

Summer 2017

Facebook and value congruence

Andrew James Eyberg

Follow this and additional works at: http://scholarsmine.mst.edu/masters_theses

 Part of the [Psychology Commons](#)

Department:

Recommended Citation

Eyberg, Andrew James, "Facebook and value congruence" (2017). *Masters Theses*. 7693.
http://scholarsmine.mst.edu/masters_theses/7693

This Thesis - Open Access is brought to you for free and open access by Scholars' Mine. It has been accepted for inclusion in Masters Theses by an authorized administrator of Scholars' Mine. This work is protected by U. S. Copyright Law. Unauthorized use including reproduction for redistribution requires the permission of the copyright holder. For more information, please contact scholarsmine@mst.edu.

FACEBOOK AND VALUE CONGRUENCE

By

ANDREW JAMES EYBERG

A Thesis

Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of the
MISSOURI UNIVERSITY OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree

MASTERS OF SCIENCE

In

INDUSTRIAL-ORGANIZATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY

2017

Approved by

Nathan Weidner, Advisor

Clair Reynolds Kueny

Jessica Cundiff

© 2017

Andrew James Eyberg

All Rights Reserved

ABSTRACT

The current discussion on the use of social networking sites (SNS) in personnel selection is mixed at best. The present research utilized participant's Facebook profiles to determine if raters can correctly - and accurately evaluate work value dimensions as a measure of person-organization fit. Similar research was successful in capturing personality dimensions via SNS (Buffardi & Campbell, 2009). Additionally, the value dimensions of the current measure used – the Organizational Culture Profile (OCP) (O'Reilly et al., 1991) has been correlated with aspects of personality. Rater participants ($N=105$). Every five raters were randomly assigned five profiles to rate, for a total of 525 ratings. Participant Facebook profiles were collected from Amazon Mechanical -Turk participants ($N = 99$). Profiles were rated using the 54 - item OCP. Impression management was assessed using Paulhaus, (1988) 40 – item measure of balanced inventory of desirable responding. Based on a principle components analysis the original OCP factor structure was unstable. A suitable factor structure of six dimensions based on Sarros et al., (2005) was used. Scale indices were created for every profile rated and agreement and interrater reliability calculated. A wide range of average ICC ($_{2,k}$) indices emerged the majority of ratings failing to meet standardized ICC thresholds. r_{wg} indices were also calculated and were sufficient acceptable. Correlations of rater accuracy were conducted and found little to no accuracy. Moderation analyses of impression management also fell short. Untrained raters do not appear to be able to accurately or reliably rate individual's values via viewing their Facebook profiles. This has substantial implications for hiring managers.

Keywords: P-O Fit, SNS, Values, Personnel Selection, OCP, Facebook.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Dr. Nathan Weidner, his support, and guidance throughout this process cannot be overstated. Patience, encouragement and clear direction through teamwork have made this project possible. His leadership, motivation, and support have instilled a sense of values to last a lifetime. A definitive scholar who embodies tried and true research methods his inspiration allowed for this project to come to life.

Dr. Clair Reynolds Kueny, her incredible support and unfailing positive critique of the research methods have helped develop this project and reach impossible goals.

Dr. Jessica Cundiff, her support on this project has above and beyond. Her insight and advanced methodological support have been invaluable. She has always been willing to lend a helpful hand and deliver clear guiding feedback.

To my Family, many individuals who are not nearly as blessed as I to have such a supporting family who has done whatever they can whenever they can to make sure I reach this point and go beyond. Specifically, my father Carl Eyberg – his ever present and loving guidance has brought me not only to finish this project but to advance farther in life than I ever thought possible. My mother, Janet Eyberg, my friend and biggest champion since the day I was born – through much trial and tribulation she has been by my side. If I could ever be a fraction of the wonderful person she is, nothing could stop me. My parent's ever-present faith has shown me how to be the man I am today. Finally, to my sister – one of my best friends and driving force in my life. You have become a most wonderful woman, sister, and mother, Emily, thank you for always being there. A special thank you to

Special thanks to Dr. Charles O'Reilly, for the use of the OCP.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT.....	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	iv
LIST OF TABLES.....	viii
SECTION	
1. INTRODUCTION	1
1.1. LITERATURE REVIEW.....	1
1.2. SNS OVERVIEW	3
1.3. VALUE CONGRUENCE OVERVIEW.....	5
1.4. FIT IN ORGANIZATIONS OVERVIEW.....	7
1.5. PERSON-ENVIRONMENT FIT.....	10
1.6. SUPPLEMENTARY AND COMPLEMENTARY FIT.....	10
1.7. FIT PARADIGM	13
1.8. USING FIT IN PERSONNEL SELECTION	15
1.9. SOCIAL NETWORKING SITES AND SELECTION.....	16
1.10. EVALUATING SNS	19
1.11. MEASURING PERSON-ORGANIZATION FIT THROUGH SNS	22
1.12. RESEARCH QUESTION ONE: ARE VALUES ASSOCIATED WITH P- O FIT EXPRESSED THROUGH AN INDIVIDUAL’S SNS?.....	23

1.13. RESEARCH QUESTION TWO: CAN INDIVIDUAL VALUES ASSOCIATED WITH P-O FIT BE ACCURATELY ASSESSED BY UNTRAINED RATERS?	24
2. METHOD	28
2.1. SAMPLE ONE TARGET RATEES	28
2.2. SAMPLE ONE MEASURES AND ADAPTATION OF THE ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE PROFILE	29
2.3. THE BALANCED INVENTORY OF DESIRABLE RESPONDING.....	33
2.4. SAMPLE 1 PROCEDURE AND FACEBOOK PROFILE COLLECTION AND LAB FACEBOOK ACCOUNT.....	34
2.5. SAMPLE TWO UNTRAINED RATERS	36
2.6. SAMPLE TWO MEASURES	36
2.6.1. Organizational Cultural Profile.....	36
2.6.2. Exploratory Items.....	36
2.7. SAMPLE 2 PROCEDURE	37
3. RESULTS	40
4. DISCUSSION	48
5. IMPLICATIONS	50
6. FUTURE DIRECTIONS	53
7. LIMITATIONS.....	55
8. CONCLUSIONS.....	57
APPENDICES	
A. ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE PROFILE	58
B. BALANCED INVENTORY OF DESIRABLE RESPONDING	61

C. AMAZON MECHANICAL TURK PARTICIPANT INSTRUCTIONS	64
D. SAMPLE TWO RATER INSTRUCTIONS	66
E. INDIVIDUAL ASSESMENT ITEM LIST	68
F. LAB FACEBOOK ACCOUNT	71
BIBLIOGRAPHY	73
VITA.....	81

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
2.1. Sarros et al. (2005) Dimension Reliabilities and Item Loadings	32
3.1 Cronbach's Alpha of Revised OCP Dimensions	41
3.2 ICC _(2,k) Means by Rater Set	42
3.3 Descriptives of r_{wg} and ICC _(2,k) indices	44
3.4 Correlations Between Sample 1 and Sample 2 Ratings	45
3.5 Correlations Between BIDR Scores and Sample Two $-r_{wg}$ indices	46
3.6 Correlations Between BIDR Scores and Difference Scores	47

1. INTRODUCTION

Expression of values from Facebook? An investigation of fit through SNS.

1.1 LITERATURE REVIEW

A developing issue within organizations is the incorporation of using social networking sites (SNS) as a tool in personnel selection. A recent survey discovered organizations were significantly less likely to hire an individual if they could not access their SNS (Grasz, 2015). This process is a problem because an applicant should be hired based on their knowledge, skills, and abilities that relate to the job rather than job - irrelevant information. This growing trend could imply an unstructured and inappropriate attempt to assess job applicants based on more subjective and possibly inaccurate measures (Brown & Vaughn, 2011; Rozenblum, 2012).

The subjective content being assessed by employers - through SNS are not easily specifiable. The content on an SNS can potentially range from just the individual's name to years' worth of rich information about a person. What is known, is that 45% of employers are looking at applicants SNS to screen (Grasz, 2015). That number is up from 2008 when Society of Human Resource Management found 34% of organizations use social media to screen candidates (SHRM, 2008). Additionally, subjective decision making is most likely occurring from those viewings (Brown & Vaughn, 2011), and this subjectivity is left open to a wide array of biases (Zanella & Pais, 2014). Furthermore, these biases can be dangerous for the applicant and the organization because it is both legally and ethically threatening to conduct personnel selection based on anything other than an individual's knowledge, skills, abilities, and other work-relevant attributes.

Collectively, this begs the question: What are organizations exactly looking for in an SNS? It is possible they are looking for compatibility between the applicant and the organization (Sekiguchi & Huber, 2011; Zanella & Pais, 2014). More specifically, they are likely looking for how much the beliefs, values, and attitudes of an organization fit with the applicant. There is growing support for the notion that fit is being examined via aspects of organization culture when assessing an individual's SNS (Tepeci & Bartlett, 2002).

An assessment of the utility of SNS as a potential tool in the selection specialist's toolkit is greatly needed. Research must strive to stay current with technological advances and practitioners' needs. There is a further need to determine if individuals' values can be identifiable through SNS, let alone - accurately. Multiple calls have been made to examine the use of SNS in personnel selection (Boselie, 2010; Chang & Madera, 2012; Kluemper, Davison, Cao & Wu, 2015) but this particular gap in the literature has yet to be addressed.

The current paper's objective was to determine if values can be identifiable by examining an individual's SNS to determine person - organization (P-O) fit. Additionally, the present research will seek to evaluate the accuracy and reliability of which novice raters can determine these values, beliefs, and attitudes that are associated with the P-O fit.

Fit in personnel selection has a long history and has become one of the most reviewed concepts in the literature (Kristof, 1996; O'Reilly et al., 1991). Fit has been examined from many different angles, beginning with its roots in organizational culture (Schneider, 1989). Person-environment fit (P-E fit) will be discussed via the two primary

modes used in personnel selection: Person-organization fits (P-O) fit and person-job (P-J) fit. The current trends and consensus on the use of fit in organizations are only gaining strength (Kristof –Brown, & Jansen, 2007) along with current techniques for the measurement of fit. Collectively, these discussions lead to a summarization of these components and how they support two guiding research questions and hypotheses herein.

To begin this discussion, first an overview of SNS, followed by an incorporation of value congruence, personality, and fit in organizations will be helpful to frame the current issues surrounding SNS in personnel selection. Next, the argument for why SNS has the potential to be a valuable resource in selection - when examined via the lens of P-O fit is discussed. Specifically, examples on how the evaluation of culture and P-O fit may be contributing to issues of incorporation of SNS in personnel selection. Additionally, current trends associated with the legal and practical issues of incorporating SNS into the personnel selection process are addressed. Thus, the present paper contributes to filling a current gap in the literature around using SNS within a personnel selection context.

1.2 SNS OVERVIEW

Social Networking Sites can be defined as websites that allow users to interact socially online through a variety of status updates, tweets, pictures, and videos. There are multiple popular SNS including Twitter, Facebook, LinkedIn, and others. Additionally, Boyd and Ellison (2007) define SNS as “web-based services that allow individuals to (1) construct a public or semi-public profile within a bounded system, (2) articulate a list of other users with whom they share a connection, and (3) view and traverse their list of

connections and those made by others within the system.” (p.2). Earlier designs and methodology of using SNS for personnel selection, deal primarily with capturing aspects of the big five personality dimensions through SNS (Sorokowski et al., 2015).

For the current paper, the SNS Facebook is of primary interest. While previous research on the use of SNS has come from a broad range of personality examinations, and validation studies to ensure measurement accuracy and reliability (Goodmon, Smith, Ivancevich, & Lundberg, 2014), little has been done to examine the utility of SNS in connection with selection systems. That is - can individuals reliably agree on an interpretation of the content someone posts on their SNS profile, about what it means for a hiring process? While the personality aspect regarding its use in selection procedures is an important trend – there are a variety of other valid and reliable options to use other than examining SNS. The more in-depth research with SNS even addresses what aspects on an SNS stand out as the most accurate predictors of behavior (Darbyshire, Kirk, Wall, & Kaye, 2016). Within these predictors, Back et al., (2010) have found supporting evidence that the personality aspects seen in an SNS are reflective of the actual personality of the individual and not just a facade.

The finding that true personality of individuals is reflected in an SNS has been empirically supported. Kluemper, et al., (2015) found direct positive correlations between hirability and aspects of the Big Five personality traits on a SNS. Extroversion and emotional stability were two of the strongest relationships out of those tested. From this finding, it is necessary to understand the mechanisms driving those personality traits. Authors Bilsky and Schwartz (1994) examined this very issue. Using structural analyses, between personality variables such as emotionality, extraversion, and a value priorities

scale, they successfully determined that values are indeed positively related to an individual's personality. That relation appears to be reciprocal in nature.

The present research builds on incorporating the use of SNS via examination of the degree to which value dimensions commonly associated with (P-O) fit (O'Reilly, et al., 1991; Sarros. et al., 2005) can be captured through pictures, statements, and postings that are manifestations of an individual's values via their SNS. Per the call of Kristof – Brown, and Billsberry (2012), the overall benefits and discussion of the current research work to bring about a complete understanding of how this design and investigation bring several meaningful contributions to the literature.

