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ABSTRACT

Despite their operational and strategic importance to their firms, recruiters remain virtually invisible within management scholarship today. In this dissertation, I draw on research from a variety of theoretical perspectives and use role theory as a foundation for developing a theory intended to generate insight into the major individual, social, and contextual factors that underpin their behavior and performance. I define full life cycle recruiters as quasi-agentic brokers of resources among parties internal and external to a firm who operate at the intersection of social systems, are involved in recruiting, assessment, and onboarding processes, and adopt multiple micro roles with the primary purpose of enabling human capital resource accumulation. Key tenets of this theory are that (1) recruiter performance depends on the ability to forge and manage internal and external stakeholder relationships in such a way that cooperative and competing obligations to all stakeholders and/or stakeholder groups to which they should be attending are fulfilled, (2) recruiters’ capacities to fulfill obligations to all stakeholders and/or stakeholder groups are shaped and constrained by the nature of their micro role hierarchies, and (3) whether contextual events modify relationships among antecedents and recruiters’ micro role hierarchies or recruiters’ micro role hierarchies and performance is determined by event strength and duration. Following a pilot study, where I interviewed 10 recruiters and four supervisors, I derive several key predictions from my theory to empirically test using a sample of recruiters and supervisors from organizations across a range of industries who describe actual activities in their organizations.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

“People are not your most important asset. The right people are.”
—Jim Collins

“Recruiters are unique in that they are at the foundation of talent. They are tasked with the identification of quality talent that will help the organization succeed.”
—Pilot Study Recruiter

“Recruiters differ from many other managerial roles in that they often deal in purely intangible resources. They are charged with selling a dream, a future, possibilities, and opportunity—both to candidates and to internal customers.”
—Pilot Study Recruiter

“Recruiters are the face of organization. It is one of the very few roles other than sales that go out and spread the good word and have a direct impact on their organizations’ brands. Internally, they have to be capable of consulting up, while being the boots on ground. They also need to have great insight into their business units’ operations, much more than others in HR, for example, have.”
—Pilot Study Recruiter

Recruiters play a key role in organizations because they have the most direct influence over whether the right people are hired. Their behaviors not only influence whether the right kind of human capital is acquired, but also have dramatic implications for organizational costs in the long term. For example, consider a recruiter who recruits
three individuals for a professional occupation every month for a year. If each of these new recruits is assumed to receive salary and benefits costing the organization $80,000 and to stay for an average of 10 years, then a conservative estimate of the costs associated with the efforts of the recruiter over the course of a single year is $28.8 million alone. Yet, despite their inherent value, the sheer number of them that exist, and the monetary implications of their efforts toward recruiting top talent today, recruiters are virtually invisible in scholarly research on recruitment to date. Illustrating this, recruiter is not recognized as a separate occupation according to O*NET (onetonline.org), which is the most definitive research-based list of occupations in existence.

The problem for scholarship on recruiters is that recruiters can and, to some degree, often do, touch upon nearly every aspect of staffing. Paradoxically, however, this often results in the roles they play being overlooked in research for various reasons (e.g., they are only supporting HR staff and/or hiring managers during assessment by maintaining applicant relationships and ensuring compliance issues are met). A second, but equally important problem is that recruiters facilitate and manage relationships and information flow on behalf of numerous, diverse constituencies both internal and external to their firms. Because of this, there is a strong tendency for elements of the job to emerge that do not generalize across contexts and organizations (Ilgen & Hollenbeck, 1991).

The purpose of this dissertation is to begin to address this theoretical void in three ways. First, I develop a comprehensive definition of recruiters. I define full life cycle recruiters as quasi-agentic brokers of resources among parties internal and external to a firm who operate at the intersection of social systems, are involved in recruiting,
assessment, and onboarding processes, and adopt multiple micro roles with the primary purpose of enabling human capital resource accumulation. Second, with this definition in mind, I integrate role theory with concepts from a variety of areas of research to develop a theory of full life cycle recruiters. A theory that transcends the boundary of a single area of study is useful in this context because it enables complementary perspectives (and their associated primary constructs of focus) to be considered, it provides an avenue for broader organizational and strategic outcomes to be explored moving forward, and it sets the stage for future research to remain integrated. To this end, I explore the nature of recruiter performance in organizations, explain how key individual, social, and contextual factors shape the nature of recruiters’ roles, and examine how recruiters’ roles impact their behavior and performance. Third, I empirically test predictions derived from this theory and a pilot study I performed that examine how inter and intra-stakeholder conflict relate to recruiter performance in light of the moderating effects of recruiter micro role hierarchies. I also pose several research questions relating to how recruiter workload, the sequencing and synchronization of job requisitions and candidate flow, and the degree to which recruiters exhibit agency by reprioritizing candidates and job requisitions within their applicant tracking systems relates to inter and intra-stakeholder role conflict and recruiter performance. Thus, this dissertation offers both theoretical and practical contributions, which provide a much needed inroads to connecting research on recruiters with what occurs in practice today.

