APPLICANT REACTION TO FACEBOOK SCREENING: A CROSS-CULTURAL

EXAMINATION

by

Jarod Fyler

Honors Thesis

Appalachian State University

Submitted to the Department of Psychology
and The Honors College
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Bachelor of Arts

December, 2020
Department of Psychology, Appalachian State University

Approved by:

Yalcin Acikgoz, Ph.D., Thesis Director

Matthew Ruble, Ph.D., Second Reader

Jefford Vahlbusch, Ph.D., Dean, The Honors College

Abstract

APPLICANT REACTION TO FACEBOOK SCREENING: A CROSS-CULTURAL
EXAMINATION

As Social Media becomes more widely used by organizations for hiring and selection, research investigating applicant reactions to fairness, privacy and justice to social network screening has also proliferated. Because these factors can affect organizational attractiveness and withdrawal intentions, researchers have constructed a model predicting applicant reactions across different contexts. One context that received less attention is Socio-Cultural variables. Such variables like Power Distance and Individualism (from Hofstede's Cultural Dimensions model) differ across cultures and could moderate applicant reaction to Social Network Screening. Two countries with significantly different Power Distance and Individualism scores are Turkey and the US. Therefore, this study seeks to investigate how Turkish applicant reaction to Social Network Screening might differ from US counterparts. The present study did not find significant relationships between certain social-cultural variables and Social Network Screening reactions as hypothesized. Further analysis revealed that the samples did not differ in relevant Socio-Cultural variables as predicted. Although the study did find other meaningful correlations between Socio-Cultural variables, Social Network Screening and applicant reactions. Findings are discussed

Applicant reaction to Facebook Screening: a Cross-Cultural Examination

As businesses rapidly globalize, new exigencies for I/O Psychology emerge. Organizations grapple with problems of cultural integrations, organizational communication, and ethical business practices. In response, I/O psychologists have opened new lines of research on these issues. The issue that this study focuses on is applicant reactions to Social Network Screening (SNS) methods through a cross-cultural lens. To adequately understand applicant reactions to SNS across cultures, we use Black, Stone & Johnson's privacy model and Hofstede Cultural Dimensions to examine differences between Turkish and US applicants (Black, Stone, & Johnson, 2015; Hofstede & Bond, 1984). First, a general description of applicant reactions in selection contexts and its importance is laid out. Secondly, an overview of historically relevant models and studies in applicant reaction research will be given. Third, the three most recent trends of applicant reactions research will be explained. The three trends will be recent theoretical explanations, globalization of research, and current technological adaptation. This will then dovetail into research on social media screening and the need for cross-cultural research on the topic.

Applicant Reactions and their Importance

Organizations value selection and screening methodology as an important step in recruiting and hiring. The predictive validity (ability to predict job performance, job learning, etc) of several tests are invaluable in increasing productivity and employee retention. But such a purely organizational focus overlooks the perspective of the applicant. Applicant perceptions of

screening methods also have an impact on companies. If applicants perceive the screening

method as unfair, not job-related or highly invasive, this can affect litigation intentions,

withdrawal intentions, and perceived organizational attractiveness. For example, Smither et al.

(1993) have shown that perceived predictive ability of a test is an important determinant of

employee willingness to recommend the company to others.

A Foundational Model

The first influential applicant perceptions models focused on fairness perceptions among

applicants and how they influenced subsequent attitudes about the organization (Ryan &

Ployhart, 2000). Gilliland (1993) developed a model of several situational factors that influenced

fairness perceptions during the selection process. Gilland's conceptualization of the applicant

perceptions largely stemmed from organizational justice literature. Specifically, Gilliland

proposed that procedural justice (i.e., fairness during the selection process) and distributive

justice (i.e., fairness in the outcome of the selection process) combine to influence fairness

perceptions. Procedural rules pertain to job-relatedness, consistency of administration, propriety

of questions of the selection process, while distributive justice concerns principles like equity,

equality, and need. Gilland predicted that adherence or violation of procedural and distributive

norms would influence applicants' acceptance decision, litigation intention, and organizational

attractiveness, among others. Current research echoes this prediction by showing that when

applicants perceive selection methods as unfair, invasive or unfavourable, they are less likely to

accept job offers (Macan, Avedon, Paese & Smith, 1994), are more likely to press lawsuits

(Smither, Reilly, Millsap, Pearlman & Stoffey, 1993), and perceive less employer attractiveness (Bauer, Maertz, Dolen & Campion, 1998).

<p style="text-align:center">Additions and Theoretical Expansions</p>

Current research has expounded upon Gillland's model (Gilliland, 1993). An additional dimension was added to the model to further explain applicant perceptions of justice (Bies, 2005). Specifically, informational Justice is concerned with providing applicants with an explanation of the selection procedure and the selection decision (Ployhart, Ryan & Bennett, 1999). Research has expanded past the original model by further exploring some of the consequences of applicant reactions proposed by Gilliland. For example, it has been found that applicant reactions to selection procedures influence test performance (Truxillo, Steiner & Gilliland, 2004), organizational satisfaction (Ambrose & Cropanzano, 2003), and test taking motivation (Bell Wiechmann & Ryan, 2006).

