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INTRODUCTION

Readers of the first edition of this Handbook will probably not remember much about the section on organizational recruiting. In that volume, recruitment received less than one page of coverage in a chapter encompassing recruitment, selection, and job placement. The author, Robert Guion, explained the de-emphasis on recruiting this way:

"Technology in employee selection is more highly developed than in recruiting or placement; therefore, the major emphasis is on selection... Recruiting or placement are not less important processes; to the contrary, they probably are more vital and more profitable to the organization. An organization's success in recruiting defines the applicant population with which it will work; selection is more pleasant, if not easier, when any restriction of range or skewness of distribution is attributable to an overabundance of well-qualified applicants... Unfortunately, the contributions and confusions of the literature, the central social pressures, and the facts of contemporary practice conspire to place the emphasis on selection" (pp. 777-779).

Despite the brevity of his recruitment discussion, Guion did offer two substantive conclusions: (1) that little recruitment research existed as of 1976, and (2) where it did, it was not characterized by a "search for understanding."

Since that time, the empirical literature on recruitment has expanded considerably. Moreover, there have been a number of important conceptual advances as well. In particular, researchers have begun to speculate as to how recruitment might influence applicant and employee behaviors. Some theoretical models pertain to recruitment practices in general (e.g., Boudreau & Rynes, 1985; Schwab, Rynes & Aldag, 1987), while others pertain to specific practices such as choice of recruitment sources (e.g., Breaugh, 1981; Schw., 1982) or effects of realistic versus traditional job previews (e.g., Breaugh, 1983; Reilly, Brown, Blood & Malatesta, 1981; Wanous, 1977 & 1980). In addition, a broader range of potential outcomes (e.g., expectancies of receiving offers, effects of new hires
on current employees) have been linked to recruitment as well (e.g., Boudreau and Rynes, 1985; Schwab, 1982; Sutton & Louis, 1987).

Despite these advances, some of the most central questions about applicant attraction remain almost completely unaddressed. Examples of questions that employers frequently ask, but researchers have not answered, include the following:

"We have a limited amount of money to spend on attracting applicants. What is the most cost effective way to spend it: on realistic recruitment, on recruitment advertising, on training recruiters, or on improving vacancy characteristics?"

"We are willing to train recruiters if we think we can recoup our investment. What are the most essential content areas for recruiters to master? What kinds of improvements can we expect to obtain in terms of applicant acceptance rates or higher acceptee quality?"

"Unfortunately, we are constrained to pay below-market wages and salaries. Can we still attract high-quality applicants? How?"

"What can we do to really set our organization apart in applicants' eyes?"

"Dollar for dollar, are we better off recruiting at top-tier or second-tier universities?"

"When should we begin campus recruiting to get the greatest number of high-quality applicants? What are the implications of sending (or not sending) recruiters if we might have vacancies, but won't know for several months?"

"Our recruiters are complaining that we have a poor organizational image on campuses. What are the components of organizational image, and how hard is it to change them?"

"We would like to be completely honest with applicants during recruitment, but our line managers argue that we will lose our best candidates because everyone else is "selling" their vacancies. Are they right?"

"We spend lots of money on recruiting films and wine and cheese receptions. However, very few applicants bother to attend. What are we doing wrong?"
More examples could be generated, but the preceding are sufficient to make the point. Recruitment research has advanced in a fragmented fashion, with a few topics generating many studies (e.g., recruiters, realistic job previews) and others (e.g., job and organizational attributes, recruitment timing) almost none. The present chapter attempts to place recruitment research in a broader context and, in so doing, to direct attention toward new questions that might be of greater interest to organizational decisionmakers charged with attracting and retaining a quality workforce.

ORGANIZATION OF THE CHAPTER

The chapter is divided into three major sections: theory, research, and suggestions for future research. The theory section outlines (1) the major recruitment practices and activities (independent variables) that have dominated previous speculation and research, (2) the principal outcomes of those practices and activities (i.e., dependent variables), and (3) the process or intervening variables believed to determine the precise nature of the impact of recruitment activities on outcomes.

The research section reviews previous empirical work on three major categories of recruitment practices and activities. These include (1) recruiters and other organizational representatives, (2) recruitment sources, and (3) administrative policies and procedures, including realistic job previews.

The future research section calls for a broader conceptualization of the recruitment function, as well as increased variety in future empirical work. Suggestions are made for incorporating additional independent and dependent variables, for paying greater attention to the context in which recruitment occurs, and for studying the adaptive and interactive features of the recruitment process.
RECRUITMENT THEORY

Recruitment theories have focused primarily on process variables; that is, on the psychological or environmental mechanisms believed to determine the outcomes of various recruitment practices. However, in order to discuss these processes, it is first necessary to delineate the major practices (independent variables) and outcomes (dependent variables) that comprise the recruitment domain. We begin with a discussion of recruitment practices and activities, followed by recruitment outcomes, and finally, by hypothesized recruitment processes. A summary of these variables and their interrelationships is provided in Figure 1.

(Insert Figure 1 about here)

Independent Variables

Conceptually, a wide range of policies, practices, and decisions might be regarded as part of organizational recruitment (Rynes & Boudreau, 1986; Taylor & Bergmann, 1987). However, a review of previous theory (e.g., Wanous, 1977; Schwab, 1982), empirical research (e.g., Alderfer & McCord, 1971; Gannon, 1971; Reilly, Brown, Blood & Malatesta, 1981), and descriptive research (e.g., Miner, 1979) reveals that recruitment researchers have primarily been concerned with three sets of recruitment variables.

First, research on recruiters has focused on the impact of various recruiter characteristics (e.g., demographics, behaviors) on applicant impressions and decisions. Recruitment source research has focused on employer preferences for various sources, and on differences in post-hire outcomes (e.g., performance or retention) across individuals hired through various sources. Finally, research on administrative policies and procedures has examined the roles of realistic
Recruitment

previews, recruitment followups, recruiting expenditures and application processes on job acceptance rates and post-hire outcomes.

Dependent Variables

For the most part, various recruitment outcomes have been linked rather narrowly to particular recruitment activities. Thus, for example, we have theories of how recruiters influence job choices (e.g., Rynes, Heneman & Schwab, 1980; Rynes & Miller, 1983), and how recruitment sources influence employee retention (e.g., Breaugh, 1981; Schwab, 1982). In contrast, we have no explicit theories of how sources influence job acceptance, or how recruiters influence employee retention.

In an attempt to devise a more general framework for recruitment research, Boudreau and Rynes (1985) integrated recruitment activities into a standard selection utility model. In the process, they identified a wide variety of potential outcomes (e.g., variability in qualifications, service costs, service value) that might be affected by recruitment practices. However, only a small subset of the outcome variables suggested by Boudreau and Rynes (1985) have been investigated to date.

The present chapter focuses primarily on outcome variables that have been investigated with some regularity. Generally speaking, these can be classified into two categories: pre-hire and post-hire. In the pre-hire category are applicant impressions of recruiters, perceived job or organizational attractiveness, intentions to pursue job offers, expectancies of receiving offers, and actual job choices. Post-hire outcomes consist of such variables as satisfaction, commitment, performance, and length of service (Figure 1).

For some reason (most likely convenience), research on recruiters and recruitment followups has focused almost exclusively on pre-hire variables.
Indeed, with few exceptions (e.g., Taylor & Bergmann, 1987), applicant reactions to recruiters have been obtained immediately following recruitment interviews, but no later. As such, we have virtually no information about whether, or how, recruiters influence actual job choices or post-hire adjustment.

In contrast, recruitment source studies and realistic preview research have focused on post-hire outcomes such as satisfaction, performance, and turnover. Again, convenience appears to have played a role: selectees represent a convenient sample for correlating post-hire effects (performance, turnover) with pre-hire variables (e.g., source), both of which can easily be obtained from personnel files. Unfortunately, the practice of studying only selectees introduces competing explanations for observed post-hire phenomena, including potentially serious selection biases (e.g., Lord & Novick, 1968). Equally important, it prohibits investigation of the immediate objective of recruitment, applicant attraction.

**Process or Intervening Variables**

Increased attention has also been paid to the psychological processes through which recruitment activities and practices translate into applicant decisions and behaviors. However, specific hypotheses vary, depending on whether the concern is with pre-hire or post-hire outcomes. As such, the two are discussed separately (Figure 1).

**Pre-Hire Outcomes.** Here, the challenge is to show why recruitment practices should have any impact on job choices, over and above characteristics of job vacancies per se (see Rynes, et al., 1980). After all, the major economic (e.g., Lippman & McCall, 1976; Smith, 1976; Rottenberg, 1956) and psychological models of job choice (e.g., Vroom, 1964; Soelberg, 1967) view those choices as a function of job characteristics, not of recruitment practices.
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For example, in expectancy theory, job choices are viewed as a function of the perceived instrumentalities and valences of the characteristics associated with alternative offers (Vroom, 1964). Motivation to pursue alternatives is viewed as a function of the preceding variables (i.e., instrumentalities and valences), multiplied by perceived expectancies of successful pursuit (e.g., probabilities of receiving the various job offers). Thus, the question remains: How might recruitment practices (e.g., recruiters, recruitment sources, realistic versus traditional previews) alter applicants' (1) job pursuit strategies, and/or (2) ultimate job choices?

Rynes et al. (1980) and Schwab (1982) have proposed several ways in which recruitment practices might affect job choices. One set of explanations emphasizes uncertainty in instrumentality estimates; the other, uncertainty regarding expectancies. These are discussed in turn.

(Instrumentality Effects). This set of explanations follows from the fact that many important vacancy characteristics, such as considerateness of supervision or opportunities for promotion, cannot be determined with certainty prior to job acceptance. Uncertain instrumentalities would seem to permit at least three possible kinds of recruitment effects.

First, in the absence of perfect information, applicants may interpret recruitment characteristics as signals or cues concerning unknown organizational attributes (see Spence, 1973; Einhorn & Hogarth, 1981). Thus, recruiter preparedness may become a symbol of general organizational efficiency; dining extravagance, a signal of the firm's ability to pay.

Second, imperfect attribute information permits recruiters and other organizational representatives to consciously manipulate the information they give applicants about job characteristics. Indeed, the entire realistic
Recruitment literature can be viewed as an attempt to understand the consequences of such manipulations.

The third possibility is that in contrast to the vague information applicants have about job attributes, recruiter behaviors leave rather vivid impressions on applicants. If so, recruitment practices may become highly salient features in applicants' decision models, regardless of whether or not they represent valid bases for making job choice decisions (e.g., Behling, Labovitz, and Gainer, 1968).

(Expectancy Effects). At the beginning of job search, most job seekers are unsure about how well they are likely to do in the job market. More specifically, they are unlikely to know much about the total number of viable alternatives, the number or quality of competing applicants, or how they will be perceived by employers relative to other applicants. Indeed, field research suggests that most applicants approach the job market with considerable apprehension and a feeling of relative disadvantage vis a vis employers (e.g., Reynolds, 1951; Sheppard & Belitsky, 1966).

Given this uncertainty, individuals are likely to be on the lookout for any information that might help them estimate their chances of receiving offers. Thus, recruitment experiences may become major sources of expectancy cues: "Did the recruiter look enthusiastic during my interview? Did s/he tell me when to expect the next call?"

Expectancy estimates, in turn, may influence eventual job choices. First, applicants who receive positive expectancy cues may be more motivated to continue pursuing a job offer (Schwab, Rynes & Aldag, 1987; Wanous, 1977). Increased pursuit, in turn, increases the probability of actually receiving an offer, which in turn enhances the probability that the job will ultimately be chosen.
A second possibility is that expectancy perceptions have a direct effect on perceived job valence (Rynes & Lawler, 1983). That is, applicants who perceive high probabilities of receiving an offer may cognitively distort their perceptions of job characteristics in a favorable direction (Soelberg, 1967). It should be noted, however, that this hypothesis is inconsistent with expectancy theory, which posits the independence of expectancies and valences.

Post-Hire Effects. Basically, explanations of how recruitment practices influence post-hire outcomes fall into one of two categories: self-selection or adjustment. The self-selection hypothesis suggests that variations in recruitment practices create differences in the type of individual who enters the organization in the first place. The best-known articulation of this view comes from the realistic recruitment literature, which hypothesizes that applicants self-select on the basis of "fit" between personal needs and organizational climates (Wanous, 1980).

In contrast, adjustment explanations focus on the possibility that some recruitment practices better prepare acceptees for early work experiences than others. Again, the fullest articulation of this explanation is found in the realistic recruitment literature, which posits that realistic information may aid adjustment by reducing new employee expectations, increasing commitment, or triggering anticipatory coping mechanisms (e.g., Reilly, Brown, Blood & Malatesta, 1981).