This dissertation has broad implications that both develop and challenge current scholarship on recruiters. First, I reframe recruiters as accountable to numerous internal and external stakeholders and stakeholder groups, rather than as stewards of a single
entity—the firm. This brings balance to prior scholarship on recruiters by shifting the focus more internally towards strong social forces affecting recruiters that have thus far been neglected. It also provides a way for future research to progress in a less applicant-centric direction (e.g., Chen, Hsu, & Tsai, 2013; Fisher, Ilgen, & Hoyer, 1979; Harris & Fink, 1987; Powell, 1991; Higgins & Judge, 2004; Rogers & Sincoff, 1978).

Second, rather than treating recruiters as performing jobs and attempting to identify the myriad types of knowledge, skills, abilities, and other characteristics (KSAOs) recruiters must have and the tasks they perform, I treat recruiters as enacting a compilation of roles. Specifically, I propose that the recruiter macro role exists as a hierarchy of six micro roles, that the organization of this hierarchy is influenced by recruiter individual differences, recruiter-stakeholder relationships, and context, and that differences in the organization of recruiter micro role hierarchies, in turn, influence which behaviors recruiters exhibit and their capacities to perform. Adopting this role-based perspective thus enables me to develop a theory that offers a more parsimonious and generalizable set of insights regarding the nature of the recruiter role in organizations and the key underlying factors that influence recruiter behaviors and performance across contexts and organizations. This places one of the primary mechanisms affecting human capital resource inflow in firms, which has traditionally been studied using an industrial/organizational psychology lens, within the broader purview of management theory.

Finally, by conceptualizing recruiter performance as the fulfillment of a combination of fundamentally incompatible behavioral and results-oriented obligations to various stakeholders, rather as a one or more generic recruitment outcomes (e.g.,
applicant attitudes towards job or organization, Harris & Fink, 1987; number of applicants who applied, Asch, 1990) that may or may not be aligned with internal stakeholder obligations, I offer a revision to the way prior scholarship has conceptualized recruiter performance. In so doing, I reinforce their incremental value above and beyond other recruitment methods to their organizations, identify several critical barriers to recruiter performance that to date remain unidentified, and offer theoretical and practical insights by incorporating event system theory to highlight how the characteristics of mechanisms organizations can leverage to navigate these barriers influence the extent to which this incremental value is realized.

The remainder of this dissertation proceeds as follows. In Chapter Two, I review the literature on recruitment and recruiters. In Chapter Three, I first review role theory. Then, I integrate this theory with concepts from other areas of study to develop my theory of full life cycle recruiters. In Chapter Four, I develop and empirically test hypotheses derived from my theory. I also discuss the nature and results of my pilot study, detail my research methodology, discuss my findings. Finally, Chapter Five will present overall conclusions based on my study. This chapter will include a discussion of the theoretical and practical implications, future directions, and limitations of my research.
CHAPTER 2
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

In this section, I first provide a brief overview of recruitment. Here, I define recruitment, discuss the stages involved in the recruitment process, and highlight some of the activities in which recruiters are involved. This overview, therefore, serves to offer insight into the general context within which recruiters work and is kept brief because several somewhat recent reviews of recruitment are available elsewhere (see Breaugh, 2008, 2013; Breaugh & Starke, 2000). I then provide a more detailed review of prior research performed on recruiters because these reviews offer little in the way of an exhaustive discussion regarding what is currently known about recruiters and the limitations associated with this topic area. For example, Breaugh’s (2013) recent review only devotes four paragraphs to discussing recruiter scholarship. Finally, this chapter concludes with a discussion of the limitations of scholarship on recruiters as it presently stands which is intended to motivate and explain the need for a more holistic theory of full life cycle recruiters.