1.3 VALUE CONGRUENCE OVERVIEW

Delimitating and breaking apart fit is no easy task, as the pieces that make up fit are easily and often misunderstood (Rhynes & Gerhart, 1990). With this in mind, it is important to first begin with a discussion of value congruence. Value congruence can be thought of as shared similarities between individuals and organizations (Edwards & Cable, 2009; Kristof, 1996). Within the fit literature, values are often regarded as intrinsic components of the fit model (Chatman, 1989). Humans are attracted to certain things more than others due to naturally developed values. These differences in desire make up values which individuals actively seek out. As these values grow, the better the potential for future high value congruence grows as well.

These values are often examined through the concept of objective fit, which is the lens through which outsiders view how well entities fit together (Kristof, 1996). The idea of value congruence and fit is perhaps best described through Schneider's (1987)

attraction-selection-attrition (ASA) model. The ASA model states that individuals are attracted to organizations that share their values, by which they are more likely to select into these organizations due to a value congruence, and that over time those that do not fit with the values of the organization will leave through the process of attrition. Schneider posits that through this ASA process organizations become more homogeneous regarding their shared values over time. Value congruence is therefore particularly important to the attraction portion of the model. According to Schneider's logic - values appear to be the cornerstone of the model. As individuals are attracted to organizations, so are organizations attracted to individuals who share their same values (Edwards & Cable, 2004; Kristof, 1996).

Therefore, a mutual attraction of values is paramount in the employee selection literature; and the current discussion is no exception. Cable and Edwards (2004), worked toward an integrated model of value congruence and psychological needs fulfillment. They found value congruence and psychological needs fulfillment come together to form an optimal fit between an employee and organization. The authors argued that value congruence is most likely indirectly assessed via psychological needs fulfillment; because individuals are working to meet their psychological needs – their goals (Cable & Edwards, 2004). That is when an individual's psychological needs are met; value congruence will occur as well because of an intrinsic psychological completeness. Thus, a fair assumption might be that the inverse is true as well. The more someone presents information about themselves, the easier their values can be understood, and the more likely their psychological needs are to be met.

Additionally, Edwards and Cable (2009) found value congruence to be a significant predictor of trust. Trust in turn promotes communication, intent to stay, and job satisfaction. The promising outcomes of value congruence via fit are even being linked to positive financial gains (Newman & Nollan, 1996). The logical next step in research for this topic would be to find a readily available medium where these values are salient. If these values can be accurately predicted, and easily accessible the potential for improved selection procedures is vast. It is plausible this could be done with modern methods - such as utilization of an SNS.

1.4 FIT IN ORGANIZATIONS OVERVIEW

Organizations are becoming more aware of the importance of fit, with stories even reaching major news sources (Sorrentino, 2016). Writing for Forbes magazine, Sorrentino discussed the need for a value change in banking organizations to improve their culture. For example, more organizations are adding an appreciation of fit to their selection processes. A partial reason for this is that fit leads to long-term retention and subsequent positive job performance of employees (Kristof, 1996; Sutarjo, 2011).

To fully appreciate what someone means when they say someone is or is not a good fit for the organization - an understanding of the logic behind that statement is necessary. Kristof (1996) defined P-O fit as “the compatibility between people and organizations that occur when: (a) at least one entity provides what the other needs, or (b) they share similar fundamental characteristics, or (c) both” (p. 6). Layperson definitions of “fit” generally include statements such as - “a feeling of something that just works.” For example, “Applicant X simply wasn’t a good fit” is a probable statement that heard

from employers. This statement has vague, unintelligible, and subjective undertones that may have potential legal consequences for the organization (Forster, 2006). Specifically, this vagueness leaves the organization vulnerable to potential turnover and legal consequences because they cannot defend their selection decisions.

The vagueness of being rejected for not being a good fit can often lead to resentment and issues of organizational justice from applicants (Rozenblum, 2012). A sense of unintelligible outcomes of good or bad fit can often be harmful to the organization, as any follow-up feedback is rarely given (Pervin, 1968). From this, a pattern often develops, employees are left in the cold, or they will only do the bare minimum the job requires in the future. Additionally, a similar negative pattern occurs for the organization – turnover, and future selection systems are costly and time-consuming.

Furthermore, reliance on selecting persons based solely on their level of P-O fit with the organization may lead to detrimental outcomes. The adverse results first and foremost are ill-equipped employees thrown into a job where they do not fit. This outcome is expensive, and resource is depleting to the organization and anyone involved. Employees should be selected based on their knowledge, skills, abilities, and other (KSAOs) to maximize positive job performance (Campion, Palmer, & Campion, 1997). Additionally, a selection system based in reliable and valid KSAOs is the most legally fair way to approach hiring. To reject an applicant on anything more than their qualifications is not only discriminatory but illegal as well (Bowen, Ledford & Nathan, 1991).

For example, discriminating against an applicant based on race, sex, color, or creed is a discriminatory and illegal practice. It must be made abundantly clear that when

examining types of fit and selection - that to be selected for specific KSAO's is to select for Person – Job (P-J) fit (Adkins et al., 1994). That is, in a selection system P-J fit comes first before any other type of fit can be considered.

Ultimately, the previous point is another example where fit can become ambiguous and misconstrued in the selection process. Decision - makers might believe they are making an informed decision about an applicant's P-O fit, but it is most likely highly subjective if they have no P-J fit to also support their decision (Cable & Judge, 1999; Edwards & Cable, 2004).

Many personnel decision makers are not adequately trained to assess fit and yet many proceed to do just that (Campion, et al., 1997). This inadequacy can be seen in interviews, job searches, and across organizations (Sekiguchi & Huber, 2011). At face value simply hiring someone because you like them - may look safe, but in reality, a qualified person could be discriminated against simply due to not being a good fit (Kristof-Brown, 2000). In turn, an unqualified person may get hired, simply because they were more charismatic than the competition. An ambiguous lack of good fit could be due to anything that is not directly related to the KSAOs.

In turn, validity and reliability of research, and applications of fit are gaining ground in the literature (Resick, Baltes & Shantz, 2007). Research has determined several models that accurately drive the construct of fit, without relying on subjective unfounded guesses (Buffardi & Campbell, 2008). Just like with any measurement of human behavior, research strives to capture the construct occurring (i.e. fit) and the mechanisms or models that drive that construct (i.e. P-J, P-O fit). In particular, the two most common

types of fit used for personnel selection purposes are P-J and P-O fit. Both of which are nested within P-E fit.

1.5 PERSON-ENVIRONMENT FIT

To disentangle the elements that make up person - environment fit is briefly necessary to give the reader a sense of logic and supporting evidence for the paper's guiding research question. P-E fit can be thought of as an all-encompassing umbrella covering multiple aspects of fit (Marley, 2007). Despite all the intricacies that must be understood and accounted for when examining fit, it can be helpful to go back to the roots of fit. Research on fit shows an upward trend of comprehension surrounding the construct - an ever - expanding construct. However, the original concept was a person - based model (Kristof, 1996). Specifically, the fit is the degree to which characteristics of an individual match the characteristics of a given environment (Kristof, 1996). While this concept may be simplistic, it is vital to many organizational and individual outcomes. For example, if one is putting together a jigsaw puzzle, many pieces might appear similar, but there is a specific spot for each one.

1.6 SUPPLEMENTARY AND COMPLEMENTARY FIT

The construct of fit within the P-E fit domain has been broken down into two major types of research. In particular, the two types of research on fit primarily involve supplementary fit and complementary fit. Both research types evolved separately but in a parallel manner (Cable & Edwards, 2004). That is, they both appear to predict similar outcomes and yet offer different explanations. Complementary fit occurs when the

weaknesses of the organization or person are offset by the other. Additionally, complementary fit involves the interests of the person and level of assessment (i.e. organization, job, supervisor, and group). Complementary fit provides what the other wants. Thus, psychological needs fulfillment theory is whether the employee's basic needs are being met (Edwards, 1991).

Within the theory of psychological needs fulfillment, there is a certain reciprocation that must occur. An exchange of tangible or intangible goods two entities need from each other is the theory at its core. These could be any number of resources, such as time, money, benefits or even networking opportunities (Cable & Judge, 1996). When these needs are fulfilled, both parties can benefit from them (Cable & Edwards, 2004). Just as in the jigsaw puzzle example, when working towards complementary fit, an individual and organization will fit a particular role, matched with the requirements of the job (Rhynes & Gerhart, 1990). When there is a complementary fit between two entities that offsets each other's weaknesses, it becomes a necessity that these two entities come together. Like a puzzle that is not complete until it has all the pieces in place.

The second strain of research is supplementary fit, which is based on the notion that both the individual and the organization possess similar characteristics (Cable & Edwards, 2004) which are a necessary, yet not sufficient condition for optimal fit. The notion of supplementary fit is driven by value congruence theory (Kristof, 1996). When entities share similar values or characteristics they deem worthwhile; they have sufficient fit (Chatman, 1989). These characteristics can be thought of as supplemental skills that the organization considers valuable, including characteristics of both the organization and the person that need to be fulfilled. The person characteristics could include values,

abilities, goals, or personality (Cable & Edwards, 2004). The organizational characteristics could include cultural values, environmental conditions, or psychological demands (Cable & Judge, 1996). Once these conditions are satisfied, a healthy level of fit can occur.

Many positive outcomes within the congruence dimension characteristics come from the values of individuals and organizations being met with a certain level of fit. That is to say that determining the qualities both entities possess and then making a decision on whether they will be an effective match, can lead to increased job satisfaction as well as decreased intent to quit, and turnover (O'Reilly, & Chatman, 1998). These positive outcomes can serve to strengthen the relationship between employee and organization.

While both complementary and supplementary can be assessed throughout the P-E fit paradigm, certain areas can be readily seen in the selection process. Supplementary fit, for example, can often be examined under the lens of P-O Fit (Edwards & Cable, 2009). That is, both entities are looking for a well-rounded match (Kristof-Brown, & Billsberry, 2012). This process is different from the P-J fit, which is complementary in nature, in that a person's values and beliefs are matched with the culture of the organization instead of a resume matching with a job position (Doverspike, Kung, O'Connell, & Durham, 2006). Specifically, this strengthens Kristoff's (1996) position on a linear trend of first establishing P-J Fit (initial qualifications) then moving to P-O Fit (values). This process seems redundant at first, but this is why there are valid, reliable and thorough selection, procedures to establish fit. Specifically, establishing general KSAOs, before looking for a culture fit.

1.7 FIT PARADIGM

There is a long history of research on P-E fit (see Kristof-Brown & Guay, 2011 for a review), and it is best viewed as a multi - dimensional construct with many distinct subsets. The primary dimensions of P-E fit are P-O fit (Kristof-Brown & Guay, 2011), P-J fit (Flecke, 2015), followed by- person group (P-G) fit (Kristof-Brown, Zimmerman, & Johnson, 2005), and finally, person-supervisor (P-S) fit (Shin & Zhou, 2003). Just as any multidimensional construct works on different levels of analysis (i.e. individual, group, and organizational), there are certain times when it is best to assess a particular type of fit (Kristof, 1996; O'Reilly, et al., 1991). For the sake of brevity, only P-J and P-O fit will be briefly discussed as P-G fit, and P-S fit is primarily beyond the scope of the current research.

For fit to be understood, it will be helpful first briefly to examine each type of fit. The p-j fit is defined as the level of congruence between a person's abilities and the requirements of the job (Kristof, 1996). This level of congruence, in turn, follows the needs-supplies model of fit (Bretz, & Judge, 1994) and is considered to be a primary aspect of complementary fit. The needs and demands of both the job and the person must be met. Simply, the P-J fit is less about a mutual feeling and more about finding the correct tool for the task at hand. If the individual requires financial support or certain benefits and the job requires skilled labor; then both parties will be in agreement, and a strong level of fit will occur (Marley, 2007).

The construct of P-J fit is regarded as one of the most consistently used tools in the selection toolkit and is strongly related to specific job/task performance and job attitudes (Doverspike, et al., 2006). For example, the strong P-J fit is positively related to job satisfaction, and negatively related to intent to quit. Furthermore, high positive P-J fit

has been positively linked to job performance (Meglino, Ravlin & Adkins, 1989). For example, when a candidate completely matches the job requirements with his or her resume, then sufficient P-J fit has been established. Positive job attitudes can also come from a strong P-J fit (Kristof-Brown, 2005).

P-O fit, on the other hand, is defined as the congruence of goals, and values between an organization and an individual (Kristof, 1996) and is best conceptualized as an aspect of supplementary organizational fit. P-O fit arose from Schneider's (1995) attraction, selection, and attrition model (ASA). According to Schneider, individuals will select into an organization if they feel an attraction to it. Over time, individuals that do not share a sense of P-O fit will turnover through the natural process of attrition (Schneider, 1995) which is costly and time-consuming.

Organizations use measures of P-O fit in their hiring processes due to the evidence that congruence between individual and organization values leads to workforce retention (Meglino, Ravlin & Adkins, 1989). Furthermore, even employees are also basing their job search intentions on perceived value congruence with organizations (Cable & Judge, 1996; Edwards & Cable, 2004). P-O fit has been found to be directly linked to a variety of job attitudes and behaviors including job satisfaction, intent to quit, turnover, absenteeism, organizational citizenship behaviors (OCBs), and job performance. (Bowen, Ledford, & Nathan, 1991; Kristof, 1996; Meglino, Ravlin, & Adkins, 1989). From this, culture fit related to P-O can be assessed many different ways.

Instruments such as the organizational culture profile (OCP) (O'Reilly, Chatman & Caldwell, 1991) measure seven value dimensions which are commonly associated with the P-O fit. While this is just one of the many measures used to assess fit, this will be the

primary focus of the current research due to the breadth of the captured dimensions. The OCP items maintain seven value dimensions that operationalize P-O fit specifically. The seven value dimensions are: *innovative, aggressive, outcome oriented, stable, people oriented, team oriented, and detail oriented* (listed by item loading in Appendix A). These dimensions make up various types of salient organizational cultures, and when correctly matched the congruence between a person and an organization is made clear. Specifically, when applicants' scores more closely match with those of employees within an organization, a higher perception level of P-O fit is believed to exist.

