

Oxford Handbooks Online

Who Is Searching for Whom? Integrating Recruitment and Job Search Research

Serge P. da Motta Veiga and Daniel B. Turban

The Oxford Handbook of Job Loss and Job Search (*Forthcoming*)

Edited by Ute-Christine Klehe and Edwin A.J. van Hooft

Online Publication Date: Jun
2014

Subject: Psychology, Organizational Psychology

DOI: 10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199764921.013.024

[–] Abstract and Keywords

We note that organizational recruitment processes and applicant job search processes occur simultaneously; as organizations are attempting to attract qualified applicants, job seekers are searching for potential employers. Whereas the job search literature examines various outcomes within-subjects across organizations, the recruitment literature examines similar outcomes between-subjects within an organization. Thus, although the recruitment and job search literatures have developed relatively independently, we believe that it would be useful to integrate theories and concepts from these literatures. Therefore our goal in this chapter, as we review both literatures, is to integrate relevant concepts that can stimulate future research examining recruitment and job search simultaneously rather than independently. To achieve this goal, we first provide a brief overview of the recruitment and job search literatures. As part of this overview, we review predictors of applicant attraction and job choice and of job search behaviors and outcomes. We also suggest how both literatures have been and could be further integrated. Second, we suggest how three theories (i.e., signaling, expectancy, and the theory of planned behavior) have been (and could be further) used to integrate job search and recruitment research. Finally, we propose directions for future research investigating and theorizing how and when both literatures could be further integrated.

Keywords: recruitment, job search, applicant attraction, job choice

Introduction

Attracting qualified applicants is an extremely important human resources practice (Barber, 1998; Chapman, Uggerslev, Carroll, Piasentin, & Jones, 2005). Specifically, the utility of selection practices depends in part on the quality of the applicant pool and whether the top applicants accept job offers (e.g., Boudreau & Rynes, 1985; Carlson, Connerley, & Mecham, 2002; Murphy, 1986). Thus, not surprisingly, many studies have investigated predictors of applicant attraction and job choice, frequently focusing on firms' recruitment practices and job and organizational attributes (e.g., Collins, 2007; Turban & Cable, 2003). From an organization's perspective, both recruitment and selection practices occur simultaneously, resulting in numerous studies that examine how selection practices influence applicants' reactions (e.g., Chan & Schmitt, 2004; Collins, 2007). From an individual applicant's perspective, intentions and behaviors toward a specific potential employer are components of the applicant's job search process, which typically involves multiple possible employers. Specifically, as individuals conduct their job search, they are exposed to various recruitment practices and obtain information about job and organizational attributes, which may influence their subsequent job search activities.

Thus we argue that recruitment and job search are "two sides of the same coin." On one side, recruiting applicants is an essential human resource practice for organizations looking to attract and select the best potential applicants. On the other side, job seekers are searching for the best possible job and can be attracted to apply for

jobs at specific organizations. We argue that a firm's recruitment processes not only influence an applicant's attraction to that firm but also may influence the applicant's job search processes. Similarly, we expect that how an applicant searches for a job will influence how a potential employer is perceived during the job search process. Interestingly, the job search literature examines various job search outcomes for an applicant across time and organizations, whereas the recruitment literature examines similar outcomes for applicants (and potential applicants) within a specific organization and period of time. Therefore, although the recruitment and job search literatures have developed somewhat independently, we believe that it may be useful to integrate such literatures in an attempt to stimulate further research.

Although an extensive amount of research examining recruitment outcomes has taken an organizational perspective (e.g., Barber, 1998; Chapman et al., 2005), it is critical to note that applicants' intentions and behaviors are also important aspects of the job search process (e.g., Jaidi, Van Hooft, & Arends, 2011; Schreurs, Derous, Van Hooft, Proost, & De Witte, 2009). Specifically, we argue that an organization's recruitment practices not only influence applicants' attraction to the firm (e.g., Barber, 1998; Collins, 2007) but also impact applicants' job search processes and behaviors. For example, a delay in responding to an applicant following an interview may not only influence the applicant's attraction to the firm but also influence the intensity of subsequent job search behaviors. The applicant may indeed decide to put more intensity in job seeking to find alternative opportunities.

This chapter thus aims at making two general contributions. First, we provide a brief overview of the recruitment and job search literatures, including predictors of applicant attraction and job choice and of job search behaviors and outcomes. Second, as we review these literatures, we integrate relevant concepts that can stimulate future research examining recruitment and job search together rather than independently. We then review three theories (i.e., signaling, expectancy, and the theory of planned behavior), which have been utilized and could be further used to integrate recruitment and job search concepts. Finally, we propose how future research could integrate both literatures theoretically, methodologically, and empirically. We should note that although most chapters in this handbook adopt a perspective that focuses solely on the individual job seeker, we also include the organizational perspective, as we argue that potential employers' recruitment practices and activities can influence individuals' job search behaviors and outcomes.

Brief Overview of the Recruitment and Job Search Literatures

Recruitment Literature Overview

Most scholars define employee recruitment as the organizational practices that influence the number and quality of individuals who apply for vacant positions (e.g., Barber, 1998; Chapman et al., 2005; Rynes, 1991). For example, Breaugh (2008) noted that important recruitment objectives include attracting qualified applicants and processing applicants quickly in order to fill positions with qualified workers, although he also included the job performance and retention of new hires as important objectives. Barber (1998) noted that the recruitment process includes these three phases: generating applicants, maintaining applicant status, and influencing job choice. In the *generating applicants* phase, organizations attempt to attract quality applicants to apply for positions with them. During the *maintaining applicant status* phase, organizations attempt to keep applicants interested in the firm as they are exposed to the organization's selection practices (i.e., interviews, site visits). When a job offer is made, the organization attempts to *influence job choice*, such that applicants will accept the jobs offered. In general, the recruitment literature has attempted to predict individual-level recruitment outcomes, such as job pursuit and job choice (Barber, 1998; Breaugh, 2008; Chapman, et al., 2005; Rynes, 1991). Specifically, Chapman et al. (2005) meta-analyzed 71 studies and found that the recruitment outcomes of job pursuit intentions, job-organization attraction, acceptance intentions, and job choice were predicted by job and organizational characteristics, applicant perceptions of the recruiting process, recruiter behaviors, perceived fit, and hiring expectancies.

Thus recruitment is predominantly perceived and studied as an organizationally driven process. Specifically, organizations try to influence quality candidates to apply, to keep those quality applicants interested in the firm as an employer, and ultimately to influence the best applicants to accept a job offer. Although there is a wide range, the predictors of applicant attraction and job choice can be divided into five relatively broad categories: organizational characteristics (e.g., reputation), job characteristics, recruitment processes (e.g., recruitment lags), recruiter behaviors, and other predictors (e.g., fit perceptions) (Breaugh, 2008; Chapman et al., 2005; Dineen &

Soltis, 2010; Rynes & Cable, 2003). We briefly review representative findings from each of these five categories, including some of the most commonly investigated predictors, in order to provide some background about the recruitment literature. Note, however, that we do not provide an exhaustive review of all predictors of applicant attraction and job choice. Our intent is to provide a broad yet selective overview of some of the predictors of applicant attraction and job choice that may usefully inform job search research and thus drive future research bridging the gap between the recruitment and job search literatures.

Predictors of Applicant Attraction and Job Choice

Organizational Characteristics

Recruitment scholars have examined whether and how organizational characteristics influence applicants to pursue employment with some organizations rather than others (Barber, 1998; Breaugh, 2008; Dineen & Soltis, 2010; Rynes & Cable, 2003). Considerable evidence indicates that organizational characteristics, such as reputation and culture, can influence perceptions of organizational attractiveness. For example, firms with greater corporate social responsibility are seen as more attractive employers (Turban & Greening, 1997; Greening & Turban, 2000). Other organizational characteristics that have been examined include reputation and organizational image (Chapman et al., 2005; Collins & Stevens, 2002; Turban & Cable, 2003), organizational culture (Judge & Cable, 1997), firm personality (Slaughter, Zickar, Highhouse, & Mohr, 2004), firm knowledge (Cable & Turban, 2001), and corporate websites (Dineen & Noe, 2009; Williamson, Lepak, & King, 2003). For example, the size and quality of the applicant pool was related to both the firm's brand equity and reputation (Collins & Stevens, 2002; Turban & Cable, 2003). Applicant perceptions of the firm and attraction to the firm also appear to be influenced by the potential employer's websites (Allen, Mahto, & Otondo, 2007; Dineen & Noe, 2009; Williamson et al., 2003). For example, applicants reported more attraction to the firm when the website had a recruitment versus selection orientation (Williamson et al., 2003). More recently, Dineen and Noe (2009) presented evidence that customization of the web site influences the characteristics of the applicant pool. To summarize, considerable evidence indicates that organizational characteristics influence applicant attraction to the firm.