Recruitment

Recruitment is defined as “encompass[ing] all organizational practices and decisions that affect either the number, or types, of individuals that are willing to apply for, or to accept, a given vacancy” (Rynes, 1991, p. 429). There are three stages of the recruitment process, during which time the primary goals of firms are to generate applicants (Stage 1), to maintain applicant status or interest (Stage 2), and to influence
job choice (Stage 3) (Barber, 1998). Recruitment and personnel selection are both components of staffing in firms. However, personnel selection is distinct from recruitment in that it focuses primarily on (a) identifying individual differences in KSAOs that predict individual outcomes important to the organization (e.g., job performance), (b) the development and use of procedures and systems that assess individuals based on their KSAOs, and (c) hiring and placement of individuals based on their assessment scores (Ployhart, Schneider, & Schmitt, 2006). Using this definition of recruitment, and with this distinction in mind, a small number of studies on this topic can be identified prior to the 1960s, most of which focused on those job and organizational characteristics that attract individuals to jobs (e.g., Bendig & Stillman, 1958; Kerr, 1943). However, the vast majority of work in this domain began to appear in the mid to late 1970s (e.g., Cohen & Bunker, 1975; Decker & Cornelius, 1979; Farr & York, 1975; Gill & Banks, 1978; Keenay & Morgan, 1979; Rogers & Sincoff, 1978; Sands, 1973; Schmitt & Coyle, 1976; Simas & McCarrey, 1979; Wanous, 1976, 1978). Since then, a virtual explosion in research in this area has ensued, and most research split off into three separate streams each with a particular focus: realistic job previews (RJPs), recruitment methods (or sources), or recruiters (Barber, 1998; Breaugh & Starke, 2000; Rynes, 1991).

Generally speaking, RJPs are defined as “the presentation by an organization of both favorable and unfavorable job-related information to job candidates” (Phillips, 1998, p. 673). Research in this area suggests that RJPs serve at least two primary functions for organizations and their applicants. First, the provision of realistic information by an organization serves a selection function (Wanous, 1992). By presenting applicants with realistic information about the job as well as its requirements prior to entry, the RJP helps
to screen out applicants who recognize that they are not qualified. Second, RJP{s serve an
expectation-altering function (Wanous, 1992). By presenting realistic information
regarding the job, the RJP reduces any unrealistic expectations candidates might have
regarding the job for which they have applied or any offers they are about to accept.
These two arguments, however, are based on a number of assumptions not the least of
which are that candidates will both receive and process the information provided
(Phillips, 1998). Several meta-analyses have been conducted on RJP{s over the course of
the past 50 years on this topic (e.g., Phillips, 1998; Premack & Wanous, 1985; see
Wanous, 1992 for a review). Despite the apparent straightforwardness and logic of RJP{s,
however, research has tended to find mixed results regarding their effectiveness
(Breaugh, 2008). Although studies do exist that appear to reinforce their value (e.g.,
Premack & Wanous, 1985), the most recent meta-analysis in this area appears to suggest
otherwise (see Phillips, 1998). This may indicate a greater need to consider contextual
and methodological factors such as the job being staffed, applicants’ ability to select out
of the process, types of samples included, and variables examined (e.g., candidates’
initial expectations) (Breaugh, 2008; Wanous, 1992).

Research on recruitment methods early on tended to focus on pre-hire and post-hire outcomes associated with different types of recruitment sources, or the ways in
which applicants are made aware of job openings. Such sources include but are not
limited to newspaper ads, employee referrals, Websites, word-of-mouth (WOM),
employment agencies, and campus recruiting (Breaugh & Starke, 2000; Zottoli &
Wanous, 2000). This early research offered two potential reasons for why recruitment
methods differed in terms of the outcomes they produced. The first reason is often
referred to as the realistic information hypothesis (Rynes, 1991). This explanation argues that certain sources are more effective because they provide more realistic information regarding what the job entails and requires. This information, in turn, endows potential applicants with the ability to make a more informed decision regarding whether to apply in the first place (Breaugh & Starke, 2000). The second hypothesis is known as the individual difference hypothesis. This explanation argues that sources differ in terms of what types of potential applicants they reach. Different types of sources reach individuals with different characteristics. These differences, in turn, affect recruitment outcomes of interest to organizations. While early research often examined multiple recruitment methods concurrently, attempting to find support for one of these explanations (e.g., Kirnan, Farley, & Geisinger, 1989; Williams, Labig, & Stone, 1993), more recent research on recruitment methods has shifted toward examining a single type of recruitment method such as Websites (e.g., Dineen, Ash, & Noe, 2002; Dineen, Ling, Ash, & DelVecchio, 2007), WOM (e.g., Van Hoye & Lievens, 2005, 2007, 2009), employee referrals (e.g., Yakubovich & Lup, 2006), or internships (Zhao & Liden, 2011).