1.8 USING FIT IN PERSONNEL SELECTION

Current literature agrees that P-O fit should be assessed early in a selection process but only after minimal screening has been conducted (e.g. resumes and application blanks) (Sekiguchi, & Huber, 2011). Sekiguchi gave supporting evidence that P-J fit must come first because it inherently forms a psychological contract between employee and organization. That is, it guarantees the aspect of psychological needs fulfillment – “If I go to work, I will be paid for it.” In sum, humans require these aspects of fulfillment for stability, without stability, anxiety tends to occur quickly followed by similar negative consequences. Additionally, Adkins, Russell, and Werbel (1994) suggest that the most beneficial assessment of fit occurs after the first interview. Due also to a general agreement on the multidimensionality of P-E fit (Pervin, 1968; Rhynes & Gerhart, 1990) it is imperative that each investigation of P-O fit captures as much variance of the congruence from both parties to achieve optimal fit. New technology now makes this theoretically possible (Kluemper et al., 2015). Self-reports are a common

method of measuring P-O culture fit, but with advances in technology, other options are becoming available. Past and present options include a card sort or point system; however, these methods can be just as cumbersome if not more so compared to Schein's (2010) clinical approach to culture assessment. That is, the clinical approach – while, beneficial it might not always be apt for organizations that need a relatively quick solution.

1.9 SOCIAL NETWORKING SITES AND SELECTION

Many personnel decision makers are often not trained to thoroughly conduct an assessment of fit (Brown & Vaughn, 2011) let alone content on an SNS. Additionally, organizations are indeed using SNS to screen candidates as part of their personnel selection procedures (Elley, 2015; Grasz, 2015; Rozenblum, 2012; Zanella & Pais, 2014). While, it is still unclear whether this practice violates EEOC guidelines (Cascio, 1986; Elley, 2015), it is safe to assume that it is possibly not supported by a job analysis. While organizations could be using SNS for any number of reasons, a growing body of evidence has come out in support for the notion that they are looking for a culture fit (Grasz, 2014). Specifically, organizations appear to be seeking to increase a congruence of culture fit amongst their employees (Morrison, n.d.).

Using SNS in selection is a delicate but necessary investigation. The research is quickly gaining momentum in academic circles. Delicate, in that the use of SNS is extremely cautioned. While, this is a good thing, and is in line with the current generational shift in the United States, there is still much work to be done to fill the gap in the current literature relating to SNS usage in organizations, particularly in the

personnel selection process. The generational shift implies that organizations will have a wide range of employees from entry level to nearing retirement. That said, new literature continues to shed light on the potential in-depth benefits that come from using SNS (Davison, Maraist, & Bing, 2011) within organizations.

This gap in the literature is partially brought on by a hailstorm of legal issues and uncertainty surrounding the use of SNS in personnel selection (Zanella & Pais, 2014). In particular, a specific litany of legal and methodological issues such as discrimination, validity, and reliability in the use of SNS in personnel selection (Brown & Vaughn, 2011) still need to be addressed. In selection by only looking for obvious, blatant images or phrases that might appear negative, as opposed to the positive, only leads to further legal troubles (Grasz, 2015; Zanella. & Pais, 2014).

Authors, Davison, Maraist, Hamilton and Bing, (2012) go into great detail in their extensive list of cautions regarding the use of SNS to screen job candidates. In particular, issues that might come up are privacy concerns and blatant disregard for EEOC guidelines (Cascio, 1986; Elley, 2015). The former being a primary concern for employees, and the latter a concern for everyone involved. In short, current consensus on the use of SNS in selection is that it is not recommended, or at the very least it is highly cautioned. Part of the problem with SNS use in selection leading to muddy waters is at the core of SNS use as free speech does not protect it. A recent court ruling found that a “Like” on an SNS does not count as explicit speech, and thus not protected (Bland v. Roberts, 2012)

That said, entire books calling for the issues of SNS in personnel selection to be addressed been written (Landers & Schmidt, 2016). Thus it becomes an understatement

that researchers must continue to investigate this trend. If employees are being screened via SNS, there is a necessity to understand it better. As of 2017, the author knows of no one that has had to appear in court for SNS use directly related to selection - but there have been many instances in which organizations quietly settled SNS matters (Melanthiou, Pavlou, & Constantinou, 2015). Frantz, Pears, Vaughn, Ferrell, and Dudley (2016) even compare the use of SNS to the minefield that was originally executive coaching. Therefore, the need to inform employers and employees about the use of SNS becomes imperative.

Specific legal issues have involved everything from what an applicant posts on their own time to a direct violation of company protocol. For example, the University of Kentucky recently had to settle with a professor because of personal beliefs he posted to SNS harmed is an advancement. His posts had effectively gone against the culture of the university, but the posts were in fact not job relevant – hence the settlement (Hastings, 2013). To protect applicants, certain laws are even being passed to prohibit organizations from asking for applicants SNS passwords (Hastings, 2013). Unfortunately, laws such as that do not solve the problem; they are merely a band - aid for a much larger issue.

The reluctance to use SNS in personnel selection is valid, though its inexpensiveness and trendiness make it ever - present in practitioners' and researchers' minds (Landers & Schmidt, 2016). To avoid lawsuits and general legal troubles, algorithms that code and sort individuals are being developed to judge SNS profiles more accurately with the end goal of eliminating human error (Youyou, Kosinski, & Stillwell, 2015). However, if that level of machine learning was practical, there might not be any need to study human behavior – the previous points refute that argument. The simple fact

of the matter is, it is a stretch to believe any small organization is going to have the resources to pay for a program that sorts and analyzes content an individual's SNS.

1.10 EVALUATING SNS

The primary lines of research involved with SNS and personnel selection revolve around issues of utility and gaining an understanding of the validity and reliability of measurement through SNS (Zanella & Pais, 2014). In a broader sense, it appears that individuals in personnel selection have been inappropriately handling examinations of an individual's SNS (Brown & Vaughn, 2011; Zanella & Pais, 2014). An example of this can include simply looking for reasons to not hire an individual based on nothing more than spelling errors in their SNS (Forster, 2006). Furthermore, these mishandlings of an individual's SNS can lead to harmful consequences, such as wrongful rejection and a variety of other legal issues (Chang & Madera, 2012). Various Legal issues such as *U.S v. Merigildo* (2012). Within that case, the court ruled that particular SNS such as "tweets" are public emails, and the authors have no right to privacy. Some research even goes so far as to entirely condemn the use of SNS in personnel selection (Boselie, 2010). That said, there is a body of literature developing on the use of assessing personality in SNS.

Current personality assessment using the Big Five through SNS has been supported to be valid and reliable (Chang & Madera, 2012; Darbyshire, Kirk, Wall, & Kaye, 2016). Other personality traits have also been accurately identified by viewing individuals' SNS. For example, another study assessed how many pictures people take of themselves (known as "selfies") and post to their SNS and found the number of self-pictures predicted narcissism; depending on the framing (Buffardi & Campbell, 2008).

From the findings above, an intriguing image of a hiring manager using SNS to screen candidates develops. On the one hand Buffardi and Campbell (2008) give empirical evidence that personality is evident on SNS, and on the other hand, a trained selection specialist will have ready access to other valid and reliable measures of personality. Thus, it is likely not the trained professionals utilizing SNS, but those who do not have access to valid and reliable selection methods. These individual assessments of a person's SNS can lead us to a better understanding of how people will behave at work. If SNS can become a reliable and valid part of a decision maker's toolkit, it has the potential to increase hiring accuracy if raters are trained (Kluemper, Davison, Cao, & Wu, 2015). The objective of the current project is not to justify the use of SNS as a selection tool, but rather to explore if there is value in SNS for measuring P-O Fit

In regards to selection, the possibility that recent research is operationalizing applications of SNS incorrectly in selection moves from possible to actuality. Personality is characterized as an aspect of P-J fit, which is an aspect of complimentary fit. In particular, personality traits such as extroversion and narcissism have been measured through SNS and have been linked to job performance for a wide variety of jobs (Buffardi & Campbell, 2008). These traits would be included in KSAOs which are the basis of P-J fit. There is currently a growing body of evidence that gives support to the notion that P-J fit is strongly visible in LinkedIn (Roulin & Bangerter, 2013). Much of the content on LinkedIn can easily be tied to a resume or application blanks, as LinkedIn is, in essence, an application blank.

On the other hand, many hiring managers may be focusing more on aspects of P-O fit and examples of supplementary fit when looking at SNS sites. For example, a

Career Builder (survey/HR website) (2014) survey found one-third of employers who research candidates on social networking sites say they have found content that made them more likely to hire a candidate. Also, nearly a quarter (23%) found content that directly led to hiring the candidate, up from 19% the previous year. Some of the most common reasons employers hired a candidate based on their social networking presence included aspects of how an interviewer or recruiter “got a feel for a candidate” (Graze, 2014). This feeling would often lead the interviewer to decide that the applicant was a good “fit” within the organization. This could imply an incredibly subjective hiring process within those organizations. That is a selection process not based firmly in KSAOs.

In resounding agreement with Kristof, (1996) authors, Brown and Vaughn (2011), the state only P-J fit should be assessed at the initial process of personnel selection, not P-O fit. This implies a strict linear trend during the selection process (i.e. P-J fit must come before P-O fit). Much of the previous research has focused on the initial personnel selection process by assessing personality, which is an aspect of P-J fit. The use of SNS in personnel selection should be reserved for only after P-J fit has been firmly established (Adkins et al., 1994; Flecke, 2015; Kristof-Brown, 2000). The possibility that organizations are looking at SNS before the qualifications of P-J fit have been established can create bias and legal pitfalls for organizations.

Based on the results of surveys such as the Career Builder survey (Career Builder, 2014; Grasz, 2016), the act of establishing qualifications before examining an SNS may be what is occurring. While previous research had demonstrated that personality could be

inferred from SNS sites (Ivcevic & Ambady, 2012), the degree to which employers can accurately assess employee values and beliefs as an aspect of P-O fit remains suspect.

1.11 MEASURING PERSON-ORGANIZATION FIT THROUGH SNS

Facebook profiles are rich with information, especially if raters are allowed to look at multiple sections (timeline, about me, photos, friends) (Darbyshire, Kirk, Wall, & Kaye, 2016). Numerous studies have recently found considerable support for the notion that there is indeed valuable information to be found in an individual's SNS (Chauhan, Buckley, & Harvey, 2013; Goodmon, Smith, Ivancevich, & Lundberg, 2014; Kluemper, Davison, Cao, & Wu, 2015). While some authors have suggested that information gathered from SNS is potentially superficial (Buffardi & Campbell, 2008), in general - research has found that information collected from SNS to be rich and indicative of values and goals of people (Kluemper, Davison, Cao, & Wu, 2015).

For example, researchers have already tapped into finding the Big - Five personality traits in SNS multiple times (Chauhan, Buckley, & Harvey, 2013; Goodmon, Smith, Ivancevich, & Lundberg, 2014). To reiterate, even images have been used to identify traits such as narcissism (Chauhan, Buckley, & Harvey, 2013; Sorokowski, et al., 2015). Additionally, personality and culture are often found in connection with one another (O'Reilly et al., 1991). If the personality and values tie is accurate (Bilsky & Schwartz, 1994), then the values of an individual should also be salient in an SNS.

As the current research is exploratory in nature, two general overarching research questions will guide the current study. Each research question will be evaluated by empirically testing hypotheses.

1.12 RESEARCH QUESTION ONE: ARE VALUES ASSOCIATED WITH P-O FIT EXPRESSED THROUGH AN INDIVIDUAL'S SNS?

Before continuing to the discussion on the operation of fit on organizations, it is important to pause, and clarify where the aspect of personality falls in the value congruence –SNS –fit domain. As for connecting elements of personality and value congruence to the fit paradigm, this too has been tested and supported. After developing and testing the organizational culture profile, O'Reilly, et al. (1991) found significant positive correlations between the culture dimensions and aspects of personality. Specifically, a few of those aspects of personality were autonomy, creativity, and self-confidence. Based on this information, it is plausible that the values individuals resonate with are indeed salient on an SNS. However, it is worth noting specific aspects of the Big Five personality traits have not been empirically tested in connection with SNS. Specifically, the Big Five are known as the most well-understood personality traits and found to be valid and reliable. However, O'Reilly merely tapped generic personality traits about dimensions of the OCP.

Because values are highly related to the core actions of members in an organization, they are thus manifestations of personality (O'Reilly. Et al., 1991). For a reason above alone, it makes sense that O'Reilly et. al., (1991) was able to tap the generic personality traits in connection with dimensions of culture. From this, it becomes relatively apparent that because values and personality are correlated, it is logical to take Buffardi and Campbell's (2008) work a step further and pull individual values from SNS as well. The present research, therefore, seeks to evaluate the potential validity and

reliability with which individuals can assess dimensions of organizational culture related values through SNS.

Hypothesis 1: Individual values and behaviors related to person-organization culture fit are salient to raters viewing a person's SNS profile.

Even though individual value indicators may be perceived to be salient through an SNS website, the ability for an untrained rater to accurately assess these values will also need to be evaluated. As noted previously, the Career Builder (2014) survey detailed information regarding how employers use and apply SNS use. Additionally, even more, evidence has come about that justifies further investigation into SNS.