However, one can think of other recruitment practices that might affect adjustment as well. For example, recruiting from the same sources year after year may create a homogeneous environment to which new entrants quickly adjust (e.g., Louis, 1981; Sutton & Louis, 1987). However, this early adjustment may come at the expense of longer-term organizational stagnation and nonadaptability.
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(e.g., Schneider, 1983, 1985). Alternatively, recruitment from elite sources may facilitate early adjustment (due to high employee ability), but be associated with early turnover as well (due to high employee marketability).

In summary, previous theoretical work has focused largely on three independent variables: recruiters, recruitment sources, and administrative policies and practices. These variables are presumed to influence both pre-hire and post-hire outcomes through a variety of intervening process mechanisms, as summarized in Figure 1. Empirical research related to each of these independent variables is summarized below.

PREVIOUS RESEARCH

Recruiters

Overview. Prior to publication of the first Handbook, most recruitment research focused on applicant likes and dislikes with respect to organizational recruiters (e.g., Downs, 1969). The implicit assumption behind this research was that recruiters are capable of affecting applicants' job choice decisions. That assumption was not formally tested, however; impressions of recruiters were not linked empirically to other attitudes or behaviors.

Beginning with Alderfer & McCord (1970), recruiter characteristics began to be treated explicitly as independent variables, potentially capable of influencing a variety of dependent variables. Thus, for the first time, perceptions of recruiters were empirically linked to choice-related outcomes such as perceived organizational attractiveness and probability of job acceptance.

Table 1 summarizes recruiter research following the publication of Alderfer & McCord's (1970) ground-breaking study. To qualify for inclusion in the table, a study had to (1) present new empirical findings (literature reviews were excluded); (2) address recruiters as central, rather than secondary issues, (3)
be published, and (4) include both independent (recruiter) and dependent (outcome) variables. This last condition disqualified most early recruiter-related research, (e.g., Downs, 1969; Driscoll & Hess, 1974; Hilgert and Eason, 1968), reviewed previously in Rynes et al., 1980.

(Insert Table 1 about here)

Before reviewing and evaluating this research, a few general characteristics should be noted. For example, with only one exception, subjects have been college students interviewing through campus placement offices. Additionally, field surveys have outnumbered experimental studies by nearly two to one, with most field data collected immediately following initial interviews.

In terms of independent variables, three kinds of recruiter characteristics have been examined: (1) recruiter demographics (sex, race, and age); (2) functional area (personnel versus line recruiter, recruiter versus job incumbent), and (3) personality or behavioral traits. These last variables differ from the first two in that they are perceptual in nature, and hence must be inferred by applicants. In field studies, such traits have typically been derived via factor analyses of applicant reactions, a trend begun by Schmitt and Coyle (1976).

Relative to recruitment's implied dependent variable (job choice), operational dependent variables have ranged from distal to proximal criteria (e.g., from general impressions of recruiters to stated probabilities of offer acceptance). Generally speaking, previous dependent variables can be grouped into four areas: (1) overall impressions of recruiters, (2) expectancies of receiving offers, (3) perceived job or organizational attractiveness, and (4) probabilities of pursuing or accepting offers.
In the sections that follow, recruiter research is reviewed in terms of the major independent variable categories (recruiter demographics, functional area, and personality or behavioral traits). The review is followed by a summary and evaluation.

**Recruiter Demographics.** Studies of recruiter demographics have rarely presented a theoretical rationale as to why such (superficial) variables might make a difference in applicants' job choices (e.g., Rogers & Sincoff, 1978). However, a look at the variables that have been investigated suggests at least two "implicit" theories.

One hypothesis seems to be that similarity bias causes applicants to favor recruiters with characteristics similar to their own (e.g., same race or sex). This is suggested by the fact that several authors have tested for significant Recruiter Demographic X Applicant Demographic interactions.

A second hypothesis is that applicants hold general biases against certain classes of recruiters, regardless of their own personal characteristics. This phenomenon would be revealed via main effects favoring certain classes of recruiters over others. It should be noted, however, that the root causes of such biases are not apparent from the existence of main effects per se. For example, applicants might be less favorably disposed to female recruiters either because they do not like them, or because femaleness is associated with low power and status. In the latter case, low (perceived) recruiter status might unwittingly signal that the vacancy is also low in prestige, thus making it less attractive to applicants.

Turning first to recruiter age, the possibility of similarity bias has not been tested because subjects have all been homogeneously young. However, Taylor & Bergmann did find a significant ($p < .01$) negative relationship between
Recruiter age and perceived company attractiveness at the campus interview stage. Given that the average applicant was only 23 years old, this result is consistent with either kind of potential bias (i.e., general or similarity).

Rogers & Sincock (1978) experimentally manipulated recruiter age (20, 30 or 50 years) and then observed the effects on overall impressions of the recruiter. Analyses revealed a positive main effect for age, as well as significant age interactions with recruiter title and verbal fluency. However, closer inspection of the data revealed a curvilinear age effect, with the 30-year old perceived most positively, and the 20-year old least positively. In retrospect, it appeared that the 20-year was not viewed as a credible organizational representative, particularly when introduced as "Recruiting Director for Sterling Industries."

Thus, ignoring the non-credible manipulation level, Rogers and Sincock's results also suggest a bias against older recruiters (i.e., the 30-year old recruiter was favored over the 50-year-old). Again, however, it is not clear whether this result is due to similarity or general bias. To distinguish between the two would require a broader applicant age distribution, and explicit tests for Applicant Age x Recruiter Age interactions.

Only two studies have examined the effects of recruiter race. Wyse (1972) found that black applicants preferred black recruiters, but that race made little difference to white applicants. Thus, his results support the existence of either similarity bias or general bias on the part of blacks, but not whites. On the other hand, Taylor & Bergmann (1987) found that recruiter race made no difference in terms of job attractiveness or probability of accepting an offer. Note, however, that their dependent variables were further removed from recruiter characteristics per se and, as such, less likely to yield significant differences.
Three studies examined the effects of recruiter sex, with mixed results. Harris and Fink (1987) found no effects for recruiter sex, applicant sex, or their interaction on any of their dependent variables (perceived job attributes, expectancy of an offer, intention to accept an offer, general regard for the organization). In contrast, both Liden and Parsons (1986) and Taylor and Bergmann (1987) reported significant sex effects. However, their findings were in opposite directions. Liden and Parsens observed more favorable reactions to female recruiters, particularly among female applicants. In contrast, Taylor and Bergmann (1987) found that female recruiters were associated with lower job attractiveness, as well as with lower probabilities of accepting an offer among female (but not male) applicants. Although the reasons for these differences are impossible to discern, possible explanations include the higher job levels in Taylor & Bergmann's study, or the high proportion of applicants from male-dominated occupations (business and engineering).

In summarizing the demographic research it is important to note that with a single exception, the only cases where demographics have had significant impacts involve dependent variables far removed from job acceptance (i.e., overall impressions of the recruiter and/or the interview). Thus, only in Taylor & Bergmann (1987) was any (recruiter) demographic characteristic associated with perceptions of job attractiveness or intentions to accept an offer. Moreover, even there, effect sizes were very small in comparison with other recruiter characteristics (i.e., empathy and informativeness), and did not maintain significance at later stages of the recruiting process. Thus, although recruiter demographics may influence impressions of recruiters per se, they do not appear to have important effects on applicants' job choices.
Recruiter Function. Both Harris and Fink (1987) and Taylor and Bergmann (1987) examined whether line or personnel recruiters create more positive impressions on applicants. Conceptually, personnel recruiters might be expected to excel in terms of general company knowledge and interviewing skills, whereas line recruiters might have advantages in terms of more specific job-related information and (possibly) higher status.

In any event, Harris and Fink (1987) found no differences by recruiter function for any of their dependent variables. In contrast, Taylor and Bergmann (1987) observed lower company attractiveness ratings among applicants interviewed by personnel specialists.

In a tangentially related study, Fisher, Ilgen & Hoyer (1979) examined the effect of disseminating job information via "formal" organizational recruiters versus job incumbents. Subjects were mailed information about a job, and told that the information had come from one of four sources (recruiter, job incumbent, friend, or professor). Results showed that job incumbents (as well as professors and friends) were better liked and more trusted than formal recruiters. Probabilities of accepting an offer were also lowest when told that the information came recruiters.

Thus, although job incumbents and recruiters are both presumably organizational representatives, recruiters appear to be regarded with greater scepticism. On a purely speculative basis, perhaps the lower job attractiveness associated with personnel recruiters in Taylor & Bergmann's (1987) study reflects a feeling that personnel representatives are primarily recruiters, while line representatives are primarily coworkers or supervisors (and recruiters only secondarily).
Recruiter Personality and Behavioral Traits. Several field studies have asked applicants to rate recruiters in terms of multiple behaviors (usually 20-30) exhibited during recruiting interviews (Harn & Thornton, 1985; Harris & Pink, 1986; Herriott & Rothwell, 1981; Liden & Parsons, 1986; Powell, 1984; Schmitt & Coyle, 1976; Taylor & Bergmann, 1987). Responses have then been factor-analyzed to produce anywhere from two to six recruiter traits, as summarized in the "Independent Variables" column of Table 1. In addition, one two-part experimental study (Rynes & Miller, 1983) manipulated a videotaped recruiter's behavior to reflect the two traits most commonly derived from such factor analyses: recruiter affect (primarily warmth and supportiveness), and recruiter informativeness about vacancy characteristics.

Although different studies attach different labels to similar factors, in every study the trait that explained the most variance in all dependent variables had something to do with recruiter affect (alternatively called warmth, enthusiasm, counseling, personableness, or empathy). A second factor reflecting informativeness about the vacancy also emerged in every study and, as a general rule, explained the second most variance across dependent variables. Beyond these two factors, however, results diverge across studies. Moreover, other factors have rarely explained much additional variance in dependent variables.

Evaluation. Although a number of studies have established empirical linkages between (perceived) recruiter traits and job choice-related variables (e.g., expectancies, instrumentalities, pursuit intentions), there are reasons to be cautious about concluding that recruiters have important impacts on job choices. One reason for caution is that with the exception of Taylor & Bergmann (1987), subjects were questioned either immediately or very shortly after the initial employment interview. This is when recruiter behaviors are likely to be
of greatest salience to applicants, given that other experiences (competing interviews, plant visits) are likely to supplant initial interview impressions over time. Indeed, this is precisely what Taylor & Bergmann (1987) found in the only multi-stage study to date: recruitment variables had an impact on perceived company attractiveness at the campus interview stage, but not at any of four later stages.

A second reason to be cautious about the impact of recruiters on job choice is that recruiter effect sizes are generally small. This is particularly true (1) as dependent variables get conceptually closer to job choice, and (2) when job attributes are also taken into account -- in short, precisely under the conditions in which real-world job choices are made.

Regarding the first point, it is instructive to look at explained variance figures from studies that assessed multiple dependent variables with varying degrees of proximity to job choice. For these purposes, it seems reasonable to assume that the least choice-related variables reflect impressions of the recruiter per se, while the closest involve intentions to pursue or accept job offers.

Schmitt & Coyle (1976) reported the following multiple correlations (R, not $R^2$) between six factor-analytically derived recruiter traits and the following dependent variables: overall perception of recruiter pleasantness (.68); overall perception of recruiter competence (.67); change in favorableness toward interviewer's company (.56); likelihood of further exploring a job possibility with the company (.48); estimate of likelihood of receiving job offer immediately after interview (.44), and estimate of likelihood of job acceptance immediately after interview (.33).
Similarly, Harn & Thornton (1985) reported that recruiter counseling behaviors explained 47% of the variance in perceived recruiter warmth, but only 13% of variance in willingness to accept a job offer. Harris and Pink (1987) did not report effects of recruiter behavior on overall impressions of the recruiter, but did report effects on regard for the company ($R^2 = .19$) and job ($R^2 = .09$), and job acceptance intentions ($R^2 = .10$). Taylor and Bergmann (1987) reported significant effects of recruiter empathy on company attractiveness and probability of offer acceptance immediately following the campus interview, but nonsignificant effects thereafter.

In the only experimental study of this kind, Rynes and Miller (1983, Study 1) manipulated recruiter affect and recruiter informativeness via videotaped job interviews. Affect accounted for 19% of the variance in how well the recruiter represented the company, but only 6% in perceived company treatment of employees, and 4% in whether subjects would accept a second interview.

In general, then, the pattern is clear: recruiter behaviors have moderate effects on overall impressions of the recruiter, but small or nonsignificant effects on intentions to pursue or accept job offers. Moreover, this is true even at the point where the recruiter would be expected to have maximal impact; i.e., immediately following the recruitment interview.

There is also growing evidence that once job attributes are taken into account, recruiter traits add little or nothing to explained variance in recruiting outcomes. In fact, Harris and Pink (1987) is the only study to report a significant recruiter impact on job choice intentions, controlling for job attributes.