Along with this increasingly focused emphasis on single types of recruitment methods, more rigorous theoretical perspectives have also been advanced. For example, while prior research based its predictions on general implications associated with the realistic information or individual difference hypothesis, Van Hoye and Lievens (2009) developed a recipient-source framework based on the concepts of accessibility and diagnosticity of information to develop their predictions. As another example, Dineen et al. (2002) offered a framework based on prior research regarding person-organization fit to explain why certain Websites are more likely to attract candidates than others. Finally,
Yakubovich and Lup (2006) drawn on concepts from sociology to explain the effects of referrer’s job performance on applicants’ performance throughout various stages of recruitment and selection.

In conclusion, ignoring research on recruiters for the moment, prior research on recruitment has focused primarily on RJP s and recruitment methods. Results regarding the effectiveness of RJPs remains mixed suggesting a greater need to consider contextual moderators associated with this practice. Unfortunately, research in this area has begun to dwindle since the most recent meta-analysis by Phillips (1998). Research on recruitment methods remained fairly atheoretical until it became more focused in recent times, examining the effectiveness of single types of recruitment sources (e.g., Websites, Dineen et al., 2002; WOM, Van Hoye & Lievens, 2009). Looking forward, there are several interesting new developments emerging in scholarship on recruitment. For example, research has begun to focus more critically on how recruitment processes following initial application influence job seekers (Walker et al., 2013). Research has also begun to draw on marketing concepts to examine how organizational attributes (e.g., employer trait inferences and branding) influence applicants (Lievens & Highhouse, 2003; Dineen & Allen, 2016). Finally, research has begun to take initial steps towards differentiating strategic recruitment from traditional recruitment in organizations (Phillips & Gully, 2015).

Re Recruiters

There is a long history of research on recruiter effects on recruitment outcomes. The impression one gets from reading this literature is that the term, recruiter, generally refers to a college campus recruiter as these individuals have received the most attention
in this literature. These individuals usually include HR staff, hiring managers, alumni, and so on, whose activities include visiting campuses, marketing jobs, soliciting and collecting applications, and conducting preliminary screening. However, recruiting is much broader than this, and recruiters are often involved in nearly all aspects of staffing whether they are playing a primary (e.g., performing prescreening interviews) or supportive (e.g., maintaining applicant relations and status during assessment) role. In practice, recruiters who are involved in all stages of the recruitment process from initial contact to onboarding for a particular job requisition are referred to as full life cycle recruiters, as this represents the full life cycle of the staffing or hiring process. Figure 2.1 provides a general starting point for organizing this prior research and summarizing the frequency with which relationships have been examined among variables. In what follows, I review each of these areas of research as well as the recruitment outcomes purported to be affected by recruiters, providing tables that include exhaustive lists of the constructs examined along with a small list of illustrative references. Then, I discuss the theoretical lenses through which these phenomena are generally examined. I conclude this review with a discussion of the limitations associated with this area of research. Note that I refrain from offering a definition of recruiters until the following chapter. This decision was made because it enables me to more clearly highlight (a) the limitations of scholarship on recruiters at the present time, and (b) why a more holistic theory of recruiters is necessary for the advancement of research in this area in the future.

Recruiter characteristics. There are a variety of recruiter characteristics that prior research has examined. An exhaustive list of these characteristics is outlined in Table 2.1 along with a small list of illustrative references. As depicted in this table, there
are seven categories of recruiter characteristics that have been examined in prior research. This category of variables can be seen in item 3 in Figure 2.1. As shown in this figure, these variables are most frequently examined in terms of how they directly predict recruitment outcomes (e.g., applicant intentions, applicant reactions; solid line between items 3 and 5). However, they are also studied in terms of how they predict recruiter behaviors (e.g., recruiter judgments and decisions regarding applicants; dotted line between items 3 and 4), albeit to a less extensive degree.

Recruiter attitudes and beliefs. Prior research has examined a small number of recruiters’ attitudes and beliefs. For example, Oostrom, van der Linden, Born, and van der Molen (2013) investigated recruiters’ attitudes towards technology and computer self-efficacy beliefs. They found that these two constructs predicted recruiters’ perceptions of ease of using technology as well as its value. These perceptions, in turn, were related to their adoption of new technology in recruitment. This study represents an important shift in the way recruiter research has traditionally been examined given the infusion of new technology in organizations today and is likely to pave the way for a new direction in recruiter research. In addition, Boswell, Moynihan, Roehling, and Cavanaugh (2001) investigated the degree to which consensus exists in recruiter beliefs regarding their responsibilities to their organizations given their employer-employee relationships. While not linking this construct to a particular recruitment outcome, this study is innovative in that it recognizes the potential influence of the employer-employee relationship in guiding recruiter behavior (also see Campion, 2014).