The Ponemon Institute in 2007 found 23% of hiring managers relied on social media to screen candidates. Of course, 23% does not seem that large in the grand scheme. Next, the Society for Human Resource Management (SHRM) found that 34% of organizations use social media to screen candidates. Thirty-four percent is not substantially larger in a four-year gap, by itself but, a linear trend does appear obvious. Finally, the body of literature on SNS has developed well enough to pose the following question:

1.13 RESEARCH QUESTION TWO: CAN INDIVIDUAL VALUES ASSOCIATED WITH P-O FIT BE ACCURATELY ASSESSED BY UNTRAINED RATERS?

As was mentioned previously, researchers have already discovered a relationship between the Big - Five personality traits and SNS multiple times (Chauhan, Buckley, & Harvey, 2013; Goodmon, Smith, Ivancevich, & Lundberg, 2014). Even images have been used to identify traits such as narcissism (Chauhan, Buckley, & Harvey, 2013;

Sorokowski, et al., 2015). Current personality assessment using the Big Five through SNS has been supported to be valid and reliable (Chang & Madera, 2012; Darbyshire, Kirk, Wall, & Kaye, 2016). Other personality traits have also been accurately identified by viewing individuals' SNS. For example, another study found a primary mechanism by which these traits are salient. The authors found the more pictures people take of themselves (known as "selfies") and post to their SNS directly predicted higher narcissism; depending on the framing (Buffardi & Campbell, 2008). Because personality and culture are often found in connection with one another (O'Reilly et al., 1991) the values of an individual should also be reliably and validly measurable through an SNS. The cyclical relationship of personality, values, and culture are intertwined in such a way that a person should also acquire some idea of a person's values – similar to SNS.

Evaluating the accuracy with which untrained raters can evaluate personal values associated with P-O fit will require evaluating both the reliability and the validity of the ratings. First, the ratings of personal values should be reliably identified by untrained raters. Second, those ratings should accurately reflect the self-identified values of the ratees. The use of untrained raters is a deliberate decision for the research. Much research has given research assistants, or participants some frame of reference training to complete a task – this is not always indicative of the workplace. This leads to hypotheses 2 and 3.

Hypothesis 2: Personal values related to P-O fit are reliably identifiable by untrained raters.

Hypothesis 3: Untrained raters identify values related to P-O fit through an SNS which are consistent with those espoused by the target.

Information found on an SNS appears to be a real and honest portrayal of an individual's personality (Boselie, 2010). These findings are supported- both empirically and through SNS user self-report. It has been empirically reviewed via Back et al. (2010) who tested the idealized virtual identity hypothesis (content on SNS reflects ideal, not true self) vs. the extended real life hypothesis (SNS content is a true representation of the self). The results, strongly supported the extended real life hypothesis – that is, because pictures, statements, and posts on an SNS are in the user's control, they are used to share their actual personality. Next, multiple self-report surveys have directly asked SNS users their thoughts on the utility of SNS (Grasz, 2015). The majority of user responses were in agreement that their SNS was merely a social outlet (Adecco, 2014). Information that is shared freely among peer groups is most likely not restricted by aspects of personality, and thus likely an aspect of real personality.

While some literature examining SNS indicates that the values individuals depict on their SNS are a true representation of their personality (Back et al., 2010) however, based on what research has found on self-monitoring and impression management, a prediction about how individuals who are in an active job search will manage their SNS is necessary (Graeff, 1996). As it is well known that humans can actively control how they act in certain situations and the true personality is represented on an SNS, special care is required for a prediction on the outcomes of impression management (Back et al., 2010; Snyder, 1979). In short, it is highly plausible that individuals may impression manage on their Facebook profiles. Schaufeli and Salanova (2007) suggest that negative work outcomes can come from impression management during selection, possibly due to

creating inappropriate impressions of fit. O'Reilly, et al. (1991) called for the measurement of impression management and how it would impact P-O fit outcomes.

There are also some elements that might deter the raters ability to rate individual's profiles effectively. For example, general predictive analyses discussed by Black, Stone, and Johnson (2015) found supporting evidence suggesting that a privacy factor plays into effect. The privacy factor is related to dependable role behavior if a hiring manager believes the applicant is hiding information on their SNS the manager's level of perceived dependability goes down. As long as research can control for this privacy variable, or in effect – impression management, then valuable information can be effectively pulled from an SNS. Just as in an interview setting, trained interviewers work to identify a holistic picture of the applicant. While some interviewers are trained, yet many are not. It is for this reason that hypothesis four is necessary as well.

Hypothesis 4a: Target self-monitoring behaviors moderate the consistency of P-O value ratings obtained through an SNS.

Hypothesis 4b: Target self-monitoring behaviors moderate the accuracy of P-O value ratings obtained through an SNS.

\

2. METHOD

The study was conducted in two phases using two different sets of participants. The first set of participants (known from here on as “Sample One”) provided their Facebook profiles to serve as target ratees and were recruited from Amazon Mechanical Turk (MTurk). The second set of participants (known from here on as “Sample Two”) provided ratings of the Facebook profiles provided by sample one participants and were recruited from an undergraduate psychology subject pool.

2.1.SAMPLE ONE TARGET RATEES

A total of 100 participants were requested through MTurk. Participants were required to be above the age of 18, willing to let undergraduate students rate their Facebook profile, and agree to “friend”(to add a friend to your network) the lab Facebook account for two weeks so that their profile could be copied. Participants that agreed to these terms were allowed to participate in a brief survey for the study. Sample one participants were assured of confidentiality multiple times throughout the process. Additionally, sample two raters were required to sign a non-disclosure form and a confidentiality agreement. It is well known that Facebook profiles and other SNS are extremely public (Chauhan, Buckley & Harvey, 2013). However, it was the researcher’s desire to err on the side of caution, as the legality of examining SNS for any purpose other than what it was designed for, is still under consideration (Kluemper, Davison, Cao, & Wu, 2015).

Sample one participants were each paid \$1 for completing the survey and “friending” the lab Facebook account. Additionally, participants who followed the exact

instructions, and remained friends with the lab Facebook account for the two week period had the chance to win one of 30, \$10 bonuses. At the conclusion of the two-week period, the researchers took the names of all individuals who followed instructions, coded them to a random number system – and then used a random number generator to generate a list of 30, \$10 bonus winners. The bonuses were then distributed through MTurk. A total of ($n = 99$) usable Facebook profiles were successfully captured. Sample one participants had a mean age of ($M = 35.13$ $SD = 10.99$) years, were 43% Male, and 70% White/Caucasian.

2.2 SAMPLE ONE MEASURES AND ADAPTATION OF THE ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE PROFILE

Sample one participants were asked to complete the OCP (O’Reilly, et al., 1991). OCP Ratings came from the full set of 54 – items. Scale directions were, “Please rate the extent to which you personally value each of these 54 characteristics in a potential workplace”. Ratings for each item were made on a 5-point Likert-type scale, ranging from (1) Not Valued to (5) Extremely Valued. Sample items include “Fitting in” and “Working long hours.” The full item list for the OCP is located in Appendix A.

The OCP was originally developed to be a forced distribution Q-Sort. With the need for employees and organizations to connect over long distances as part of an ever – changing, technologically advanced world (Adkins, et al., 1994) the OCP might not be as practical as it once was. The original adjective checklist that made up the OCP has been reduced many times over. However, each new author still starts with the original 54-items (Verquer, Beehr, & Wagner, 2003; Sarros, Gray, Densten, & Cooper, 2005). This is done because different organizations and cultures resonate with the various items on the

OCP. Repurposing the original OCP appears only to shift the dimensions and not the outcomes predicted from the fit scale (Chatman & Jehn, 1994; Chatman, et al., 2014; Chatman & O'Reilly, 2016; Vandenberg, 1999; Verquer, Beehr, & Wagner, 2003).

To examine the factor structure of the OCP using the Likert scale responses as described above, the researcher began with an exploratory factor analysis (principal axis factoring with varimax rotation) using all 54-items from the OCP. A total of 15 possible factors were identified based on eigenvalues greater than one. No clear factor structure emerged, however, due to many high cross-loading items. Item reduction techniques (principal components analysis) were attempted by removing items that either did not load onto a single factor or appeared to highly cross-load onto multiple factors. After numerous attempts, the 54-item set was reduced to less than six items in total which still suffered from high-cross loadings and an unclear solution.

The next step in the process was to use only the items which were loading on the final factor structure of the individual preferences dimensions of the OCP as identified by O'Reilly et al. (1991). This process was suggested by O'Reilly C. (e-mail correspondence, March 3, 2017). Again exploratory factor analysis (principal axis factoring with varimax rotation) was conducted on this reduced set of 33 items. Similar to the overall OCP analysis, no clear factor structure emerged due to high item cross-loadings. Of particular interest for the current study, Sarros, Gray, Densten, and Cooper (2005) were able to obtain a 28 item Likert successfully - type scale, based on a new factor structure developed from the OCP items. Again, exploratory factor analysis was conducted, but no stable solution was obtained.

Lack of a stable factor structure for work-value dimensions presents significant limitations to the interpretation of the findings from this study. The difficulty with obtaining a stable factor structure may in part be due to several factors. There were found to be low commonalities on several items as well as high-inter-correlations between factors which make model convergence particularly challenging given the small sample size (MacCallum, Widaman, Zhang, & Hong, 1999). Much larger sample sizes may be needed to obtain a stable factor structure estimate using the OCP measure. Additionally, Sarros et al. (2005) found evidence for higher-order dimensions of organizational culture values when using the OCP with a Likert-type response format. This higher order dimensionality, which was not accounted for using exploratory factor analysis, may also contribute to the difficulty of determining a stable factor structure.

To address these issues, without collecting further data, it was decided to examine each proposed dimension independently. This may offer greater power to examine each dimension by reducing the sample size to item ratio which has been suggested to impact the appropriate sample size for obtaining stable factor structure solutions (MacCallum et al. 1999). Principle components analysis and internal consistency reliability estimates were therefore generated for each of the eight dimensions previously found by the O'Reilly (1991) individual preference measure as well as for the seven Sarros et al. (2005) dimensions. Of the eight O'Reilly (1991) dimensions, six were found to have reliability levels below the desired ($\alpha = .70$) cut off, and three of them were below ($\alpha = .50$). For this reason, it was decided to use the Sarros et al. (2005) dimensions which were moderately better as described below.

The dimensions of the revised OCP by Sarros et al. (2005) are competitiveness, supportiveness, social responsibility, innovativeness, emphasis on rewards, performance orientation, and stability. Only three out of seven factors emerged with acceptable reliabilities ($\alpha > .70$), although three others were close ($\alpha > .60$) (see Table 2.1). The innovativeness dimension was not found to have sufficient reliability ($\alpha = .56$) or to be unidimensional in the current sample (see Table 2.1) and was dropped from further analyses. The remaining six dimensions were each found to be unidimensional when analyzed independently and were considered sufficiently reliable to move forward with the analyses. It is important to note that due to the limitations of this factor structure, results should be interpreted with caution as dimensions may not be orthogonal or stable.

Table 2.1 Sarros et al. (2005) Dimension Reliabilities and Item Loadings

Dimension	Item	Alpha	Item Loadings	
			1	2
Competitiveness		0.66		
	Achievement orientation		.76	
	An Emphasis on Quality		.78	
	Being Distinctive – Different From Others		.67	
	Being Competitive		.67	
Social Responsibility		0.77		
	Being Reflective		.63	
	Having a good reputation		.80	
	Being Socially Responsible		.84	
	Having a Clear Guiding Philosophy		.82	
Supportiveness		0.74		
	Being Team Oriented		.80	
	Sharing Information Freely		.71	
	Being People Oriented		.79	
	Collaboration		.72	

Table 2.1 Sarros et al. (2005) Dimension Reliabilities and Item Loadings (cont.)

Innovativeness	0.56		
Being Innovative		.86	.01
Quick to Take Advantage of Opportunities		.77	.20
Risk Taking		.33	.73
Taking Individual Responsibility		-.05	.89
Emphasis on Rewards	0.77		
Fairness		.63	
Opportunities for Professional Growth*		.76	
High Pay For Good Performance		.87	
Praise for Good Performance		.83	
Performance Orientation	0.76		
Having High Expectations for Performance		.77	
Enthusiasm for the Job		.67	
Being Results Oriented		.80	
Being Highly Organized		.83	
Stability*	0.62		
Stability*		.34	
Being Calm		.75	
Security of Employment		.70	
Low Conflict		.79	

Note * Item #3 Stability was removed from stability dimension due to low loading and poor reliability.

2.3 THE BALANCED INVENTORY OF DESIRABLE RESPONDING

A 40-item scale of socially desirable responding by Paulhus (1988) was included in determining if sample one participants were likely practicing impression management in their Facebook postings. The Balanced Inventory of Desirable Responding's (BIDR) 40-items was rated on a 7-point Likert - type scale ($\alpha = .84$) ranging from (1) *Not true to* (7) *Very True*. Sample items include "It would be hard for me to break any of my bad habits," and "I am fully in control of my own fate." A full item list for the BIDR is located in Appendix B. No revisions to the BIDR occurred.