Job Characteristics

In addition to these organizational predictors, scholars have also examined job characteristics as predictors of applicant attraction and job choice (Dineen & Soltis, 2010). Indeed, applicants are influenced not only by characteristics of the organization but also by characteristics of the job, such as location, supportive work environment, salary, or advancement opportunities (Cable & Judge, 1994; Chapman et al., 2005; Turban, Forret, & Hendrickson, 1998). For example Turban et al. (1998) found that job characteristics—such as perceptions of potential coworkers and whether the work was challenging and interesting—were positively related to applicant attraction. Similarly, Chapman et al. (2005) found that salary and the combination of compensation and advancement were positively related to applicant attraction, although to a lesser extent than job-organizational characteristics (e.g., supportive work environment). Interestingly, research also indicates that work-life benefits of the job—such as flexible work schedules and dependent care assistance—were positively related to job pursuit intentions (Casper & Buffardi, 2004).

Recruitment Processes

Although job and organizational characteristics are probably the most investigated predictors, scholars have also examined the influence that recruitment processes have on applicants' intentions to pursue employment with the organization. Indeed, applicants might have initial positive perceptions of both the job and the organization but have different perceptions after experiencing the organization's recruitment processes. For example, when organizations take too long (i.e., recruitment delays) to respond to applicants following an interview or site visit, applicants are less likely to be interested in the employer (Becker, Connolly, & Slaughter, 2010; Rynes, Bretz, & Gerhart, 1991). Similarly, interview and site visit characteristics (Macan & Dipboye, 1990; Stevens, 1998; Turban, Campion, & Eyring, 1995) influence perceptions of the job and applicant attraction to the firm. Recruiters make a decision about whether to focus the interview more on evaluating applicants (a selection focus) or selling the firm to the employer (a recruitment focus) or both (Barber, Hollenbeck, Tower & Phillips, 1994; Turban & Dougherty, 1992). Evidence suggests that the interview focus influences perceptions of the organization, and although results are mixed, some evidence indicates that when interviews were high on both recruitment and selection, more

applicants remained in the pool (Barber et al., 1994). Research has also examined the influence of realistic job previews on post-hire outcomes such as turnover (Breaugh, 2010; Earnest, Allen, & Landis, 2011). Specifically, realistic job previews increase the degree to which applicants perceive the job and the recruiting organization as trustworthy and honest and reduce future turnover. Thus recruitment processes influence applicants' perceptions of the employer and attraction to the employer. We also expect that an employer's recruitment processes may impact applicants' subsequent job search intensity, as described below.

Recruiter Behaviors

Another category of predictors, recruiter behaviors, is more individually oriented than the three previous ones. Evidence indicates that recruiter behaviors are related to job and organizational characteristics and to applicant attraction to the firm as an employer (Chapman et al., 2005; Harris & Fink, 1987). When recruiters are seen as more personable, competent, and informative, applicants tend to be more attracted to the firm (Chapman et al., 2005). Specifically, recruiter behaviors are thought to provide applicants with insight into what it would be like to be an employee in the firm (Rynes et al., 1991); thus these behaviors influence both perceptions of and attraction to the firm. For example, a warm and personable recruiter is more likely to indicate a warm working environment than a recruiter who is low in warmth and congeniality. In their meta-analysis, Chapman et al. (2005) found that recruiter behaviors influenced applicant attraction by influencing perceptions of job and organizational characteristics.

Other Predictors of Applicant Attraction and Job Choice

A final category encompasses predictors that span across different dimensions of the recruitment literature: fit perceptions, hiring expectancies, and perceived alternatives. Considerable evidence indicates that perceptions of person-job and person-organization fit positively influence applicant attraction to a firm as well as job choice decisions (Cable & Judge, 1996; Chapman et al., 2005; Judge & Cable, 1997). Additionally, hiring expectancies tend to be positively related to application attraction (Barber, 1998; Chapman et al., 2005; Rynes, 1991; Rynes & Lawler, 1983). Specifically, when job applicants expect to be made an offer by an organization, they are more likely to be attracted to the organization as an employer and to accept an offer if they are to receive one. Interestingly, studies examining the relationship between perceived alternatives and various applicant attraction outcomes provided mixed findings (Barber, 1998; Chapman et al., 2005). For example, meta-analytic results suggested that perceived alternatives had a positive relationship with job-organization attraction and a negative relationship with acceptance intentions, although in both cases there was significant heterogeneity of the effect sizes, indicating moderation and the need for future research (Chapman, et al., 2005).

To summarize, a wide range of predictors of applicant attraction and job choice have been examined in the literature, ranging from organization and job characteristics to recruiter behaviors. We classified these predictors into three organization-level categories, one individual-level category, and one category of other predictors. We now discuss predictors of job search behaviors and outcomes, which—in contrast with the recruitment literature—are for the most part individual-level variables.

Job Search Literature Overview

The job search process involves various activities engaged in by job seekers to learn about and pursue job openings with the ultimate goal of generating job offers (Boswell, Zimmerman, & Swider, 2012). The job search process is considered a dynamic, self-regulated process in which job seekers attempt to regulate their motivations and emotions as they search for suitable employment (Boswell et al., 2012; Kanfer, Wanberg, & Kantrowitz, 2001; Wanberg, Zhu, & Van Hoof, 2010). The key outcomes examined by job search researchers are job search behaviors and the employment outcomes of whether the seeker received an offer, how many job offers were received, and the duration of the job search, although some research has also measured employment quality indicators, such as employee attitudes (Boswell & Gardner, this volume; Saks, this volume; Saks & Ashforth, 2002; Virick & McKee-Ryan, this volume). Job search behavior¹ is typically operationalized by assessing the *intensity* (frequency) with which job seekers engage in job search activities, such as revising the résumé, completing applications, or looking at the overall *effort* exhibited by the job seeker (Blau, 1994; Boswell et al., 2012; Saks & Ashforth, 2002; Van Hove, this volume).

The job search literature has consistently been examined from an individual, self-regulated, motivational

perspective (Kanfer et al., 2001). Taking such an approach has led job search scholars to predominantly examine two relatively broad categories of predictors of job search behaviors and outcomes: individual differences (e.g., personality) and self-regulatory and motivational variables (e.g., metacognitive strategies, procrastination, emotion, and motivation control). We should note, however, that these categories are not mutually exclusive or exhaustive. For example, self-efficacy, which is discussed below, can be conceptualized as a relatively stable individual difference or as a self-regulatory/motivational variable. Furthermore, other variables—such as employment commitment, financial need, and social support—although they are also important predictors of job search behaviors and outcomes, do not fit into either of these broad categories (Kanfer et al., 2001).

Predictors of Job Search Behaviors and Outcomes

Individual Differences

Because job seekers approach the job search process differently, scholars have examined the role of personality characteristics in influencing job search behaviors and outcomes (Boudreau, Boswell, Judge, & Bretz, 2001; Brown, Cober, Kane, Levy, & Shalhoop, 2006; Caldwell & Burger, 1998; Saks, 2006; Tay, Ang, & Van Dyne, 2006; Turban, Stevens, & Lee, 2009). In general, considerable evidence indicates that personality characteristics impact the way job seekers behave throughout the process as well as the job search outcomes they receive. For example, conscientiousness is positively related to job search effort (Brown et al., 2006), the number of interviews, interview success, academic achievement, leadership experience (Tay et al., 2006) and job offers (Turban et al., 2009). Furthermore, extraversion is positively related to interview success (Tay et al., 2006), whereas neuroticism is positively related to job search activity among employed managers (Boudreau et al., 2001). Brown et al. (2006) also found that having a proactive personality positively influences job search success, such that more proactive job seekers are more successful in their search for employment.

In addition to personality traits, scholars have also examined the role of affect in job search (Côté, Saks, & Zikic, 2006; Crossley & Stanton, 2005; Turban et al., 2009). Evidence indicates that positive emotions are positively related to second interviews and job offers (Turban et al., 2009) and that trait positive affectivity is positively related to job search intensity and motivation control (Côté et al., 2006; Turban, Lee, da Motta Veiga, Haggard, & Wu, 2013) and negatively to procrastination (Turban et al., 2013). Although negative affect has been included in some of these job search studies, few studies have actually found negative affect to be related to job search behaviors and outcomes (Côté et al., 2006; Crossley & Stanton, 2005). Nonetheless, Crossley and Stanton (2005) found that trait negative affectivity was negatively related to interview quality and job offers.

Finally, another individual difference, self-efficacy, also plays an important role in the job search process. Indeed, considerable evidence indicates that job seekers with a greater belief in their ability (e.g., self-efficacy) to find a job reported higher job search intensity (Côté et al., 2006; Crossley & Stanton, 2005; Ellis & Taylor, 1983; Van Hooft, Born, Taris, Van der Flier, & Blonk, 2004). Similarly, individuals with higher interviewing self-efficacy, defined as beliefs about one's interviewing capabilities, had greater interview success than individuals with lower interviewing self-efficacy (Tay et al., 2006).