Recruiter demographic variables. Prior research on recruiter characteristics has investigated how a host of demographic variables of recruiters relate to their behavior as
well as various recruitment outcomes. For example, age has been examined as it relates to applicant impressions of recruiters (Rogers & Sinoff, 1978) as well as applicant perceptions of organizational attractiveness and likelihood of accepting job offers (Taylor & Bergmann, 1987). Findings from these studies suggest that recruiter age does affect applicant impressions and perceptions of organizational attractiveness. However, it does not impact their likelihood of accepting job offers.

Recruiter degree or education has also been examined as it relates to organizational attractiveness and likelihood of accepting a job offer (Taylor & Bergmann, 1987). Interestingly, a recruiter’s level of education was found to predict applicants’ likelihood of accepting a job offer. Research has also investigated the impact of recruiter experience in that job (Connerley & Rynes, 1997; Taylor & Bergmann, 1987). Findings suggest that this characteristic positively relates to applicant perceptions of recruiter effectiveness.

Another demographic variable of interest in prior research has been recruiter functional area (e.g., Connerley & Rynes, 1997; Fisher, Ilgen, & Hoyer, 1979). This research has provided mixed findings. For example, Connerley and Rynes (1997) found that line recruiters and staff recruiters did not differ in their effectiveness from the applicant’s perspective. On the other hand, Fisher et al. (1979) found that sources such as job incumbents and friends were perceived as more trustworthy than interviewers.

Gender has also been widely examined in prior research on recruiters (e.g., Giles & Field, 1982; Graves & Powell, 1995; Taylor & Bergmann, 1987). Findings from these studies indicated that female recruiters perceived male applicants to be more similar to themselves and more qualified, but male recruiters perceptions did not differ by applicant
gender. Further, recruiter gender did not affect applicant likelihood of accepting a job offer if the applicant was male, but females were more likely to accept a job offer if the recruiter was male. It is important to note, however, that this research is quite dated and the nature of the workforce has changed quite substantially in terms of gender composition, which may impact whether these results would still be found today.

Job title, as a demographic characteristic, has also been explored in recruiter research (e.g., Fisher et al., 1979; Keenan, 1976; Rogers & Sincoff, 1978). This variable has been defined in multiple ways. For example, comparisons have been made between those stating their title (i.e., recruiting director) as opposed to not (Rogers & Sincoff, 1978). Comparisons have also been made between personnel and non-personnel managers (Keenan, 1976). Findings from this research suggest that personnel (as opposed to non-personnel) managers emphasize different qualifications when evaluating applicants. Similarly, applicants differ in terms of their impressions of recruiters depending on their job title.

Organizational membership has also been studied (e.g., Carless & Wintle, 2007; Johnson, Wilding, & Robson, 2014). For example, Carless and Wintle (2007) examined whether internal HR personnel differed from recruiters from an external recruitment company in terms of their ability to attract applicants to organizations. However, they found that no significant differences existed. Importantly, Johnson et al.’s (2014) work represents a noteworthy departure from traditional research orientations in past recruiter research in that it examines line managers’ perceptions of external recruitment firms. Thus, it not only highlights line managers as an important component to the recruitment
process (as well as the fact that recruitment outsourcing occurs), but also indicates that they can be considered internal customers.

Recruiter race has also been examined in prior research (e.g., Taylor & Bergmann, 1987). Yet, this research suggests that recruiter race affects neither applicant perceptions of organizational attractiveness nor their likelihood of accepting job offers. It should be noted, however, that the relatively recent emphasis of firms on generating racioethnic diversity through recruitment as well as recent research finding significant effects for diversity-oriented recruitment messages on applicants (e.g., Avery, Hernandez, & Hebl, 2004) suggest that this characteristic may deserve greater attention in future research.

Recruiter tenure has also been studied (e.g., Taylor & Bergman, 1987); however, this characteristic also has not been found to impact recruitment outcomes. In addition, recruiter training has been examined (e.g., Connerley, 1997; Connerley & Rynes, 1997; Stevens, 1998; Taylor & Bergmann, 1987). Findings from this research have shown this variable to exert little impact in affecting applicant perceptions of the organizations and intentions to pursue jobs. However, more proximal variables on the part of the recruiter, such as recruiters’ perceptions of their own effectiveness as well as the manner in which they conduct interviews, appear to be influenced by training (see Connerley, 1997; Stevens, 1998). Finally, alumni status and volunteer status have both been examined in prior research (Connerley & Rynes, 1997); however, neither characteristic was shown to influence applicant perceptions of recruiter effectiveness.