2.4 .SAMPLE 1 PROCEDURE AND FACEBOOK PROFILE COLLECTION AND THE LAB FACEBOOK ACCOUNT

The first step in the research process was to create and standardize a Facebook account (see Appendix F). Due to Facebook's terms of service – the creation of the account required the author to use a real name. This, in turn, required the development of a new email address associated with the Facebook account. With both accounts created it was then necessary to standardize the account. To put upcoming participants at ease (i.e. assuring them they found the correct profile) two stock images were added to the profile. It was also necessary to put all security settings of the account at the highest levels so that no outside interference might affect the account. To be specific, it was not possible for the Facebook account to be found by any search engine or person while the security settings were on. The security settings were not lowered until after the official study launch day.

Sample 1 participants were given instructions (see Appendix C) and completed general demographics, the BIDR, the OCP and general questions about SNS use (Age, sex, how often they use social media, other social media use). Upon completion of the survey, a message appeared directing participants to click a link to a friend the lab Facebook account. Additional instructions to find the lab Facebook account were given in case the link did not work. Over a period of two weeks, a variety of participants added/defriended the account. A final friend list came to 101 participants, with 99 usable profiles which could be linked to survey responses. At the end of the two weeks, a final message was posted to the lab Facebook account thanking everyone for their time and informing them that the random winners for bonuses had been selected.

Due to several Hyper Text Markup Language (HTML) coding issues within the Facebook website, it is hard to capture a profile for later viewing fully. To the author's knowledge, no other previous work involving SNS has laid out the steps they used to obtain a profile for research purposes. The following method was successfully developed for the current project. The profiles captured were saved offline and broken into four individual sections (Timeline, About me, Friends, and Photos). These four sections represent the major content areas visible on a Facebook profile. The offline copies of the profiles are, however, as realistic looking as if someone was naturally browsing Facebook using a web-browser.

The method entails utilizing a web browser that fully recognizes MIME HTML language (MHTML). As of 2017, this process can be accomplished using either Mozilla Firefox, or Opera internet browsers. Once the appropriate profile is selected and opened, the researcher let the page load and scrolled down to capture as much content as desired. Next, pages were saved for offline use using the "save page as" function available in the browser menu. This process allowed for capturing the sample one profiles for viewing offline in a standardized manner. The final collection of profiles contained: 396 pages of Timelines, 396 pages of About me, 396 pages of Friends, and 396 pages of Photos. The determining factor of how much to capture was between five – ten clicks of the "Page Down" key or scrolling down until at least two months of content was captured – whichever came first. This standard was necessary because some individuals update their Facebook frequently and others have little more than a name listed. While this creates some variability in the size of each subject's profile, these differences reflect natural

differences in the rates which would be found by organizations seeking to view their profiles.

2.5 SAMPLE TWO UNTRAINED RATERS

Sample two participant raters ($n = 105$) were recruited from an undergraduate Psychology subject pool using Sona Systems and also informed by their professors of the study. Sample two had a mean age of ($M = 20$ $SD = 2.76$) years, was (66%) Male, (82%) White/Caucasian, and (10%) Black/African American. The incentive given was one hour of research credit which is required in their introductory psychology course. If participants did not require research credit, they were granted some extra credit in other courses instead.

2.6 SAMPLE TWO MEASURES

2.6.1. Organizational Culture Profile. Sample two participants also completed the OCP, with two revisions. First, sample 2 participants rated sample one participant profiles on the 54-item OCP, a total of five times. Participants were assigned a set of five profiles from sample 1 participants which they were asked to rate using the OCP items. Second, the directions for the OCP were changed to, "Below you will find 54 value statements. Please rate the degree to which this profile participant values each item." Each item was rated on a 5 – point Likert –type scale ranging from (1) *Not Valued* to (5) *Extremely Valued*. Reliability information on these ratings is described in detail in the Results section below.

2.6.2. Exploratory Items. As a mechanism to learn more about how the raters were providing their ratings, items were developed that assessed where raters were acquiring the majority of their information to support their ratings. Items such as “If you had to make your ratings using only one section, which section would you use?” and “How confident were you in your ratings?” These items were included for exploratory purposes to gain further insight into what was driving participant ratings. A full listing of these items is available in Appendix E.

2.7 SAMPLE 2 PROCEDURE

Sample two participants were scheduled for lab sessions that required 45-minutes of their time. When they came into the lab, they were asked to please thoroughly read, sign, and date the informed consent. The participants were then asked if they had any questions – if not they were directed to the rating room. The rating room itself consisted of two computer stations. Both computer stations had two flat screen monitors and one computer tower. A brief set of instructions was in front of each computer station (see Appendix D). The profiles were loaded onto each computer station before the participants arrived. For the left screen, the profiles were each opened in a separate browser window in the order in which they were to be rated. For the right screen, a Qualtrics anonymous link was opened.

To begin the study; sample two raters had to type in their ID number, given to them upon arrival, to keep track of the targets they were assigned to ratee. Participants were then given a list with the order in which they were supposed to rate each of the five profiles provided. Additionally, a timer was included on each of the five profile ratings.

This was done because previous research has found that rating and coding profiles, rarely takes more than a few minutes (Kluemper, Davison, Cao, & Wu, 2015). Additionally, hiring managers would also rarely have the time to spend more than a few minutes on a profile. Participants were not allowed more than five minutes to view and rate each profile.

To create sets of five profiles for each sample 2 participant to rate, all 99 usable profiles were first randomized, and assigned ID numbers are ranging from 1 to 99. The files were directly handled by the primary investigator only to ensure confidentiality as much as possible. Next, a random number generator was used to create groups of five profiles. For example, a random set of five numbers between 1 and 99 [e.g. 67, 83, 91, 2, 7] was generated for which each number corresponding to a particular profile. After a profile had been selected, it was removed from inclusion in future sets. This process was repeated to generate 21 sets of five sample 1 participant profiles. While some profiles were rated in multiple sets, each of the 99 profiles was rated in at least one set. Within each set of profiles, the order of rating was maintained as constant so that participants assigned to rate the same set, would each rated the same five profiles in the same order of presentation.

Each profile being rated consisted of a Timeline capture, About me capture, Friends capture, and Photos capture. Each set of five profiles was loaded onto the lab computers before participants arrived with each profile having its individual browser window. Within each browser window, a new tab was dedicated to each section of the profile (Timeline, About me, Friends, and Photos). The dual-screen setup of the computers allowed for the raters to easily browse each profile, one at a time on the left

screen, while simultaneously making their ratings on the OCP measure being presented through Qualtrics on the right screen.

Sample two participants were given minimal instructions (see Appendix D), reminded of the five-minute timing on profiles, and then asked to proceed with the study. Participants first completed a brief set of demographic questions. Next, they came to the first OCP and individual assessment questions – this was their cue to open the first profile. Participants could view and make their ratings based on all four sections (Timeline, About me, Friends, and Photos) for each profile. Although being viewed in an internet browser, the profiles were saved offline so participants could not click on any other links than what was preloaded. They repeated the OCP ratings for each of the five profiles. After completing the ratings, participants were debriefed and reminded not to contact participants they had rated or disclose any of the information they had viewed on the participant profiles.

3. RESULTS

All analyses were conducted using IBM -SPSS Version 2014. *Hypothesis 1* stated that individual values and behaviors related to person-organization culture fit are salient to raters viewing a person's SNS profile. To test this hypothesis the Sarros et al. (2005) dimensions were calculated based on the ratings provided from the sample two untrained raters. The innovation dimension was excluded due to problems with unidimensionality and reliability from sample one ratings as described above. Each dimension was examined individually using principle components analysis (Varimax rotation) and internal consistency reliability analyses in the same manner that was used with the sample one responses as described above. Each dimension was found to be unidimensional with only one eigenvalue being greater than 1. Additionally, each of the six retained Sarros et al. (2005) dimensions appears to be roughly equivalent in reliability between the sample one and sample two ratings. In general, the Sarros et al. (2005) cultural value dimensions appeared to be measurable by untrained raters through viewing Facebook profiles. As sample two was moderately able to identify the same dimensions as found by sample 1 – modest support for hypothesis one was concluded. Table 3.1 below includes the coefficient alpha reliability estimates for each dimension for both sample 1 and sample 2 participant ratings.

Hypothesis 2 stated that the ratings of values should be consistent across raters. Testing this hypothesis consisted of calculating interrater reliability and agreement among raters (McHugh, 2012).

Table 3.1 Cronbach's Alpha of Revised OCP Dimensions

	CO	SR	SU	ER	PO	ST
Sample 1	.66	.77	.74	.77	.76	.62
Sample 2	.60	.77	.72	.78	.80	.73

Note: CO = Competitiveness. SR = Social Responsibility. SU = Supportiveness. IN = Innovativeness ER = Emphasis on Rewards. PO = Performance Orientation. ST = Stability.

Measures of both inter-rater reliability ($ICC_{2,k}$), where typically ($k = 5$), and agreement (r_{wg}) were calculated for each dimension across each set of profiles to evaluate the general consistency of rater measurements. $ICC_{(2,k)}$ was calculated per Landers (2015) because each set of raters made ratings on the same of profiles and this was a sample of raters drawn from the population. Furthermore, this was necessary because any variance across raters would only be attributed to an inflated noise in the final indices. r_{wg} indices were calculated per Lebreton and Senter (2008) to determine if there was enough agreement among ratings to determine a consensus. The process involved calculating a total of 126 $ICC_{(2,k)}$ indices (21 sets of raters X six dimensions). Often these $ICC_{(2,k)}$ indices broke their theoretical bound of one to zero. On handling these extreme negative ICC indices they were promptly reset to zero as per Bartko, (1976) and Fleiss and Cohen, (1973) suggest. As ICC indices can theoretically not be negative, this was the most appropriate step.

From the six-factor solution described earlier, scale score indices were created for each sample two participants ratings of each profile, and then $ICC_{(2,k)}$ indices were calculated on the six dimension scores. The mean ICC by dimension ranged from .37 to

.69 indicating the very little agreement was found among the raters for each dimension according to benchmark standard of greater than .70 (LeBreton & Senter, 2008). These ICC (2, k) indices can be interpreted as the reliability of the collective ratings provided. Table 3.2 below includes mean levels of inter-rater reliability ICC (2, k) for each dimension. This low agreement implies a conflict between Interrater Agreement and Interrater Reliability. While, the ICC (2, k) indices were relatively low, and the r_{wg} indices were high this then implies the consensus on the agreement of dimensions is sufficient, but the ability to rank the dimensions is poor.

ICC (2, k) means were also calculated within each set of profiles averaging across dimensions. These ICC (2, k) indices ranged from .07 to .76 indicating poor inter-rater reliability in ratings. Minimal standards for sufficient agreement was found on certain rater sets (sample sets: 2, 3, 11, and 16) indicating that some sets of raters were able to demonstrate reliable rating across their set of profiles. Table 3.2 below includes the mean level of inter-rater reliability ICC (2, k) for each set of raters averaging across the six included dimensions. Due to an error in coding the profile sets and more sample two participants than were needed, some profiles were rated as part of more than one set. Each set, however, includes five distinct profiles.

Inter-rater agreement was also examined by calculating r_{wg} indices. While ICC (2, k), provides a measure of the reliability of the ratings as a whole, r_{wg} examines the level of agreement in ratings compared to a random distribution.

Table 3.2. ICC(2,k) Means by Rater Set

	ICC(2,k) Means
Set 1	.07
Set 2	.75
Set 3	.75
Set 4	.67

 Table 3.2. ICC_(2,k) Means by Rater Set (cont.)

Set 5	.40
Set 6	.57
Set 7	.23
Set 8	.48
Set 9	.62
Set 10	.49
Set 11	.76
Set 12	.13
Set 13	.68
Set 14	.67
Set 15	.78
Set 16	.71
Set 17	.58
Set 18	.29
Set 19	.34
Set 20	.36
Set 21	.31

A total of 594 r_{wg} indices were calculated for aggregated sample two agreement on the six OCP dimensions for all 99 sample one profiles. In contrast to the ICC $(2, k)$ indices calculated above, there was found to be high agreement among r_{wg} indices. See Table 3.3. below for mean r_{wg} indices and mean ICC $(2, k)$ indices across dimensions.

This low agreement between ICC $(2, k)$ and r_{wg} indices implies a conflict between interrater agreement and interrater reliability. While, the ICC $(2, k)$ indices were relatively low, and the r_{wg} indices were high this then implies the consensus on the agreement of dimensions is sufficient, but the ability to rank the dimensions is poor. This contrast may be due to the different measures provided by ICC and r_{wg} respectively. While ICC examines the reliability of the ratings across profiles, r_{wg} simply looks at the agreement on the particular value being provided compared to a random distribution. It would seem that participants may not be able to reliably differentiate between targets even if they

provide relatively consistent ratings within targets. Therefore when examining the r_{wg} indices combined with ICC indices moderate support was found for *Hypothesis 2*.

Table 3.3 Descriptives of r_{wg} and ICC_(2,k) indices

	Mean(SD) r_{wg}	% > .7	Mean(SD) ICC (2,k)	% > .7
CO	.91(.06)	100%	.37(.34)	1.1%
SU	.90(.07)	97%	.69(.32)	2.0%
SR	.88(.09)	97%	.49(.32)	1.4%
ER	.88(.09)	95%	.55(.26)	1.6%
PO	.88(.09)	96%	.52(.27)	1.5%
ST	.87(.09)	95%	.41(.34)	1.2%

Note CO = Competitiveness. SR = Social Responsibility. SU = Supportiveness. ER = Emphasis on Rewards. PO = Performance Orientation. ST = Stability

Hypothesis 3 states that the ratings provided by untrained raters will accurately represent those values that are espoused by the target individuals. Testing this hypothesis involved obtaining an estimate of the validity of the dimensions being rated. The validity of measurement was evaluated for each dimension by creating composite scores (mean of the five sample two ratings made) for each target rated on each of the six dimensions. The composite scores were then correlated with the sample one ratees' actual OCP responses to obtain a validity estimate. The six primary correlations of interest were the correlations between the sample two composite scores and the sample one ratee scores for the competitiveness, social responsibility, supportiveness, emphasis on rewards,

performance orientation, and stability dimensions. None of the primary correlations of interest were significant, and only a single significant correlation was found between sample two composite scores for performance orientation and sample one ratings of stability (see Table 3.4.). Given that there is 36 correlations present, this is likely due to random or familywise error. It was therefore concluded there was no support for *hypothesis 3*. See Table 3.4. below for correlations between sample one ratings and sample two composite scores.