The three recent theoretical contributions to this literature are Expectation theory, Fairness Heuristic theory, and Attribution theory. First, Bell, Ryan and Wiechmann (2004) theorize that direct experiences, indirect influences, and other beliefs compose exceptions that affect the applicant's expectation of justice. This theory focuses heavily on several antecedents (factors before test evaluation) to applicant reaction models. For instance, if an applicant has experienced perceived discrimination in selection contexts in the past, this theory incorporates such experiences in predicting applicant attitudes towards test-taking and reactions. An implication of this theory is that tests must meet applicant expectations while predicting other factors (e..g, job performance and turnover probability). As evidence supporting this theory, Bell,

Wiechmann, and Ryan (2006) demonstrate that higher justice expectations was associated with higher levels of pre-test motivation, self-efficacy, and recommendation intention.

Lind's Fairness Heuristic Theory (Lind, 2001) suggests that individuals create "fairness heuristics" to navigate the uncertainty and risk in giving others power over us. A heuristic is generally an intuitive rule of thumb that helps predict scenarios, solve problems or make decisions.The possibility of being rejected or accepted (during selection process) presents a risk in which we have little to no control over (the company sending job offers has control). Lind believes this triggers the fairness heuristic in anticipating the possibility of potential (fair) outcomes. Certain features of the selection test or process can influence fairness heuristics in certain ways. Although not much attention has been paid to fairness heuristic,it has relevance for applicant justice perceptions and job offers (Harold, Holtz, Gienpentrog, Brewer, & Marsh, 2016).

Ployhart & Harold (2004) advanced the Attribution and Reaction theory, which states that applicant reaction and behaviours are the results of attributional processing. Attributional processing can be described as attributing an event outcome to either situational or dispositional factors. A classic example of attributional processing is demonstrated in driving. Being cut-off while driving is not a good experience and people usually attribute the action to negative qualities of the driver. But a reversal happens when we cut-off another, in that we tend to attribute our actions to the situation (the action was necessary). Attributional theories help explain what factors influence us to attribute causality to certain situations or people.

Ployhart, Ehrhart, and Hayes (2005) applied Kelly's Covariation Model to attribution theory, which suggests that three features which influence social attributions are distinctiveness, consensus, and consistency. In applicant reaction contexts, distinctiveness pertain to how common or unique organizational treatment or selection procedures are (high distinctiveness denotes unique selection procedures, while low distinctiveness denotes common selection procedures), consensus pertain to distribution of treatment (high consensus signals that most applicants receive similar outcomes relative to the person, while low consensus signals most applicants received different outcomes relative to the person), and consistency pertains to the frequency of selection procedure (high consistency denotes that selection procedures do not vary from year to year, low consistency denotes that selection procedure can change rapidly over time). Ployhart and colleagues applied the covariation model, providing support for the theory by demonstrating a significant relationship between applicant attribution and organizational perception. Specifically, Ployhart et al (2005) showed that participants who roleplayed college applicants were sensitive to the three features of the covariation model. Results also show that the patterns of interaction between the three features were also consistent with the model.

Applicant Reactions Abroad

With more Multinational Corporations expanding further abroad, selection systems travel with them. This raises the question of cross-cultural generalizability of applicant reactions literature. A well-known meta-analysis addresses this question. Specifically, Anderson, Salgado, and Hülsheger (2010) includes 38 independent samples from 17 countries, reviewing the generalizability of 10 common selection procedures. They discovered that selection procedure preference did not vary across cultures (with work samples and interviews being the most

preferred and honesty tests, graphology, and personal referrals being the least preferred). This

lends credence to the idea that a common applicant reactions framework is held across cultures.

Ryan, Boyce, Ghumman, Jundt, Schmidt and Gibby (2009) also support this contention. Ryan et

al (2009) collected applicant reactions data across 8 selection procedures from 21 different

countries. Although each country held differing cultural values, applicant perceptions of the

selection procedures demonstrated to be more similar than disparate. However, some aspects of

culture may still cause differences in applicant reactions, even though applicant reactions

framework generalizes fairly well across cultures. A study conducted by Walsh, Tuller, Barnes

Farell and Matthews (2010) hypothesized that cultural differences in performance orientation

and uncertainty avoidance would moderate the relationship between selection fairness

perceptions and organizational attractiveness. They showed that higher performance orientation

strengthened the relationship between fairness and organizational attractiveness. Another study

demonstrates significant differences between US and Belgium in regards to internet based

selection systems. Belgium citizens tend to believe that privacy is a right, while US citizens tend

to believe that it is an individual's responsibility to protect their privacy. So Harris, Van Hoye,

and Lievens (2003) sought to test whether this cross-cultural difference in privacy conception

would affect attitudes towards internet-based selection systems (a system rife with privacy

concerns). Although both groups had concerns with privacy, they had different concerns and

levels of apprehension regarding submitting employment related information over the internet.