**Recruiter knowledge and skills.** Researchers have also investigated recruiter knowledge and/or skills as types of recruiter characteristics. For instance, researchers
have examined the impact of recruiters’ knowledge of the job (e.g., Powell, 1991; Rynes & Miller, 1983). Findings from these studies suggest that recruiter knowledge of the job (communicated to the applicant) influences applicants’ inferences regarding the organization, their felt attractiveness towards the job, their perceptions of how likely they were to receive a job offer, and the likelihood that they would accept an offer. In addition, research has also examined recruiter knowledge of the organization and its jobs (Rynes & Boudreau, 1986). This study is somewhat unique in that it was concerned with whether this characteristic was considered important by firms as an attribute they use to select recruiters. This study also examined interpersonal skills as a recruiter characteristic. Both of these characteristics were found to be important to firms. Research on recruiters has also examined recruiters’ listening skills, finding that this characteristic (among others) contributed to applicants’ perceptions of recruiter warmth and thoughtfulness (Harn & Thornton, 1985). Finally, the importance of recruiters’ presentation skills have been examined (Rogers & Sincoff, 1978). This research suggests that the fluency of a recruiter’s presentation may only selectively influence applicant impressions of their effectiveness as an interviewer.

**Recruiter personality and dispositions.** Research has also devoted some attention to personality and dispositions. For example, recruiter neuroticism and openness have been investigated with respect to how these factors relate to perceptions of new technology and ease of its use (Oostrom et al., 2013). However, only neuroticism was found to be significantly and negatively related to perceived ease of use. Other studies on dispositional factors have examined the effects of recruiters’ recruitment/selling and screening orientations (e.g., Marr & Cable, 2014; Stevens, 1998). Results from these
studies suggest behavioral differences exist depending on the recruiter’s orientation. For example, Stevens (1998) found that recruiters with recruitment orientations, which refers to a general tendency toward attracting rather than screening applicants, tended to speak 50% more often, volunteer twice as much information, and ask half as many questions than those with a screening orientation. In addition, Marr and Cable (2014) found that recruiters with a selling orientation tended to make less accurate judgments regarding applicants’ core self-evaluations. These less accurate judgments were then linked to interviews with less predictive validity.

Studies have also examined a number of other recruiter characteristics that, while not subsumed within the Big Five or necessarily personality traits or dispositions, nonetheless represent latent characteristics of recruiters that are measured through factor analysis of survey items describing behaviors recruiters exhibit on the job. Examples of such recruiter characteristics include aggressiveness, competence, friendliness, informativeness, personableness, thoughtfulness, trustworthiness, and warmth. Studies investigating these characteristics, in large part, tend to examine their effects on outcomes such as applicant perceptions of job attributes, applicant regard for the job and company being considered, and applicant likelihood of job acceptance (e.g., Connerley & Rynes, 1997; Goltz & Giannantonio, 1995; Harris & Fink, 1987; Fisher et al., 1979; Harn & Thornton, 1985; Rynes & Miller, 1983; Turban, Forret, & Hendrickson, 1998). Findings from these studies are fairly mixed. Within studies, some recruiter characteristics predict applicant outcomes, while others do not (e.g., recruiter personableness versus recruiter competence; Harris & Fink, 1987). In other cases, recruiter characteristics predict some applicant outcomes and not others (e.g., recruiter competence and applicant regard for
company versus regard for job or expectancy of a job offer; Harris & Fink, 1987). In terms of between-study results, characteristics often predict applicant outcomes in some studies and do not in others (e.g., recruiter competence, cf., Harris & Fink, 1987; Turban et al., 1998). Still, other outlying studies exist that have either investigated these recruiter characteristics as outcomes (e.g., DeBell, Montgomery, McCarthy, & Lanthier, 1998), or merely included them as part of a broad-scale survey to better understand practice (e.g., Rynes & Boudreau, 1986).

**Recruiter states.** Prior research has also investigated recruiter states, which refer to noncognitive, malleable individual differences. Research in this area has tended to focus on the effects of recruiter mood and affect on various outcomes (e.g., Chen & Lin, 2014; Chen, Hsu, & Tsai, 2013; Powell, 1991; Rynes & Miller, 1983). Most of this research focuses on these characteristics as an input and suggests that recruiter affect and mood influences applicants’ perceptions of the recruiters’ competence and informativeness as well as their perceptions of the job itself, the likelihood of receiving a job offer, and the likelihood of accepting a job offer. However, Chen and Lin (2014) focused on the extent to which applicant impression management tactics predicted recruiters’ moods and, in turn, their perceptions of applicant fit.