Table 3.4. Correlations Between Sample 1 and Sample 2 Ratings

Sample One Ratings	Sample Two Composite Scores					
	CO	SU	SR	ER	PO	ST
Competitiveness	.03	.00	.00	.06	.08	.01
Supportiveness	-.03	-.10	-.12	.00	-.01	-.11
Social Responsibility	.07	.02	.02	.09	.11	.03
Emphasis on Rewards	.07	.01	.02	.12	.08	.01
Performance Orientation	.05	.04	.01	.01	.01	.08
Stability	.07	.14	.07	.17	.24*	.15

Note CO = Competitiveness. SR = Social Responsibility. SU = Supportiveness. ER = Emphasis on Rewards. PO = Performance Orientation. ST = Stability

Note * is significant at the 0.05 level. Correlations of Interest are marked in **Bold**

Hypothesis 4a and 4b state that the level of impression management engaged in by the ratee may moderate consistency and the accuracy of ratings made about them by raters. To test this, a series of correlations were conducted. To test hypothesis 4a, the r_{wg} indices for each profile were used as a measure of agreement or consistency in ratings. Each dimension of each profile had a corresponding r_{wg} which indicated the agreement of the sample two raters on the value dimension provided. These r_{wg} index scores for each

dimension were then correlated with BIDR scores provided from sample one participants. See Table 3.5 for the bivariate correlations with each dimension and the BIDR scale. The resulting correlations would indicate the degree to which the level of agreement on ratings of a profile varied as a function of BIDR. Hypothesis 4a was found to have no support with no correlations being significant between BIDR scores and r_{wg} indices for each dimension.

Table 3.5. Correlations Between BIDR Scores and Sample Two $-r_{wg}$ indices

	CO	SR	SU	ER	PO	ST
BIDR	.04	-.15	-.03	.01	.03	.08

Note: CO = Competitiveness. SR = Social Responsibility. SU = Supportiveness. ER = Emphasis on rewards. PO = Performance Orientation. ST = Stability

*Note: * Significant at the 0.05 level.*

Next, to examine if impression management influenced the accuracy of ratings, the composite scores computed earlier (the mean of sample two ratings provided for a given target on a given dimension) and the sample 1 scores were used to calculate difference scores. These difference scores were the absolute value of the difference between the sample one dimension score provided through self-report and the composite scores calculated from sample two participant ratings. For these difference scores, a value of 0 would indicate that the composite (average) rating of sample two participants was the same as the self-report score given. The greater the difference score, the less accurate the sample two raters were deemed to be. Table 3.6 below shows the correlations of the BIDR with difference scores for each dimension. BIDR was found to significantly correlate with difference scores for the competitiveness dimension $r(99) = .21, p < .05$.

This would indicate that there was more error for rating competitiveness for individuals that practiced higher levels of impression management. In general, this would indicate that hypothesis 4b was not well supported. These findings are shown in Table 3.6 below.

Table 3.6 Correlations Between BIDR Scores and Difference Scores

	CO	SR	SU	ER	PO	ST
BIDR	.21*	.05	.03	.11	.11	.18

Note: CO = Competitiveness. SU = Supportiveness. SR = Socially Responsible. ER = Emphasis on Rewards. PO = Performance Orientation. ST = Stability

*Note: *Significant at the 0.05 level*

4. DISCUSSION

Overall, the present study found mixed results for the included hypotheses. As the current research was primarily exploratory in nature, this was a plausible outcome. While hypothesis one was moderately supported, the lack of a stable factor structure on organizational values measured by the OCP limits the strength of conclusions that can be drawn from the findings.

Inter-rater agreement indices and interrater reliabilities received mixed support. So much so that the mixed results possibly open up more questions than answers on what exactly people are rating an SNS profile can agree on; let alone reliably rate. As ICC is a combination of interrater reliability and interrater agreement (IRR + IRA), there appears to be a strong conflict between interrater reliability and interrater agreement. While the interrater agreement shown with the r_{wg} indices is sufficiently acceptable, many of the values are in fact well above benchmark standards. However, participants appeared unable to differentiate rank order consistently as indicated by the low interrater reliability ICC (2, k) indices.

The present study also found no support that untrained raters were able to make accurate ratings. Additionally, the present study hypothesized that impression management or socially desirable responding might be affecting the consensus and accuracy of the ratings. This too was generally not well supported by the current findings. Only one dimension, competitiveness, was weakly but significantly correlated with socially desirable responding. It is possible that competitiveness could have been mistaken for a type of aggression such as inflammatory posts or derogatory information

found on the profiles. Although with this mixed finding, it is all the more important to note incongruence in ratings of profiles.

While the questions from the BIDR (Paulhaus, 1988) were not adapted or revised to address SNS specifically, based on the extended real life hypothesis, if participants are practicing socially desirable responding offline then they would likely be practicing socially desirable responding online as well.

5. IMPLICATIONS

The current research has made a valuable contribution to the literature in that there is now empirical evidence that suggests untrained raters examining an individual's SNS can not necessarily reliably or accurately determine an individual's work values as they relate to person-organization fit. These findings pose serious implications for hiring managers. For example, a hiring manager who is tempted to screen a candidate via SNS could easily put the organization and applicant in legal and ethical peril because they cannot accurately or reliably pick up on the values espoused through an SNS. Just because raters do appear to agree the value dimensions of individuals are salient, does not mean they will reliably rank them the same way from one profile to the next. An apt question should form in the reader's mind – if untrained raters cannot correctly determine the work values as a measure of “fit” through viewing an individual's SNS, then perhaps SNS should not be included in selection procedures. From these findings, it becomes apparent that other psychological mechanisms are at work when determining the “fit” as previously described by the Career Builder (2014) survey.

Perhaps, after reviewing an applicant's SNS, a hiring manager is either rejecting or accepting the applicant based on nothing more than their own like or dislike of the person. Put simply, hiring managers might be making selection decisions that are not related to the knowledge, skills, and abilities of the job – and for that matter, not related to aspects of culture fit either. These subjective biases are well known in the social psychology literature it is possible and even likely that these biases might be activated during the perusal of a SNS. While this notion has yet to be tested, the current research

lends itself to support for mechanisms other than P-O fit might be driving a desire or undesirability to hire a candidate based on the content of their SNS.

Previous research (e.g. Buffardi & Campbell, 2008; Kluemper et al., 2012) has however found the personality, which may serve as a measure of P-J fit, has been accurately and reliably rated through viewing and individual's SNS. There are many other reliable and valid ways to assess personality besides using SNS which are widely accepted and used in organizations. Aside from measuring different constructs (i.e. personality, and values), the current findings are in direct contrast with previous findings (e.g. Kluemper et al., 2012). One possible explanation is that Kluemper et al., (2012) had a sample size of over 500, as opposed to the current sample size of less than 200. Second, the authors specifically trained and recruited three participants to provide ratings on each of their given profiles. For the current research, there was no training provided, as SNS is still a fairly new concept in the workplace and as of 2016 no known SNS training has been developed for hiring managers. The specific reason to use untrained raters derived from the author's inability to find any current training programs related to assessing an individual's SNS. Therefore the undergraduate raters (sample two) are possibly on an even keel with hiring managers. While undergraduates might lack the same frame of reference as hiring managers and their motivation might be lower, the current findings suggest there may be a need to provide training for individuals who seek to use SNS to screen job candidates.

With this in mind, practical tools and processes could be developed to more beneficially incorporate an evaluation of SNS into the personnel selection process. Logically, organizations will look for the best individual for the position, so in theory,

this process could be more expensive for organizations due to training raters, but it could also save the organization thousands of dollars in the long term (Rhynes & Gerhart, 1990) through improved employee fit outcomes. After applicants have been thoroughly vetted via aspects of P-J fit (resume and application blanks), then and only then, hiring managers might find valuable information on their SNS

To have a more holistic selection procedure and possibly enhance fit, Darbyshire, Kirk, Wall, and Kaye (2016) found supporting evidence for several cues being sought from an SNS. Those cues are vocabulary, pictures, interactions, health, and status. While each of these cues is beneficial in their right, the authors work is in line with previous research supporting success in the ability to predict personality aspects from a SNS (Back et al., 2010; Buffardi & Campbell, 2010). Additionally, a decision maker could possibly, look for the following skills in an SNS (Bretz & Judge, 1994): Interpersonal skills (Sekiguchi & Huber, 2011), extroversion (Bowen Ledford & Nathan, 1991), knowledge (Adkins et al., 1994), managerial/leadership skills (Buffardi and Campbell, 2008), and maturity (Zanella. & Pais, 2014) to name a few. Each of these skills can result in positive outcomes for the organization and individual consistent with their values. As O'Reilly et al. (1991) have already related a variety of personality characteristics to work values, the above skills could still likely be seen in a SNS.

6. FUTURE DIRECTIONS

Further investigation of the role of SNS in selection is necessary because this online social media platform is here to stay. As of 2016 a good amount of the literature on the incorporation of SNS in personnel selection comes from master's theses, dissertations, and last but not least, empirical evidence (Brown & Vaughn 2011; Boselie, 2010; Schneider, 2015).

The value dimensions discovered in by both sample one and sample two (competitiveness, emphasis on rewards, stability, supportiveness) were found to be salient and moderately within the range of acceptable reliability. Because of this supporting evidence, it would be worthwhile to determine what other values are espoused on a Facebook profile and how researchers can capture that content. Additionally, steps should be taken to identify linkages between those values and specific areas of interest such as job performance. Questions such as do the values of an innovative individual found on Facebook have a direct positive impact on job performance in an innovative industry? – are eagerly waiting to be answered.

Finally, while the current research worked to control for aspects of noise on an SNS if hiring managers insist on using SNS to screen candidates, there are a few considerations to account for. To reach the goal of utilization of SNS in a valid and reliable manner, research should work to control all aspects, and noise within SNS. This noise could be advertisements, outdated information, daily updating, or uncharacteristic pictures. Authors Black, Stone, and Johnson (2015) worked to do just that. As individuals have a literal twenty-four/seven unfettered access to their SNS accounts, it is plausible for there to be an unlimited amount of updates of information at any given time. For that

reason alone it is difficult to standardize and appropriately capture SNS information, which a researcher might then compare to another individual's SNS. This is why many researchers work to narrow down their research focus, only addressing specific cues or categories.

As research gets closer to a better understanding of where exactly to target investigation efforts, the research objective becomes clearer - it is possibly about determining accuracy (Kluemper, Davison, Cao, & Wu, 2015). Indeed, when there are multiple postings on a daily or sometimes hourly basis, the need to capture real personality is crucial to make sure researchers are accurately rating/seeing actual behavior and traits.

Future studies might seek to assess why the certain groups of raters were better and why some dimensions were more readily identifiable and even more reliably rated than others. Future research could improve upon the sample, the process, and especially the measures used. If the values can only be seen by certain raters, then this structure should be investigated to make clear the path for SNS use in selection. Furthermore, it is possible that some raters are simply not as good at detecting the saliency of a lying target. The work conducted by Bond and DePaulo (2006) found that when raters were given a visual representation of a lie from the target, as opposed to a spoken lie – their accuracy was poor. In line with the hypotheses regarding impression management and what we know about SNS profile to be rich and indicative sources of information – perhaps the targets are not practicing a motivation to be believed by the raters and their Facebook friends – thus they are judged as deceptive. This might explain why the raters could not reliably rate the targets as well.

7. LIMITATIONS

While this research makes a valuable contribution to the literature, it is not without limitations. First, the use of college students for a sample two. College students are often an overused sample due to convenience. The students conducting the ratings had no training or context and limited motivation. They may therefore not be comparable to some more experienced hiring managers. While many of the studies which have previously examined the measurement of personality through SNS also used undergraduate raters some of them provided training (e.g. Kluemper et al., 2012). Second, it may be more difficult for undergraduates to evaluate work values through Facebook pages. Many of these undergraduate students had limited work experiences themselves and therefore may not be particularly familiar with how these values are expressed

Third, several legal issues surround this study. While this study did abide by the Facebook Terms of Use, it is possible those terms of service might change in the future and limit the replicability of the study. Similarly, this study captured images of all of the profiles during a two-week period. It is possible that the amount and type of content that is shared may fluctuate over time. Perhaps events such as holidays may mask some of the differences between individuals through creating a shared context for posting.

Fourth, using self-report is consistently a debated issue. With that said, the measures utilized were found to have less than desirable reliability and validity. Additionally, whom better to give information about themselves than the person themselves, they are the most motivated person to ask. As the impression management hypotheses concerning validity and reliability have shown, just because the targets did

not appear to be practicing impression management, does not mean that the raters themselves might have been having some impact on the ratings that was not controlled for.