In contrast, Powell (1984) found that perceived recruiter characteristics (path coefficient = .17) did not explain a significant amount of variance in
probabilities of offer acceptance once perceived job attributes (path coefficient = .46) were taken into account. Similarly, in the only experimental study to simultaneously examine recruiters and job attributes, Rynes and Miller (1983) found that recruiter affect impacted on job attractiveness and pursuit intentions only when job attributes were held constant (Study 1). When job attributes were also manipulated (Study 2), these recruiter effects were no longer significant.

Taylor & Bergmann (1987) did not collect job attribute information following the campus interview, but collected both recruiter and attribute information at the plant visit stage. Only job attributes had a significant effect on company attractiveness following the plant visit; the change in $R^2$ due to expected attributes was .29, versus .02 for a set of recruitment variables. In terms of the probability of accepting an offer, only one recruitment variable (discussion of on-site factors) had a significant effect, and that was negative. As a whole, the set of recruitment variables did not explain significant variance in probabilities of offer acceptance.

In sum, previous research suggests that recruiters probably do not have a large impact on actual job choices. Generally speaking, the size of observed recruiter effects (rarely very large to begin with) appear to decrease as (1) dependent variables get conceptually closer to actual job choice, (2) vacancy characteristics are taken into account, and (3) applicants get farther along in the recruitment process.

In addition, it should also be noted that all previous field studies share a methodological confound that, if anything, has caused more variance to be attributed to recruiters than is actually merited. Specifically, applicants have provided data subsequent to recruitment interviews, which obviously include both recruiter and job attribute content. Previous researchers have implicitly
assumed either that (1) perceptions of job attributes and recruiter behaviors are formulated independently of one another, or (2) recruiter behaviors influence perceptions of job attributes, but not vice versa. A third possibility, of course, is that impressions of job attributes spill over onto perceptions of the recruiter (e.g., when the vacancy is attractive, applicants attribute positive characteristics to the recruiter as well).

Although field research inherently confounds these alternative causal processes, previous researchers have analyzed and interpreted their results as if only the first two exist. As such, more variance may have been attributed to recruiters than warranted.

Two final comments pertain to future research possibilities. First, the vast majority of what we know about this area comes from campus recruiters and initial screening interviews. Arguably, campus recruiters are less likely than other organizational representatives to have an impact on applicant decisions because (1) they are unlikely to play an important future role in applicants' daily work lives, and (2) they are seen at early stages of the job choice process. Thus, organizational representatives involved in second and third interviews (e.g., potential supervisors and co-workers) may have larger impacts than those observed in the research just reviewed.

Of course, it could be argued that potential supervisors and co-workers reflect job attributes rather than recruitment variables. To some extent, this is true. However, at least part of (potential) supervisor and coworker behavior during a plant visit is properly attributed to recruitment, given that people often act differently during recruitment than they do in daily worklife. As such, supervisor and coworker recruiting behaviors are really only signals (some more accurate than others) of what they will "really be like" to work with.
Still, to debate whether potential supervisors and coworkers represent recruitment, or job, attributes is somewhat premature, given that virtually no evidence exists as to their effects (of whatever kind) on applicant behaviors.

A second issue that has been completely neglected is whether (or what kind of) recruiter training might produce more favorable impacts on job applicants. Early research suggested that most recruiters were perceived as ill-prepared and ineffective (e.g., Rynes, et al., 1980). More recently, Rynes and Boudreau (1986) documented that most recruiters receive little training, even in large, financially successful organizations. Moreover, even where training is provided, it tends to focus on procedural issues (e.g., filling out records; permissible reimbursements) rather than substantive ones (e.g., what to ask job applicants; what to tell applicants about the company and job).

Thus, it may be that recruiters have had little impact in field research because there are few really good campus recruiters. If so, there may be serious restriction of range in observed recruiter behaviors, centered around a low average level of effectiveness.

Thus, it would seem desirable to conduct recruiter training field experiments, in much the same manner as realistic preview experiments. Still, extant research suggests that there may be a pretty low limit to what can be accomplished merely by altering the messenger (i.e., recruiter) or the message (realistic preview). Therefore, any such studies should pay careful attention to other variables that might also play a significant role in applicant attraction (e.g., labor market conditions, job attributes).

**Recruiting Sources**

**Overview.** Early studies of recruitment sources focused primarily on differences in employee retention. Based on this criterion, early results
suggested that employee referrals were superior to other sources, particularly newspaper advertisements (e.g., Ullman, 1966; Gannon, 1971; Reid, 1972).

Subsequent researchers have broadened the focus of source studies in two ways. First, they have examined a wider variety of dependent variables, including performance, absenteeism, and work attitudes. Second, they have speculated about the processes underlying observed source-outcome relationships.

Table 2 summarizes previous source-related research. Note that although the specific sources examined vary across studies, all have looked at referrals and newspaper advertisements, and nearly all at direct applications and employment agencies as well. On the dependent variable side, turnover has been most widely studied, although absenteeism, performance, and worker attitudes have also been examined.

(Insert Table 2 about here)

The "Other Variables" column reflects the fact that later researchers have sometimes measured additional variables in an attempt to explain the origins of source-related differences. Selection of these variables has largely been governed by the theoretical debate as to whether source-related differences are caused by (1) differences in the type of information conveyed by various sources (the "realistic information" hypothesis; Ullman, 1966; Hill, 1970; Breaugh, 1981), or (2) differences in the personal characteristics of individuals recruited through various sources (the "individual differences" hypothesis; Schwab, 1982; Taylor & Schmidt, 1983).

The following review is organized around the following topics: (1) outcome differences by source, (2) attempts to explain outcome differences (i.e., tests of the "individual differences" versus "realistic information" hypotheses), and (3) evaluation of the research.
Outcome Differences by Source. The most frequently observed result in source research has been that individuals recruited through employee referrals have lower (or later, depending on the measure) turnover than other groups (e.g., Conard & Ashworth, 1986; Cornelius & Decker, 1979; Gannon, 1971; Reid, 1972; Ullman, 1966). However, this finding has not been universal. Breaugh & Mann (1984) and Swaroff et al. (1985) found no turnover differences across sources, whereas Taylor and Schmidt (1983) found the lowest turnover among rehires.

Six studies have examined differences in employee performance by source. Three (Hill, 1970; Taylor & Schmidt, 1983; Swaroff, et al., 1985) found no significant differences (although in all three of Hill's samples, the direction of performance ratings favored referrals). Breaugh (1981) found that scientists recruited through college placement were rated lower on work quality and dependability than direct applicants and respondents to professional journal advertisements. Those recruited through newspapers were also rated lower than the other two sources, but only on dependability. Caldwell and Spivey (1983) found that formal advertising was generally more likely to yield successful store clerks, although racial groups varied in terms of specific results. Finally, Breaugh & Mann (1984) reported that social service workers who applied directly had higher performance ratings than other groups. In summary, there has been little consistency in previous findings concerning source-performance relationships.

Only two studies examined the relationship between source and absenteeism, again with varying results. Breaugh (1981) found that research scientists recruited through newspapers were absent twice as often as those recruited through other sources. Taylor & Schmidt (1983) observed significantly lower absenteeism for rehired seasonal packaging employees than for all other sources.
Finally, two studies looked at differences in worker attitudes by source. Breaugh (1982) found that scientists recruited through college placement exhibited lower job involvement and lower satisfaction with supervision than did scientists recruited in other ways. Latham and Leddy (1987) reported that referrals had higher organizational commitment and job involvement than did newspaper recruits, and higher job satisfaction than either newspaper recruits or direct applicants.

Attempts to Explain Differences in Source Outcomes. Although the realistic information and individual differences hypotheses are not necessarily mutually exclusive, at least three studies have compared their relative usefulness for explaining source-related differences (Breaugh & Mann, 1984; Conard & Ashworth, 1986; Taylor & Schmidt, 1983). Before reviewing these three, it should be noted that several other studies have also assessed variables pertinent to at least one of the two hypotheses (see Table 2). However, they are not examined in detail here, for a variety of reasons.

First, in some cases, observed differences in perceived realism were not linked to differences in turnover or performance, but rather were examined as ends in themselves (e.g., Quaglieri, 1982). In other cases, only one of the two hypotheses was specifically addressed. For example, Hill (1970) measured only perceived source accuracy. Breaugh (1981) measured demographic characteristics, but did not specifically relate them to the individual differences hypothesis. (Conversely, Breaugh cited the realism hypothesis as a possible explanation for his findings, but did not measure realism). Finally, Swaroff et al. (1985) intended to address both hypotheses, but found no significant source-outcome relationships to "explain."
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Turning to the studies that addressed both issues simultaneously, Taylor and Schmidt (1983) constructed an individual differences variate composed of personal characteristics that managers believed to be related to performance and tenure. Rehires were found to differ from all other sources in terms of this variate (recall that rehires also stayed longer, and were absent less frequently, than other groups in their study). Moreover, when individual differences were entered first into a hierarchical regression, source per se no longer accounted for significant variance in either turnover or absenteeism. Consequently, Taylor and Schmidt (1983) interpreted their results as supporting the individual differences hypothesis.

It should be noted, however, that Taylor and Schmidt did not directly measure source realism: rather, they inferred it based on logic and previous research. Moreover, they conceded that rehires probably had highly realistic information as compared with other applicants. In addition, they acknowledged that a potential reason for failing to find positive effects for referrals (generally assumed to be a "realistic" source) was that the company paid monetary bonuses for successful referrals.

Thus, the positive findings for rehires are, by themselves, consistent with either hypothesis. However, Taylor and Schmidt's interpretation in favor of individual differences rests on their finding that no source-related absenteeism or turnover differences remained once individual differences were controlled.

In contrast, Breaugh and Mann (1984) reported greater support for the realistic information hypothesis. Specifically, they found significant source-related differences on four of five retrospective measures of perceived source realism. In contrast, they found only two demographic differences (sex and age) by source, no differences in a personnel manager's retrospective ratings of
employee qualifications at time of hire, and no differences in employees' (retrospectively recalled) alternative opportunities at time of hire. As such, they argued there was little support for the existence of individual differences across sources.

However, Breaugh and Mann did not explicitly analyze the extent to which differences in perceived realism accounted for differences in performance or retention. Rather, the greater number of significant differences in perceived realism (versus individual characteristics) were merely presumed to "explain" differences in performance (there were no differences in retention). A more appropriate procedure would have been to determine the extent to which source *per se*, perceived realism, and individual differences each accounted for unique variance in performance or retention.

Conard and Ashworth (1986) tested the two hypotheses using a sample of nearly 6000 life insurance agents. Their study improved on previous research in two ways. First, rather than obtaining retrospective measures of perceived realism, they measured what applicants actually *knew* about the job at the point of application. Second, their individual differences measure (an empirically scored biographical inventory blank) came closer than previous measures to assessing the type of individual differences that might have important impacts on post-hire outcomes. That is, the BIB assessed job-related ability or aptitude, whereas previous studies focused mainly on applicant demographics (with little theoretical justification).

Using a series of partial and semipartial correlations, Conard and Ashworth found that individual differences in BIB scores accounted for a significant portion of the source-turnover relationship. In contrast, differences in pre-hire knowledge of the job did not. As such, they obtained more support for the
individual differences hypothesis than the realistic information hypothesis. However, significant source effects remained even when individual differences and job knowledge were taken into account, suggesting that additional mechanisms might also be operating.

In summary, attempts to look at both major explanations of source-outcome relationships have produced mixed results. Two studies supported the individual differences hypothesis, one the realistic information hypothesis.

These mixed results are likely due, at least in part, to weak measures of the hypothesized constructs. With the exception of Conard and Ashworth (1986), source studies have been characterized by superficial individual difference variables (e.g., demographics, retrospective accounts of alternative opportunities), and both contaminated and deficient measures of information accuracy (e.g., retrospective accounts of perceived realism).

Nevertheless, the causes of inconsistency in previous results probably extend beyond weak measurement. Also implicated are: (1) other uncontrolled differences across studies, (2) failure to examine source-related differences prior to hire, and (3) inadequate conceptualization of source-outcome linkages. We turn now to these issues.

**Evaluation.** The ability to draw conclusions from previous research is hampered by numerous potentially confounding differences across studies. Specifically, studies have varied not only in terms of the sources and outcome variables examined (as well as their operationalizations), but also in terms of statistical power (sample sizes ranged from 68 to more than 6,000); type of subject (e.g., professional versus clerical); whether or not widely varying job types were aggregated into a single analysis; timing of study initiation (e.g,
six-week post-hire followups, versus cross-sectional surveys of incumbents with varying tenure), and study duration (six week- to two year-followups).