**Recruiter job performance or value.** Recruiter job performance or value has also been examined, albeit to a small degree relative to other recruiter characteristics. Note that, in this research, recruiter job performance has been examined in two ways—as a recruiter characteristic (i.e., when used as an antecedent or predictor) and as an individual-level recruitment outcome. The latter use of this variable focuses on recruiter productivity, which is subsumed within the recruitment outcome of applicant quantity.
below. Research investigating recruiter job performance as a characteristic has focused on three primary constructs: recruiter past productivity or performance (e.g., Asch, 1990; Carroll, Lee, & Rao, 1986), time spent by the recruiter performing job-related activities (Yakubovich & Lup, 2006), and recruiter wages as a proxy to their value to the firm (Fernandez, Castilla, & Moore, 2000). Research by Asch (1990) and Carroll et al. (1986) examined recruiter behavior in military contexts, attempting to understand their productivity over time as predicted by their previous performance given contextual factors such as incentive or reward systems set in place. Findings from these studies showed that recruiters with superior prior performance tended to not be influenced by incentives in the same way as recruiters with lower performance, suggesting a pattern of diminishing returns. Research using time spent by recruiters performing job-related activities and recruiter wages as proxies for recruiter performance/value were conducted in banking contexts and focused on the use of employee referrals. These studies indicated that those referred by “higher performers” tended to realize an advantage across the recruitment process when compared to their peers, and, surprisingly, that referrals by incumbents with higher wages (and thus greater value to the firm) were less likely to move on to the next stage of the recruitment process.

Recruiter behaviors. Although the majority of prior research on recruiters has focused on recruiter characteristics, a fair amount of research has also been conducted on recruiter behaviors. These recruiter behaviors are depicted in Table 2.2 along with a small list of illustrative references. Rather than categorizing behaviors purely based on their relatedness, this table is first arranged by recruitment stage (Barber, 1998), and then by theme. This method was chosen in order to illustrate more clearly when behaviors have
been examined as well as what research gaps remain. For example, while evaluative behaviors exhibited by recruiters may have been studied previously, it may be the case that research on these behaviors has remained focused on these behaviors only as they occur during the screening (or maintaining applicant status; Barber, 1998) stage, neglecting that recruiters likely also make evaluations during pre-recruitment and stage one of recruitment. Thus, this table contains four recruitment stages: pre-recruitment activities, stage one (recruiting activities), stage two (screening activities), and stage three (negotiating activities). Recruiter behaviors are shown as item 4 in Figure 2.1. They have been examined primarily in terms of how they relate to recruitment outcomes at the individual level (e.g., applicant reactions; dashed line between items 4 and 5), but also to a much lesser degree in terms of how they relate to unit-level recruitment outcomes (e.g., applicant quality for firms; dotted line between items 4 and 2). In addition, as noted above, recruiter characteristics have been examined as an antecedent to recruiter behavior (e.g., race; dotted line between items 3 and 4). Finally, omnibus (e.g., labor supply; dotted line between items 1 and 4) and discrete context variables (e.g., interview focus; dotted line between items 6 and 4) have been examined in terms of how they relate to recruiter behavior.

**Pre-recruitment.** The pre-recruitment activities stage refers to a set of ongoing activities that underlie the recruitment process as a whole, where recruiters develop resources in an attempt to enhance their effectiveness during other stages. In this stage, prior research has investigated recruiters’ use of social media to develop weak ties with potential job candidates and organizations (Ollington et al., 2013). In this study, these researchers found that recruiters believed that occupying a connector role, or a position
that bridges two previously disconnected entities or individuals, with numerous weak ties to potential candidates and clients enabled them to act as a bridge linking job seekers to job openings.