The most robust and commonly used framework in understanding cross-cultural behaviour is

Hofstede's cultural dimensions (Hofstede & Bond, 1984). Steiner and Gilland (2001)

hypothesizes that certain cultural dimensions are more likely to influence perceptions of

procedural and distributive justice and gives further research directions on the topic. Although international research has exponentially increased, there is still much to be explored regarding cross-cultural applicant reactions.

<u>Social Media in HR</u>

With technology's ever evolving pace and impact, it is no surprise that Industrial-Organizational psychology would feel its effect. Although many technologies, like Computer Adaptive Testing and Video-Based Assessment, are being adapted by organizations, some of applicant reaction research has been focused on social media. Social media describes online platforms that allow people to share social information with others. Popular examples of social media are Twitter, Facebook, and Linkedin. Social media's influence is seen through novel practices in different fields. Politicians use viral campaign ads to reach large audiences. Marketing departments develop targeted advertisements to appeal to specific consumer profiles. And the copious amount of data generated through social media can be analyzed to reveal nuanced trends. Recruiters have also adapted social media for their own ends. A survey by Careerbuilder (2018), which suggests 7 in 10 US employers use social media to research job candidates, captures this growing trend. HR departments in favor of social network screening (SNS) argue that it helps avoid negligent hiring, attracts passive job-seekers, and investigates beneficial personality traits. But comparable issues, like lack of validity, legality, and privacy, also accompany it (e.g., Van Iddekinge, Lanivich, Roth, & Junco, 2016).

Benefits of using SNS in Hiring

Research has produced some evidence of social media's benefits in selection. For example, Kluemper, Rosen, and Mossholder (2012) showed that personality information obtained through trained raters evaluating Facebook profiles could add incremental validity to personality self-reports, evaluator ratings were reliable, and evaluator ratings had higher criterion validity compared to self-reports regarding GPA, job performance, and hireability. Such a team of evaluators could help companies further hone in on specific personality traits and other qualities necessary for a job. It could also help identify negative traits like the dark tetrad (narcissism, machiavellism, psychopathy, and sadism). Cracker and March (2016) reports that dark tetrad personality traits can be predicted in online trolling behaviour. Another possible benefit of SNSs involves users' self-posted biographical information. Biodata relies on past behaviour and beliefs predicting future behaviour. This information might be obtainable through SNSs (Davison, Maraist, Hamilton & Bing, 2012). Information from SNS could also help measure person-organization fit, but (Kluemper, 2014) has noted that much of the process is subjective and unstructured. More organized approaches would need to be created.

Risks of using SNS in Hiring

Although SNS could have some practical application and benefits, many consequences are also attached. For example, Stoughton, Thompson, and Meade (2015) demonstrated that applicants screened through Social Media in experimental simulations felt their privacy was violated, resulting in lower perceptions of organizational justice and organizational attraction

with an increase in litigation intention. Suen (2018) also reported that passive candidates demonstrate a higher intent to withdraw from candidacy because of feelings of privacy invasion caused by SNS screening. But Aguado, Rubio and Fernández (2016) showed that applicant attitudes towards professional social media sites being screened (Linkedin) was significantly more positive than when nonprofessional sites were screened. These authors also reported that women were more concerned about SNS of non-professional sites compared to men and that younger participants were more concerned compared to older applicants.

Researchers have also noted that SNS screening could result in discrimination and adverse impact. For example, Van Iddekinge, Lanivich, Roth and Junco (2016) tested recruiter ratings of Facebook profiles on two factors related with adverse impact, criterion related validity and subgroup differences. Results show that females score higher than males on social media assessments, Whites score higher than African-Americans on cognitive factors, and that Hispanics score higher on contextual factors (interpersonal skills, adaptability, and creativity). Another potential pitfall is the potential access to protected class information. Such information might include disabilities or religion (Davison et al, 2012). Using such information in a selection decision (unless justified) is illegal under US federal law..

The validity of SNS can also be called into question. Although there is some evidence regarding validity of personality information gleaned from SNS (Cracker and March, 2016, Kluemper, Rosen and Mossholder, 2012, Stoughton, Thompson Meade, 2013), other studies cast doubt upon SNS validity in other contexts. Van Iddekinge et al. (2016) also show that recruiter ratings of Social Media sites do not predict turnover or job performance.