Self-Regulatory and Motivational Variables

The job search process is widely accepted to be a self-regulated process, such that job seekers need to regulate their behaviors and emotions to stay motivated as they strive toward their goal of finding a job (Kanfer et al., 2001; Wanberg et al., 2010). Scholars have examined whether and how self-regulatory variables influence job search behaviors and outcomes (Creed, King, Hood, & McKenzie et al., 2009; Turban et al., 2009, 2013; Wanberg et al., 1999, 2012). For example, Turban et al. (2009) found that metacognitive activities (i.e., self-regulation activities that involve setting goals, developing plans, etc.) mediated the relationships between personality traits (i.e., extraversion and conscientiousness) and job search outcomes. Similarly, Creed et al. (2009) found that self-regulatory variables (i.e., emotion control and work commitment) mediated the relationship between job seekers' goal orientation and their job search intensity. Finally, Turban et al. (2013) found that the self-regulatory variable of procrastination mediated the relationship between positive affectivity and job search outcome.

Because job seekers need to self-motivate throughout the search process (Kanfer et al., 2001; Wanberg et al., 2010), scholars have also examined the influence that motivational variables have on job search behaviors and

outcomes (Creed et al., 2009; Van Hooft & Noordzij, 2009; Van Hooft & Saks, 2009; Wanberg et al., 2012). For example, research has examined the role of motivation control in the job search (Creed et al. 2009; Turban et al., 2013; Wanberg et al., 1999, 2012). Furthermore, research has examined goal orientations and goal-directed behaviors in job search. Specifically, Creed et al. (2009) showed that learning goal orientation was positively related to job search intensity. Van Hooft and Saks (2008) found that different job search goals (e.g., finding a new job, staying aware of job alternatives) were related to different job search behaviors (e.g., looking at job ads, visiting job sites).

To summarize, we categorized job search predictors into individual differences and self-regulatory and motivational variables. Evidence indicates that variables from each of these categories influence job search behaviors and outcomes. Further, some evidence also indicates that individual differences influence job search behaviors and outcomes through self-regulatory and motivational strategies (Creed et al., 2009; Kanfer et al., 2001; Turban et al., 2009, 2013).

Integrating Recruitment and Job Search

As described above and summarized in Table 1, there are similarities and differences in the recruitment and job search literatures. A major difference between recruitment and job search scholars is the focus, or level of analysis. Recruitment scholars typically examine intentions and behaviors toward a specific organization, whereas job search researchers typically examine job search behaviors across various organizations. The outcomes are similar yet different. Recruitment scholars are most interested in job choice, typically defined as whether the applicant accepts a job offer from an employer, whereas job search scholars frequently focus on the number of job offers (choices) obtained. Thus the practical question driving much recruitment research is how to attract more qualified individuals into the applicant pool, whereas the practical question driving much job search research is how job seekers obtain employment, preferably high-quality employment. Nonetheless, both organizations and individuals have similar goals: They both want a qualified applicant filling an open position. Another area of overlap yet distinctiveness is that whereas recruitment scholars examine sources of applicants, job search scholars examine methods of finding jobs. We discuss some of the similarities and differences in these literatures before describing theoretical frameworks that we believe can be useful in integrating these research streams.

Who Is Searching for Whom? Integrating Recruitment and Job Search Research

Table 1 Similarities and Differences Between Recruitment and Job Search

	Recruitment	Job Search
Level of Analysis	Organizational	Individual
Main Objective	Job choice	Job offers
Proximal outcomes, predictor categories	Applicant attraction, job pursuit, job pursuit intentions, acceptance intentions Organizational characteristics; job characteristics; recruitment processes; recruiter behaviors; other predictors	Job search behaviors (and intensity) interviews, site visits: Individual differences; self-regulatory and motivational variables
Predictors	Organization reputation, brand equity, and organization website; job characteristics (e.g., location), supportive work environment, salary, and work-life benefits; interview characteristics (i.e., focus, length, structure) and recruitment delays; recruiter behaviors; fit perceptions, hiring expectancies, perceived alternatives	Job seekers' individual differences (e.g., personality, affect, self-efficacy) motivation and procrastination, and metacognitive activities commitment, financial need social support
Integrating recruitment and job search	Job seekers are involved in multiple recruitment processes for different jobs and different organizations at the same time, While recruitment research has mostly examined factors related to organizations, job search research has mostly been driven by individual factors related to job seekers	
Future research	Taking a multilevel approach (e.g., level 1, job seekers; level 2, organizations), future research could examine the influence of recruiter behaviors, recruitment processes, job characteristics, and organization characteristics on job search behaviors and outcomes	Future research could examine the role that job search behaviors and intensity, such as how the amount of time researching an organization before a visit might influence recruiter behaviors and/or the recruitment process

Focusing on outcomes, perhaps the “ultimate” outcome of the recruitment literature is actual *job choice*, which is whether a highly qualified applicant accepts the job offer from the organization (Barber, 1998; Chapman et al., 2005).² Notably, however, although recruitment scholars are interested in job choice, only a few studies have actually measured job choice (Chapman et al., 2005). Instead, researchers typically measure proximal indicators of job choice. Perhaps the most popular outcome variable is applicant attraction to the firm as an employer, which is a global evaluation of potential employers (Chapman et al., 2005). Other outcome variables include *job pursuit* and *job pursuit intentions*, which are conceptualized as an applicant’s activities or intentions to pursue a job and continue in the applicant pool by attending an interview or site visit. Recruitment scholars have also examined *acceptance intentions*, or the likelihood that an applicant would accept a job offer, when actual job choice information cannot be collected (Barber, 1998; Chapman et al., 2005). In general, as might be expected, these indicators of applicant attraction tend to be relatively strongly correlated (Chapman et al., 2005). Furthermore, although there is limited evidence, acceptance intentions tend to be correlated with job choice (e.g., Chapman et al., 2005; Turban et al., 1995). To summarize, scholars interested in recruitment attempt to predict, understand, and explain the job choice of applicants, although proximal indicators of job choice are often examined.

Job search scholars are interested in understanding what leads job seekers to quickly find excellent job offers. Thus the focus is on understanding attributes and processes that lead to securing one or more job offers from good

employers in a timely manner. Job search scholars have examined job search behaviors (job search intensity) and differentiated between preparatory and active job search behaviors (Blau, 1994). *Preparatory job search behaviors* include activities utilized to prepare for and learn about potential job opportunities, such as preparing or revising one's résumé, whereas *active job search behaviors* occur after job seekers have started their search—for example, by sending out résumés to potential employers or contacting them. Although researchers have combined preparatory and active job search behaviors and added or dropped items to make the scale more relevant (Saks; 2006; Saks & Ashforth, 2002), job search behavior (intensity) is perhaps the most important proximal predictor of job search outcomes (Kanfer et al., 2001).

Another example of how recruitment and job search scholars have examined similar concepts, although with a different focus and different labels, is the concept of job pursuit behavior. Recruitment scholars have conceptualized job pursuit behavior as an applicant's decision to apply for a job and to attend an interview or a site visit (Jaidi et al., 2011; Schreurs et al., 2009). Job search scholars, however, have conceptualized résumés submitted, interviews, and site visits attended as job search outcomes (Turban et al., 2009).

Similarly, whereas recruitment researchers have examined the recruitment sources through which organizations attract and find applicants (e.g., Breugh & Starke, 2000), the job search literature has examined methods through which job seekers find and apply for jobs (e.g., Barber et al., 1994; Van Hove, this volume; Van Hove & Saks, 2008). For example, recruitment sources are defined as sources used by employers to find qualified applicants and are frequently categorized as internal (i.e., employee referral) and external sources (i.e., direct applications). In contrast, job search methods are defined as sources used by applicants to find jobs and are frequently categorized as formal (e.g., public employment agencies) and informal sources (e.g., friends or relatives) (Barber et al., 1994). Thus both literatures have examined sources through which both organizations and applicants look for each other, although they have a different focus and use somewhat different conceptualizations.

To summarize, although the recruitment and job search literatures have developed relatively independently, we propose that they may be fruitfully integrated; this is a major goal of our chapter. The job search literature typically focuses on behaviors that an applicant engages in, across various organizations, to obtain a job offer. Such behaviors, within a specific organization, are relevant to recruitment researchers who typically examine behaviors and attitudes of multiple applicants within an organization. Stated differently, job search research typically examines behaviors within-subjects and across organizations, whereas recruitment research typically examines behaviors across various subjects within an organization. Thus, applicants and organizations are nested within each other as an applicant has engaged in job search behaviors with multiple organizations, and organizations have multiple applicants. Note, however, that applicants may interact differently with different organizations and an organization may interact differently with different applicants. Furthermore, both applicants and organizations can have multiple interactions over time, and, importantly, actions of one party are thought to influence actions of the other party. For example, recruitment practices may influence job search behaviors toward that organization, such that recruitment delays lead job seekers to increase the intensity of their search as they look for alternative opportunities. In a recent qualitative study, Wanberg et al. (2012) found that job seekers who experienced negative experiences with recruiting organizations (e.g., lack of professionalism) developed negative attitudes toward those organizations. Similarly, job search behaviors may influence organizational practices toward the applicant, such that an applicant who has researched the organization and is thus more prepared may receive more follow-up attention from that organization. Clearly such reciprocal interactions, which unfold over time, are complex, and research is only now beginning to investigate that complexity.

