality and academic achievement derived from the profiles will be studied.

2. Explanation of Procedures.

The researcher will need to take a series of screenshots of those aspects of your Facebook profile that are publicly accessible (what people who are NOT your friends see when they search your name). You will also be asked to take the NEO IPIP personality test. This measure is comprised of 50 questions and typically takes 10-15 minutes to complete. You are also asked to report your most recent grade point average, and take a brief survey on how you feel about employers using Facebook as a hiring tool. Participants taking this study will view the screenshots taken of your Facebook profile and attempt to estimate your personality and level of academic achievement, as compared to your self-report data.

3. Discomfort and Risks.

All efforts have been taken to anticipate risk to the participant and minimize it accordingly. All measures may be taken either on paper or via Internet.

4. Benefits.

This study will give us a clearer picture of the search styles being used by manager and non-manager groups, and help us determine whether experience in hiring will lead to increased accuracy when rating social networking profiles for FFH. Furthermore, it will provide data as to which aspects of an applicant's profile provide reviewers with the most useful data.

5. Confidentiality.

Your last name and any information that might be used to identify you will be altered or deleted. You will have the option to review and approve of all screenshots taken of our profile before the commencement of the study. However, you will not be able to withdraw from the study once it has commenced. Neither your personality scores nor your academic achievement levels will be shared with anyone outside of the data-collection process.

APPENDIX C

Informed Consent Form for Participants

Angelo State University

Institutional Review Board (IRB)

Consent to Participate in an IRB-Approved Research Event

Project Title: Scanning social networking sites as part of a hiring process:
An eye-tracking study

Investigator Name/Department: Kevin Fowler / Industrial Organizational Psychology

Investigator Phone: (325) 812 6468

You are being asked to participate in a research event conducted with the approval of the Angelo State University Institutional Review Board (and if applicable, other relevant IRB committees). In order to participate, you are required to give your consent by reading and signing this document.

The investigator will explain to you in detail the purpose of the project, the procedures to be used, and the potential benefits and possible risks of participation. You may ask any questions you have at any time before the project begins. A basic explanation of the project is written below. Please read and, should you decide to participate, sign this form in the presence of the person who explained the project to you. Upon request, you will be given an unsigned copy of this form for your records.

Refusal to participate in this study will have no effect on any future services you may be entitled to from the University. Anyone who agrees to participate in this study is free to withdraw from the study at any time without penalty. I understand also that it is not possible to identify all potential risks in an experimental procedure, and I believe that reasonable safeguards have been taken to minimize both the known and potential but unknown risks.

APPENDIX C (cont.)

1. Nature and Purpose of the Project

The purpose of the project is to examine the differences between the eye paths of managers and non-managers when viewing social networking profiles as part of a hiring process. Furthermore, the accuracy of predictions of personality and academic achievement derived from the profiles will be studied.

2. Explanation of Procedures.

Participants will play the part of a hiring manager who is using Facebook to finalize a hiring decision. Participants will view 6 sets of screenshots taken from Facebook. They will then rate the personality and perceived academic achievement of the owners of these profiles, and provide a final decision on whom they will 'hire'. Participants will perform all tasks on a Tobii T120 eye-tracking monitor, which will record eye paths, saccades, and fixations.

3. Discomfort and Risks.

All efforts have been taken to anticipate risk to the participant and minimize it accordingly. Participants may be exposed to profanity or other disagreeable material – the sample profiles have been represented in the most accurate way possible to preserve the integrity of the study.

4. Benefits.

This study will give us a clearer picture of the search styles being used by manager and non-manager groups, and help us determine whether experience in hiring will lead to increased accuracy when rating social networking profiles for FFH.

5. Confidentiality.

You have been assigned a random participant number for the purpose of this study. Your name will not be attached to any of the data collected, and none of your responses will be revealed to anyone outside of the study.

Furthermore, you are expected to respect the confidentiality of those individuals whose Facebook profiles you will be viewing: Please do not make any attempt to contact them outside of the study, or use any of their information outside of the purposes of this study.