<u>Emergence of SNS Applicant Reaction Models</u>

Even though this line of research is still in its infancy, other researchers have already theorized models that help predict applicant reactions to SNS screening. Black et al. (2015) adapted a previous privacy model for the specific purposes of applicant perceptions of SNS screening in the employment process. This is also the model utilized in this study. The model states that four factors influence several variables leading to perceived invasion of privacy and this perception is what predicts behaviours such as job acceptance and litigation intention. The four factors are information factors (e.g. job relatedness and purpose of data collection), procedural factors (transparency and advanced notice of data collection), socio-cultural factors (local norms about privacy and cultural differences, particularly Individualism/Collectivism and Power distance), and individual factors (sex, age, race, etc). These alterations help this model specifically explore applicant reaction to SNS screening. Black et al (2015) also listed several hypotheses and future research directions for this model and applicant reaction to SNS screening.

While research has begun exploring applicant reactions to SNS (e.g., Stoughton, Thompson, & Meade, 2015), little research has explored cross-cultural reactions to this practice. Social media use has become a ubiquitous global phenomenon (Statista, 2020) and therefore SNS will be ubiquitous too. With the advent of globalization, familiarity with international applicant reactions to selection methods becomes paramount for retention. These concerns are heightened amidst the global "war for talent" (Michaels, Handfield-Jones, & Axelrod, 2001). As

businesses expand globally and SNS hiring methods proliferate, an examination of how culture influences applicant reactions to SNS screening becomes imperative.

<div align="center">Applicant Reaction to SNS and Culture</div>

A popular model in cross-cultural psychology is Hofstede's cultural dimensions theory. Hofstede's cultural dimensions postulate that culture has an impact on the values held by societies. Through factor analysis, Hofstede and Bond (1984) theorized that six dimensions are necessary to differentiate cultures. Power Distance Index, Individualism/Collectivism, Masculinity/Femininity, Uncertainty Avoidance Index, Long Term Orientation, and Indulgence/Restraint. Power Distance Index (PDI) represents the extent to which cultures accept inequality and power differences. Individualism/Collectivism (I/C) details how cultures value goals, relationships, and work styles. Masculinity/Femininity reflects whether the society endorses masculine traits (achievement, material success, assertiveness) or femine traits (cooperation, compassion, quality of life). Uncertainty Avoidance Index measures a culture tolerance for ambiguity and receptiveness or surprises, unknown factors and deviations from status quo. Long Term Orientation describes cultural emphasis on present versus long term goals. Indulgence/Restraint refers to how culturally valuable indulgence or restraint of desires and gratifications of needs.

With the need for research abroad becoming more apparent, I/O psychologists have adapted existing models to include cross-cultural input. The model used to measure applicant reaction to SNS screening across culture in this study is Black et al. (2015) model because it contains a specific socio-cultural facet in predicting privacy invasion perceptions. The two

relevant cultural dimensions cited by the Black et al. (2015) model are power distance index

(PDI) and individualism/collectivism (I/C). I/C details how cultures value goals, relationships,

and work styles. Individualist countries are motivated by personal goals, are less reliant on those

around them and are comfortable working autonomously, while collectivist countries are

motivated by group goals, value long-term relationships, and are comfortable working in a team.

High I/C scores indicate individualism, while low I/C scores indicate collectivism. PDI

represents the extent to which cultures accept inequality and power differences. A country with a

high PDI will err towards strict bureaucracies, are more respectful of superiors, and have

centralized hierarchies. A country with a low PDI leans towards egalitarian organizational

structures, more democratic approaches and are likely to give criticism to authority.

Privacy and Culture

Because individualistic and collectivist countries emphasize opposing values, a contrast

should appear between privacy values. Individualistic cultural emphasis on independence,

autonomy, and individual rights should lead to a stronger sensitivity to privacy invasions.

Collectivistic cultural emphasis on interdependence, relationships and group welfare should lead

to a weaker sensitivity to privacy invasion. We should also see a similar trend between high and

low PDI cultures and privacy invasion concerns. Cultures high in PDI might be more lenient

with authority requesting private information, while low PDI cultures might be more reactive to

invasive requests from authority. Based on these differences, we hypothesize that

H1) Participants low in I/C and high in PDI will have more positive reactions to Social Media

screening via Facebook compared to participants low in I/C and PDI

H1a) Participants low in I/C and high in PDI will have a higher organizational attraction scores when screened through Social Media compared with participants low in I/C and PDI

H1b) Participants low in I/C and high in PDI will perceive Social Media screening via Facebook as less invasive to privacy compared with participants low in I/C and PDI

H1c) Participants low in I/C and high in PDI will have less litigation intention than participants low in I/C and PDI when screened through Social Media.