Along such lines, we speculate that advances in multilevel modeling (i.e., hierarchical-level modeling) might help to advance both job search and recruitment literatures and might even help to integrate both literatures. Multilevel modeling techniques allow researchers to examine variance within subjects (applicant or organizations) over time as well as variance at different levels of analysis (at the level of the individual, the organization, or the economy). As such, multilevel modeling could be useful to examining how applicants vary over time (level 1), are different from each other (level 2), and how they vary depending on the organization (i.e., variance between organizations – level 3). We should note that job search and recruitment researchers have started using multilevel modeling to examine how recruitment activities attract applicants and how job seekers search for jobs (Collins & Stevens, 2002; Jaidi et al., 2011; Song, Uy, Zhang, & Shi, 2009; Wanberg et al., 2010, 2012). For example, using a daily diary study, Song et al. (2009) found that job seekers who experienced increased distress utilized more job search effort the following day. Interestingly, Collins and Stevens (2002) and Jaidi et al. (2011) also took a multilevel

approach to examine the role of recruitment-related sources and activities on recruitment outcomes. Specifically the authors collected information from the applications about the various organizations they were interested in, allowing the examination of recruitment activities across applicants and organizations.

We suggest that multilevel modeling might be useful for understanding applicant attraction, as the recruitment literature has yet to examine how recruitment processes and the pool of applicants change over time. Further, it could be interesting to examine, from both sides (the applicant and the recruiting organization), how job search and recruitment processes unfold over time, across organizations (for job seekers), and between job seekers (for organizations). We now describe what we think are useful theoretical perspectives for integrating the recruitment and job search literatures.

Theoretical Approaches to Recruitment and Job Search

We now describe three theories that provide a framework which can help to integrate recruitment and job search in examining predictors of job search and recruitment processes. Although scholars have used various theories to examine recruitment and job search, we review only the following three theories, which we believe can help (further) integrate recruitment and job search research: signaling theory (Spence, 1973), expectancy theory (Vroom, 1964), and the theory of planned behavior (Ajzen, 1991). Throughout this section, we review these theories, how they have been used in each area, and how they could be used to integrate recruitment and job search approaches.

Signaling Theory

Signaling theory has been widely used in recruitment research but has not been used much if at all, to understand job search behaviors. As originally articulated by Spence (1973), signaling theory proposes that in situations of information asymmetry in which individuals want to make decisions, they will interpret available information as providing signals about what is unknown (for a review of signaling theory, see Connelly et al., 2011). Signaling theory has been utilized by recruitment scholars, who note that because applicants do not have complete information about what it would be like to be an employee of an organization, they interpret available information as signal(s) about the job and working conditions in the organization (Rynes, 1991). For example, job seekers are theorized to use firm reputation as a signal about job attributes and working conditions in the organization (Turban & Cable, 2003). More broadly, applicants are likely to interpret recruitment activities as providing signals about what it would be like to be an employee of the firm (Breaugh, 1992; Rynes, 1991; Turban, 2001). For example, recruitment behaviors may be interpreted such that an unfriendly recruiter may signal an unfriendly work environment (Rynes, Heneman, & Schwab, 1980; Taylor & Bergmann, 1987; Wanberg et al., 2012). Additionally, evidence indicates that applicants interpret recruitment delays as a signal of the organization's interest in them as potential employees (Becker et al., 2010; Rynes et al., 1991). What is important to highlight is that the organization may not be aware of how the applicant is interpreting information; thus organizations might be sending the wrong signal to potential applicants. In any case, signaling theory has been used to examine how various predictors—such as organizational reputation, recruiter behaviors, and recruitment delays—influence applicant perceptions of the firm as an employer (Cable & Turban, 2001; Collins, 2007; Turban, 2001; Turban & Cable, 2003).

In their review of the literature utilizing signaling theory, Connelly et al. (2011) proposed a “signaling time line” in which a signaler sends a signal to a receiver who then observes and interprets the signal and subsequently provides the signaler with feedback. We theorize, focusing on the dyad of an applicant and a potential employer, that both parties are sending signals and interpreting information from the other party as a signal. As noted above, researchers theorize that applicants interpret recruitment activities as providing signals about the working conditions in the organization. Thus, for example, firm reputation and recruiter behaviors during the interview have been conceptualized as providing signals that influence potential applicants' perceptions of working conditions in the organization and their attraction to the organization as an employer. However, we found no research that has specifically examined whether and how applicants' job search behaviors vary depending on an organization's signals. For example, does a firm's reputation, which might be interpreted as a signal of selectivity, influence how applicants contact the firm? One might expect that if applicants perceive firms with positive reputations as more selective, they might invest more time and energy to obtain employment with such firms. Alternatively, applicants might also use specific job search methods, such as networking or internships, to increase their chances of

obtaining a job at such high reputation organizations. We expect that applicant self-efficacy might moderate relationships between firm reputation and job search behaviors, such that applicants with low self-efficacy might not bother to apply to firms with excellent reputations because they do not think that they have a chance of getting a job with such firms. Note that we are attempting to extend signaling theory by examining how signals from a potential employer influence job search behaviors of applicants.

Another interesting extension of signaling theory would be to examine signals sent by job seekers to recruiting organizations, keeping in mind that applicants could be sending signals in an intentional and unintentional manner. Evidence indicates that applicants are attempting to manage the impressions that they leave with organizational representatives in an attempt to obtain a job offer (Barrick, Shaffer, & DeGrassi, 2009). For example, nonverbal behaviors during the interview may be interpreted by the interviewer as providing information about the applicant's credibility. Thus, one may consider self-presentation skills during the job search process as an attempt by the applicant to intentionally manage the signals that are communicated to potential employers. Importantly, meta-analytic results indicate that such self-presentation tactics do influence interviewer ratings, albeit more strongly in unstructured versus structured interviews (Barrick et al., 2009). Thus, applicants can influence the signals that are sent to interviewers; some evidence suggests that the applicant's handshake influences interviewer ratings of the applicant (Stewart, Dustin, Barrick, & Darnold, 2008). Apparently a quality handshake—which is measured by grip, strength, duration, vigor, and eye contact—provides a signal about the applicant's interpersonal skills.

Applicants may also be sending signals to employers that are less intentional than the self-presentation skills discussed above. For example, organizations may interpret information that applicants “publish” on social networking sites (e.g., LinkedIn, Facebook, and Twitter) as signals regarding the applicant's personality, ability, and possible fit with the organization. Of course, applicants might also intentionally attempt to signal attributes through social networking sites. For example, we know students who have joined LinkedIn with the specific purpose of attempting to signal professionalism to potential employers; we are not sure, however, whether those same students have thought about what is being signaled by their Facebook profile.

As noted above, the recruitment literature has focused predominantly on signals sent by the organization (or its recruiters), whereas the job search literature has paid little attention to examining whether and how signals sent either by the organization or by the job seekers influence job search behaviors and outcomes. Future research could examine the role of signals not only sent by the organization but also sent by job seekers (intentionally or not). For example, as suggested earlier, perhaps signals sent by job seekers through social networking sites (e.g., Facebook or LinkedIn) influence follow-up attention from employers. Additionally, research could investigate whether job seekers spend more time on social networking sites if they believe that recruiters pay attention to what they communicate through those sites, and, importantly, if they believe that such impression management activities lead to more success in the job search.

Expectancy Theory

As noted by Latham and Pinder (2005) there are various subtheories under the umbrella term *expectancy theory*, although the various expectancy theories draw from Vroom (1964; see also Feather, this volume). In general, expectancy theory is a cognitive theory proposing that individuals will choose actions that they believe will maximize their positive outcomes (pleasure) and minimize their negative ones (pain). Broadly speaking, individuals will choose actions they expect are most likely to lead to valued outcomes. As noted by Rynes (1991) in her review of the literature, firms engage in various recruitment activities in an attempt to enhance the perceived valence of a job with the firm. For example, firms create recruitment advertisements and websites and train recruiters in an attempt to influence potential applicants' perceptions of the job and the organization.

In the recruitment literature, expectancy theory has been used to examine the concept of *hiring expectancies*, or job seekers' perceptions of the likelihood of receiving a job offer. More specifically, scholars have theorized, based on expectancy theory (Vroom, 1964), that applicants are more likely to pursue positions when they believe they have a higher likelihood of obtaining the position (i.e., higher hiring expectancies). The theory has received some support as meta-analytic results indicated that hiring expectancies were related positively to job pursuit intentions, acceptance intentions, and job choice (Chapman et al., 2005). Thus, results indicate that applicants are more attracted to and more likely to pursue employment with firms that they expect are more likely to hire them; stated differently, applicants are less likely to pursue employment with firms when they expect the firm is not likely to hire

them. Importantly, evidence suggests that recruitment activities and recruiter behaviors can influence hiring expectancies and thereby have an influence on recruitment outcomes (Rynes, 1991; Chapman et al., 2005). As noted earlier, applicants tend to interpret longer recruitment delays as a signal that the firm is not interested in them; thus recruitment delays lead to lower hiring expectancies.