One can easily imagine how several of these variables, particularly the obvious ones such as differential statistical power, might affect the conclusions drawn. For example, studies that aggregate widely varying job types inherently confound source explanations of turnover with other potential explanations (e.g., job attractiveness), given that: (1) different sources are used to fill different job types (Schwab, 1982) and (2) different job types have differential turnover rates (see also Swaroff, et al., 1985). In addition, studies based on incumbents with widely varying job tenure are less likely to uncover significant turnover differences than studies that track newly hired cohorts, given that most turnover occurs early in job tenure.

Yet another confound may come from potential correlations between source usage and other variables that affect ease of attraction or retention. For example, newspaper advertisements and other formal sources may be used primarily when less formal methods (such as referrals) prove ineffective (e.g., with unattractive vacancies or in tight labor markets; see also Schwab, 1982; Ullman, 1966). If so, advertisements may appear to be inferior sources when, in fact, the lower success rates stem from other (correlated but unmeasured) causes.

A second serious problem with previous research is the failure to examine the impact of "recruitment" sources during the actual recruitment process. Without exception, source studies have been initiated when recruitment has already been completed, that is, when all organizational selection and applicant self-selection processes have already operated. As a result, there are multiple competing explanations for observed source differences.
For example, if we observe higher retention rates for employee-referred selectees than for newspaper-generated selectees, we do not know whether the initial pool of referrals was superior to the newspaper recruits in terms of personal characteristics and/or knowledge of the job; whether referrals were treated differently (e.g., recruited more vigorously) by the employer during the recruitment process; whether the two groups had different reactions (e.g., differential self-selection) to the recruitment message, whether employers treated referred employees more favorably after hire (e.g., paid more attention to them because they had a "sponsor"), or whether referred applicants adjusted better to the job because they had better pre-hire information (the cause most frequently assumed by previous researchers). Neither theory nor empirical research has pursued these important distinctions.

Source theories and research have also been weak in terms of delineating expected differences across various dependent variables (e.g., job choice, retention, performance). Indeed, turnover is the only outcome variable for which there is any semblance of a "source theory". For example, performance has been included in empirical studies with little theoretical justification, a fact which probably accounts for the decidedly mixed results with respect to that outcome.

More importantly, there has been no speculation or research as to how recruitment sources affect job choice, despite the fact that influencing job choice is the principal objective of the recruitment process. Moreover, one would almost certainly predict differences in job choice processes between, say, Harvard MBAs and MBAs from state universities, or between unemployed and employed job seekers (see Schwab, Rynes & Aldag, 1987).

Finally, even the two most well-developed hypotheses have been vague as to precisely what kinds of informational differences (e.g., information about the
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company? the vacancy? the immediate supervisor?) or individual differences (e.g., aptitudes? abilities? credentials?) are most likely to (1) be observed across sources, and (2) make a difference to recruiting outcomes. In sum, much work remains to be done, conceptually as well as empirically, before we can offer sound conclusions concerning recruitment sources.

Administrative Policies and Practices

Previous theory and research have not devoted much attention to defining the domain of recruitment policies and practices. However, where such variables have been considered, one or more of the following have generally been included: timing of recruitment followups, policies regarding recruitment expenditures (e.g., reimbursement policies), nature of the application process, and realism of recruitment messages (e.g., Rynes & Boudreau, 1986; Schwab, 1982; Taylor & Bergmann, 1987).

Only the last topic has generated a substantial body of research. As such, it will be discussed separately, following a brief review of less well-studied practices.

General Policies and Practices. Administrative practices have been hypothesized to affect job applicants in one of two ways: by signalling something about the company (e.g., organizational efficiency, ability to pay), or by influencing applicants' expectancies of receiving job offers (Rynes, et al., 1980).

Other than realistic job previews, the most frequently researched administrative practice has been the promptness of followup contacts between various stages of the recruitment process. Two early studies (Arvey, Gordon, Massengill & Mussio, 1975; Ivancevich & Donnelly, 1971) suggested that dropouts from the applicant pool might be minimized by timely followup contacts. However,
Taylor and Bergmann (1987) observed no relationship between length of followup and perceived company attractiveness. Thus, previous studies appear to have produced conflicting results.

Although it is risky to speculate from only three studies, the fact that different dependent variables were involved in these studies may be of substantive importance. Specifically, the two studies that reported a timing effect (Arvey et al., 1975; Ivancevich and Donelly, 1971) assessed whether or not individuals were still part of the applicant pool, whereas the one that did not (Taylor and Bergman, 1987) assessed perceived job attractiveness among those who remained in their sample at the post-campus interview stage.

Two studies have also examined whether recruiting expenditures on meals, hotels and the like have any impact on recruitment outcomes. Taylor and Bergmann (1987) examined this question from the perspective of job applicants; Rynes and Boudreau (1986) from that of corporate recruiting directors. Neither study found any evidence of expenditure-outcome relationships.

Finally, a single study (Gersen, 1976) examined the effects of implementing a more rigorous application process for (teacher) applicants. There, implementation of a process requiring college transcripts, evidence of teaching certification, and five personal references (in addition to the customary application blank) produced only half as many applicants as in previous years. However, contrary to expectations, no differences were observed in applicant quality.

**Realistic Job Previews.** No recruitment issue has generated more attention, empirical or theoretical, than realistic job previews. Indeed, because realistic preview research has already been reviewed a number of times (e.g., Breaugh, 1983; McEvoy & Cascio, 1985; Premack & Wanous, 1985; Wanous, 1977; Wanous, 1980;
Wanous & Premack, 1986; Wanous and Colella, 1988), the present chapter will discuss broad themes and issues rather than single studies (as in previous sections).

(Theory). The primary focus of realistic recruitment theory is employee retention rather than applicant attraction. Indeed, realistic recruitment theory hypothesizes that customary strategies for attracting applicants may have detrimental effects on subsequent attempts to retain employees.

The most common hypotheses pertaining to retention involve either self-selection or early work adjustment. **Self selection** has been conceptualized as the "matching of individual needs and organizational climates" (Wanous, 1980, p. 42). Presumably, this matching leads to lower turnover by producing a better fit between organizational characteristics and characteristics of individuals who remain in the applicant pool.

Empirically, however, the self-selection construct has been operationalized via job acceptance rates. As such, it is impossible to tell whether differences in acceptance rates reflect "matching" in the above sense, or some other phenomenon. For example, an alternative possibility is that realistic job previews (RJPs) cause "adverse" self-selection, whereby the most qualified applicants withdraw from the applicant pool due to the realistic (usually more negative) information provided. Because empirical research has failed to distinguish between these two effects (or any other), the self-selection hypothesis will be referred to as the "dropout" hypothesis when reviewing previous research.

Hypotheses pertaining to **early work adjustment** fall into several categories. The most frequently mentioned is the met expectations hypothesis, which posits that people are less likely to be dissatisfied, and hence to quit, when early job
experiences match pre-employment expectations. The coping hypothesis suggests that realistic information allows new hires to devise anticipatory strategies for dealing with problems that are likely to arise on the job. Finally, the commitment hypothesis suggests that people develop stronger commitment to organizations that give them the information they need to make fully informed job choices.

The preceding hypotheses all pertain to the presumed relationship between realism and turnover. However, researchers have also examined the relationship between realistic information and performance (Premack & Wanous, 1985).

Despite this growing body of empirical research, theories as to how realistic recruitment might affect job performance are not well developed. Wanous (1978) hypothesized that realistic previews might help new recruits focus their work efforts by removing role ambiguity. Two years later, he cited validation evidence suggesting that performance is affected by the degree of matching between applicant qualifications and job requirements, but did not link this point explicitly to realistic previews (Wanous, 1980). Moreover, in both discussions, Wanous (1978 & 1980) predicted that the RJP-performance relationship was likely to be weak, because performance depends on many factors "other than just how well abilities are matched to job requirements" (1980, p. 16).

In summary, theories linking realism to performance are quite general. Moreover, they do not predict strong relationships. Perhaps as a result, empirical research investigating RJP-performance linkages has been largely atheoretical.

(Previous Research). Three meta-analyses have examined the relationship between realistic job previews and turnover. In the first, Reilly, Brown, Blood and Malatesta (1981) aggregated results from eleven studies and found a
significant negative relationship ($Z = 4.33$, $p < .0001$) between realism and turnover. More specifically, they observed a 5.7 percentage point difference between experimental (19.8%) and control group (25.5%) turnover rates.

In addition, Reilly et al. (1981) found a significant moderator effect for job complexity. For "simple" jobs (categorized by the authors as telephone operators, telephone service representatives, sewing machine operators, and supermarket clerks), there were no significant turnover differences in any of the individual studies, and only a 1.9% overall difference when aggregated across studies. In contrast, studies involving more "complex" jobs (i.e., West Point cadets, Marine Corps recruits, life insurance sales representatives) produced a 9.4% difference (14.9% vs. 24.3%). Two other potential moderators were tested (preview medium, length of followup), but neither was significant.

Reilly et al. (1981) also concluded that there was little support in previous RJP literature for any of the common process hypotheses (i.e., the dropout, coping, met expectations, or commitment hypotheses). However, process variables were reviewed narratively, rather than through meta-analysis.

McEvoy and Cascio (1985) reviewed fifteen realistic preview studies (and five job enrichment studies) designed to assess effects on turnover. They obtained an average correlation of .09 between realism and retention, and a mean effect size ($d$) of .19; comparable statistics for job enrichment were .17 and .35. On average, those receiving realistic previews had turnover rates of 30%, as compared with 40% for control groups. Like Reilly, et al. (1981), McEvoy and Cascio (1985) also reported a significant moderator effect for job complexity: the average correlation for complex jobs was .12; for simple jobs, .02.

Given the small size of the correlation between realistic previews and turnover, McEvoy and Cascio concluded that "managers might do well to look
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elsewhere when seeking turnover reduction strategies" (p. 351). Among the alternatives they suggested were job enrichment, changes in compensation, supervisory training, and weighted application blanks (weighted against a turnover criterion).

Premack and Wanous (1985) observed even smaller relationships than did McEvoy and Cascio (correlation = .06; d = .12), but drew far more optimistic conclusions about the usefulness of RJPs for reducing turnover:

"RJPs increase job survival modestly, as indicated by the mean effect size (d) of .12 .... Because RJPs are inexpensive to produce, the dollar savings could be substantial for an organization with low job survival among the newly hired" (p. 715).

In addition to turnover, Premack and Wanous (1985) meta-analyzed a variety of other dependent variables, including: perceptions of climate, organizational commitment, coping, initial expectations/met expectations (analyzed together), job satisfaction, performance, and pre-hire dropout rates. The following correlations were obtained: climate (-.01); commitment (.09); coping (-.01); initial and/or met expectations (-.17); job satisfaction (.06); performance (.03); and prehire dropout rates (.00). However, after omitting two "outlier" studies (one with 400 subjects, one with 1260), the correlation for satisfaction diminished (from .06 to .02), while that for prehire dropouts increased (from zero to .06).

Premack and Wanous' (1985) results differed from the two prior meta-analyses in that they did not find significant residual variance in turnover after correcting for sampling and measurement error. As such, they did not explicitly test for the job complexity-turnover interaction reported in the two previous meta-analyses. Indeed, Premack and Wanous reported only one significant moderator effect across all dependent variables. Specifically, applicants who
received audiovisual realistic previews had higher performance than those who received booklets \( (r = .15 \text{ versus } -.02) \). Two post hoc explanations were offered: either the videotapes served as role models for applicants, or the results were due to chance (the meta-analysis was based on only seven studies).

(Evaluation). Before discussing future research needs, a few comments are in order about previous meta-analyses. For example, in Premack and Wanous (1985) the authors conclude:

"Eight criteria were used to assess the effects of RJPs, and for four of these, the variance around the mean effect size can be explained methodologically as a result of sampling error, differences among studies in measurement reliability, or as a result of a single 'outlier' study. Only one moderator was found. Considering all eight criteria together, the average amount of variance attributable to sampling error alone is 74.2%. Thus, recent speculation about the possible moderating effects of 'personal' or 'situational' variables seems unwarranted" (p. 706).

However, a case can be made that Premack and Wanous' data are not compelling enough to preclude future searches for moderator effects. First, for two of the eight dependent variables, findings of low residual variance rest on the arbitrary removal of "outlier" studies with large sample sizes. That is, Premack and Wanous (1985) merely assumed that the nonconforming results reflected error rather than systematic variance in psychological processes or results. Clearly, the effect of removing outliers is to bias analyses against the likelihood of detecting moderator effects.

Indeed, the rather dramatic changes in effect sizes and residual variability attained by removing single studies points to a second reason for caution in concluding that realistic previews produce only main effects. Specifically, by meta-analytic standards, Premack and Wanous' results were based on a very small number of studies (e.g., eight for job satisfaction, seven for dropout rates, five for commitment, and four each for coping and climate). As a result, they
had only low-to-moderate power for detecting significant moderator effects (Sackett, Harris & Orr, 1986).