Methodology

The study examined the hypotheses by using the data collected from samples of US and Turkey college students via an experimental design. These populations are good cultural analogues considering applicant reaction to SNS screening. The US is considered an individualistic country while Turkey is considered high in collectivism (91 vs 37 I/C score) (Hofstede Insights, n.d.). There are also moderate differences in PDI between the two countries (US - 66 vs Turkey - 40). All participants were directed to a website page that contained a job ad from a faux company. The job ad was created such that the only option to apply was via an "apply through Facebook" button placed under the information about the job). After viewing the website, the two groups received surveys measuring invasion of privacy, organizational attractiveness, and related measures. A comparison of how each condition affected US and Turkey applicants was conducted.

Participants and Measures

The sample examined in this study was composed of Turkish and US college students (*N* = 331). 242 participants were students in a US-based college (73.1%) and 89 participants were

students in a college in Turkey (26.9%). The mean age of participants was 23.79 (SD = 1.76

years), 207 of the participants were female (62%), and 108 participants were male (32%).

Twelve participants chose 'preferred not to answer' or did not answer (4.8%).

Individualism/Collectivism, Power-Distance

These variables were adapted from Hofsted's cultural dimensions model (Hofstede &

Bond, 1984). I/C is defined by emphasis placed on individual goals and rights versus group goals

and collective good. The converging measurement of horizontal and vertical individualism and

collectivism survey (Triandis, H. C. & Gelfland, M. J., 1998) was used to probe

Individualism/Collectivism. The scale is composed of 16 items. The first 8 items measure

individualism (α = .74). The last 8 items measure collectivism (α = .68). A sample item from the

scale is "The well-being of my coworkers is important to me". PDI is defined by cultural

acceptance or resistance of power inequality between its members. The power distance measure

by Dorfman and Howell (Dorfman, P. W., & Howell, J. P., 1988) was used to probe PDI. This

scale is composed of 6 questions (α = .72). An example of a sample item would be "Managers

should seldom ask for the opinions of employees".

Organizational Attractiveness, Invasion of Privacy, Litigation Intention

Organizational attractiveness measure developed by Highhouse, Lievens, & Sinar (2003)

was used to measure organizational attractiveness. The scale is composed of 15 items (α = .92).

A sample item is "For me, this company would be a good place to work". Invasion of Privacy

(IOP) relates feelings of violation prospective employees may face during the recruitment

process. The scale, which is composed of five items (α = .69) and was developed by Stoughton,

Thompson, and Meade (2015) was used to measure IOP. . A sample item is "I feel like the

manner in which this organization screens applicants is an invasion of privacy". Litigation

intention describes employee inclination to litigate. This was also measured by a scale developed

by Stoughton et al. (2015), which is composed of 5 items (α = .87). A sample item describing

Litigation intention would be "An organization that uses a hiring system like this would likely be

sued by applicants".

Results

The means, standard deviations, and the correlation between the variables used are

presented in Table 1. Hypothesis 1a proposed that a positive relationship between organizational

attraction and I/C and PDI would occur. To test this hypothesis, we conducted an independent

sample T-test, with country being the grouping variable and organizational attraction the

dependent variable (see Table 2). We found that the mean of the US group (*M*= 2.91, *SD=.69*)

was not significantly different from the Turkish group (*M*= 2.85, *SD=.86, t(307) = .558, p=*

.539), failing to support the hypothesis. Hypothesis 1b suggested that participants low in I/C and

high in PDI would perceive Social Media screening via Facebook as less invasive to privacy

compared with participants low in I/C and PDI. This hypothesis was also tested using an

independent samples t-test. The mean Invasion of Privacy (IOP) for the US group (*M*= 2.24,

SD=.74) was significantly less than the mean for the Turkish group (*M*= 2.60, *SD=.68, t(324)*

=.-4.078, p= .000). While the difference was significant, the relation was opposite of the

direction expected, leading to the rejection of this hypothesis. The last hypothesis (1c) was not

supported by the results. The mean litigation intention of the US group (*M*= 2.67, *SD=.84)* was

significantly lower than that of the Turkish group (*M*= 3.04, *SD=.71, t(318) =.-3.711, p=.000*).

This demonstrates an opposite relationship predicted by the hypothesis. Our main hypothesis, that participants higher in I/C and PDI (represented by Turkish participants) would have more positive reactions to social media screening than participants low in I/C and PDI (represented by US participants) are not supported by the results.

Exploratory Analysis

One explanation for these results is the differences in I/C and PDI between the two groups. Further analysis reveals that individualism differences were not very stark. An independent sample t-test showed that US mean individualism (*M*= 3.48, *SD*=.56) was slightly lower and the difference non-significant compared with Turkish group's individualism (*M*= 3.49, *SD*=.55, t(329) =.-.178, p=.859). Another independent sample t-test examining power distance confirms this pattern. The mean differences between the groups are scant and non-significant (US, *M*= 2.05, *SD*=.56, Turkey, *M*=2.17, *SD*=.66, t(329)=.-1.72, p=.085). We believe the composition of the Turkish sample might be the cause for the above results. While Turkey as a country tends to score higher on I/C and PDI, the college students used for our Turkish sample might not be good representatives of the rest of the country. Differences in organizational attractiveness and IOP could not be sought because US and Turkish college students may be culturally alike.