Several studies have also examined the role of expectancy theory in the job search process (e.g., Feather, 1990, 1992; Feather & Davenport, 1981; Feather & O'Brien, 1987; Van Hooft & Crossley, 2008; see also Feather, this volume). Consistent with expectancy theory predictions, job seekers tend to exert greater effort toward jobs that have higher valence (Feather, 1990, 1992). The effects of expectancy on job search effort are somewhat mixed. Feather and Davenport (1981) found that unemployed job seekers' expectancy to get a job was positively related to their job search effort. In contrast, however, Feather and O'Brien (1987) found that job seekers with stronger hiring expectancies submitted fewer job applications, which is interesting, as it suggests that greater expectancies lead to lower job search effort, in contrast to expectancy theory predictions. Thus the evidence suggests that job seekers exert greater effort to pursue jobs that are highly valued. The role of expectancy is less clear, however. It should be noted, however, that expectancy theory is a within-subjects theory (i.e., focusing on processes within subjects) whereas much of the research has adopted a between-subjects approach.

Future research might thus examine the role of hiring expectancies within subjects over time. For example, Feather and O'Brien (1987) found that subjects with greater hiring expectancies submitted fewer job applications. Such results are consistent with control theory (Carver & Scheier, 1981, 1982), which proposes that individuals will reduce effort if they perceive they are making good progress toward goal achievement. More broadly, future research could test the tenets of expectancy theory (i.e., expectancy, valence, and instrumentality) and examine relations of expectancy with effort throughout the job search process to determine whether and when expectancy is positively or negatively related with job search effort. We expect that the amount of time and energy spent on the job search for a particular position will be influenced by the applicant's expectancy beliefs and also by the extent to which the applicant's expectancy beliefs change during the process.

Theory of Planned Behavior

An extension of the theory of reasoned action (Fishbein & Ajzen, 1975), the theory of planned behavior (Ajzen, 1991) suggests that most conscious human behavior can be predicted by intentions, although individuals need to perceive that they control their behaviors. Ajzen (1991) further suggested that the theory of planned behavior explains how attitudes and perceptions predict human behavior. Stated differently, the theory of planned behavior assumes that human behavior (e.g., job search behavior) is explained, in large part, by attitudes and perceptions that individuals hold about some event or process. In the context of job search, the theory of planned behavior would predict that job seekers' intentions to apply or look for a job will influence their actual job search behaviors. Whether they perceive that they control their behaviors or not is theorized to be related to their belief in their job-seeking ability (i.e., job search self-efficacy). The theory of planned behavior also suggests that perceived behavioral control is likely to influence job search behaviors both indirectly (through job search intentions) and directly (Ajzen, 1991, Van Hooft et al., 2004).

The theory of planned behavior has been applied to various contexts and types of behaviors, such as choosing a career (Sutton, 1998), job search behaviors (Song, Wanberg, Niu, & Xie, 2006; Van Hooft et al., 2004; see also Van Hooft, this volume), and employee turnover (Van Breukelen, Van der Vlist, & Steensma, 2004). Van Hooft et al. (2004) used the theory of planned behavior to investigate predictors of job search intentions and behaviors among employed and unemployed people. They found that job search attitudes influenced job search intentions, which in turn influenced job search behaviors, as suggested by the theory of planned behavior.

Although Van Hooft et al. (2004) examined the role of the theory of planned behavior from a job search perspective, the theory has also received some attention in the recruitment literature (Arnold et al., 2006; Jaidi et al., 2011; Schreurs et al., 2009; Van Hooft, Born, Taris, & Van der Flier, 2006). For example, Schreurs et al. (2009) proposed and found support for a model in which perceived behavioral control and job pursuit attitudes predicted job pursuit intentions, which in turn predicted job pursuit behaviors. Jaidi et al. (2011) extended that model by also examining actual job choice; they also found support for their model and thus for the theory of planned behavior. Interestingly, these studies, although framed as recruitment studies, examined processes that are very similar to the job search process.

Although evidence seems to indicate that the theory of planned behavior is helpful in explaining job pursuit attitudes, intentions, and actual behaviors, we believe that future research could use the theory of planned behavior to incorporate organizational predictors, such as organizational attractiveness. Indeed, it would be interesting to use individual and organizational mechanisms to understand whether job seekers' attitudes and intentions change throughout the process and also whether they vary depending on the organization that is recruiting them. For example, future research could examine whether job pursuit attitudes and intentions, which lead to job pursuit and search behaviors, change once applicants have contact with an organization. Indeed, it could be interesting to examine to what extent a positive or negative experience with an interviewer influences one's general job pursuit attitudes and intentions. To achieve such research goals, collecting multiple measures over time and using multilevel modeling is necessary. Such an approach would allow scholars to understand how job search and recruitment processes unfold over time, across organizations (for job seekers), and between job seekers (for organizations).

Finally, recruitment has been viewed as a multiple-hurdle process in which organizations (attempt to) attract a large pool of qualified applicants and narrow down the pool to a smaller set of "finalists" (Carlson et al., 2002; Dineen & Soltis, 2010). Similarly, scholars have proposed that job seekers change their approach during the search (Barber et al., 1994; Sun, Li, & Song, this volume). For example, job seekers may change their job search behaviors over time either because they move to a different stage of the search process, because they learn how to master the process, or because of emotional responses during the search process. Barber et al. (1994) found support for the sequential model of change, indicating that job seekers change their behaviors because they move to a different stage of their process (e.g., from identifying a pool of potential jobs to narrowing down to a few jobs). Using a multilevel perspective, researchers could examine whether changes in job search processes are related to changes in a firm's recruitment processes. Specifically, researchers could collect data from both organizations and job seekers at different stages to examine how both job search and recruitment processes simultaneously unfold over time.

Directions for Future Research

The recruitment process and the job search process occur simultaneously; firms are attempting to attract qualified applicants and applicants are searching for potential employment opportunities. Although these processes occur simultaneously, the research areas have developed relatively independently. A major goal of our chapter is to highlight areas of overlap and to suggest where insights from one literature can inform the other. In this section, based in part on our review of the literatures and our attempts at integrating them, we describe some specific areas that we think would benefit from future research.

Considerable evidence indicates that in interpersonal interactions people have a tendency to behave in a manner that leads to confirmation of their prior beliefs (Snyder & Swann, 1978; Swann, 2011). Similarly, evidence indicates that interviewers' preinterview impressions influence how they conduct the interview in terms of questioning strategies and how they interact with the applicant (Dipboye, 1982, 1992; Dougherty, Turban, & Callender, 1994; Macan & Dipboye, 1990). More specifically, interviewers engage in confirmatory questioning in order to confirm their preinterview impressions (Binning, Goldstein, Garcia, Harding, & Scattaregia, 1988). For example, interviewers with more positive first impressions were more likely to sell the company and job to applicants (Dougherty et al., 1994).

In his model of self-fulfilling prophecy in employment interviews, Dipboye (1982, 1992) suggested that applicants may respond in a manner consistent with interviewers' expectations and may thereby fulfill the prophecy. Note, however, that a confirmatory questioning strategy is different from a self-fulfilling prophecy; a confirmatory questioning strategy can become a self-fulfilling prophecy when the applicant behaves in a manner to confirm the interviewer's initial impressions although such applicant behavior would not have occurred without the confirmatory questioning strategy. Although evidence is more supportive of the confirmatory questioning strategy effect than the self-fulfilling prophecy effect, evidence does suggest that interviewers' first impressions were related to applicants' communication style and the applicants' rapport with the interviewer (Dougherty et al., 1994). Specifically, Dougherty et al. (1994) found that interviewers' preinterview ratings of the applicant were related positively to ratings—from coders who listened to the actual audiotaped selection interviews—of how well applicants communicated their strengths to the interviewer and their rapport with the interviewer. Additional

analyses indicated that the applicant's interviewer behaviors (i.e., communication style and rapport) were related to the interviewer's behaviors of positive regard during the interview. Thus, to summarize, evidence indicates that interviewer's preinterview impressions influence how applicants behave and perform during the interview, which could influence applicants' subsequent employment outcomes, such as receiving a job offer.

Although research has focused on how *interviewers'* preinterview impressions influence how they behave in the interview, we believe that *applicants'* preinterview impressions may influence interview outcomes also. For example, applicants' preinterview impressions may influence their preinterview behavior and thereby influence interview behaviors and outcomes. Evidence suggests that applicants are more attracted to firms when they have greater hiring expectancies for such firms (Chapman et al., 2005). If applicants engage in more company research for firms with greater hiring expectancies, then the applicants may be able to perform better during the interview, resulting in more positive employment outcomes. More broadly, we are suggesting that what have been considered "recruitment" variables may influence applicants' preinterview behaviors, which can then have an impact on the applicants' job search success. As another example, evidence indicates that company reputation influences applicant attitudes and behaviors toward the firm (Cable & Turban, 2001; Collins & Stevens, 2002; Collins, 2007; Turban & Cable, 2003). In particular, evidence indicates that companies with more positive reputations attracted more and higher-quality applicants (Turban & Cable, 2003). If those higher-quality applicants engaged in more preparation for the initial interviews we expect that the applicants would perform better during the interview. Future research might examine whether and how firm reputation influences applicants' job search behavior, and in particular the moderating effect of job search self-efficacy. In particular, one might expect that applicants with greater job search self-efficacy engage in higher quality job search preparations for firms with excellent reputations than applicants with less self-efficacy, who probably perceive they have a lower likelihood of receiving a job offer from a firm with an excellent reputation.