APPENDIX D

NEO IPIP (50 item version)

Please rate the following statements using the following scale:

Strongly disagree
Disagree
Neutral
Agree
Strongly agree

1. I often feel blue.
2. I often dislike myself.
3. I am often down in the dumps.
4. I have frequent mood swings.
5. I panic easily.
6. I rarely get irritated.
7. I seldom feel blue.
8. I feel comfortable with myself.
9. I am not easily bothered by things.
10. I am very pleased with myself.
11. I feel comfortable around people.
12. I make friends easily.
13. I am skilled in handling social situations.
14. I am the life of the party.
15. I know how to captivate people.
16. I have little to say.
17. I keep in the background.
18. I would describe my experiences as somewhat dull.
19. I don't like to draw attention to myself.
20. I don't talk a lot.
21. I believe in the importance of art.
22. I have a vivid imagination.
23. I tend to vote for liberal political candidates.
24. I carry the conversation to a higher level.
25. I enjoy hearing new ideas.
26. I am not interested in abstract ideas.
27. I do not like art.

APPENDIX D (cont.)

28. I avoid philosophical discussions.
29. I do not enjoy going to art museums.
30. I tend to vote for conservative political candidates.
31. I have a good word for everyone.
32. I believe that others have good intentions.
33. I respect others.
34. I accept people as they are.
35. I make people feel at ease.
36. I have a sharp tongue.
37. I cut others to pieces.
38. I suspect hidden motives in others.
39. I get back at others.
40. I insult people.
41. I am always prepared.
42. I pay close attention to details.
43. I get chores done right away.
44. I carry out my plans.
45. I make plans and stick to them.
46. I waste my time
47. I find it difficult to get down to work.
48. I do just enough work to get by.
49. I don’t see things through.
50. I shirk my duties.

APPENDIX E

Big 5 Trait Descriptions

Each of the following traits was rated using a 15 point semantic differential scale, with the following anchors:
1 – Extremely Low, 8 – Neither High nor Low, 15 – Extremely High

---

Openness to Experience refers to an individual's tendency to seek and appreciate experiences for their own sake.

Individuals who are HIGH in the Openness to Experience trait tend to have active imaginations, have a strong appreciation of art and beauty, be open to their own feelings and emotions, tend to seek out new and exciting experiences, have a high level of intellectual curiosity, and have a readiness to re-evaluate their own values and those of authority figures.

Conscientiousness refers to an individual's degree of organization, persistence, control and motivation in goal directed behavior.

Individuals who are HIGH in Conscientiousness tend to believe in their own abilities, have a high degree of personal organization, place an emphasis on fulfilling moral obligations, have a high need for personal achievement, have high levels of self-discipline, and tend to think things through before speaking or acting.

APPENDIX E (cont.)

Extraversion is an individual's quantity and intensity of energy directed outwards into the social world. People who are HIGH in extraversion tend to be warm and friendly towards others, tend to prefer the company of others instead of being alone, are assertive and forceful, tend to be highly active, need to experience a high level of environmental stimulation, and tend to experience positive emotions.

Agreeableness refers to the kinds of interactions an individual prefers, from compassion to tough mindedness.

Individuals who are HIGH in Agreeableness tend to believe in the sincerity and goodness of others, tend to speak frankly and honestly, have an active concern for the welfare of others, tend to be adept at resolving interpersonal conflicts, tend to be modest, and show sympathy for others.

Neuroticism refers to an individual's tendency to feel negative emotions or experience psychological distress.

People who are HIGH in Neuroticism tend to be anxious, are more likely to feel angry, frustrated, or bitter, are more likely to feel guilt, sadness, despondency, or loneliness, tend to be self-conscious, are more likely to act impulsively, and have a high overall susceptibility to stress.

APPENDIX F

Pre-task Questionnaire (Applicants)

Name: _____
Age: _____
Gender: _____
Ethnicity: _____

Most recent SAT/ACT/GRE score (Please specify which) _____

Please circle only one choice for each of the questions below:

1. 1. Do you feel that it is ethical for businesses to use social networking sites such as Facebook to make hiring decisions?

   Yes No Unsure

2. Using the scale below, how accurate do you expect others' predictions of personality and academic achievement to be?

   1. Extremely accurate
   2. Mostly accurate
   3. Somewhat accurate
   4. Mostly inaccurate
   5. Extremely inaccurate

3. Please rate the extent to which you use Facebook's privacy settings to control who is able to see your account:
   1. Everything is visible to everyone
   2. Most things are visible to everyone
   3. Only basic information (such as name, profile picture, friends) is visible to everyone
   4. Everything is only visible to friends
   5. Everything is only visible to certain friends – some friends are not able to view all aspects of your profile

APPENDIX G

Demographics Questionnaire

1. Do you currently possess a Facebook account?
2. Are you currently a full- or part-time student at ASU?
3. Are you currently, or have you been in the past, a hiring manager with at least one year of experience?
4. If you answered "Yes" to the last question, does your business or organization currently possess a Facebook page?
5. Please provide your gender.
6. Please select your age range:
    - Under 20
    - 20-24
    - 25-29
    - 30-34
    - 35-40
    - 40-44
    - 45-49
    - 50-54
    - 55-59
    - 60-64
    - 65-69
    - 70 or older
    - I prefer not to answer