On the issue of sample size, Premack and Wanous (1985) imply that the inclusion of six additional studies makes their conclusions more valid than those of McEvoy & Cascio (1985). In particular, they cite enhanced sample sizes and reduced likelihood of a "file drawer" problem as relative advantages of their study. However, sample size is not the only factor influencing the veracity of meta-analytic conclusions. Rather, the relative quality of the studies included is also at issue (e.g., Cotton & Cook, 1982).

In the present case, 38% (eight of twenty-one) of Premack and Wanous' (1985) studies were unpublished (and in five cases, had remained so for five years or more). The most common assumption about unpublished (or "file drawer") studies is that they remain unpublished due to negative results. However, in the area of realistic recruitment, negative results have been regarded as substantively interesting, and certainly have not prevented publication of studies that failed to disprove the null hypothesis (e.g., Dugoni & Ilgen, 1981; Reilly, Tenopyr & Sperling, 1979; Wanous, 1973; Zaharia & Baumeister, 1981).

An alternative possibility, then, is that unpublished RJP studies suffer from design or other methodological problems, rather than from nonsignificant results. To the extent that methodological difficulties characterize unpublished research, their inclusion in a meta-analysis may obscure, rather than clarify, true relationships. Unfortunately, Premack and Wanous (1985) did not provide any information that might help the reader judge the likely merits of their unpublished sources (e.g., sample sizes, variables investigated, results, potential confounds).
Finally, despite the large number of subjects in Premack and Wanous' analysis (6,088 for turnover; fewer for other dependent variables), close scrutiny of the job types involved suggests very narrow occupational representation. Specifically, the vast majority of subjects came from four occupations: bank tellers (N = approximately 400), insurance agents (N = 900), low-level clericals in phone companies (N = 2200), and military recruits (N = 2400). Needless to say, these samples hardly tap the full diversity of occupational labor markets. Again, probabilities of finding significant moderator variables are correspondingly reduced.

A second conclusion from the Premack and Wanous meta-analysis also merits closer scrutiny; namely, that "the question of why RJP...s reduce turnover....is of greater scientific than applied interest" (p. 717). As the following examples illustrate, employers and "applied" human resource professionals might well care a great deal about the mechanisms responsible for lower turnover.

Researchers have not yet assessed whether those who drop out of the applicant pool following realistic previews are different in any substantive way from those who remain or who do not receive previews. However, given that realistic previews tend to increase the amount of negative information provided, one might reasonably hypothesize that applicants who drop out prior to hire are likely to be those with more attractive employment alternatives. If so, lower subsequent turnover among selectees might reflect their lower employability, rather than better "fit" between selectee values and organizational climates.

A second possibility, consistent with findings from several empirical studies, is that the level of initial expectations has a greater influence on job satisfaction and turnover than does the discrepancy between initial and realized expectations (e.g., Dugoni & Ilgen, 1981; Greenhaus, Seidel and Marinis, 1983;
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Meglino, DeNisi, Youngblood & Williams, 1988, Miceli, 1986). In the words of Dugoni and Ilgen:

"Wanous (1980) points out that RJP's are no substitute for good working conditions. (We) strongly concur. Telling prospective employees about unpleasant working conditions may improve the probability that they will remain on the job in comparison to those who are not told about the conditions. However, the data in this study imply that those who are told about less pleasant conditions will be no more satisfied with them once they are experienced than will those who are not told. To improve satisfaction and the quality of work, ultimately some changes must be made in those aspects of the work environment with which employees are dissatisfied" (p. 590).

Indeed, several studies that have examined both initial expectations and met expectations have shown stronger support for the former, and occasionally disconfirming evidence for the latter (see Miceli, 1986).

The point of the preceding examples is not to argue that realistic previews actually cause adverse self-selection, or that expectation levels are truly more important than expectational discrepancies. In both cases, evidence is insufficient to draw firm conclusions. Rather, the point is that some of the processes that have been hypothetically linked to realistic recruitment are of considerable "applied" interest to organizations.

Looking ahead, numerous authors have suggested future directions for RJP research (e.g., Breaugh, 1983; Miceli, 1983 & 1986; Premack and Wanous, 1985; Reilly et al., 1981). In general, their suggestions fall into one of two categories: examination of realistic recruitment processes, or searches for potential moderator variables.

Attempts to better understand the processes associated with realistic recruitment have been hindered by a variety of factors. One of these is that "realistic" and "traditional" recruitment have rarely been defined in explicit operational terms. Rather, most researchers have been vague about the content of
both the realistic and traditional messages provided via previews. Thus, we do not really know which aspects of realistic recruitment messages (e.g., job information, organizational information, suggestions on how to cope) are associated with differences in recruiting outcomes. Nor do we know the extent to which so-called traditional recruitment messages were "unrealistic" to begin with across the various studies.

In 1981, Reilly et al. argued, "While it may not be feasible to operationally define realism in most field studies, it should be possible to use consistent guidelines in developing RJP...it would seem that, at a minimum, RJP development should include steps parallel to those involved in content validation" (p. 832). Unfortunately, there has been little more attention to this issue subsequent to 1981 than before.

The ability to draw process-related conclusions has also been hampered by weak construct definition, inconsistent measurement, and confusing terminology. For example, the following constructs have commonly been interchanged in the literature: (1) realistic, balanced, and accurate recruiting messages; (2) realistic, reduced, and met expectations; (3) initial expectations and anticipated satisfaction, (4) early satisfaction and early value attainment; (5) job, organizational, and occupational information; (6) self-selection and matching, and (7) realistic previews versus realistic socialization.

Finally, process research has been hampered by designs that do not examine applicants' decisions as processes. For example, many RJP studies have not assessed applicant perceptions prior to, or immediately following, realistic versus traditional presentations. Only half the studies have examined whether realistic previews cause differential dropout rates. Even then, none have pursued information about the kinds of individuals who left (or stayed), or
their reasons for doing so. Similarly, few researchers have studied the coping hypothesis, but when they have, they have typically done so via cross-sectional responses to a single scale item. In other words, realistic recruitment processes have been inferred more often than they have been studied.

Previous research has also been poorly designed for studying moderator effects or boundary conditions (Breaugh, 1983). Despite only a few previous findings of moderator effects, logical arguments continue to suggest that realistic previews are likely to have different impacts under different conditions (e.g., Breaugh, 1983; Meglino, et al., 1988; Miceli, 1983 & 1986). Unfortunately, some of the most likely moderator variables have either been inappropriately operationalized (e.g., alternative employment opportunities; see Breaugh, 1983) or ignored (e.g., actual job characteristics). Moreover, insufficient attention has been paid to generating wide variance across studies in terms of theoretically interesting variables (e.g., type of work, typical job acceptance rates). As such, it seems premature to rule out the possibility of important moderator variables.

The preceding research suggestions notwithstanding, a case can be made that the amount of attention focused on realistic job previews has been out of proportion to their probable importance in actual recruiting. First, as Wanous (1980) and others (Krett & Stright, 1985; Stoops, 1984) have noted, the vast majority of organizations and organizational representatives still use marketing (rather than realistic) strategies to recruit job applicants. One obvious reason they do so is from fear that if they are the only ones to "tell the whole truth, and nothing but the truth," candidates (perhaps the best ones) will be lost to other organizations.
Realistic recruitment research has not assuaged their fears. Indeed, the one meta-analysis to address the question (Premack & Wanous, 1985) reported higher dropout rates (after removing an "outlier" study) for realistic preview recipients. Similarly, Meglino, et al. (1988) reported higher turnover among military recruits who were shown a realistic "reduction" preview (one focusing on negative aspects) subsequent to organizational entry. Although realistic recruitment theory optimistically hypothesizes that dropouts are not well "matched" to organizational climates anyway, this has not been demonstrated and the possibility of adverse self-selection (losing the best candidates) remains.

Second, the vast majority of job applicants get most of their pre-hire information through sources other than formally designed booklets, films, or recruiter presentations. Moreover, previous research has shown that the typical recruiter receives almost no training concerning how to describe the job and organization to potential recruits (Rynes and Boudreau, 1986). Thus, in studying "realistic" recruitment (as transmitted via formal booklets, films, or trained recruiters), we are studying a phenomenon that probably occurs in a very small percentage of recruitment efforts. In contrast, other recruitment variables (e.g., recruitment sources, characteristics of the jobs themselves) are present in nearly all recruitment situations. As such, one might argue that they should receive relatively more research attention.

Third, common sense suggests that actual characteristics of the job and organization probably swamp the effects of realism manipulations. Indeed, the content of realistic (and traditional) previews must be designed around the constraints of actual job and organizational characteristics. Still, researchers continue to study the effects of realism, while ignoring the job characteristics on which "realistic" presentations are based. Indeed, because job
characteristics (e.g., relative and absolute pay levels, benefits) have not been recorded, they cannot even be investigated via meta-analyses. As a result, we know nothing about whether realistic previews work better (or differently) with "bad" jobs than with "good" ones.

Finally, it seems somehow inappropriate that the dominant issue in recruitment theory and research should be a topic whose main focus is not even recruitment, but rather turnover. Although it is certainly legitimate to question what happens after people are attracted into organizations, it seems rather curious to pay so little attention to the implications of realistic recruiting for recruitment per se. Moreover, the effect sizes observed with respect to post-hire behaviors (i.e., turnover and performance) are hardly large enough to render pre-hire outcomes uninteresting or unimportant.

Does realistic recruitment cause the best candidates to turn elsewhere? If so, does this effect occur consistently, or only under certain conditions (e.g., with "bad" jobs, or with low unemployment)? To date, RJP studies have not provided the kinds of data that would be necessary to answer these, and other, crucial questions. In short, it is time for recruitment to play a more prominent role in future "recruitment" research.

THEORY AND RESEARCH NEEDS

Overview

As the preceding review illustrates, recruitment theory and research have broadened considerably since Guion (1976) wrote his chapter for the first Handbook. Nevertheless, there are still some major gaps in both theory and research, particularly in terms of applicant attraction.

The remainder of the chapter addresses future research needs. Recommendations are based on the following conceptualization of recruitment:
Recruitment encompasses all organizational practices and decisions that affect either the number, or types, of individuals who are willing to apply for, or to accept, a given vacancy.

As will be seen, this conceptualization leads to a broader view of recruitment activities, processes, and outcomes than has typically been considered.

The structure for the remainder of the chapter is illustrated in Figure 2. Note that in comparison with Figure 1 (Previous Theory and Research), Figure 2: (1) contains a new category, recruitment context; (2) adds a number of independent, dependent, and process variables; and (3) uses more general headings to summarize recruitment processes and dependent variables.

(Insert Figure 2 about here)

Recruiting Context

Neither recruitment practices nor recruitment outcomes are determined in isolation from broader contextual factors. Rather, both are affected by (1) environmental factors, (2) organizational characteristics, and (3) institutional norms.

By implication, then, contextual factors may have both direct and indirect effects on recruiting outcomes (Figure 2). For example, labor markets (an external factor) have a direct effect on recruiting outcomes: all else equal, employers will attract fewer and/or less qualified employees when applicants are scarce. However, the very fact that external conditions are unfavorable for attraction may cause employers to change their recruitment practices (e.g., use different sources, increase advertising expenditures), which in turn should improve recruitment outcomes (the indirect effect). Similar logic applies to the other contextual variables as well. Each is discussed in turn.

External Characteristics. All recruitment takes place within the context of at least two important external variables, labor markets and the legal
environment. These variables are external in the sense that in the short run, any particular organization has little (if any) control over them.

(Labor Market Characteristics). Previous research suggests that employers modify their recruiting behaviors in response to changes in market conditions. For example, as labor becomes increasingly scarce, employers have been observed to: (1) improve vacancy characteristics (e.g., by raising salaries or increasing training and educational benefits; Hanssens & Levien, 1983; Lakhani, 1988; Merrill, 1987; Tannen, 1987); (2) reduce hiring standards (Kerr & Fisher, 1950; Malm, 1955; Thurow, 1975; Lewin, 1987); (3) use more (and more expensive) recruiting methods (e.g., Hanssens & Levien, 1983; Malm, 1954) and (4) extend searches over a wider geographic area (Kerr & Fisher, 1950; Malm, 1954).

By modifying these recruitment practices, employers attempt to counter the difficulties posed by unfavorable market conditions. Thus, one important direction for future research would be to examine the extent to which changes in various recruitment practices are capable of overcoming adverse market conditions, or enhancing favorable ones (see, e.g., Altman & Barro, 1971; Hanssens & Levien, 1983). At a minimum, the importance of market characteristics to both recruitment practices and outcomes should be acknowledged through more careful reporting (e.g., of unemployment rates) and, wherever possible, explicit control.