Reciprocal Processes in Interviews

We expect that applicants and organizational recruiters influence each other throughout the job search/recruitment process, although it seems likely that the reciprocal effects will be strongest in interviews. First, considerable evidence indicates recruiter behaviors influence recruitment outcomes, such as applicant attraction and job search intentions (Chapman et al., 2005). In particular, when recruiters were seen as personable and showed interest in the applicant, applicants reported greater attraction to the firm (e.g., Harris & Fink, 1987; Turban & Dougherty, 1992). Furthermore, as discussed above, some evidence indicates that recruiter behaviors can influence applicant behaviors (Dougherty et al., 1994). Thus evidence supports the conclusion that recruiters can influence applicant behaviors and attraction outcomes.

We theorize that applicants also can (and do) influence the reactions and behaviors of organizational representatives. In particular, emotional contagion theory suggests that individuals have a tendency to experience emotions that are similar to and influenced by those of others (Barsade, 2002; Kelly & Barsade, 2001). For example, controlling for initial interviews, evidence indicates that applicants' positive emotions have a positive influence on the success of obtaining second interviews (Burger & Caldwell, 2000; Turban et al., 2009). Such results led Turban et al. (2009) to suggest that applicants' positive emotions during the interview led to more favorable evaluations in the interviews because of contagion effects. Note, however, that these studies did not measure applicant or recruiter behaviors. Rather, emotions were measured and the authors proposed emotional contagion theoretical processes may have occurred.

More broadly, research might examine whether and how applicant personality characteristics influence recruiter behaviors and outcomes. In an interesting study examining customer and service provider interactions in a fast food restaurant, customer personality traits influenced displays of positive emotions by the service provider in a very brief interaction (Tan, Foo, & Kwek, 2004). Notably, service providers displayed more positive emotions to customers who were high on agreeableness and low on negative affectivity; furthermore the display of positive emotions by the service provider resulted in increased customer satisfaction. Although Tan et al. (2004) did not measure customer behaviors, presumably customers with different personality characteristics behaved differently to the service provider, which impacted the positive emotions displayed by the service provider. Note that the customer-service provider interaction is typically "scripted" and relatively short; thus the evidence provides additional support indicating that "thin slices of behavior" can predict important outcomes (Ambady & Rosenthal,

1992, 1993). By extension, research might examine how applicant personality characteristics influence recruiter behaviors, which then, presumably, influence recruitment outcomes. We believe that an employment interview is typically much longer and much less scripted than a customer-service provider interaction.

In our review of the job search and recruitment literatures we were struck by the finding that numerous studies have examined the role of job seeker personality in predicting and explaining job search success (Brown et al., 2006; Caldwell & Burger, 1998; Tay et al., 2006; Turban et al., 2009) but that few if any studies examined whether and how applicant personality influence recruitment outcomes. We expect that this disparity resulted because many recruitment scholars are interested in how an organization's recruitment activities influence applicant reactions and behaviors. In contrast, many job search scholars are interested in what leads applicants to have a more successful job search and have thus focused on applicant attributes and behaviors. With the exception of the person-organization fit literature (Cable & Judge, 1996; Kristof-Brown, Zimmerman, & Johnson, 2005; Saks & Ashforth, 2002), which measures the fit between individual and organizational attributes, there is a noticeable dearth of research examining how applicant attributes influence recruitment outcomes. Thus, a promising area for future research is the examination of how applicant characteristics and emotions influence organizational representatives and subsequent applicant reactions. More broadly, future research that examines applicant and interviewer behaviors during the initial interview is warranted, perhaps using dyadic data analysis techniques (Kenny, Kashy, & Cook, 2006).

Scholars interested in integrating the recruitment and job search literatures may elect to utilize additional research methodologies. In particular, qualitative studies of applicants may provide additional insight into how applicants search for jobs and how potential employers' recruitment activities influence job search behaviors (e.g., Wanberg et al., 2012). Specific questions that can be addressed include whether applicants prepare differently for employers based on the firm's reputation, and whether and how applicants respond differently to potential employers depending upon the initial employment interview. Evidence indicates that interviewers may focus more heavily on attracting or selecting applicants and that the interview focus influences applicant attraction and retention in the applicant pool (Turban & Dougherty, 1992; Barber et al., 1994). To the extent that applicant attraction is related to job search activities, such as sending thank-you letters or preparing for a site visit, interview focus may influence applicants' job search behaviors. We acknowledge, however, that we are speculating about this relationship, since we know of no evidence linking applicant attraction and job search behaviors, although it seems like an important area for future research. Specifically, do applicants search differently for jobs with firms for which they have more attraction toward as a potential employer? We encourage research that simultaneously examines applicants' perceptions of and reactions to potential employers and how such perceptions influence job search activities.

A promising methodological (and theoretical) development in both the job search and recruitment literatures is the tracking of applicants multiple times during their job search/recruitment process. For example, several recent studies that have examined applicant attitudes, emotions, and behaviors daily or weekly over time have provided valuable insight into job search behaviors (e.g., Song et al., 2009; Wanberg et al., 2010, 2012). As such, it could be interesting to examine not only job search behaviors, processes, and outcomes but also recruitment processes over time. For example, by collecting multiple measures throughout the recruitment process, organizations could understand why and how applicants change their intentions and perceptions about organizations over time.

Practical Implications

In addition to theoretical and empirical implications, the integration of the job search and recruitment literatures provides practical implications that highlight the importance of understanding the interactions between both job search and recruitment processes. For example, organizations need to better understand what job seekers expect from the process, whether and how job search behaviors change dependent upon organizational recruitment activities, and what organizations can do to help compensate for negative recruitment experiences. For example, an organization with a poor reputation might be able to compensate for this by highlighting interesting and challenging jobs (i.e., job characteristics). Thus, although applicants initially are less interested in such an organization, their behaviors and pursuit intentions may change at different stages of the recruitment and job search processes if the organization can compensate for negative global reputation perceptions. More broadly, it is important for organizations to understand that applicants are involved in various recruitment processes

simultaneously and that they can and will change their behaviors and pursuit intentions during their job search.

From an individual perspective, job seekers need to understand what organizations are looking for, what they expect, and how they recruit their applicants. For example, career counselors could train job seekers to understand the importance of the signals they send to recruiting organizations. Similarly, career counselors could emphasize the timeliness of their job search activities, as delayed responses to organizations may influence applicants negatively. Indeed, recruiting organizations have a pool of applicants that they contact for interviews or follow-up visits. If employers do not hear back quickly from an applicant, they assume that the applicant is not interested in them as an employer (i.e., delay signals lack of interest) and move to the next applicant. More broadly, it is important for career counselors to help job seekers understand that organizations have a pool of qualified applicants and that they can and will change their recruitment intentions and preferences during the process.

Conclusion

In this chapter, we have argued that recruitment processes of organizations and job search processes of applicants occur simultaneously. Specifically, this chapter provides ideas and suggestions to integrate recruitment and job search approaches. We reviewed categories of predictors of applicant attraction and job choice, and of job search behaviors and outcomes. We discussed how three theories (i.e., signaling, expectancy, and the theory of planned behavior) could be used to integrate job search and recruitment research. Finally, we further integrated relevant concepts that can stimulate future research examining recruitment and job search processes simultaneously rather than independently.

In conclusion, both recruitment, from an organizational perspective, and job search, from an individual applicant's perspective, occur simultaneously. We suggest that recruitment and job search are "two sides of the same coin." On one side, recruiting (or attracting) applicants is an essential human resource practice for organizations looking to recruit and select the best potential applicants. On the other side, job seekers are attracted to apply for jobs at specific organizations. Thus, as job seekers engage in aspects of the job search process, they are exposed to various recruitment processes, which may influence their subsequent job search behaviors. We suggest that, although the recruitment and job search literatures have developed somewhat independently, it may be useful to integrate such literatures in an attempt to stimulate further research. As such, we hope that this chapter will stimulate future work integrating recruitment and job search research, as these are essential areas for both applicants and organizations.

Practical Recommendations

For Organizations/Recruiters

- Understand applicant expectations in terms of recruitment activities and processes and how recruiters can compensate for some negative experience.
- Understand the importance of signals sent to applicants, such as recruitment delays, as they can influence applicant attraction, job pursuit, and job choice.

For Job Seekers/Career Counselors

- Manage the signals sent to recruiters—for example, through social networking sites (Facebook, Twitter, or LinkedIn).
- Emphasize the timeliness of job search activities, as organizations may switch to another applicant if they do not hear back from their top candidate.
- Job search and recruitment are two sides of the same coin: not only may job seekers change their preference order but recruiters may also do so.