Other Notable Findings

Although the two groups do not differ enough to find significantly different reactions to social media screening, we can look at the differences in I/C and PDI within both groups and see if that impacted responses to organizational attractiveness, IOP and litigation intention. A

correlation matrix (Table 1) revealed a positive correlation between collectivism and organizational attractiveness, $r = .21$, $p=.000$. As collectivism increases, so does the organizational attractiveness of the company screening through social media. Another finding is the relationship between IOP and Litigation intention. A significant positive relationship was discovered between IOP and Litigation intention, $r = .32$, $p=.000$, suggesting that businesses screening through social media should still be concerned with applicant feelings of privacy.

Discussion

The results of this study did not support our hypotheses. We predicted that Turkish participants would have more positive reactions to Social Media screening via Facebook compared to US participants. Turkish participants are more likely to be low in I/C and high in PDI. We predicted this low I/C and high PDI group would exhibit higher organizational attractiveness scores, less invasion of privacy, and less litigation intention (compared with high I/C and low PDI group). But these results cannot be taken as evidence that differences in cultural variables have no impact on reactions to social media screening. Our exploratory analysis showed US and Turkish students possessing similar levels of I/C and PDI. This would cause comparisons between the groups to demonstrate non-significance or minute differences. What we did find is a relationship between individualism and organizational attraction within the participants as a whole. When comparing differences within the groups, we found that higher collectivism was positively correlated with the perceived attractiveness of the company screening the participant through social media. We also found a positive relationship between IOP and litigation intention within the groups. This result suggests that reducing employee

perception of IOP can reduce applicant litigation intention (and subsequent litigation attempts). This hints that invasion of privacy is still a concern abroad as well as home. Companies should avoid privacy transgressions if possible, no matter the location.

Some implications of the study pertain to recruiting efforts abroad and domestically. Businesses are more likely to go abroad and interact with employees of different cultures. Although different countries in general score differently on several cultural variables, certain groups between several countries may not. Within a country, there will be cultural variation; Cohen (2007) found differences in cultural variables between five groups within Israel. Accordingly, instead of considering cultural variables at the country level, businesses should examine the cultural differences between the groups they aim to recruit from within each country. For example, suppose an American business primarily hires college students and this business starts a branch in Turkey. Our study demonstrates similar levels of I/C and PDI between the US and Turkey college students. Therefore, there would be little need to change hiring practices (regarding differences in Hofstede's cultural dimensions). A possibility is that college students in many countries may score similarly in terms of I/C and PDI. This could replicate with groups ubiquitous across multiple countries (religious groups, socio-economic groups, geographic groups, etc).

A limitation of this study is the lack of differences between the US and Turkish samples. The lack of cultural differences between the groups rendered most analyses non-significant. More importantly, college students may not adequately represent the population of a country. The sample was also very young, with a mean age of 23.7, and this would also be a limitation. Global companies recruit employees of all ages and different ages interact with or view social

media differently (Aguado, Rubio and Fernández, 2016). This study cannot probe the interaction between cultural differences and older age in regards to SNS reactions.

A recommendation for future research is to extend this study to more cultures and groups within these cultures. Different levels of cultural variables and cultural context can influence privacy sensitivity and SNS reaction. To understand the full range of reactions between countries (and the nuances that accompany), expanding the countries studied with regards to their reactions to recruiting practices is crucial. It can also help avoid collecting samples that are too homogenous. College students are the most accessible participants across the globe, but our study suggests that college students may not embody the same cultural differences between countries. Collecting multiple collegatie samples might confirm a cultural similarity between college students of certain countries.

Another recommendation is screening different social media platforms. Different media platforms attract different kinds of content. While all content posted to different platforms might be personal, a possibility is that different cultures have different sensitivity to the invasion of privacy of different content. For example, Facebook is noted to contain more content centered on friends and family (Olivas-Lujan, M. R., & Bondarouk, T., 2013). And it was noted that people high in collectivism are more sensitive to community concerns and opinions. The invasion of privacy of a Facebook page might be more invasive for a collectivistic person than an individualistic person. Different cultures might be more sensitive to the invasions of different platforms.

References

Aguado, D., Rico, R., Rubio, V. J., & Fernández, L. (2016). Applicant reactions to social

   network web use in personnel selection and assessment. *Revista de Psicología Del*

   Trabajo y de Las Organizaciones, 32(3), 183–190.

Ambrose, M. L., & Cropanzano, R. (2003). A longitudinal analysis of organizational fairness: an

   examination of reactions to tenure and promotion decisions. *Journal of Applied*

   Psychology, *88*(2), 10..

