

Association for Information Systems

**AIS Electronic Library (AISeL)**

---

ICEB 2021 Proceedings (Nanjing, China)

International Conference on Electronic Business  
(ICEB)

---

Winter 12-3-2021

## **Cybervetting Perceptions of Job Seekers in Saudi Arabia**

Omar A. AlZamel

Ibrahim M. Al-Jabri

Follow this and additional works at: <https://aisel.aisnet.org/iceb2021>

---

This material is brought to you by the International Conference on Electronic Business (ICEB) at AIS Electronic Library (AISeL). It has been accepted for inclusion in ICEB 2021 Proceedings (Nanjing, China) by an authorized administrator of AIS Electronic Library (AISeL). For more information, please contact [elibrary@aisnet.org](mailto:elibrary@aisnet.org).

## Cybervetting Perceptions of Job Seekers in Saudi Arabia

Omar A. AlZamel <sup>1,\*</sup>

Ibrahim M. Al-Jabri <sup>2</sup>

\*Corresponding author

<sup>1</sup> Lecturer, King Fahd University of Petroleum & Minerals, Saudi Arabia, oalzamel@kfupm.edu.sa

<sup>2</sup> Professor, King Fahd University of Petroleum & Minerals, Saudi Arabia, imjabri@kfupm.edu.sa

### ABSTRACT

Organizations have leveraged the use of social media (SM) in recruitment and selection to reach a wider pool of job applicants. The purpose of this study is to understand the perceptions of job seekers in Saudi Arabia using the job seekers' attitudes toward the cybervetting (ATC) scale. This research is a quantitative cross-sectional study in which an online questionnaire was distributed among the target population who were seeking jobs and using social media sites. The ATC was translated to Arabic language and back-translated to English language and administered to a sample of 160 job applicants. The results showed negative perceptions of social media use as a screening and selection tool. Moreover, respondents perceived cybervetting negatively on the three dimensions tested: justice perceptions, privacy invasion, and face validity. The findings of this study have practical implications for human resources managers about the use of social media as an employee selection tool.

*Keywords:* Cybervetting, social media, personnel selection, applicant reactions, Saudi Arabia, human resource management.

### INTRODUCTION

Around 98% of the Saudi Arabian population are Internet users, and 79.3% are active monthly social media users (Kemp, 2021; World Bank, 2020). Consequently, the availability of personal information of job seekers on social media platforms is tempting for employers to use in hiring decisions. The term cybervetting is used to describe using job applicants' online information in the selection process (Berger & Zickar, 2016; Backman and Hedenus, 2019). Mainly, Screening job applicants' social media accounts is increasingly common among employers (Cook *et al.*, 2020; Jacobson & Gruzd, 2020; Roth *et al.*, 2016; Van Iddekinge *et al.*, 2016). According to a CareerBuilder survey, 70 percent of organizations use social media in personnel selection (Nauen, 2017).

Saudis are fast to join popular social media platforms. These platforms may change from time to time as some gain popularity, and others disappear. Therefore, we are interested in non-professional social media platforms (e.g., Facebook, Twitter, Snapchat) where users share personal information publicly without particular attention to specific platforms. The social media users in Saudi Arabia are around 27.8 million users out of a 35 million population (KSA Social Media Statistics, 2021). The estimated numbers of social media users per platform are 31.40M for YouTube, 26.80M for Instagram, 25.92M for Facebook, 25.05M for Twitter, and 13.96M for LinkedIn (KSA Social Media Statistics, 2021).

While social media screening has taken its place as one of the selection methods used by employers, certain appraisal dimensions must be considered. Personnel selection methods are traditionally evaluated based on factors such as reliability, validity, and legal compliance (Gilliland, 1993). Applicant reactions to selection procedures became an additional factor in the 1980s (McCarthy *et al.*, 2017). They include "attitudes, affect, and cognition an individual might have about the hiring process" (Ryan & Ployhart, 2000, p.566). Conventionally, researchers studied justice perceptions following Gilliland's (1993) influential applicant reactions model, which was based on organizational justice theory. More recent research has examined other reactions in addition to fairness perceptions. McCarthy *et al.* (2017) listed "motivation, anxiety, and test/self-efficacy" as areas that gained increased attention in recent years.