References

- Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 50, 179–211.
- Allen, D. G., Mahto, R. V., & Otondo, R. F. (2007). Web-based recruitment: effects of information, organizational brand, and attitudes toward a web site on applicant attraction. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92, 1696–708.
- Ambady, N., & Rosenthal, R. (1992). Thin slices of expressive behavior as predictors of interpersonal consequences: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 111, 256–274.
- Ambady, N., & Rosenthal, R. (1993). Half a minute: Predicting teacher evaluations from thin slices of behavior and physical attractiveness. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 64, 431–441.
- Arnold, J., Loan-Clarke, J., Coombs, C., Wilkinson, A., Park, J., & Preston, D. (2006). How well can the theory of planned behavior account for occupational intentions? *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 69, 374–390.
- Barber, A. E. (1998). *Recruiting employees: Individual and organizational perspectives*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Barber, A. E., Hollenbeck, J. R., Tower, S. L., & Phillips, J. M. (1994). The effects of interview focus on recruitment effectiveness: A field experiment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 79, 886–896.
- Barrick, M. R., Shaffer, J. A., & DeGrassi, S. W. (2009). What you see may not be what you get: Relationships among self-presentation tactics and ratings of interview and job performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94, 1394–1411.
- Barsade, S. G. (2002). The ripple effect: Emotional contagion and its influence on group behavior. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 47, 644–675.
- Becker, W. J., Connolly, T., & Slaughter, J. E. (2010). The effect of job offer timing on offer acceptance, performance, and turnover. *Personnel Psychology*, 63, 223–241.
- Binning, J. F., Goldstein, M. A., Garcia, M. F., & Scattaregia, J. H. (1988). Effects of pre-interview impressions on questioning strategies in same- and opposite-sex employment interviews. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 73, 30–37.
- Blau G. (1994). Testing a two-dimensional measure of job search behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 59, 288–312.
- Boswell, W. R., Zimmerman, R. D., & Swider, B. W. (2012). Employee job search toward an understanding of search context and search objectives. *Journal of Management*, 38, 129–163.
- Boudreau, J. W., Boswell, W. R., Judge, T. A., & Bretz R. D. Jr. (2001). Personality and cognitive ability as predictors of job search among employed managers. *Personnel Psychology*, 54, 25–50.
- Boudreau, J. W., & Rynes, S. L. (1985). Role of recruitment in staffing utility analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 70, 354–366.
- Breaugh, J. A. (1992). *Recruitment: Science and practice*. Boston, MA: PWS-Kent.
- Breaugh, J. A. (2008). Employee recruitment: Current knowledge and important areas for future research. *Human Resource Management Review*, 18, 103–118.
- Breaugh, J. (2010). Realistic Job Previews. In R. Watkins, & D. Leigh (Eds.), *Handbook of improving performance in the workplace*, Vol. 2: *Selecting and implementing performance interventions* (pp. 203–250). New York: Wiley.
- Breaugh, J. A., & Starke, M. (2000) Research on employee recruitment: So many studies, so many remaining questions. *Journal of Management*, 26, 405–434.

Who Is Searching for Whom? Integrating Recruitment and Job Search Research

- Brown, D. J., Cober, R. T., Kane, K., Levy, P. E., & Shalhoop, J. (2006). Proactive personality and the successful job search: A field investigation with college graduates. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 91*, 717–726.
- Burger, J. M., & Caldwell, D. F. (2000). Personality, social activities, job-search behavior and interview success: Distinguishing between PANAS trait positive affect and NEO extraversion. *Motivation and Emotion, 24*, 51–62.
- Cable, D. M., & Judge, T. A. (1994). Pay preferences and job search decisions: A person–organization fit perspective. *Personnel Psychology, 47*, 317–348.
- Cable, D. M., & Judge, T. A. (1996). Person–organization fit, job choice decisions, and organizational entry. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 67*, 294–311.
- Cable, D., & Turban, D. (2001). Establishing the dimensions, sources and value of job seekers' employer knowledge during recruitment. In G. Ferris (Ed.), *Research in Personnel and Human Resource Management* (Vol. 20, pp. 115–163). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Caldwell, D. F., & Burger, J. M. (1998). Personality characteristics of job applicants and success in screening interview. *Personnel Psychology, 51*, 119–136.
- Carlson, K. D., Connerley, M. L., & Mecham, R. L. (2002). Recruitment evaluation: The case for assessing the quality of applicants attracted. *Personnel Psychology, 55*, 461–490.
- Carver, C. S., & Scheier, M. F. (1981). *Attention and self-regulation: A control theory approach to human behavior*. New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Carver, C. S., & Scheier, M. F. (1982). Control theory: A useful conceptual framework for personality-social, clinical, and health psychology. *Psychological Bulletin, 92*, 111–135.
- Casper, W. J., & Buffardi, L. C. (2004). Work-life benefits and job pursuit intentions: The role of anticipated organizational support. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 65*, 391–410.
- Chan, D., & Schmitt, N. (2004). An agenda for future research on applicant reactions to selection procedures: A construct-oriented approach. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 12*, 9–23.
- Chapman, D. S., Uggerslev, K. L., Carroll, S. A., Piasentin, K. A., & Jones, D. A. (2005). Applicant attraction to organizations and job choice: A meta-analytic review of the correlates of recruiting outcomes. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 90*, 928–944.
- Collins, C. J. (2007). The interactive effects of recruitment practices and product awareness on job seekers' employer knowledge and application behaviors. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 92*, 180–190.
- Collins, C. J., & Han, J. (2004). Exploring applicant pool quantity and quality: The effects of early recruitment practices, corporate advertising, and firm reputation. *Personnel Psychology, 57*, 685–717.
- Connelly, B. L., Certo, S. T., Ireland, R. D., & Reutzel, C. R. (2011). Signaling theory: A review and assessment. *Journal of Management, 37*, 39–67.
- Collins, C. J., & Stevens, C. K. (2002). The relationship between early recruitment-related activities and the application decisions of new labor-market entrants: A brand equity approach to recruitment. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*, 1121–1133.
- Côté, S., Saks, A. M., & Zikic, J. (2006). Trait affect and job search outcomes. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 68*, 233–252.
- Creed, P. A., King, V., Hood, M., & McKenzie, R. (2009). Goal orientation, self-regulation strategies, and job seeking intensity in unemployed adults. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 94*, 806–813.
- Crossley, C. D., & Stanton, J. M. (2005). Negative affect and job search: Further examination of the reverse causation hypothesis. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 66*, 549–560.

Who Is Searching for Whom? Integrating Recruitment and Job Search Research

- Dineen, B. R., & Noe, R. A. (2009). Effects of customization on application decisions and applicant pool characteristics in a web-based recruitment context. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 94*, 224–234.
- Dineen, B. R., & Soltis, S. M. (2010). Recruitment: A review of research and emerging directions. In S. Zedeck (Ed.), *APA handbook of I/O psychology: Vol. 2. Selecting and developing members for the organization* (pp. 43–66). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Dipboye, R. L. (1982). Self-fulfilling prophecies in the selection-recruitment interview. *Academy of Management Review, 7*, 579–586.
- Dipboye, R. L. (1992). Social interaction in the interview. In R. L. Dipboye (Ed.), *Selection interview: Process perspective* (pp. 75–100). Cincinnati, OH: South-Western.
- Dougherty, T. W., Turban, D. B., & Callender, J. C. (1994). Confirming first impressions in the employment interview: A field study of interviewer behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 79*, 659–665.
- Earnest, D. R., Allen, D. G., & Landis, R. S. (2011). Mechanisms linking realistic job previews with turnover: A meta-analytic path analysis. *Personnel Psychology, 64*, 865–897.
- Ellis, R. A., & Taylor, M. S. (1983). Role of self-esteem within the job search process. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 68*, 632–640.
- Feather, N. T. (1990). *The psychological impact of unemployment*. New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Feather, N. T. (1992). Expectancy-value theory and unemployment effects. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 65*, 315–330.
- Feather, N. T., & Davenport, P. R. (1981). Unemployment and depressive affect: A motivational and attributional analysis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 41*, 121–144.
- Feather, N. T., & O'Brien, G. E. (1987). Looking for employment: An expectancy-valence analysis of job-seeking behavior among young people. *British Journal of Psychology, 78*, 251–272.
- Fishbein M., & Ajzen I. (1975). *Belief, attitude, intention, and behavior: An introduction to theory and research*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Greening, D. W., & Turban, D. B. (2000). Corporate social performance as a competitive advantage in attracting a quality workforce. *Business and Society, 39*, 254–280.
- Harris, M. M., & Fink, L. S. (1987). A field study of employment opportunities: Does the recruiter make a difference? *Personnel Psychology, 40*, 765–784.
- Jaidi, Y., Van Hooft, E. A. J., & Arends, L. R. (2011). Recruiting highly educated graduates: A study on the relationship between recruitment information sources, the theory of planned behavior, and actual job pursuit. *Human Performance, 24*, 135–157.
- Judge, T. A., & Cable, D. M. (1997). Applicant personality, organizational culture, and organization attraction. *Personnel Psychology, 50*, 359–395.
- Kanfer, R., & Hulin, C. L. (1985). Individual differences in successful job searches following lay-off. *Personnel Psychology, 38*, 835–847.
- Kanfer, R., Wanberg, C., & Kantrowitz, T. (2001). Job search and employment: A personality-motivational analysis and meta-analytic review. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*, 837–855.
- Kelly, J., & Barsade, S. (2001). Mood and emotions in small groups and work teams. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 86*, 99–130.
- Kenny, D. A., Kashy, D. A., & Cook, W. L. (2006). *Dyadic data analysis*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Kristof-Brown, A. L., Zimmerman, R. D., & Johnson, E. C. (2005). Consequences of individuals' fit at work: A meta-