(Legal requirements). Employment law and litigation are similarly assumed to affect both practices and outcomes (Cascio, 1982; Rosen & Mericle, 1979; Schwab, 1982). In terms of practice, equal employment regulations have been linked to broader use of recruitment sources (Miner, 1979), shifts in screening procedures (Tenopyr, 1981), and lower minimal position requirements (Dreher & Sackett, 1982). On the outcome side, the latter two practices have also been
linked (conceptually, at least) with decreases in average applicant and selectee qualifications (Tenopyr, 1981; Dreher & Sackett, 1982). However, almost no empirical research has been done establishing linkages between legislative requirements, recruitment practices, and recruiting outcomes (perhaps because of the sensitive nature of such data).

**Organizational Characteristics.** At present, we have little information about the impact of organizational characteristics on recruiting. In part, this is because much recruitment research has focused on job seekers rather than employing organizations. Moreover, those studies that have examined employer practices have typically done so within single organizations (e.g., Arvey, et al., 1975; Taylor & Bergmann, 1987). Neither of these methodologies permit examination of organizational differences in recruiting practices or outcomes.

Nevertheless, it is clear that different organizations recruit differently (Miner, 1979; Schwab, 1982). Moreover, it seems intuitively likely that a company like IBM would recruit differently from smaller, less-known computer firms, or from firms in very different industries (e.g., financial services). However, there exists no overall conceptual scheme for thinking about which organizational characteristics are likely to produce differences in recruiting practices or outcomes.

One broad category of relevant variables would seem to be those that are both (1) readily observable or easily researchable (e.g., industry, size, profitability, recent growth and financial trends), and (2) likely to affect applicants' general impressions of organizations. In the short run, most of these variables are largely fixed for recruitment purposes; nevertheless, they almost certainly have an impact on the size and composition of applicant and acceptee pools. Moreover, they are also likely to affect the recruitment
strategies employed (e.g., sources used, salaries offered) and, hence, to have indirect effects on recruiting outcomes as well.

Therefore, such organizational characteristics should be attended to in future recruitment research. In single-organization studies, this can be done by more thoroughly describing the organizational context in which the research takes place (e.g., declining vs. growing organization and industry; profitability relative to industry competitors, etc.) for the benefit of future meta-analyses. In multi-organization research, such characteristics can be incorporated as substantive or control variables.

Business strategies (e.g., Miles & Snow, 1978; Porter, 1985) and general human resource strategies (e.g., Snow & Miles, 1986; Schuler & Jackson, 1987) have also been hypothesized to affect recruitment practices. For example, using Miles and Snow's (1978) typology, Olian and Rynes (1984) developed a set of normative propositions as to how various business strategies might be reflected in recruitment practices.

Empirical research on these (or similar) propositions would be highly desirable, particularly since recruitment strategies are more readily manipulated than the broader organizational characteristics mentioned earlier. Moreover, organizations with similar characteristics have been found to vary widely in terms of such things as general human resource strategies, organization of internal labor markets, and internal versus external recruitment emphases (e.g., Miles & Snow, 1978; Osterman, 1987).

Institutional Norms. In many occupations and industries, traditions have developed with respect to typical or accepted means of recruiting applicants. For example, in executive recruitment, large sums of money are expended on consultants or search firms to determine the suitability of candidates to a given
Recruitment vacancy (Ryan & Sackett, 1987). Executive recruitment has also evolved a series of elaborate norms regarding such sensitive issues as the acceptability of "pirating," possible violations of trade secrets legislation, conflicts of interest in raiding client organizations, and whether search firms should accept retainers to "feel out" executives from the client's own firm (as a way of determining the executive's "loyalty"). In contrast, such issues are nonexistent (and, indeed, would be considered ludicrous) in recruiting for the typical production or service worker.

Thus, in a descriptive sense we know that recruitment is conducted very differently for different occupations. In addition, we know that the kinds of information available about prospective employees differs across occupations as well (e.g., performance is more visible for executives than, say, human resource specialists or secretaries). Finally, there are reasons to suspect that the effectiveness of various inducements (e.g., pay, scheduling, career ladders) differs across occupations as well (e.g., nursing versus law; see Lawler, 1971; Rynes, et al., 1983).

The major implication of these differences is that findings from one type of occupational or industrial market may be ungeneralizable to others. This is particularly important, given that only one market has been studied with any frequency over the past quarter century (i.e., college graduates for entry-level business and engineering positions). In contrast, virtually nothing is known about how to improve recruiting effectiveness for low-level, low-paying positions -- precisely the areas where the greatest long-term labor shortages are predicted.

Summary. Future research should examine the impact of contextual factors on (1) recruitment practices and (2) recruitment outcomes. In cross-sectional,
single organization research, studies should describe more fully the context (e.g., unemployment levels; organizational growth and profitability) in which the research is conducted, as such information may be critical for interpreting differential results across studies. In designs that permit temporal or cross-organizational comparisons, contextual variables should be included as controls wherever possible. In this way, we can begin to determine the incremental contribution of recruitment practices, over and above the context in which recruitment is conducted (e.g., Hanssens & Levien, 1983).

**Independent Variables**

As mentioned earlier, previous research has focused on a rather narrow range of recruitment practices: primarily recruiters, recruitment sources, and realistic job previews. Clearly, other employer practices and decisions also affect employment matches, and hence should receive increased attention. Three are suggested here: vacancy characteristics, employer selectivity, and recruitment timing.

**Vacancy characteristics.** One set of decisions that merits closer scrutiny concerns the determination of vacancy characteristics such as pay, hours, working conditions, benefits, perquisites, and the like. Applicants' job choices are obviously affected by these variables; yet there has been little speculation about how vacancy characteristics might be modified in the service of attracting applicants.

Limited field evidence suggests that vacancy characteristics indeed swamp other variables as influences on job choice and retention. For example, Tannen (1987) studied the impact of a pilot program to improve educational benefits for Army applicants meeting certain aptitude requirements. Results revealed a dramatic increase in both the quantity and quality of Army applicants. Indeed,
the increase was so dramatic that other branches of the service began to lobby Congress about "unfair" Army recruitment practices.

Similarly, Lakhani (1988) studied the effects of salary increases and retention bonuses on the re-enlistment behaviors of soldiers whom the Army wished to retain. Although both forms of compensation were found to increase retention, bonuses were more effective than equivalent increases in salaries. This is a potentially important finding for employers in that bonuses are not "rolled into" base pay and, hence, may be a more cost-effective means of attracting and retaining labor.

Given the obvious importance of vacancy characteristics to applicant attraction, it is strongly recommended that a variety of methodologies (e.g., field and laboratory experiments, field surveys) be employed to investigate the role of job and organizational attributes in job pursuit and choice behaviors. One potential objection to this suggestion, raised consistently in the realistic recruitment literature, is that employers must be concerned not only with attracting applicants, but also with retaining them. However, in contrast to "unrealistic" recruitment, modifying vacancy characteristics in order to attract applicants is likely to have beneficial effects on satisfaction and retention as well (e.g., McEvoy & Cascio, 1985; Reilly, et al., 1981; Miceli, 1986).

A second potential objection follows from the belief that vacancy characteristics are impossible, or prohibitively expensive, to modify. For example, Wanous & Colella (1988) argue that it is "of limited usefulness" to determine the relative effect sizes for recruiters versus job attributes in various contexts, because it is easier to "manipulate recruiter behavior via selection and training than it would be to try to change the entire organization (or at least its image)"; p. 44-45).
Although it is unarguably easier to manipulate recruiters, recruiting brochures, and the like than to change entire organizations, it is not obvious that "entire organizations" must be changed in order to attract more or better applicants. Second, not all vacancy characteristics are equally expensive to modify. For example, provision of flextime or on-site day care (even at the employee's expense) might yield high returns in terms of attraction and retention, because such nonstandard benefits more clearly distinguish an employer from its competitors (Rynes, et al., 1983; Schwab, et al., 1987). Similarly, there are several benefits that might be used only by a subset of the employee population (and hence be relatively inexpensive), but that might have substantial effects on an organization's image as a "good place to work" (e.g., educational benefits, sick child day care).

Moreover, even in the case of the most "expensive" vacancy characteristic (i.e., salary), it is unit labor costs (i.e., productivity-adjusted costs) that determine firm competitiveness (e.g., Weiss, 1980). Thus, organizations can afford to pay higher wages if other personnel policies (e.g., selection practices, job design, career paths, performance standards) are structured to obtain greater employee effort, higher ability, or broader skill bases in return.

In the end, it is an empirical question whether investments in modifying various job characteristics are compensated (or more than compensated) by higher job acceptance rates, higher quality workers, or improved employee retention. In the meantime, the failure to even consider the question has contributed to an erroneous tendency to regard vacancy characteristics as fixed, rather than as managerial decision points subject to strategic manipulation and evaluation.

Because job and organizational characteristics are the dominant factors in applicant attraction, they cannot be ignored -- even in studies of other
recruitment variables -- without serious risk of omitted variable bias (James, Mulaik & Brett, 1982). As such, greater attention must be paid to vacancy characteristics, both (1) as direct objects of study, and (2) as potentially relevant contextual or control variables in studies of other recruitment variables.

Employer Selectivity. Although the issue has not been addressed in previous research, it also seems likely that recruitment outcomes are affected by the selectivity of employers in targetting their recruitment activities. That is, all else equal, it should be easier to attract applicants if one is willing to recruit less-qualified individuals or those considered somehow less desirable by other employers.

Thurow (1975) has gone furthest toward formalizing a theory of how vacancy characteristics and applicant qualifications interact to produce employment matches. He suggests that both jobs and job seekers can be arrayed in a hierarchy from most to least desirable. Employers at the top of the organizational hierarchy are able to attract workers from the top of the applicant hierarchy, while less attractive employers have to settle for less marketable applicants. Should employers experience labor shortages, they need only to move down the job seeker queue to attract the necessary workforce (so long as there is some positive level of unemployment). Any selectee deficiencies resulting from this approach are remedied via enhanced training and socialization procedures.

Economists have documented that employers shift hiring standards (both work-related qualifications and demographic characteristics) in response to recruiting difficulties (e.g., Kerr & Fisher, 1950; Malm, 1955; Thurow, 1975). For example, employers faced with labor shortages in World War II turned to women
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to fill jobs for which they would not previously have been considered. More recently, foreign immigrants have been recruited for jobs deemed "unacceptable" by native-born citizens.

Thus, in the typical case, employers are likely to be able to fill most of their vacancies with somebody (see also Rynes & Boudreau, 1986). As such, the most critical measures of attraction successs are not whether vacancies are filled, but rather with whom they are filled, and at what costs. Thus, there is a need to move beyond purely quantitative assessments of attraction success (e.g., percent vacancies filled, job acceptance ratios), to assessments of the productivity- and cost-related characteristics of those attracted. To date, few studies have reported even job acceptance rates, let alone specific acceptee characteristics.

Finally, an often discussed (but little researched) question involves the relationship between applicant pool characteristics and post-hire outcomes. Despite common assertions that hiring "overqualified" applicants leads to subsequent dissatisfaction and turnover (e.g., Lindquist & Endicott, 1984), there is little research documenting this proposition. Indeed, meta-analytic findings that turnover is generally higher among poor performers (McEvoy & Cascio, 1987) would appear to indirectly challenge this assumption; (overqualified individuals should not, on average, be poorer performers).

Recruitment timing. To date, the only research in this area has addressed the length of time between various recruiting stages. However, other timing issues may also be important. For example, there is some reason to believe that job seekers develop subconscious preferences for early job offers due to job search anxiety and uncertainty about other offers (Reynolds, 1951; Soelberg, 1967; Schwab et al., 1987). If so, companies that enter the market early in the
recruiting season or that begin pursuing individuals even before they are "on the market" may have a competitive advantage in terms of securing job acceptances. Indeed, internship, co-op, and early enlistment programs are predicated on this assumption. However, if Thurow (1975) is correct, early recruiting advantages may accrue only to the most desirable employers.

A second, and more speculative, possibility is that early entry into the market affects applicant quality as well as quantity. Presumably, highly qualified candidates generate offers more quickly and easily than the less qualified. If so, firms that delay recruitment may find only less qualified individuals still available. Indeed, indirect evidence of a negative relationship between worker quality (proxied by re-employment wages) and length of unemployment has been reported in the economic job search literature (see Schwab, et al., 1987).

Finally, because job search and choice are longitudinal processes, applicants may be subject to primacy, recency, contrast, and other time-based effects. Such effects have been ignored in the recruitment literature; subject reactions to one vacancy have been assumed independent of reactions to other vacancies. However, evidence from the selection literature (e.g., Hakel, 1982) suggests that such an assumption is probably untenable.