Applicant reactions are related to critical organizational outcomes. Research findings support positive relationships between applicants' perceptions and their intentions to accept job offers, their performance on the assessments, and whether they would recommend the employer to others (Hausknecht *et al.*, 2004). McCarthy *et al.* (2017) reviewed 145 applicant reactions studies and reported significant relationships between job applicant reactions and employer attractiveness; fairness perceptions and each of job acceptance, job pursuit, and recommendation intentions; test anxiety and test performance; and test motivation and test performance among other outcomes.

Businesses are interested in how selection methods are perceived by applicants (McCarthy *et al.*, 2017). Applicant reactions influence the effectiveness of the selection process. The organization's ability to attract people interested in the employer's jobs depends on the applicants' current and previous experiences with that employer. The reactions of job candidates who inform their peers about their experiences, including their perceived fairness or the anxiety associated with some selection methods, may influence the quantity and quality of the organization's applicant pool. Qualified applicants may withdraw from the selection process to prevent negative experiences. Therefore, organizations interested in maintaining their positive employer brand – the

organization's image as an employer-of-choice – recognize the recruitment and selection function as the first point of contact between prospect employees and the organization.

Personnel selection tools have gone through interesting technological developments. Some advancements came as electronic versions of existing methods such as multimedia-enhanced situational judgment tests or online interviews. Others presented new selection methods such as social media screening, digital interviews, and gamification (Nikolaou, 2021). Technology developments in selection can be classified into the five categories presented by Woods et al. (2020): online applications, psychometric tests, digital interviews, gamified assessments, and social media assessments. The adoption of these new technology methods by organizations remains faster than research in the area. Therefore, researchers called for more studies to understand reactions to new technology selection methods, including social media assessments (McCarthy *et al.*, 2017). Woods et al. (2020) described the gap between research and practice in the area as widening and called for 'realignment' between selection practice and its evidence base.

## LITERATURE REVIEW

Backman and Hedenus (2019, p. 158) defined cybervetting as “the use of search engines and social media platforms to evaluate job seekers.” Understanding cybervetting can take different angles. From the organizations' side, evaluating 'fit' between the applicant and the job, team, and organization seems to be central. Berkelaar and Buzzanell (2014) conducted a qualitative study to understand employers' online job screening practices. Employers were found to engage in cybervetting to reduce the risk of investing in an unsuccessful hire. Other reasons they found shared among employers include maintaining employer image and reputation; saving time and cost compared to other selection methods and background checks; because cybervetting is fun; and because it is transformative (perceived features such as inevitable, available, and more accurate).

In a 2010 study commissioned by Microsoft Corporation to understand the role of individuals' online reputation, 1,106 HR professionals and hiring managers and 1,345 Internet users were interviewed in the United States, United Kingdom, Germany, and France (Cross-Tab Transforming Market Research, 2010). The study explored employers' hiring practices and Internet users' perceptions of how their online presence affects their reputation. Fewer than 15% of individuals believed that their online information could affect their chances of getting a job. As to recruiters, 70% of US recruiters have rejected job candidates based on information found online. The percentages for the remaining three countries ranged from 14% in France to 41% in the UK. Interestingly, while the US had the highest percentage of recruiters citing rejection based on online data (70%), the US Internet users were the least among the four countries to expect such practice. Only 7% of the surveyed US Internet users knew that their internet presence could negatively affect them. The survey results also show that employers use online information more as background checks than a method to evaluate specific competencies. The most common reasons for disqualifying candidates included inappropriate online comments, unsuitable photos, videos, and information, and concerns about the candidate's lifestyle. The study revealed that cybervetting practices commonly include people related to the job candidate. A significant percentage of employers, ranging from 11 percent in France to 43 percent in the US, have rejected candidates based on online posts by the candidate's friends and relatives.