Anderson, N., Salgado, J.F., Hülsheger, U.R. (2010). Applicant reactions in selection:

   Comprehensive meta-analysis into reaction generalization versus situational specificity.

   International Journal of Selection and Assessment, *18*(3), 291–304.

Careerbuilder (2018). More than half of employers have found content on social media that

   caused them not to hire a candidate, according to recent CareerBuilder survey. Retrieved

   from

   https://www.prnewswire.com/search/all/?keyword=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.prnewswire.

   com%2Fnews-releases%2Fmore-than-half-of-employers-have-found-content-on-social-m

   edia-that-caused-them-not-to-hire-a-candidate-according-to-recent-careerbuilder-survey-

   300694437 on 9/10/2019

Cohen, A. (2007). One nation, many cultures : A cross-cultural study of the relationship between

   personal cultural values and commitment in the workplace to in-role performance and

   organizational citizenship behavior. *Cross-Cultural Research*, (*41*)3, 273.

Bauer, T. N., Maertz, C. P., Dolen, M. R., & Campion, M. A. (1998). Longitudinal assessment of

    applicant reactions to employment testing and test outcome feedback. *Journal of Applied*

    Psychology, *83*(6), 892-903.

Bauer, T.N., Truxillo, D.M., Mack, K. and Costa, A.B. (2011). Applicant Reactions to

    Technology‑Based Selection: What We Know So Far. In N.T. Tippins, S. Adler and A.I.

    Kraut (Ed.), *Technology‑Enhanced Assessment of Talent* (pp. 190-223). Jossey-Bass.

Bell, B. S., Ryan, A. M., & Wiechmann, D. (2004). Justice Expectations and Applicant

    Perceptions. *International Journal of Selection & Assessment*, *12*(1/2), 24–38.

Bell, B. S., Wiechmann, D., & Ryan, A. M. (2006). Consequences of organizational justice

    expectations in a selection system. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *91*(2), 455-466.

Bellman, S., Johnson, E. J., Kobrin, S. J., & Lohse, G. L. (2004). International differences in

    information privacy concerns: A global survey of consumers. *The Information Society*,

    20(5), 313.

Bies, R. J. (2005). Are Procedural Justice and Interactional Justice Conceptually Distinct? In J.

    Greenberg & J. A. Colquitt (Ed.), *Handbook of organizational justice.* (pp. 85–112).

    Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.

Chan, D., & Schmitt, N. (1997). Video-Based Versus Paper-and-Pencil Method of Assessment in

    Situational Judgment Tests: Subgroup Differences in Test Performance and Face Validity

    Perceptions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *82*(1), 143–159.

Cracker, N., & March, E. (2016). The dark side of Facebook : The Dark Tetrad, negative social

      potency, and trolling behaviours. *Personality And Individual Differences*, *102*, 79–84.

Davison, H., Maraist, C., Hamilton, R., & Bing, M. (2012). To Screen or Not to Screen? Using

      the Internet for Selection Decisions. Cropanzano, Russell, (Ed.) *Employee*

      Responsibilities & Rights Journal, *24*(1), 1–21.

Dorfman, P. W., & Howell, J. P. (1988). Dimensions of national culture and effective leadership

      patterns: Hofstede revisited. Advances in international comparative management, 3(1),

      127-150.

Gilliland, S. W. (1993). The Perceived Fairness of Selection Systems: An Organizational Justice

      Perspective. *Academy of Management Review*, *18*(4), 694–734.

Harold, C. M., Holtz, B. C., Griepentrog, B. K., Brewer, L. M., & Marsh, S. M. (2016).

      Investigating the Effects of Applicant Justice Perceptions on Job Offer Acceptance.

      Personnel Psychology, *69*(1), 199–227.

Harris, M. M., Van Hoye, G., & 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.

Highhouse, S., Lievens, F., & Sinar, E. F. (2003). *Measuring attraction to organizations.*

      Educational and Psychological Measurement, 63, 986–1001.

Hofstede, G., & Bond, M. H. (1984). Hofstede's culture dimensions: An independent validation

      using Rokeach's Value Survey. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 15*(4), 417–433.

Hofstede Insights (n.d.). Country Comparison (Turkey and United State) [Data Set].

      https://www.hofstede-insights.com/country-comparison/turkey,the-usa/

Kluemper, D. H. (2014). Social Network Screening: Pitfalls, Possibilities, and Parallels in

      Employment Selection. In M.R. Olivas-Lujan, T. Bondarouk (Ed.), *Social Media in*

      Human Resource Management (Advanced Series in Management, Vol. 12). (pp. 1-21)

      Emerald Group Publishing Limited.

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(5), 1143–1172.