Dependent Variables

Overview. Since the mid-seventies, the dominant dependent variables in recruitment research have shifted away from applicant attraction, toward turnover and other post-hire outcomes. This development, along with the increasing tendency to study selectees rather than job applicants, is problematic from a number of perspectives. Two particularly important ones are that: (1) multiple explanations exist for most reported post-hire results (e.g., self-selection
versus post-hire adjustment hypotheses), and (2) very little has been learned about applicant attraction.

Thus, the principal recommendation with respect to dependent variables would be to accord the immediate objective of recruitment, applicant attraction, higher priority in future research. Although turnover and other post-hire variables are of obvious importance to overall recruitment utility, the nature of their relationship to recruitment should be kept in perspective.

First, recruitment is not the primary management technique for influencing post-hire outcomes such as turnover or performance. However, it is the major technique for influencing applicants' job choices.

Second, it is quite true that attempts to attract high-quality applicants through "marketing" tactics might prove counterproductive if such practices merely lead to earlier, or more frequent, turnover. However, observed effect sizes for post-hire behavioral outcomes (i.e., performance and turnover) have been very modest. Recall, for example, that Premack and Wanous reported mean correlations of .03 between RJP's and performance, and .06 between RJP's and job survival. These correlations are hardly so large that they render pre-hire processes and outcomes unimportant or uninteresting.

Pre-Hire Dependent Variables. As the literature review demonstrated, a wide variety of dependent variables have been used as indicants of applicant attraction (see also Figure 1). However, nearly all previous research has examined either applicant perceptions or behavioral intentions. As such, very little is known about the dependent variables of greatest interest to employers: (1) decisions to apply for vacancies, and (2) actual job choices.

(Job Application Decisions). Application decisions are critical to organizations: if individuals do not apply, there will be little opportunity to
influence their choices through recruitment activities. However, most recruitment research has been conducted subsequent to the first employment interview. As such, little is known about the determinants of job application behaviors.

Given applicants' limited information early in the job search process, it seems likely that application decisions are based heavily on general impressions of organizational attractiveness. As such, one useful direction for future research would be to determine the major components of organizational image, and whether any of them can be cost-effectively modified or communicated to improve applicant attraction.

Other influences on application behaviors have been proposed as well. These include social influences (Granovetter, 1974; Kilduff, 1988), convenience (Reynolds, 1951), timing (Soelberg, 1967), self esteem (Ellis & Taylor, 1983), job search anxiety (Sheppard & Belitsky, 1966), and costs of search (Lippman & McCall, 1976). At least some of these are potentially manipulable by employers and, as such, are worthy of research attention. For example, employers might build stronger informal social networks with favored recruitment sources, or schedule interviews at more convenient times or locations to reduce the costs of search.

(Job Choice). The other pre-employment behavior that has been under-researched is job choice. To date, researchers have implicitly assumed that conclusions about job choice can be drawn on the basis of information about applicants' perceptions and intentions. However, perceptions and intentions are actually quite different from choices (Rynes, et al., 1983). For example, stating one's perceptions or intentions is a completely "costless" exercise. In contrast, real job choices involve serious opportunity costs: accepting one offer
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precludes accepting others. Unfortunately, we have virtually no information about how preferences and intentions are converted into actual job choices.³

Post-Hire Dependent Variables. Much of the present chapter has argued that greater relative attention should be focused on pre-hire rather than post-hire outcomes. Nevertheless, it is recognized that the overall utility of recruitment practices is dependent upon both pre- and post-hire outcomes. Thus, continued study of post-hire outcomes is necessary for a complete understanding of recruitment processes and outcomes.

However, future research on post-hire outcomes might be made more useful in a number of ways. First, there is a need to obtain pre-hire data from job applicants, as well as post-hire information from acceptees. Without such data, selection biases will always represent alternative explanations for observed results (e.g., Lord & Novick, 1968). Of course, incorporating both pre- and post-hire outcomes in single studies will necessitate a corresponding shift from one-shot to longitudinal designs.

Secondly, there is a greater need to focus on qualitative, as well as quantitative, aspects of post-hire outcomes. Given that dissatisfaction and turnover are more dysfunctional among certain employees than others, it is important to assess the productivity-related characteristics of those who leave versus those who stay. Again, similar information is required concerning pre-employment applicant dropouts.

Finally, there are a number of additional post-hire variables that might profitably be examined. For example, Schneider (1963, 1985) and Sutton and Louis (1987) have argued that recruitment processes can have important effects on organizational insiders. For example, new recruits bring up-to-date information about the external labor market and, as such, may influence the satisfaction
levels of current employees. Similarly, job applicants are a source of clues about an employer's image and market competitiveness, which in turn may cause a rethinking of recruitment strategies or practices.

To date, speculation in this area has not been very explicit about the possible implications for recruitment. However, because of the importance of new entrants to organizational vitality and adaptability, future work in this area is worth pursuing.

Process Variables

Overview. The vast majority of recruitment research has been justified on the basis of one or more process hypotheses. For example, studies of recruiters have generally been based on the premise that recruiters somehow influence applicants' instrumentality and valence perceptions (i.e., perceived job attractiveness). Similarly, realistic recruitment studies have been pursued on the assumption that RJPs affect either self-selection or post-hire adjustment processes.

Despite the widespread use of process hypotheses as justifications for recruitment research, few process-related conclusions can be drawn from extant research. In some areas, hypothesized processes have gone largely untested (e.g., recruiter signalling hypotheses, RJP coping hypotheses). In other areas, weak measures have been used to test hypothesized constructs (e.g., retrospective recall of pre-hire information). In still others, the research designs do not rule out alternative explanations for the conclusions drawn (e.g., RJP-turnover relationships).

Indeed, a case can be made that the recruitment literature has more than enough studies demonstrating that recruiters, sources, or realistic previews are sometimes related to both pre- and post-hire outcomes. What is missing is a
clear understanding of why, and under what conditions, such relationships are likely to emerge. Thus, the time has come to pay closer attention to the design and measurement issues necessary to isolate recruitment processes.

Research suggestions pertaining to recruiter, source, and realistic preview processes (e.g., self-selection and post-hire adjustment processes) were addressed in earlier sections. As such, they are not repeated here. Rather, additional ideas are offered concerning less commonly researched processes.

**Time-Related Processes.** Recruitment and job choice occur over time. As such, many of the sequencing and order effects that have been observed with respect to other decision makers (e.g., primacy, recency, contrast effects; Hakel, 1982) are likely to apply to job applicants as well. Also, as mentioned previously, early job offers may receive more favorable evaluations from applicants, due to the security-enhancing effects of having a "firm" offer in hand versus uncertain future alternatives (e.g., Reynolds, 1951; Soelberg, 1967).

Additionally, the passage of time per se may modify individuals' decision processes. As the duration of unemployment increases, perceptions of employability decrease, while psychological and financial difficulties increase (e.g., Arvey, et al., 1975; Lippman & McCall, 1976; Sheppard & Belitsky, 1966). In response, applicants may use different job search methods, search more extensively, become more flexible in their aspiration levels, or apply to organizations believed to have less selective hiring standards. Thus, the ease of attracting individuals would appear to be partly a function of their prior experiences in the job search process.

To the extent that longitudinal and sequence effects influence job choices, they would appear to have important implications for recruitment timing and for recruitment strategies vis a vis individual applicants (e.g., inducement levels,
time permitted to consider an offer). However, the existence of such processes cannot be detected via the usual recruitment research methodologies (e.g., one-shot field surveys; measures of preferences rather than choices). Rather, experimental simulations or longitudinal field studies will be necessary to get at time-based dynamics.

**Information-Related Processes.** Other potentially important processes may arise because job seekers are forced to make choices based on imperfect information about job attributes. Some implications of this fact were discussed earlier in this chapter, such as the possibility that recruiters might explicitly manipulate informational presentations to produce particular beliefs among uninformed applicants (see Figure 1).

Other hypotheses suggest that imperfect information may influence the relative importance of various job attributes. These hypotheses follow from the facts that: (1) some attributes (e.g., starting salary, location) are known with greater certainty than others (opportunities for promotion, level of autonomy), and (2) some information is acquired earlier than others.

These factors suggest that certain vacancy characteristics may acquire greater (or lesser) importance in job choice than they would under perfect information. For example, early information (e.g., organizational image) may take on greater importance if applicants "anchor" their initial impressions on this information, and then make smaller-than-appropriate adjustments when subsequent information is acquired (Tversky & Kahneman, 1974). Alternatively, known job characteristics may take on greater importance via their role as signals of unknown characteristics (e.g., Einhorn & Hogarth, 1981; Spence, 1973).

To the extent that such phenomena exist, decisions about how to present information to applicants become more critical. Moreover, they extend well
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beyond previously raised questions of "realism," to issues such as information vividness, order of informational presentation, and the like.

To date, such questions have not been explored. This is because typical methodologies have either (1) presented subjects with hypothetical job descriptions in which all attributes are presented simultaneously and defined with certainty, or (2) asked subjects to provide instrumentality or valence estimates for researcher-generated attributes, regardless of whether or not subjects have specific information upon which to do so. Thus, the study of signalling, anchoring, and other time- and uncertainty-related processes will require new methodological approaches.

Interactive Processes. A third set of processes that merit future attention are those arising from the interactions between employers and prospective employees. Dipboye (1982) has discussed such processes in the context of the employment interview. However, interactive effects are possible during virtually any phase of the recruitment process.

For example, applicants may be discouraged by seeming employer indifference (e.g., failure to provide requested information) either prior or subsequent to employment interviews. Although one might suppose that these effects would become irrelevant if an offer were eventually to be made, this may not be the case. First, the employer's lack of attention may signal something negative about the organization, and thus permanently affect perceived organizational attractiveness. Second, apparent disinterest may cause applicants to turn their attention to other organizations and to accept offers that are more readily forthcoming.

Other kinds of interactive processes also merit future attention. For example, holding "true" job attributes constant, certain recruitment messages may
trigger particular kinds of behaviors on the part of applicants, while alternative messages trigger other behaviors. Thus, if a recruiter discusses high salaries and high performance standards in the first interview, applicants may adjust their behaviors by (1) trying to "sell" themselves as highly competent, energetic, and assertive (i.e., impression management), or (2) by seeking employment in a less demanding environment. In contrast, different applicant behaviors might emerge if the initial interview stresses organizational commitment to quality and service, or if salaries and performance standards are not discussed until later in the process (when the applicant has escalated his commitment level).

Again, because little research has been done (1) across time or (2) on the types of applicants attracted by different organizational characteristics, such interactive effects are at present largely speculative.

**Individual Differences.** Although individual differences are not, per se, "processes," they are discussed here because individuals appear to differ widely in both job search and choice processes. For example, even individuals in the same occupation have been found to differ widely as to (1) the number of alternatives examined, (2) the intensity with which each is examined, (3) the length of delay prior to beginning search (e.g., after layoff or graduation), (4) whether or not searches are instituted even where no known vacancy exists, (5) whether applicants set minimal standards of acceptability on such attributes as pay, benefits, or location, and (6) whether or not individuals are deterred by low expectancies of receiving job offers (e.g., Dyer, 1973; Glueck, 1974; Rynes, et al., 1983; Rynes & Lawler, 1983; Sheppard & Belitsky, 1966; Ullman & Gutteridge, 1973).
More importantly, at least some of the above variables have been correlated with job search success (e.g., duration of unemployment, starting salary) and post-hire outcomes (e.g., career satisfaction, subsequent earnings). Although previous research of this type has been designed from the applicant's perspective, the significant findings suggest that individuals' search and choice processes may also be relevant to organizational outcomes.

For example, it would be interesting to determine whether more intensive search strategies are accurate signals of employee motivation, or whether delays in job search signal potentially troublesome personal characteristics such as procrastination, low self esteem, or low work centrality. Similarly, it would be interesting to know whether individuals who search in different ways also tend to evaluate job offers differently. Finally, from the applicant's perspective, if differences in search strategies are associated with differences in search outcomes, can successful strategies be induced through counseling or training? Or do previously discovered relationships merely reflect underlying personality or motivational differences across applicants?

**Summary.** Many interesting job search and choice processes have received little research attention. Two factors probably account for the relative paucity of true process investigations: (1) methodological requirements for studying processes are generally more elaborate than those typically pursued in recruitment research, and (2) researchers may be unaware of many process issues due to the fragmented nature of previous theory and research.

Regarding the latter point, at present we have separate "sub-theories" and empirical research streams for recruiters, recruitment sources, and realistic previews. For example, the commitment hypothesis has been tested only in the context of realistic previews, even though one might speculate that certain
Recruitment sources (e.g., employee referrals) or recruiters (e.g., high level managers) are likely to engender higher commitment as well. Similarly, signalling has been regarded as potentially relevant to recruiters and vacancy characteristics (Rynes, et al., 1980; Spence, 1973), but not to recruitment sources.