While statistics show that most employers are using social media for screening candidates, research evidence on the reliability, validity and applicant reactions of cybervetting is limited (Roth et al., 2016). Selection methods are tested for their reliability and validity to ensure the accuracy and fairness of the hiring procedure. One issue related to the cybervetting process is that it lacks consistency. When a selection procedure is highly subjective, as in the case of cybervetting, the reliability is expected to be below. Reliability entails differences in a rater's screening process from one job candidate to another, as well as variances in procedure among raters. A recent study by Schroeder et al. (2020) tested whether the reliability of cybervetting can improve with increased structuring. It is repeatedly proposed that cybervetting is similar to job interviews in that both involve processing large amounts of qualitative information (Roth et al., 2016; Schroeder et al., 2020). There is accumulated research evidence supporting adding structure to job interviews to improve the reliability and validity of the interviews (Schmidt & Hunter, 1998). Schroeder et al. (2020) tested three structure conditions: specifying and defining the candidate's job characteristics under evaluation, providing raters with a rating scale for each characteristic, and basing the judgment on specific profile features. However, the study showed that increasing the process structure did not improve the psychometric properties of cybervetting. Other studies found similar results (Cook et al., 2020).

A selection method's validity is related to how accurate the measure compares job candidates and predicts their future performance. Selection methods are tested against a job success criterion such as job performance. Cybervetting decisions depend primarily on the impressions of the evaluator. The assessment is prone to be affected by personal biases, the randomness of the information available, and the accuracy of how candidates represent themselves in social media (Cook et al., 2020). Research on the validity of cybervetting and other new technology selection methods is limited (Woods et al., 2020).

Roth et al. (2016) listed three factors of uniqueness for cybervetting: it does not elicit job-related information from candidates, there is a mismatch between the purpose of the tool and how it is used, and there are difficulties in standardizing the screening process. From an applicant reactions perspective, cybervetting is unique because applicants do not directly experience the selection technique. Among traditional and non-traditional selection methods, a few can be conducted without the knowledge or consent of job applicants. Therefore, it is common for cybervetting researchers to address ethical and privacy concerns (Cook et al., 2020; Roth et al., 2016; Woods et al., 2020). In one study, applicants reacted negatively to cybervetting due to the invasion

of applicants' privacy (Stoughton et al., 2015). Overall, it is early to judge the applicants' perceptions of cybervetting, but they are likely to be negative (Stoughton, 2016; Woods et al., 2020).

Several applicant reactions frameworks were developed to guide theory in the field (Gilliland, 1993; Hausknecht *et al.*, 2004; McCarthy et al., 2017; Ryan & Ployhart, 2000). To understand perceptions of cybervetting, the model developed by Hausknecht *et al.* (2004) can be useful. The model builds on previous models (Gilliland, 1993; Ryan & Ployhart, 2000) and identifies four categories of antecedents of applicant perceptions. The antecedents related to justice perceptions, face validity, and privacy invasion are of particular interest to us.

## THEORETICAL BACKGROUND AND HYPOTHESES

### Justice Perceptions

Organizational justice theory classifies justice perceptions into procedural justice, interpersonal justice, informational justice, and distributive justice. Gilliland's (1993) applicant reactions model translated the four dimensions into justice rules. The satisfaction or violation of these rules amounts to the overall fairness perception of the selection process and outcome. Hausknecht *et al.* (2004) incorporated Gilliland's (1993) justice rules in their comprehensive model.

In the personnel selection context, distributive justice is related to the fairness of the hiring decision. But since the number of qualified job candidates who go through the hiring process is usually higher than the number of positions available, we turn to the process by which the hiring decision was made. In the cybervetting literature, there is particular interest in procedural justice (Cook *et al.*, 2020). The uniqueness of social media screening as a selection procedure, as explained earlier, draws attention to procedural justice perceptions. For example, using a social media platform that was created and used for social and recreational purposes raises questions about the appropriateness of the selection procedure. In fact, the comments received from participants of this study support procedural justice concerns. One comment translates to: "Social media platforms can't be a method for hiring. People present different personas in social media than in real life. Social media are mostly recreational tools" (Anonymous participants). Another participant commented: "Never should social media platforms be a measure of one's personality." Therefore, we follow Cook *et al.* (2020) in defining justice perceptions of cybervetting as applicants' fairness perceptions of social media as a method for personnel selection. Our first hypothesis is as follows:

H1: Job applicants will have negative justice perceptions towards cybervetting

### Face Validity

Hausknecht *et al.* (2004) presented the job-relatedness antecedent as having two factors: face validity and perceived predictive validity. The former describes applicants' perceptions of the similarity of the content of the selection method to the content of the job. It is distinguished from content validity in that content validity is evaluated by experts, whereas face validity is perceived by applicants. Cook *et al.* (2020), in the job seekers' attitude toward cybervetting (ATC) instrument, defined face validity as perceived predictive validity. Consequently, the face validity factor of the ATC has three items related to the perceptions of cybervetting's validity to predict the dependability, task performance, and personalities of future employees. Aguado *et al.* (2016) found that job seekers showed more negative reactions to non-professional SM sites (i.e., Facebook) compared to professional SM sites (i.e., LinkedIn) when they are used as selection tools. We postulate the second hypothesis as follows:

H2: Job applicants will have negative perceptions towards cybervetting as a valid method of selection

### Privacy Invasion

Privacy is classified into different dimensions in the literature. Harris *et al.* (2003) distinguish informational privacy as the most relevant dimension for internet-based selection. Informational privacy is defined as the "perceived control over the conditions of release, use, retention, and disposal of personal data" (Cho and LaRose, 1999, as cited in Harris *et al.*, 2003). In the case of cybervetting, applicants have limited control over the release and use of their social media information. Unlike other recruitment and selection procedures where applicants submit information to employers and provide answers to questions, Cybervetting takes away applicants' control over what information is provided. Gilliland (1993) proposed invasion of privacy as a potential factor affecting applicant reactions, although he did not list it among the ten justice rules in his model. According to Gilliland, applicants may perceive a selection method as invasive of their privacy either because of the type of the method or because of the way it was administered. However, Hausknecht et al. (2004) included intrusion of privacy as an antecedent of applicant perceptions. Our third hypothesis is as follows:

H3: Job applicants will have negative perceptions towards the privacy invasion of cybervetting

Finally, we expect job applicants to have an overall negative perception of cybervetting, as in the fourth hypothesis:

H4: Job applicants will have negative perceptions towards cybervetting

## RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

### Instrument

An Arabic translation of the job seekers' attitudes toward cybervetting (ATC) scale, which was developed and validated by Cook *et al.* (2020), was used to measure job seekers' perceptions of employers' use of social media as a selection tool. The ATC was translated from English to Arabic and back-translated to ensure equivalence. The original instrument consisted of 14 items assessing three perception dimensions: perceived justice (PJ) measured by six items; privacy invasion (PI) measured by five items; and face validity (FV) measured by three items. The whole questionnaire consisted of two parts. The first part included the detailed items of the measurement scales. The responses were measured using a five-point Likert scale (1=*strongly disagree*,

5=*strongly agree*). The second part collected demographic and personal information, including gender, age, employment status, education, marital status, privacy settings of social media account, and frequency of social media use. The complete questionnaire is shown in the Appendix.

### Participants

The sample consisted of 160 Saudis (54% female). The majority of participants used social media on a daily basis (94%). Age groups were from 20 to more than 40 years old (16% younger than 25, 53% from 25 to less than 30, 28% from 30 to less than 40, and around 3% were 40 years old and above). Unemployed participants were 36%, while full-time employees were 57.5%, 5.6% self-employed, and 1.3% part-time employees. The privacy settings of respondents' social media accounts ranged from all public (22.5%) to all private (25%), with 52.5% having both private and public accounts. Table 1 summarizes the frequency and percentage of participant characteristics.