Lind, E. (2001). Fairness heuristic theory: Justice judgments as pivotal cognitions in

      organizational relations. Cropanzano, Russell, (Ed.) *Advances in organizational justice.*

      (Ed;) (pp. 56-88)

Macan, T. H., & Avedon, M. J. (1994). The Effects of Applicants' Reactions to Cognitive

      Ability Tests and an Assessment Center. *Personnel Psychology*, *47*(4), 715–738.

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), 33

Michaels, E., Handfield-Jones, H., & Axelrod, B. (2001). *The war for talent*. Boston, MA:

      Harvard Business School Press.

Olivas-Lujan, M. R., & Bondarouk, T. (2013). *Social Media in Human Resources Management.* Bingley, U.K.: Emerald Group Publishing Limited.

Ployhart, R. E., Ehrhart, K. H., & Hayes, S. C. (2005). Using attributions to understand the effects of explanations on applicant reactions: are reactions consistent with the covariation principle? *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, *35*(2), 259.

Ployhart, R. E., & Harold, C. M. (2004). The Applicant Attribution-Reaction Theory (AART): An Integrative Theory of Applicant Attributional Processing. *International Journal of Selection & Assessment*, *12*(1/2), 84–98.

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

Ryan, A. M., Boyce, A. S., Ghumman, S., Jundt, D., Schmidt, G., & Gibby, R. (2009). Going Global: Cultural Values and Perceptions of Selection Procedures. *Applied Psychology*, *58*(4), 520-556.

Smither, J. W., Reilly, R. R., Millsap, R. E., Pearlman, K., & Stoffey, R. W. (1993). Applicant Reactions to Selection Procedures. *Personnel Psychology*, *46*(1), 49–76.

Statista. (2020) Leading countries based on number of Facebook users as of January 2020 [Data Set].

https://www.statista.com/statistics/268136/top-15-countries-based-on-number-of-facebook-users/

Steiner, D. D., & Gilliland, S. W. (2001). Procedural Justice in Personnel Selection: International and Cross-Cultural Perspectives. *International Journal of Selection & Assessment*, *9*(1/2), 124.

Stoughton, J. W., Thompson, L. F., & Meade, A. W. (2013). Big Five Personality Traits Reflected in Job Applicants' Social Media Postings. *CyberPsychology, Behavior & Social Networking*, *16*(11), 800–805.

Stoughton, J., Thompson, L., & Meade, A. (2015). Examining Applicant Reactions to the Use of Social Networking Websites in Pre-Employment Screening. *Journal of Business & Psychology*, *30*(1), 73–88.

Suen, H.-Y. (2018). How passive job candidates respond to social networking site screening. *Computers in Human Behavior*, *85,* 396–404.

Triandis, H. C. & Gelfland, M. J. (1998). Converging measurement of horizontal and vertical individualism and collectivism. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 74, 118-128.

Truxillo, D. M., Steiner, D. D., & Gilliland, S. W. (2004). The Importance of Organizational Justice in Personnel Selection: Defining When Selection Fairness Really Matters. *International Journal of Selection & Assessment*, *12*(1/2), 39–53.

Van Iddekinge, C. H., Lanivich, S. E., Roth, P. L., & Junco, E. (2016). Social media for selection? Validity and adverse impact potential of a Facebook-based assessment. *Journal of Management*, *(42)*7, 25.

Walsh, B. M., Tuller, M. D., Barnes Farrell, J. L., & Matthews, R. A. (2010). Investigating the

Moderating Role of Cultural Practices on the Effect of Selection Fairness Perceptions.

International Journal of Selection And Assessment, *18*(4), 365.

Table 1

Results of Independent t-tests

	US		Turkey		*t*	*df*	*p*	Cohen's D
	Mean	*SD*	*Mean*	*SD*				
Organizational Attractiveness	2.91	.69	2.85	.86	.61	307	.539	.74
Invasion of Privacy	2.24	.74	2.60	.68	-4.1***	324	.000	.72
Litigation Intention	2.67	.84	3.05	.71	-3.71***	318	.000	.81
Individualism	3.48	.56	3.49	.55	-.18	329	.859	.56
Collectivism	4.12	.48	3.67	.50	7.53***	329	.000	
Power Distance	2.05	.56	2.17	.66	-1.73	329	.085	.59

Note: * p < .05   ** p < .01   *** p < .001

Table 2

Descriptive Statistics and Correlations between studied variables

Variables	*n*	*M*	*SD*	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Organizational Attractiveness	309	2.892	.741	**.93**					
2. Invasion of Privacy	308	2.337	.736	-.079	**.70**				
3. Litigation Intention	302	2.768	.821	-.064	.321**	**.87**			
4. Individualism	309	3.481	.554	-.088	-.141	-.028	**.68**		
5. Collectivism	309	3.998	.526	.215**	-.147	-.146	-.114	**.75**	
6. Power Distance	309	2.082	.589	.030	.005	.041	.191**	-.096	**.72**

*Note. *p < .05. **p < .01*

Bolded values on the diagonal are reliability coefficients.