Thus, most of the theoretical foundations for previous recruitment research have been too narrow to illuminate general process questions (for exceptions see Boudreau & Rynes, 1985; Olian & Rynes, 1984; Schwab, et al., 1987). Regardless of how narrow the research question, the tendency to ignore critical issues or variables should be less when research is designed with the entire recruitment process in mind. It is hoped that the present chapter provides a useful model of that process for future research design (see also Figure 2).

FUTURE PROSPECTS

Throughout most of the seventies and eighties, recruitment has not been perceived as a "burning issue" by either human resource practitioners or researchers. On the practitioner side, descriptive research has revealed that recruiters are largely untrained, recruitment sources largely unaugmented, and costs and benefits of recruitment practices largely unknown (Miner, 1979; Rynes & Boudreau, 1986). On the research side, Campbell, Hulin, and Daft's (1982) survey of perceived research needs in I/O psychology revealed that only one of 105 respondents noted a need for additional recruitment research (i.e., "Must study the effects of baby boom demographics," p. 65).

However, the times are clearly changing. Whereas longstanding labor surpluses previously enabled employers to "sift and winnow" applicants rather than attract them, long-term labor shortages are now predicted in major segments of the economy (e.g., Bernstein, 1987; Hanigan, 1987; Johnston, 1987; Merrill, 1987).
As such, the importance of recruitment is bound to increase regardless of what we do as researchers. However, recruitment research might become a more integral factor in shaping recruitment practices if it were to ask more critical questions, to be designed in ways that are capable of answering those questions, and to frame questions and results, no matter how specific, in relation to the broader recruitment context and environment. It is hoped that the present chapter provides useful guidelines for broadening and improving research on this increasingly critical human resource function.
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Footnotes

1. Harris and Fink (1987) attempted to eliminate the problem by controlling for applicants' pre-interview perceptions of job attributes, and then looking only at incremental recruiter effects on post-interview attribute perceptions. However, adding a pre-interview control does not change the fact that interviewer and attribute information were still acquired simultaneously during the interview, but then causally analyzed and interpreted (i.e., with perceived recruiter characteristics as independent variables, and perceived job attributes as dependent variables).

2. Few previous reviews have categorized realistic job previews as administrative practices (Schwab, 1982 is an exception). However, they are similar to the other practices discussed here in that when a decision is made to be more "realistic," active changes are necessitated in administrative procedures (e.g., recruiter training, recruitment advertising).

3. By "substantive" differences, I mean differences in attributes that might reasonably be expected to affect worker quality, such as qualifications or aspiration levels. Neither substantive nor superficial (race, sex) differences between dropouts and other groups have been investigated in the RJP literature; however, future research should clearly address the former rather than the latter.

4. Meglino et al. (1988) did examine differences in personal characteristics of stayers and leavers, once on the job. However, the realistic previews in their study were presented subsequent to organizational entry and, as such, are more appropriately regarded as socialization than recruitment practices.

5. Arrow (1972) and others have shown how characteristics that are not necessarily productivity-related (race, sex, age) can come to be regarded as
signals of potential productivity, and thus influence employers' judgments of applicant quality. To the extent that some demographic groups are favored over others, they will also be more difficult (or expensive) to attract, regardless of true productivity characteristics.

6. This issue has been addressed in previous expectancy theory research, but methodological difficulties (e.g., ambiguous causality, demand characteristics) preclude conclusions about actual choice processes; see Schwab, et al., 1987.
Table 1. Summary of Previous Research Concerning Recruiter Effects on Applicants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Dependent Variables</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
2. Probability of accepting offer                                         | 1. Probability of receiving offer related to: Recruiter willingness to answer questions;  
R. interest in applicant; R. understanding of applicant's perspective; R. being trustworthy and likeable; R. familiarity with applicant's background; R. being successful young man; R. not making applicant uncomfortable.  
2. Probability of accepting offer related to: All of above, plus recruiter talking about concerns of other MBAs. |
2. Applicant race  
1. Attitudes toward recruiters  
2. Cynicism toward recruiters |                                                                 | 1. Whites were indifferent to recruiter race; blacks preferred black recruiters.  
2. Black applicants more cynical about recruiter's truthfulness. |
| Schmitt & Coyle, 1976  | Field Survey: Post-interview questionnaire; Factor analysis of applicant impressions | 237 undergraduates     | Applicant perceptions of:  
1. R.warmth  
2. R.mannerisms  
3. R.aggressiveness  
4. R.presentation  
5. Extent of job information  
6. R.opinions  
(Multiple measures of:)  
1. Impressions of recruiter  
2. Impressions of company  
3. Likelihood of receiving offer  
4. Probability of offer acceptance |                                                                 | 1. Recruiter warmth and friendliness predicted all (nine) dependent variables.  
2. Recruiter information about job predicted 7 of 9 dependent variables |
| Rogers & Sincoff, 1978 | Experiment: Audio taped interviews with questionnaire | 312 undergraduates     | 1. Recruiter age  
2. Recruiter title recruiter  
3. R.presentation | Impression of  
1. Significant main effects for age, title, and presentation  
2. Significant age x title interaction.  
3. Significant age x title x presentation interaction | }
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Dependent Variables</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fisher, Ilgen &amp; Hoyer, 1979</td>
<td>Experiment: Mailed Questionnaire</td>
<td>90 Business Seniors</td>
<td>Source of Information: Recruiter vs. job incumbent</td>
<td>1. Trust in source</td>
<td>1. Incumbents more trusted than recruiters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Expertise of source</td>
<td>2. Incumbents better liked than recruiters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Affect toward source</td>
<td>3. Less likely to accept offer if information source is recruiter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Interest in co.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herriot &amp; Rothwell, 1981</td>
<td>Field Survey: Pre-and Post-interview questionnaires</td>
<td>72 graduating British students</td>
<td>Applicant perceptions of seven recruiter behaviors during interview</td>
<td>Intentions to accept offers</td>
<td>No single recruiter behaviors related to acceptance intentions, but certain combinations of behaviors were related.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rynes &amp; Miller 1983 (Study 1)</td>
<td>Experiment: Videotaped interviews with post-viewing questionnaire</td>
<td>133 business undergrads</td>
<td>1. R. affect</td>
<td>1. Impression of recruiter</td>
<td>1. Recruiter affect influenced: Impressions of recruiter; perceived likelihood of receiving offer; perceptions of how company treats employees; willingness to attend second interview.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. R. knowledge of job</td>
<td>2. Likelihood applicant will receive offer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Job attractiveness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Pursuit intentions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rynes &amp; Miller 1983 (Study 2)</td>
<td>Experiment: Videotaped interviews with post-viewing questionnaire</td>
<td>175 Business undergrads</td>
<td>1. R. affect</td>
<td>1. Impressions of recruiter</td>
<td>1. Recruiter affect influenced: Impressions of recruiter; expectancies of offer; No influence on job attractiveness or pursuit intentions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Job attributes</td>
<td>2. Likelihood applicant will receive offer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Job attractiveness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Pursuit intentions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Method</td>
<td>Subjects</td>
<td>Independent Variables</td>
<td>Dependent Variables</td>
<td>Results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powell, 1984</td>
<td>Field Survey: Post-interview questionnaire; Factor analysis of applicant impressions</td>
<td>200 graduating college students</td>
<td>1. Perceived R. affect 2. Perceived R. responsiveness &amp; knowledge 3. Perceived job attributes</td>
<td>Likelihood of job acceptance</td>
<td>Perceptions of recruiters were not significantly associated with acceptance intentions when perceived job attributes were controlled.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harn &amp; Thornton, 1985</td>
<td>Field Survey: Post-interview questionnaire; Factor analysis of applicant impressions</td>
<td>105 graduating college seniors</td>
<td>Applicant impressions of: 1. R. counseling behaviors 2. Indications that applicant was suitable for job 3. Recruiter informativeness 4. Recruiter interpersonal sensitivity 5. Recruiter listening skills</td>
<td>1. Perceived R. warmth &amp; friendliness 2. Willingness to accept offer</td>
<td>1. Perceived recruiter warmth affected by: Counseling behaviors; indications of suitability, recruiter listening skills 2. Willingness to accept offer influenced by: Counseling behaviors; listening skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Method</td>
<td>Subjects</td>
<td>Independent Variables</td>
<td>Dependent Variables</td>
<td>Results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harris &amp; Fink 1987</td>
<td>Field survey: pre &amp; post interview questionnaires; Factor analysis of applicant impressions</td>
<td>145 graduating college students</td>
<td>Applicant impressions of:</td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Perceived recruiter traits influenced all four dependent variables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. R. person-ability</td>
<td>1. Instrumentality of perceived job attributes</td>
<td>2. No significant effects for recruiter sex or recruiter function (personnel vs. line)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. R. competence</td>
<td>2. Expectancy of offer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. R. informativeness</td>
<td>3. Intention to accept offer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. R. aggressiveness</td>
<td>4. Regard for company</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. R. sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6. Personnel vs. line recruiter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor &amp; Bergmann, 1987</td>
<td>Field Survey: Questionnaires at five stages of recruitment process</td>
<td>1286 applicants to large manufacturing firm (different number of subjects at each phase)</td>
<td>1. R. demographics</td>
<td>1. Company attractiveness</td>
<td>1. Company attractiveness was lower when recruiter was: older, female, or from personnel department.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. R. self-descriptions of interview behavior.</td>
<td>2. Probability of offer acceptance</td>
<td>2. Probability of offer acceptance was lower when: recruiter was female (especially when applicant was also female); recruiter perceived as cold and unfriendly; recruiter reported low degree of interview structure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Applicant description of recruiter interview behavior</td>
<td>3. Job offer decision</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Tenure intentions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R. = recruiter
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Sources Investigated</th>
<th>Dependent Variables</th>
<th>Other Variables</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ullman (1966)</td>
<td>263 clerical workers in two organizations</td>
<td>1. Referrals 2. Newspaper ads 3. Employment agencies</td>
<td>Turnover within 12 months</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Lower turnover among referrals in both organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reid (1972)</td>
<td>876 laid-off engineering &amp; metals trade workers</td>
<td>1. Referrals 2. Direct applications 3. Advertisements 4. Employment services</td>
<td>Turnover within 12 months</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Referrals stayed on job longer (significance tests not reported)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decker &amp; Cornelius (1979)</td>
<td>2466 employees in 3 industries; multiple jobs</td>
<td>1. Newspapers 2. Employment agencies 3. Referrals 4. Direct applications</td>
<td>Turnover rates after 12 mo.</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Referrals had lowest turnover rates in all 3 organizations; Differences significant in banking and insurance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>Sources Investigated</td>
<td>Dependent Variables</td>
<td>Other Variables</td>
<td>Results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Journal ads</td>
<td>3. Attitudes: Work satisfaction; Satisfaction with supervisor; Job involvement</td>
<td>3. Education</td>
<td>3. Attitudes: College placement showed lower job involvement and satisfaction with supervisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quaglieri (1982)</td>
<td>64 recent business school graduates</td>
<td>1. Formal sources</td>
<td>Perceptions of source accuracy and specificity in describing job</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Formal sources perceived as less specific and less accurate than other sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caldwell &amp;</td>
<td>1400 racially diverse store clerks</td>
<td>1. Referrals</td>
<td>1. Performance (potential for re-employment)</td>
<td>Race</td>
<td>1. Formal advertising more likely to produce successful performer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>Sources Investigated</td>
<td>Dependent Variables</td>
<td>Other Variables</td>
<td>Results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>Sources Investigated</td>
<td>Dependent Variables</td>
<td>Other Variables</td>
<td>Results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swaroff,</td>
<td>618 technical salespersons</td>
<td>1. Referrals</td>
<td>1. Voluntary turnover in 2 years</td>
<td>1. Age</td>
<td>1. No differences in turnover by source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Employment agencies</td>
<td>Rating; Percent sales quota in years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. College recruitment</td>
<td>1 and 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conard &amp; Ashworth</td>
<td>5,822 life insurance agents</td>
<td>1. Referrals</td>
<td>Turnover within 12 months</td>
<td>1. Aptitude index battery</td>
<td>1. Differences in aptitude accounted for significant portion of source-turnover relationship; differences in job knowledge did not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1986)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Newspapers</td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Accuracy of job knowledge at hire</td>
<td>2. Differences in turnover by source remained even after individual differences partialled out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latham &amp; Leddy</td>
<td>68 employees of auto dealerships;</td>
<td>1. Referrals</td>
<td>1. Organizational commitment</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>1. Referrals superior to newspapers in terms of organizational commitment and job involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1987)</td>
<td>mixed occupations</td>
<td>2. Direct applications</td>
<td>2. Job satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Referrals superior to both newspapers and direct application in terms of job satisfaction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 1. Summary of previous recruitment theory and research.
Figure 2. Model for Future Recruitment Research