Fifth, as personality can be accurately and reliably rated on an SNS, it is indeed curious as to why values cannot be determined. Specifically, when individuals are trained to look at specific sections instead of rating what they desire, they aren't rating values but their general sense of how much they like the person. So, as there are no current valid and reliable selection procedures using SNS and defensible by EEOC guidelines, it is strongly recommended any use of SNS should be highly documented.

It is also important to note the OCP did not transition well from a Q-Sort to a Likert -type measure. While the OCP did indeed have excellent variability across organizations as a Q-Sort, when transposed into a Likert -type measure, it appears all psychometric properties come up short. The multiple item reduction analyses should have theoretically ended with the 54-item set factor structure between five to eight dimensions. As mentioned previously, this may have been due to the nature of the items being measured and the low sample size (MacCallum et al. 1999). Additionally, the reliability of the Sarros et al. (2005) dimensions were relatively poor. In the future, perhaps other valid and reliable measures of workplace values could be used or developed to examine the measurement of workplace values better.

8. CONCLUSIONS

As personality can be accurately and reliably rated on an SNS, it is indeed curious as to why the present study did not find similar results with work values. Perhaps personality is much more salient than values on an online forum. Additionally, when individuals are trained to look at specific sections instead of rating what they desire, they might not be rating values but their general sense of how much they like the person. Further analyses will seek to determine the type of content which was driving the ratings.

From the current research and combined with previous empirical information, it becomes apparent that the use of SNS is most likely not suitable for selection procedures. A good majority of small organizations surveyed were browsing the applicant's SNS simply because they felt an acclimation of their confidence in more information about the applicant via their SNS. A question arises, does this mean small organizations are not seeking the relevant items? No, this means, there is a disconnect between research and active SNS screening managers. It is imperative we as practitioners and researchers take steps to strengthen these relationships. Finally, Employees should be hired based on the knowledge, skills, and abilities, from the current research a mistake may be occurring when we use SNS to screen out applicants based on "fit." As there are no current valid and reliable selection procedures using SNS and defensible by EEOC guidelines, any use of SNS in selection procedures should be conducted with caution and thoroughly documented to be legally defensible.

APPENDIX A
ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE PROFILE

ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE PROFILE

(O'Reilly et al., 1991)

Ratee (sample 1) Instructions: “Below you will find 54 value statements that reflect organizational values for the workplace. Please rate the degree to which you personally value each of these characteristics in a potential workplace.”

Rater (sample 2) Instructions

“Below you will find 54 work-value statements. Please rate the degree to which you believe this individual values each item. We are interested in your perception of the individual, there are no right or wrong answers.”

1 ----- 2 ----- 3 ----- 4 ----- 5

Not Valuable

Extremely Valuable

1. Flexibility	2. Adaptability
3. Stability	4. Predictability
5. Being Innovative	6. Being quick to take advantage of opportunities
7. A willingness to experiment	8. Risk Taking
9. Being Careful	10. Autonomy
11. Being Rule-Oriented	12. Being Analytical
13. Paying attention to detail	14. Being precise
15. Being Team Oriented	16. Sharing Information Freely
17. Emphasizing a single culture throughout the organization	18. Being People oriented
19. Fairness	20. Respect for the individual's right
21. Tolerance	22. Informality
23. Being easy Going	24. Being Calm
25. Being Supportive	26. Being Aggressive
27. Decisiveness	28. Action Orientation
29. Taking Initiative	30. Being Reflective
31. Achievement Orientation	32. Being Demanding
33. Taking Individual Responsibility	34. Having high expectations for performance
35. Opportunities for professional growth	36. High Pay for Good performance
37. Low Level of Conflict	38. Confronting conflict directly
39. Developing friends at work	40. Fitting in
41. Working in collaboration with others	42. Enthusiasm for the job

43. Working long hours	44. Not Being Constrained by many rules
45. An emphasis on quality	46. Being distinctively different from others
47. Having a good reputation	48. Being socially responsible
49. Being results Oriented	50. Having a clear guiding philosophy
51. Being competitive	52. Being highly organized
53. Security of Employment	54. Offers praise for good performance.

Items for Individual Preference Dimension from O'Reilley et al. (1991):

Innovation: 3R, 5, 7, 8, 9R, 11R, 53R, 52R

Attention to detail: 12, 13, 14

Outcome Orientation: 24R, 31, 32, 34, 49

Aggressiveness: 6, 26, 48R, 51

Supportiveness: 16, 25, 54, 43R

Emphasis on Rewards: 35, 36, 40

Team Orientation: 10R, 15, 41

Decisiveness: 4, 27, 37

APPENDIX B

BALANCED INVENTORY OF DESIRABLE RESPONDING

BALANCED INVENTORY OF DESIRABLE RESPONDING

(Paulhus, 1988)

Using the scale below as a guide, write a number beside each statement to indicate how much you agree with it.

1 ----- 2 ----- 3 ----- 4 ----- 5 ----- 6 ----- 7

Not True

Somewhat

Very True

True

_____	1. My first impressions of people usually turn out to be right.
_____	*2. It would be hard for me to break any of my bad habits.
_____	3. I don't care to know what other people really think of me.
_____	*4. I have not always been honest with myself
_____	5. I always know why I like things.
_____	*6. When my emotions are aroused, it biases my thinking.
_____	7. Once I've made up my mind, other people can seldom change my opinion.
_____	*8. I am not a safe driver when I exceed the speed limit.
_____	9. I am fully in control of my own fate.
_____	*10. It's hard for me to shut off a disturbing thought.
_____	11. I never regret my decisions.
_____	*12. I sometimes lose out on things because I can't make up my mind soon enough.
_____	13. The reason I vote is because my vote can make a difference
. _____	*14. My parents were not always fair when they punished me.
_____	15. I am a completely rational person
. _____	*16. I rarely appreciate criticism.
_____	17. I am very confident of my judgments.
_____	*18. I have sometimes doubted my ability as a lover.
_____	19. It's all right with me if some people happen to dislike me.
_____	*20. I don't always know the reasons why I do the things I do.
_____	*21. I sometimes tell lies if I have to.

_____	22. I never cover up my mistakes.
_____	*23. There have been occasions when I have taken advantage of someone.
_____	24. I never swear.
_____	*25. I sometimes try to get even rather than forgive and forget
. _____	26. I always obey laws, even if I'm unlikely to get caught.
_____	*27. I have said something bad about a friend behind his or her back.
_____	28. When I hear people talking privately, I avoid listening.
_____	*29. I have received too much change from a salesperson without telling him or her.
_____	30. I always declare everything at customs
. _____	*31. When I was young I sometimes stole things.
_____	32. I have never dropped litter on the street
_____	*33. I sometimes drive faster than the speed limit
_____	34. I never read sexy books or magazines.
_____	*35. I have done things that I don't tell other people about.
_____	36. I never take things that don't belong to me.
_____	*37. I have taken sick-leave from work or school even though I wasn't really sick.
_____	38. I have never damaged a library book or store merchandise without reporting it.
_____	*39. I have some pretty awful habits.
_____	40. I don't gossip about other people's business.
* Items keyed in the false (negative) direction.	

APPENDIX C

AMAZON MECHANICAL TURK PARTICIPANT INSTRUCTIONS

AMAZON MECHANICAL TURK PARTICIPANT INSTRUCTIONS

Thank you for your time in participating in this research. The data collected here helps a Master's thesis project, and the value in your participation can not be understated. At the completion of this survey you will receive a website link to a Facebook account. Upon "befriending" this Facebook account 30 random individuals will automatically be entered into a drawing to win \$10 (USD) at the completion of the study 90+ days. Those are the only things asked. Once you friend the Facebook account any information viewed on your Facebook page is subject to Facebook's Terms of Service. However, you will receive ZERO communication from the Facebook account your friend, it will merely be adding another friend. The purpose of this is so that another set of participants might rate your profiles on a measure of organizational values. Participants will simply browse your profile just as a friend would, expect they will rate what they see. For example, one of the items is "flexibility" a rater might give you a positive six if they see things relating to flexibility. You will receive a message at the study's completion stating you may "unfriend" the account. Of course, you have the option to abandon the study at any time for any reason. The best way to think of it is, a potential employer looking at your Facebook, your participation will greatly help with issues like these for the future. We thank you for your time and effort

APPENDIX D
SAMPLE TWO RATER INSTRUCTIONS

SAMPLE TWO RATER INSTRUCTIONS

- On your left screen is a Qualtrics survey account. Please enter your participant ID.
- On your right screen are five (5) Facebook pages with four (4) sections.
 - Timeline, About me, Friends, Photos.
 - Within these pages you may scroll up or down as much as you like.
 - The pages are saved offline, so you will not be able to click on anything.
- A document in front of you states whom you will be rating and the order in which they are to be rated.
- Please complete the demographics questions and you will see a large matrix table with many items. You will rate the first profile on all of these items.
 - Once you finish, pull up the next profile and move on to the next matrix table of ratings.
- You will repeat the above procedure a total of five (5) times.
Please finish out the remaining questions and see the researcher on the way out.
- If you have any questions please ask
- Thank you for your time

APPENDIX E
INDIVIDUAL ASSESMENT ITEM LIST

INDIVIDUAL ASSESMENT ITEM LIST

1. In general, this individual would be a good employee.
2. This person seems like someone I would want as a coworker.
3. I would likely hire this person to work with me.
4. This person seems professional.
5. This person seems like they would be fun to work with.
1. Overall, how confident were you in the ratings that you provided?
 - a. Strongly confident
 - b. Confident
 - c. Neither agree nor disagree
 - d. Not confident
 - e. Strongly Not Confident
1. After viewing each profile, do you believe you understood the work-values of that individual?
 - a. Yes
 - b. No
1. If you had to make your ratings using only one section, which section would you use?
 - a. About Me
 - b. Timeline
 - c. Photos
 - d. Friends

1. Please rank in order of Importance with 1 being the most important how important was each section in determining the ratings that you made?
 - a. About Me
 - b. Timeline
 - c. Photos
 - d. Friends

APPENDIX F

LAB FACEBOOK ACCOUNT

LAB FACEBOOK ACCOUNT

Andrew JJ Eyberg

Continuing Learning Health Engagement Infrastructure Appropriate Communication Responsiveness career mind others opportunities Time knowledge Risk Supervision Integrity

Research

Andrew JJ Eyberg

Update Info View Activity Log

Timeline About Friends Photos More

Andrew, where do you work? 4/9 complete

I don't work for an organization

Enter an employer

Public Skip Save

Intro

This page is strictly for academic use only. This project is directly related to a Master's Thesis.

+ Add Info About You

+ Add Featured Photos

Photos - Nothing to show

Status Photo / Video Life Event

What's on your mind?

Only Me Post

Andrew JJ Eyberg updated his cover photo. 9 mins

Research

Academic confidence Societal Public Practice Collaboration dissemination Responsibility Collegiality mentorship risk application funding literacy Self Intellectual Communication resources information management development methods knowledge

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adkins, C.L. Russell, C.J. Werbel J.D. (1994). Judgments of fit in the selection process: Role of work value congruence *Personnel Psychology*, 47, pp. 605–623
- Back, M. D., Stopfer, J. M., Vazire, S., Gaddis, S., Schmukle, S. C., Egloff, B., & Gosling, S. D. (2010). Facebook profiles reflect actual personality, not self-idealization. *Psychological science*.
- Barrick, M. R., & Mount, M. K. (1991). The big five personality dimensions and job performance: a meta-analysis. *Personnel psychology*, 44(1), 1-26.
- Bartko, J. J. (1976). On various intraclass correlation reliability coefficients. *Psychological bulletin*, 83(5), 762.
- Baumeister, R. F., & Vohs, K. D. (2003). Self-regulation and the executive function of the self. *Handbook of self and identity*, 1, 197-217.
- Bilsky, W., & Schwartz, S. H. (1994). Values and personality. *European journal of personality*, 8(3), 163-181.
- Black, S. L., Stone, D. L., & Johnson, A. F. (2015). Use of social networking websites on applicants' privacy. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, 27(2), 115-159.
- Bland v. Roberts*, 857 F. Supp. 2d 599 (E.D. Va. 2012).
- Block, J. 1978. The Q-sort method in personality assessment and psychiatric research. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Brown, V. R., & Vaughn, E. D. (2011). The writing on the (Facebook) wall: The use of social networking sites in hiring decisions. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 26(2), 219-225.
- Buffardi, L. E., & Campbell, W. K. (2008). Narcissism and social networking Websites. *Personality & Social Psychology Bulletin*, 34(10), 1303–1314
- Buhrmester, M., Kwang, T., Gosling, S. D. (2011). Amazon's Mechanical Turk: A New Source of Inexpensive, Yet High-Quality, Data. *Perspectives on Psychological Science* (6) 1-5.
- Bond Jr, C. F., & DePaulo, B. M. (2006). Accuracy of deception judgments. *Personality and social psychology Review*, 10(3), 214-234.
- Boselie, P. (2010). Strategic Human Resource Management. McGraw-Hill Higher Education

- Cable, D.M. DeRue, D. S. The convergent and discriminant validity of subjective fit perceptions *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87 (2002), pp. 875–884
- Cable, D. M., & Edwards, J. R. (2004). Complementary and supplementary fit: a theoretical and empirical integration. *Journal of applied psychology*, 89(5), 822.
- CareerBuilder. (2014, June 26). Number of Employers Passing on Applicants Due to Social Media Posts Continues to Rise, According to New CareerBuilder Survey Retrieved October 18, 2016, from <http://www.careerbuilder.com/share/aboutus/pressreleasesdetail.aspx?sd=6/26/2014>
- Chatman, J. A., & Jehn, K. A. (1991). Assessing the relationship between industry characteristics and organizational culture: How different can you be? *Academy of Management Journal*, 37, 522–553
- Darbyshire, D., Kirk, C., Wall, H. J., & Kaye, L. K. (2016). Don't judge a (face) book by its cover: Exploring judgement accuracy of others' personality on facebook. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 58, 380-387.
- Design – Yax, L., Content – Olsen. M. (n.d.). Regions and Divisions - U.S. Census Bureau. Retrieved September 30, 2016, from http://www.census.gov/econ/census/help/geography/regions_and_divisions.html
- Cable, D. M., & Edwards, J. R. (2004). Complementary and supplementary fit: a theoretical and empirical integration. *Journal of applied psychology*, 89(5), 822.
- Cable, D. M., & Judge, T. A. (1996). Person–organization fit, job choice decisions, and organizational entry. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 67(3), 294-311.
- Campion, M. A., Palmer, D. K., & Campion, J. E. (1997). A review of structure in the selection interview. *Personnel Psychology*, 50(3), 655-702.
- Cascio, W. F. (1986). *Managing human resources*. New York: McGraw-Hill
- Chang, W. & Madera, J.M. (2012). Using Social Network Sites for Selection Purposes: An Investigation of Hospitality Recruiters. *Journal of Human Resources in Hospitality & Tourism*, Vol. 11, No. 3.
- Chauhan, R. S., Buckley, M. R., & Harvey, M. G. (2013). Facebook and personnel selection: What's the big deal? *Organizational Dynamics*, 42(2), 126-134.
- Darley, J. M., & Gross, P. H. (1983). A hypothesis-confirming bias in labeling effects. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 44, 20-33.