Table 1: Demographic characteristics of participants

Variable	Values	N	%
Gender	Male	74	46.3
	Female	86	53.7
Age (years)	20-24	26	16.3
	26-30	85	53.1
	30-40	45	28.1
	Above 40	4	2.5
Employment	Unemployed	57	35.6
	Full-time job	92	57.5
	Part-time job	2	1.3
	Self-employed	9	5.6
Education	Associate	3	1.9
	Bachelor	127	79.4
	Graduate	30	18.8
Marital Status	Single	95	59.4
	Married	62	38.8
	Other	3	1.9
Privacy Setting	Private account	40	25.0
	Public account	36	22.5
	Hybrid	84	52.5
Frequency of Social Media Use	Daily	150	93.8
	Weekly	8	5.0
	Monthly	1	0.6
	Rarely	1	0.6

### Results

#### Exploratory Factor Analysis

The ATC scale was subjected to factor analysis in order to group the scale items into meaningful clusters and verify their unidimensionality and check the construct validity. Specifying three factors to extract, factor analysis was conducted via principal component analysis with orthogonal varimax rotation. Because the Community of PI5 was very low (i.e., 0.261), it was dropped. A subsequent factor analysis was conducted with the remaining 13 items. Item PJ4 was also dropped because it had high cross-loadings on both privacy invasion (PI) and perceived justice (PJ) factors. Some researchers have suggested various cutoff points for the retention of items depending on the value of factor loadings, varying from 0.35 to 0.50 (Hair *et al.*, 1998). In this study, loadings of 0.50 or more were considered practically significant. Factor analyses resulted in a solution with three factors with eigenvalues over 1.0, explaining 69.59% of the variance. Table 2 shows the exploratory factor loadings after dropping items PI5 and PJ4.

#### Reliability Analysis

The study constructs were then tested for reliability. To check the reliability of each factor, internal consistency using Cronbach's Alpha analysis was computed. The Alpha coefficients ranged between 0.829 and 0.883, which were all above the value of 0.6 (Nunnally & Bernstein 1994). This indicates that all items in the factorial groups in this study were reliable measures. An examination of the correlation coefficients showed that none of the pairwise correlations were greater than 0.7. Therefore, we conclude that there are no multicollinearity issues associated with the data. Descriptive statistics, correlations, and Cronbach's Alpha reliability coefficients were presented in Table 3.

#### Common Method Bias

Common method bias (CMB) is prevalent in empirical research. The existence of CMB can inflate relationships among study variables and create biased estimates of reliability and validity, especially for self-reported data collection methods. This study employed Harman's Single-Factor Test (Chang *et al.* 2010) to evaluate the possibility of having CMB in this study. The

procedure to test CMB is to run exploratory factor analysis and then examine the amount of variance explained by the single factor. It is found that the largest unrotated factor accounts for 37.1%, and the rotated factor accounts for 25.4%, below the cutoff value of 50% (Aguirre-Urreta and Hu, 2019). This indicates that the CMB is not present in this study.

Table 2: Exploratory factor analysis

Constructs	Mean	SD	Factor Loadings		
			PJ	PI	FV
<i>Perceived Justice (PJ)</i>					
PJ2	1.89	1.21	.842	-.050	.060
PJ1	2.31	1.36	.802	-.063	.210
PJ3	2.16	1.28	.775	-.104	.347
PJ5	2.35	1.28	.698	-.114	.412
PJ6	3.28	1.59	.589	-.077	.142
<i>Privacy invasion (PI)</i>					
PI2	2.53	1.53	-.154	.874	.099
PI3	2.46	1.50	-.093	.848	.010
PI1	2.21	1.45	-.098	.780	.174
PI4	3.36	1.62	.016	.735	-.220
<i>Face validity (FV)</i>					
FV1	1.70	1.10	.303	-.003	.868
FV3	1.56	1.12	.299	-.045	.866
FV2	1.83	1.18	.204	.141	.811
Eigenvalue			3.05	2.69	2.61
Variance explained (%)			25.43	22.43	21.73
Cumulative variance explained (%)			25.43	47.86	69.59

Table 3: Mean, standard deviation, intercorrelations, and Cronbach's alpha reliability

Dimension	No. of Item	Mean	SD	Correlation Coefficients			Cronbach's Alpha
				PJ	PI	FV	
PJ	5	2.396	1.048	1.00	-.193 <sup>a</sup>	.549 <sup>b</sup>	0.834
PI	4	2.641	1.239	-.193 <sup>a</sup>	1.00	.016	0.829
FV	3	1.698	1.019	.549 <sup>b</sup>	.016	1.00	0.883