Who Is Searching for Whom? Integrating Recruitment and Job Search Research

- analysis of person-job, person-organization, person-group, and person-supervisor fit. *Personnel Psychology*, 58, 281–342.
- Latham, G. P., & Pinder, C. C. (2005). Work motivation theory and research at the dawn of the twenty-first century. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 56, 495–516.
- Macan, T. H., & Dipboye, R. L. (1990). The relationship of interviewers' preinterview impressions to selection and recruitment outcomes. *Personnel Psychology*, 43, 745–768.
- Murphy, K. R. (1986). When your top choice turns you down: Effect of rejected job offers on the utility of selection tests. *Psychological Bulletin*, 99, 133–138.
- Pinder, C. C. (1998). *Work motivation in organizational behavior*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Rynes, S. L. (1991). Recruitment, job choice, and post-hire consequences: A call for new research directions. In M. D. Dunnette & L. M. Hough (Eds.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* Vol. 2 (2nd ed., pp. 399–444). Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Rynes, S. L., Bretz, R. D. Jr., & Gerhart, B. (1991). The importance of recruitment in job choice: A different way of looking. *Personnel Psychology*, 44, 487–521.
- Rynes, S. L., & Cable, D. M. (2003). Recruitment research in the twenty-first century. In W. C. Borman, D. R. Ilgen, & R. J. Klimoski (Eds.), *Handbook of psychology: Vol. 12. Industrial and organizational psychology* (pp. 55–76). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Rynes, S. L., Heneman, H. G. III, & Schwab, D. P. (1980). Individual reactions to organizational recruiting: A review. *Personnel Psychology*, 34, 823–834.
- Rynes, S. L., & Lawler, J. (1983). A policy-capturing investigation of the role of expectancies in decisions to pursue job alternatives. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 68, 620–632.
- Saks, A. M. (2006). Multiple predictors and criteria of job search success. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 68, 400–415.
- Saks, A. M., & Ashforth, B. E. (2002). Is job search related to employment quality? It all depends on the fit. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87, 646–654.
- Schreurs, B., Derous, E., Van Hooft, E. A. J., Proost, K., & De Witte, K. (2009). Predicting applicants' job pursuit behavior from their selection expectations: The mediating role of the theory of planned behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 30, 761–783.
- Slaughter, J. E., Zickar, M. J., Highhouse, S., & Mohr, D. C. (2004). Personality trait inferences about organizations: Development of a measure and assessment of construct validity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89, 85–103.
- Snyder, M., & Swann, W. B. Jr. (1978). Hypothesis testing processes in social interaction. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 36, 1202–1212.
- Song, Z., Uy, M. A., Zhang, S., & Shi, K. (2009). Daily job search and psychological distress: Evidence from China. *Human Relations*, 62, 1171–1197.
- Song, Z., Wanberg, C. R., Niu, X., & Xie, Y. (2006). Action–state orientation and the theory of planned behavior: A study of job search in China. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 68, 490–503.
- Spence, M. (1973). Job market signaling. *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 87, 355–374.
- Stevens, C. K. (1998). Antecedents of interview interactions, interviewers' ratings, and applicants' reactions. *Personnel Psychology*, 51, 55–86.
- Stewart, G. L., Dustin, S. L., Barrick, M. R., & Darnold, T. C. (2008). Exploring the handshake in employment interviews. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 95, 1139–1146.

Who Is Searching for Whom? Integrating Recruitment and Job Search Research

- Sutton, S. (1998). Predicting and explaining intentions and behavior: How well are we doing? *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 28, 1317–1338.
- Swann, W. B. Jr. (2011). Self-verification theory. In P. Van Lang, A. Kruglanski, & E. T. Higgins (Eds.), *Handbook of theories of social psychology*: Vol. 2 (pp. 23–42). London: Sage.
- Tan, H. H., Foo, M. D., & Kwek, M. H. (2004). The effects of customer personality traits on display of positive emotions. *Academy of Management Journal*, 47, 287–296.
- Tay, C., Ang, S., & Van Dyne, L. (2006). Personality, biographical characteristics, and job interview success: A longitudinal study of the mediating effects of interviewing, self-efficacy and the moderating effects of internal locus of causality. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91, 446–454.
- Taylor, M. S., & Bergmann, T. J. (1987). Organizational recruitment activities and applicants' reactions at different stages of the recruitment process. *Personnel Psychology*, 40, 261–285.
- Turban, D. B. (2001). Organizational attractiveness as an employer on college campuses: An examination of the applicant population. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 58, 293–312.
- Turban, D. B., & Cable, D. M. (2003). Firm reputation and applicant pool characteristics. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 24, 733–751.
- Turban, D. B., Campion, J. E., & Eyring, A. R. (1995). Factors related to job acceptance decisions of college graduates. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 47, 193–213.
- Turban, D. B., & Dougherty, T. W. (1992). Influences of campus recruiting on applicant attraction to firms. *Academy of Management Journal*, 35, 739–765.
- Turban, D. B., Forret, M. L., & Hendrickson, C. L. (1998). Applicant attraction to firms: Influences of organizational reputation, job and organizational attributes and recruiter behaviors. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 52, 24–44.
- Turban, D. B., & Greening, D. W. (1997). Corporate social performance and organizational attractiveness to prospective employees. *Academy of Management Journal*, 40, 658–672.
- Turban, D. B., Lee, F. K., da Motta Veiga, S. P., Haggard, D. L., & Wu, S. Y. (2013). Be happy, don't wait: The role of trait affect in job search. *Personnel Psychology*, 66, 483–514.
- Turban, D. B., Stevens, C. K., & Lee, F. K. (2009). Effects of conscientiousness and extraversion on new labor market entrants' job search: The mediating role of metacognitive activities and positive emotions. *Personnel Psychology*, 62, 553–573.
- Van Breukelen, W., Van der Vlist, R., & Steensma, H. (2004). Voluntary employee turnover: Combining variables from the "traditional" turnover literature with the theory of planned behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 25, 893–914.
- Van Hooft, E. A. J., Born, M. P., Taris, T. W., & Van der Flier, H. (2006). Ethnic and gender differences in applicants' decision-making processes: An application of the theory of reasoned action. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 14, 156–166.
- Van Hooft, E. A. J., Born, M. P., Taris, T. W., Van der Flier, H., & Blonk, R. W. B. (2004). Predictors of job search behavior among employed and unemployed people. *Personnel Psychology*, 57, 25–59.
- Van Hooft, E. A. J., & Crossley, C. D. (2008). The joint role of locus of control and perceived financial need in job search. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 16, 258–271.
- Van Hooft, E. A. J., & Noordzij, G. (2009). The effects of goal orientation on job search and reemployment: A field experiment among unemployed job seekers. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94, 1581–1590.
- Van Hooft, G., & Saks, A. M. (2008). Job search as goal-directed behavior: Objectives and methods. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 73: 358–367.

Who Is Searching for Whom? Integrating Recruitment and Job Search Research

Vroom, V. H. (1964). *Work and motivation*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

Wanberg, C. R., Basbug, G., Van Hooft, E. A. J., & Samtani, A. (2012). Navigating the black hole: Explicating layers of job search context and adaptational responses. *Personnel Psychology*, 65, 887–926.

Wanberg, C. R., Kanfer, R., & Rotundo, M. (1999). Unemployed individuals: Motives, job-search competencies, and job-search constraints as predictors of job seeking and reemployment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 6, 897–910.

Wanberg, C. R., Zhu, J., Kanfer, R., & Zhang, Z. (2012). After the pink slip: Applying dynamic motivation frameworks to the job search experience. *Academy of Management Journal*, 55, 261–284.

Wanberg, C. R., Zhu, J., & Van Hooft, E. A. J. (2010). The job search grind: Perceived progress, self-reactions, and self-regulation of search effort. *Academy of Management Journal*, 53, 788–807.

Williamson, I. O., Lepak, D. P., & King, J. (2003). The effect of company recruitment web site orientation on individuals' perceptions of organizational attractiveness. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 63, 242–263.

Notes:

(¹) presumably because job seekers report the frequency (intensity) with which they engage in certain behaviors.

(²) We should acknowledge, however, that scholars could argue that post-hire outcomes, such as job performance and turnover, may also be considered important outcomes of recruitment processes.

Serge P. da Motta Veiga

Serge P. da Motta Veiga, Department of Management, Lehigh University, Bethlehem, PA.

Daniel B. Turban

Daniel B. Turban, Department of Management, University of Missouri, Columbia, MO.