- Davison, H. K., Maraist, C. C., Hamilton, R. H., & Bing, M. N. (2012). To screen or not to screen? Using the internet for selection decisions. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, 24(1), 1-21.
- Davison, H. K., Maraist, C., & Bing, M. N. (2011). Friend or foe? The promise and pitfalls of using social networking sites for HR decisions. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 26(2), 153-159.
- Doverspike, D., Kung, M-C., O'Connell, M.S., & Durham, A. B. (2006). *Assessing person-job fit in selection: An objective approach*. Paper presented at the 21th annual meeting of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Dallas, TX
- Dolbier, C. L., Webster, J. A., McCalister, K. T., Mallon, M. W., & Steinhardt, M. A. (2005). Reliability and validity of a single-item measure of job satisfaction. *American Journal of Health Promotion*, 19(3), 194-198.
- Edwards, J. R., & Cable, D. M. (2009). The value of value congruence. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94(3), 654.
- Elley, T. A. (2015). Walking a fine line between EEOC and corporate social responsibility: An ethical model for HR professionals when using social networking websites to screen job candidates. *Dissertation Abstracts International Section A*, 76
- Ellison, N. B. (2007). Social network sites: Definition, history, and scholarship. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 13(1), 210-230.
- Forster, J. (2006, May 1). Job recruiters dig up dirt on applicants' web pages. *Akron Beacon Journal*, p. 2
- Fleiss, J. L., & Cohen, J. (1973). The equivalence of weighted kappa and the intraclass correlation coefficient as measures of reliability. *Educational and psychological measurement*, 33(3), 613-619.
- Grasz, J. (2015). 35 Percent of Employers Less Likely to Interview Applicants They Can't Find Online, According to Annual CareerBuilder Social Media Recruitment Survey. Retrieved July 27, 2016
from <http://www.careerbuilder.com/share/aboutus/pressreleasesdetail.aspx?sd=5/14/2015&id=pr893&ed=12/31/2015>
- Graeff, T. R. (1996). Image congruence effects on product evaluations: The role of self-monitoring and public/private consumption. *Psychology & Marketing*, 13(5), 481-499.

- Goodmon, L. B., Smith, P. L., Ivancevich, D., & Lundberg, S. (2014). Actions speak louder than personality: Effects of Facebook content on personality perceptions. *North American Journal of Psychology*, 16(1), 105.
- Morgan, H. A., & Davis, F. A. (2013, March) Social Media and Employment Law Summary of Key Cases and Legal Issues. *Paul Hastings*. Retrieved February 21, 2017, from http://www.americanbar.org/content/dam/aba/events/labor_law/2013/04/aba_national_symposiumontechnologyinlaboremploymentlaw/10_socialmedia.authc_heckdam.pdf
- Hoffman, B. J., Bynum, B. H., Piccolo, R. F., & Sutton, A. W. (2011). Person-organization value congruence: How transformational leaders influence work group effectiveness. *Academy of Management Journal*, 54(4), 779-796.
- Ivcevic, Z., & Ambady, N. (2012). Personality impressions from identity claims on Facebook. *Psychology of Popular Media Culture*, 1(1), 38
- Judge, T.A., Bretz, R.D. Jr. (1992). Effects of work values on job choice decisions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 77, 261-271.
- Kluemper, D. H., Davison, H. K., Cao, X., & Wu, B. (2015). Social networking websites and personnel selection: A call for academic research. In I. Nikolaou, J. K. Oostrom, I. Nikolaou, J. K. Oostrom (Eds.), *Employee recruitment, selection, and assessment: Contemporary issues for theory and practice* (pp. 61-79). New York, NY, US: Routledge/Taylor & Francis Group.
- Kristof, A. L. (1996). Person-organization fit: An integrative review of its conceptualizations, measurement, and implications. *Personnel Psychology*, 49, 1-49.
- Kristof-Brown, A. L., Jansen, K. J., & Colbert, A. E. (2002). A policy-capturing study of the simultaneous effects of fit with jobs, groups, and organizations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(5), 985.
- Kristof-Brown, A. L., & Billsberry, J. (2012). *Organizational Fit: Key Issues and New Directions* (1). Somerset, GB: Wiley-Blackwell. Retrieved July 15, 2016 from <http://www.ebrary.com.libproxy.mst.edu>
- Kristof-Brown, A.L. (2000). Perceived Applicant Fit: Distinguishing between Recruiters' Perceptions of Person-Job and Person-Organization Fit. *Personnel Psychology*, 53, 1-42

- Kristof-Brown, A. L., & Guay, R. P. (2011). Person-environment fit. In S. Zedeck (Ed.), *American Psychological Association handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (Vol. 3, pp. 3-50). Washington DC: *American Psychological Association*.
- Kristof-Brown, A. L., Zimmerman, R. D., & Johnson, E. C. (2005). Consequences of individuals' fit at work: A meta-analysis of person-job, person-organization, person-group, and person-supervisor fit. *Personnel Psychology*, 58, 281-342
- Landers, R.N. (2015). Computing intraclass correlations (ICC) as estimates of interrater reliability in SPSS. *The Winnower* 2:e143518.81744.
- LeBreton, J. M., & Senter, J. L. (2008). Answers to 20 questions about interrater reliability and interrater agreement. *Organizational research methods*, 11(4), 815-852.
- Leroy, H., Palanski, M., E., Simmons, T. (2012) Authentic Leadership and Behavioral Integrity as Drivers of Follower Commitment and Performance. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 107, 255-264.
- MacCallum, R. C., Widaman, K. F., Zhang, S., & Hong, S. (1999). Sample size in factor analysis. *Psychological methods*, 4(1), 84.
- Marshall, T. C., Lefringhausen, K., & Ferenczi, N. (2015). The Big Five, self-esteem, and narcissism as predictors of the topics people write about in Facebook status updates. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 85, 35-40.
- McHugh, M. L. (2012). Interrater reliability: The kappa statistic. *Biochemia Medica*, 22(3), 276.
- Meglino BM, Ravlin EC, Adkins CL. (1989). A work values approach to corporate culture: A field test of the value congruence process and its relationship to individual outcomes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 74, 424-432.
- Morgeson, F. P., & Campion, M. A. (1997). Social and cognitive sources of potential inaccuracy in job analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82(5), 627-655.
- Morrison on Sep. 27, 2016 - 12:30 Comment, K. (n.d.). Job Seekers: What's on Your Social Profile Can Hurt Your Prospects (Report). Retrieved October 13, 2016, from <http://www.adweek.com/socialtimes/job-seekers-whats-on-your-social-profile-can-hurt-your-prospects-report/645398>
- Melanthiou Y., Pavlou, P. & Constantinou, E. (2015). The Use of Social Network Sites as an E-Recruitment Tool. *Journal of Transnational Management*, Vol. 20.

- Newman, K. L., & Nollen, S. D. (1996). Culture and congruence: The fit between management practices and national culture. *Journal of international business studies*, 27(4), 753-779.
- O'Reilly, C. A., Chatman, J., & Caldwell, D. F. (1991). People and organizational culture: A profile comparison approach to assessing person-organization fit. *Academy Of Management Journal*, 34(3), 487-516.
- Paulhus, D. L. (1988). Assessing self-deception and impression management in self-reports: the Balanced Inventory of Desirable Responding. (Manual available from the author).
- Ravlin E. C., Meglino B. M. (1987a). Issues in work values measurement. In Frederick WC (Ed.), *Research in corporate social performance and policy* (Vol. 9, pp. 153-183). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Ravlin, E.C., Meglino, B.M. (1987b). Effects of values on perception and decision making: A study of alternative work value measures. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 72, 666-673.
- Roulin, N., & Bangerter, A. (2013). Social networking websites in personnel selection: A signaling perspective on recruiters' and applicants' perceptions. *Journal of Personnel Psychology*, 12(3), 143-151.
- Ryan, A. M, Schmit, M., J. (1993, April). Assessing organizational fit in employee selection. Paper presented at the Eighth Annual Conference of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, San Francisco, CA.
- Rynes, S. L., & Gerhart, B. (1990). Interviewer assessments of applicant 'fit': An exploratory investigation. *Personnel Psychology*, 43(1), 13-35.
- Rozenblum, Tatyana, "Making Hiring Decisions Using Facebook: How Job Applicants are Evaluated" (2012). *Master's Theses*. Paper 4249.
- Sapleton, N. (Ed.). (2013). *Advancing research methods with new technologies*. IGI Global.
- Sarros, J. C., Gray, J., Densten, I. L., & Cooper, B. (2005). The organizational culture profile revisited and revised: An Australian perspective. *Australian Journal of Management*, 30(1), 159-182.
- Schein, E. H. (2010). *Organizational culture and leadership* (Vol. 2). John Wiley & Sons.

- Schneider, Travis J., "Social Networking Sites and Personnel Selection: An Initial Validity Assessment" (2015). *Electronic Thesis and Dissertation Repository*. Paper 3367.
<http://ir.lib.uwo.ca/etd/3367>
- Schein, E.H. (1985). *Organizational culture and leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Schaufeli, W., & Salanova, M. (2007). Work engagement. *Managing social and ethical issues in organizations*, 135, 177.
- Sekiguchi, T. & Huber, V.L. (2011). The use of person Organization fit and person-job fit information in making selection decisions. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, Vol. 116.
- Shin, S. J., & Zhou, J. (2003). Transformational leadership, conservation, and creativity: Evidence from Korea. *Academy of management Journal*, 46(6), 703-714.
- Snyder, M. (1979). Self-monitoring processes. *Advances in experimental social psychology*, 12, 85-128.
- Sorrentino, F. (2016, October 14). Why Action is needed when Employees Aren't a Culture Fit. Retrieved October 18, 2016, from <http://www.forbes.com/sites/franksorrentino/2016/10/14/why-action-is-needed-when-employees-arent-a-culture-fit/#45352a9051fa>
- Sorokowski, P., Sorokowska, A., Oleszkiewicz, A., Frackowiak, T., Huk, A., & Pisanski, K. (2015). Selfie posting behaviors are associated with narcissism among men. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 85, 123-127.
- Tepeci, M., & Bartlett, A. L. B. (2002). The hospitality industry culture profile: A measure of individual values, organizational culture, and person–organization fit as predictors of job satisfaction and behavioral intentions. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 21(2), 151-170.
- US v. Meregildo*, 883 F. Supp. 2d 523 (S.D.N.Y. 2012).
- Verquer, M. L., Beehr, T. A., & Wagner, S. H. (2003). A meta-analysis of relations between person–organization fit and work attitudes. *Journal of vocational behavior*, 63(3), 473-489.
- Verquer, M. L. (2002). Fitting in at work: A comparison of the relationships between person–organization fit and person–group fit with work attitudes. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Central Michigan University

- Werbel, J. D., & Johnson, D. J. (2001). The use of person–group fit for employment selection: A missing link in person–environment fit. *Human Resource Management, 40*(3), 227-240.
- Wheeler, A. R., Coleman Gallagher, V., Brouer, R. L., & Sablynski, C. J. (2007). When person-organization (mis) fit and (dis) satisfaction lead to turnover: The moderating role of perceived job mobility. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 22*(2), 203-219.
- Word, C. O., Zanna, M., & Cooper, J. (1974). The nonverbal mediation of self-fulfilling prophecies in interracial interaction. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 10*, 109-120.
- Zanella S. & Pais, I. (2014). *Social Recruiting*. The Adecco Global Study 2014. Adecco Group.

VITA

The author was born in Rolla Missouri on May 20, 1989. The author later went on to acquire his Associates of Arts in Psychology in May 2010. From there the author acquired his Bachelors of Science in Psychological Science at Missouri University of Science and Technology in Rolla MO in December of 2015. In partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Masters of Science in Industrial Organizational Psychology degree from Missouri University of Science and Technology this thesis is the culmination of that degree. The Author obtained his Masters of Science in Industrial Organizational Psychology from the Missouri University of Science and Technology in July 2017.