<sup>a</sup>Correlation is significant at  $P \leq 0.05$ ; <sup>b</sup>Correlation is significant at  $P \leq 0.01$

### Hypothesis testing

A one-sample t-test was used to test the four hypotheses. The hypothesis testing of overall cybervetting showed a significant difference in the means. Respondents had negative perceptions of cybervetting. Hausknecht *et al.* (2004) identified perceived justice, privacy invasion, and face validity as determinants of applicant perceptions. Our study supports the predictions of Hausknecht *et al.* (2004). Job applicants perceived cybervetting negatively across all three factors: perceived justice, privacy invasion, and face validity. The one-sample t-test showed support to each of the four hypotheses. The t-tests and significance levels are shown in Table 4.

Table 4: One-sample t-test of cybervetting

Test Value = 3						
Dimension	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
					Lower	Upper
Perceived Justice	-7.288	159	.000	-0.60375	-0.7674	-0.4401
Privacy Invasion	-3.670	159	.000	-0.35938	-0.5528	-0.1660
Face Validity	-16.165	159	.000	-1.30208	-1.4612	-1.1430
Overall Cybervetting	-13.685	159	.000	-0.75507	-0.8640	-0.6461

## DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

This study contributes to a need highlighted by researchers to understand applicant reactions to new technology selection methods. It also provides evidence for applicant reactions from Saudi Arabia. A few studies of applicant reactions were conducted in Saudi Arabia, and -to our best knowledge- none studied perceptions of cybervetting or new technology selection methods. The purpose of our study was to understand how job seekers in Saudi Arabia perceived cybervetting relative to three dimensions: fairness of the method, face validity, and invasion of applicants' privacy. The study showed that job applicants in Saudi Arabia had negative reactions to cybervetting. Our sample of job applicants found cybervetting to be unfair, privacy-invasive, and of low face validity. These findings were consistent with past research (Madera, 2012; Stoughton *et al.*, 2015).

The results of this study were in support of the model of applicant reactions (Hausknecht *et al.*, 2004). The model proposed that negative applicant perceptions can be caused by several procedural occurrences in the selection process. Our study relates the overall negative perceptions of cybervetting to three perceived procedure characteristics from the model. First, the job-relatedness procedural justice rule was violated. Participants perceived cybervetting as an invalid method to predict and infer about job applicants. This was present in the face validity measurement. Second, the overall procedural justice was perceived negatively. According to the model, procedural justice rules are antecedents of applicant reactions.

The ATC provides a general measure of procedural justice. Further research might investigate two candidate components of procedural justice that can have a direct effect on job seekers' perceptions. Namely, the applicants' opportunity to perform and the consistency of administration of the selection method (Gilliland, 1993). When job candidates go through the selection process, they prefer to have opportunities to show their knowledge, skills, abilities, and other characteristics (KSAOs). Cybervetting does not give job seekers the opportunity to perform or to select what KSAOs to present to employers.

Also, cybervetting is a highly subjective form of assessment. Employers looking through social media accounts engage in an unsystematic process. Personnel selection is a process of comparison and prediction. That is, employers use their selection procedures to compare individuals in their applicant pool and to predict job success criteria such as future job performance. Consistency in personnel selection means "ensuring those decision procedures are consistent across people and over time" (Gilliland, 1993). It is difficult to ensure consistency in cybervetting. The information provided by social media users is different in terms of the amount of information, the sensitivity of the information, the nature of use, the account privacy settings, the format of the information posted, and the time of posting. Also, the assessment process- without a set procedure- can be described as random. When the consistency of administration rule is violated, there is an increased chance for negative applicant perceptions (Gilliland, 1993; Hausknecht *et al.*, 2004).

The third perceived procedural characteristic is the invasion of privacy. This antecedent is also consistent with Hausknecht *et al.*'s (2004) model. Invasion of privacy was found to affect the perceptions of job applicants to cybervetting negatively. Job seekers may view employers who are invasive of their privacy as less attractive. In their study, Stoughton *et al.* (2015) found privacy intrusion to be a mediator to the relationship between cybervetting and organizational attraction and intentions to litigate.