7. Please choose the category below that most closely applies to you:
    a. Native American or Alaskan native
    b. Asian
    c. Black or African American
    d. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander
    e. White
    f. Hispanic
    g. I prefer not to answer

APPENDIX H

Favorability for Hire

Please rate this individual on FFH:

1 - I would NEVER hire this person
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 - I have no preferences toward this person one way or another
9
10
11
12
13
14
15 - I would DEFINITELY hire this person

APPENDIX I

Exit Survey

1. Please choose which applicant you wish to hire.
    b. Marquis
    c. Lilly
    d. Soyun
    e. Mark
    f. Cory
    g. Cydnee

Each question below is scored using a 15 point Likert scale in the following format:
1 – Extremely low, 8 – Neither high nor low, 15 – Extremely high

1. Please rate the degree to which the PHOTOS section of the applicants' Facebook profiles informed or influenced your final hiring decision: This includes cover photos, profile photos, and any other photos uploaded by the applicant.

2. Please rate how confident you are that information gained from the PHOTOS section led to accurate predictions of the applicant's personality. This includes cover photos, profile photos, and any other photos uploaded by the applicant.

3. Please rate the degree to which the ABOUT and INFO sections of the applicants' Facebook profiles informed or influenced your final hiring decision: This includes information about age, gender, race, location, relationship status, and other demographic variables.

4. Please rate how confident you are that information gained from the ABOUT / INFO sections led to accurate predictions of the applicant's personality. This includes information about age, gender, race, location, relationship status, and other demographic variables.

5. Please rate the degree to which the EMPLOYMENT section of the applicants' Facebook profiles informed or influenced your final hiring decision.

6. Please rate how confident you are that information gained from the EMPLOYMENT section led to accurate predictions of the applicant's personality.

7. Please rate the degree to which the HIGH SCHOOL EDUCATION section of the applicants' Facebook profiles informed or influenced your final hiring decision.

APPENDIX I (cont.)

8. Please rate how confident you are that information gained from the HIGH SCHOOL EDUCATION section led to accurate predictions of the applicant's personality.

9. Please rate the degree to which the COLLEGE EDUCATION section of the applicants' Facebook profiles informed or influenced your final hiring decision.

10. Please rate how confident you are that information gained from the COLLEGE EDUCATION section led to accurate predictions of the applicant's personality.

11. Please rate the degree to which the FRIENDS section of the applicants' Facebook profiles informed or influenced your final hiring decision: This includes number of friends, friends' posts on the applicant's wall, and any other content generated by the applicants' friends.

12. Please rate how confident you are that information gained from the FRIENDS section led to accurate predictions of the applicant's personality. This includes number of friends, friends' posts on the applicant's wall, and any other content generated by the applicants' friends.

13. Please rate the degree to which the "LIKES" section of the applicants' Facebook profiles informed or influenced your final hiring decision: This includes music, sports, TV, movies, games, books, and organizations that have been liked by the applicants.

14. Please rate how confident you are that information gained from the LIKES section led to accurate predictions of the applicant's personality. This includes music, sports, TV, movies, games, books, and organizations that have been liked by the applicants.

15. Please rate the degree to which the WALL POSTS section of the applicants' Facebook profiles informed or influenced your final hiring decision: This includes notes, status updates, and conversations that took place on the applicants' Wall or Timeline.

16. Please rate how confident you are that information gained from the WALL POSTS section led to accurate predictions of the applicant's personality. This includes notes, status updates, and conversations that took place on the applicants' Wall or Timeline.

APPENDIX J

Familiarity with Applicant Measure

1 - I have never met this person before
2 - I have met or heard of this person, but do not know them well
3 - I am a close acquaintance of this person

APPENDIX K

Mean Comparisons between Individual Applicants on the Favorability for Hire Measure

	A1	A2	A3	A4	A5	A6
A1	x	0.005*	0.155	0.032	0.003*	0.732
A2	0.005*	x	0.169	1.000	1.000	0.091
A3	0.155	0.169	x	0.247	0.012	1.000
A4	0.032	1.000	0.247	x	1.000	1.000
A5	0.003*	1.000	0.012	1.000	x	0.000*
A6	0.732	0.091	1.000	1.000	0.000*	x

Note: A = Applicant. * = significant at $p < .008$.