The current study provides insights to human resources (HR) professionals and hiring managers about the use of social media as a selection tool. Understanding applicant reactions to the different selection methods affect the organization's ability to attract and retain talent. Applicants' job pursuit intentions may decrease for organizations that engage in cybervetting (Madera, 2012). The recruitment and selection function manages the organization's perception as an employer. In that sense, applicant reactions should take weight in evaluating the selection method since qualified applicants might drop out of the selection process, and the intentions to apply to the organization are affected by the recruitment and selection procedures. This is especially true for passive job seekers who are currently on the job and are targeted by organizations for their talent. Passive job seekers have fewer motives to engage in tedious or disrespectful selection processes. HR managers who want to ensure the fairness of HR processes and outcomes should be concerned about such methods.

Given the indications of unfavorable applicant reactions and the limited knowledge available on the effectiveness, legal implications, and potential assessment biases involved, employers should be cautious with cybervetting. Tools that are used to make selection decisions should be taken seriously by organizations since such decisions affect organizational capabilities and competitiveness. HR policies can be issued to prohibit such practices in organizations. HR departments are responsible toward their community and stakeholders to protect the privacy of current and potential employees.

Moreover, there are factors of organizational well-being involved. Several meta-analytical studies supported the effect of perceptions on job pursuit intentions and whether applicants accept job offers or recommend the organization to others (McCarthy *et al.*, 2017). Furthermore, there is significant evidence relating applicant reactions to their job performance after they are hired (Konradt *et al.*, 2017; McCarthy *et al.*, 2017). The selection process affects the mutual expectations, or the psychological contract, between the employee and the organization. Since the recruitment and selection process is their first contact with the organization, employees' attitudes toward the organization can result from their reactions to the selection process.

## REFERENCES

- Aguado, D., Rico, R., Rubio, V. J., & Fernández, L. (2016). Applicant reactions to social network web use in personnel selection and assessment. *Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 32(3), 183-190. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1576596216300160>

- Aguirre-Urreta, M.I. & Hu, J. (2019). Detecting common method bias: Performance of the Harman's single-factor. Test. *The DATA BASE for Advances in Information Systems*, 50(2), 45-70. <https://dl.acm.org/doi/abs/10.1145/3330472.3330477>
- Backman, C & Hedenus, A. (2019). Online privacy in job recruitment processes? Boundary work among cybervetting recruiters, *New Technology, Work and Employment*, 34(2), 157-173. <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1111/ntwe.12140>
- Berger, J. L., & Zickar, M. J. (2016). Theoretical propositions about cybervetting: A common antecedents model. In *Social media in employee selection and recruitment* (pp. 43-57). Springer, Cham. [https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-3-319-29989-1\\_3](https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-3-319-29989-1_3)
- Berkelaar, B. L., & Buzzanell, P. M. (2014). Cybervetting, person–environment fit, and personnel selection: Employers' surveillance and sensemaking of job applicants' online information. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 42(4), 456-476. <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/00909882.2014.954595>
- Chang, S. J., Van Witteloostuijn, A., & Eden, L. (2010). From the editors: Common method variance in international business research. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 41(2), 178–184. <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1057/jibs.2009.88>
- Cho, H. & LaRose, R. (1999). Privacy issues in Internet survey. *Social Science Computer Review*, 17(4), 421-434. <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/089443939901700402>
- Cook, R., Jones-Chick, R., Roulin, N., & O'Rourke, K. (2020). Job seekers' attitudes toward cybervetting: Scale development, validation, and platform comparison. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 28(4), 383-398. <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/ijsa.12300>
- Cross-Tab Transforming Market Research (2010). Online Reputation in a Connected World. Retrieved from [https://download.microsoft.com/download/C/D/2/CD233E13-A600-482F-9C97-545BB4AE93B1/DPD\\_Online%20Reputation%20Research\\_overview.doc](https://download.microsoft.com/download/C/D/2/CD233E13-A600-482F-9C97-545BB4AE93B1/DPD_Online%20Reputation%20Research_overview.doc) (accessed 20 October 2021).
- Gilliland, S. W. (1993). The perceived fairness of selection systems: An organizational justice perspective. *Academy of management review*, 18(4), 694-734. <https://journals.aom.org/doi/abs/10.5465/AMR.1993.9402210155>
- Hair Jr., J. F., Anderson, R. E., Tatham, R. L., & Black, W. C. (1998). *Multivariate Data Analysis* (5th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Harris, M. M., Hoyer, G. V., & Lievens, F. (2003). Privacy and attitudes towards internet-based selection systems: A cross-cultural comparison. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 11(2-3), 230-236. <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/1468-2389.00246>
- Hausknecht, J. P., Day, D. V., & Thomas, S. C. (2004). Applicant reactions to selection procedures: An updated model and meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology*, 57(3), 639-683. <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2004.00003.x>
- Jacobson, J., & Gruz, A. (2020). Cybervetting job applicants on social media: the new normal?. *Ethics and Information Technology*, 22(2), 175-195. <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10676-020-09526-2>
- Kemp, S. (2021). Digital in Saudi Arabia: All the Statistics You Need in 2021. DataReportal – Global Digital Insights. Retrieved from <https://datareportal.com/reports/digital-2021-saudi-arabia> (accessed 20 October 2021).
- Konradt, U., Garbers, Y., Böge, M., Erdogan, B., & Bauer, T. N. (2017). Antecedents and consequences of fairness perceptions in personnel selection: A 3-year longitudinal study. *Group & Organization Management*, 42(1), 113-146. <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/1059601115617665>
- KSA Social Media Statistics (2021). Retrieved from <https://www.globalmediainsight.com/blog/saudi-arabia-social-media-statistics/> (accessed 26 November 2021).
- Madera, J. M. (2012). Using social networking websites as a selection tool: The role of selection process fairness and job pursuit intentions. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 31(4), 1276-1282. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0278431912000448>
- McCarthy, J. M., Bauer, T. N., Truxillo, D. M., Anderson, N. R., Costa, A. C., & Ahmed, S. M. (2017). Applicant perspectives during selection: A review addressing “So what?,” “What’s new?,” and “Where to next?”. *Journal of Management*, 43(6), 1693-1725. <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/0149206316681846>
- Nauen, R. (2017). 7 in 10 Employers Research Job Candidates Online. CareerBuilder. Retrieved from <https://resources.careerbuilder.com/employment-screening/employers-research-candidate-social-media-profiles> (accessed 14 December 2021)
- Nikolaou, I. (2021). What is the Role of Technology in Recruitment and Selection?. *The Spanish Journal of Psychology*, 24(e2), 1-6. <https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/spanish-journal-of-psychology/article/what-is-the-role-of-technology-in-recruitment-and-selection/451DF5C763B110A845EEAD50F5BAF851>
- Nunnally, J. C. & I. H. Bernstein (1994). *Psychometric Theory*. New York: McGraw-Hill
- Roth, P. L., Bobko, P., Van Iddekinge, C. H., & Thatcher, J. B. (2016). Social media in employee-selection-related decisions: A research agenda for uncharted territory. *Journal of management*, 42(1), 269-298. <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/0149206313503018>
- Ryan, A. M., & Ployhart, R. E. (2000). Applicants' perceptions of selection procedures and decisions: A critical review and agenda for the future. *Journal of management*, 26(3), 565-606. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0149206300000416>
- Schroeder, A. N., Odd, K. R., & Whitaker, J. H. (2020). Agree to disagree: Examining the psychometrics of cybervetting. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*. <https://www.emerald.com/insight/content/doi/10.1108/JMP-09-2018-0420/full/html>





*Which of the following Social Media Sites do you use at least once a month?*

- Twitter
- Snapchat
- Instagram
- Facebook
- Other

*What is your current job?*

- Full-time
- Part-time
- self-employed
- unemployed

*What are the privacy settings of your SM account?*

- Private
- Public
- Hybrid

*Frequency of Social Media use:*

- Daily
- Weekly
- Monthly
- Rarely
- Never

*What is your marital status?*

- Single
- Married
- Other