**Stage one.** Stage one refers to a set of activities wherein an applicant pool is developed from the applicant general population. Here, recruiters are primarily interested in generating a relatively large pool of diverse and highly qualified candidates for assessment from which a small subset will be hired (Barber, 1998). Within stage one, only two categories of recruiter behaviors exist—acquiring information and selling/persuading. In terms of acquiring information, prior research has sought to understand the inferences recruiters draw regarding applicant individual differences such as verbal ability and personality (e.g., from resumes and applicant behavior) (Brown & Campion, 1994; Cole, Feild, Giles & Harris, 2009; Mast, Bangerter, Bulliard, & Aerni, 2011). These examinations often either focus purely on the accuracy of such judgments or whether they predicted recruiters’ judgments of applicant employability. Findings generally suggest that recruiters are fairly accurate in their ability to infer applicant individual differences. Further, these inferences do predict judgments of employability. The second recruiter behavior in this category is the strengthening of social network ties. In conducting interviews with recruitment specialists, Ollington et al. (2013) found that recruiters viewed this behavior as critical to their ability to serve in the connector role, and thus match job seekers to clients during this stage.

The second category within stage one is selling and persuading behaviors. Studies in this area have investigated counselling behaviors of recruiters, informing and selling behaviors, and the amount of time recruiters spend recruiting applicants (e.g., Harn &
Thornton, 1985; Phillips & Dipboye, 1989; Turban et al., 1998). Findings from these studies suggest that recruiter counselling behaviors are positively associated with applicant perceptions of recruiter warmth and thoughtfulness, that informing and selling behaviors are positively associated with applicant perceptions of job and organizational attributes (e.g., work environment, earnings opportunities, challenging work) as well as attraction to the organization overall, and that recruiter biases do not affect the amount of time they allocate to recruiting applicants during interviews.

Stage two. Stage two refers to the phase wherein the pool of candidates has been identified and the primary focus for recruiters becomes to maintain their interest as they are assessed, support HR staff as they assess candidates, and often, to play a role themselves in assessing candidates (Barber, 1998). Within stage two, four categories of recruiter behaviors were identified: acquiring information, communicating information, evaluating, and decision-making. Prior research on recruiter acquisition of information tends to focus on the amount of time recruiters devote to fielding questions during interviews as well as the amount of time recruiters devote to gathering information about applicants during interviews (e.g., Macan & Dipboye, 1990; Phillips & Dipboye, 1989). This research is based on the view that recruiters suffer from self-fulfilling prophecy bias during interviews they conduct (Dipboye, 1982). Findings from these studies, however, were not supportive of the general model.

Research on recruiter behaviors geared towards communicating information to applicants has generally focused on the amount of time recruiters allocate to communicating information about the organization and jobs to applicants (e.g., Phillips & Dipboye, 1989), nonverbal cues exhibited by recruiters throughout this process (e.g.,
Liden, Martin, & Parsons, 1993), the informing and selling behaviors they invoke (e.g., Turban et al., 1998), and the consequences of delayed responses throughout this process (e.g., Rynes et al., 1991). Key findings from this research indicate that applicants respond negatively to delayed responses and that recruiter behavior during interviews influences applicant behavior. It should be noted that a critical behavior missing from this category is the communication of realistic information regarding the organization and/or job. As evident from the review above, there is an entire literature on RJP. Yet, this literature has remained fairly distinct from research on recruiters despite the fact that they are generally the individuals charged with providing this preview (depending on the nature of the preview).

Research on recruiter evaluative behaviors has also received extensive attention. This research can be reduced to five principal themes including recruiter evaluations of specific constructs as they relate to applicants (e.g., core self-evaluations; Marr & Cable, 2014; impression management tactics; Mast et al., 2011), evaluations of employability (e.g., Adkins, Russell, & Werbel, 1994), evaluations of applicant information (e.g., GPA; McKinney et al., 2003), evaluation of applicant resumes (e.g., Barr & Mcneilly, 2002), and, finally, evaluations and/or judgments of applicant fit (e.g., Adkins et al., 1994; Bretz, Rynes, & Gerhart, 1993; Cable & Judge, 1997; Rynes & Gerhart, 1990). Findings from studies on this topic suggest that fit-based information is more useful later in personnel selection processes when job offer decisions are made, that focusing on selling the organization/job to applicants may, in fact, reduce the validity of interviews conducted by recruiters, and that great variability exists in how recruiters leverage information on applicants to make staffing decisions.
The final category of recruiter behavior within this stage is decision-making. In this stage, two types of recruiter behaviors have been examined in prior research—recruiter decisions regarding hiring recommendations (e.g., Higgins & Judge, 2004) and decision-making policies invoked by recruiters, which, in turn, guide how applicant information is utilized (e.g., Brown & Campion, 1994; McKinney et al., 2003). Findings in this research suggest that applicant ingratiation tactics positively impact recruiter hiring recommendations, that recruiters can draw accurate inferences regarding applicant abilities and other attributes from resumes and biodata, and that recruiters sometimes select against applicants with high GPAs (although the opposite has also been found (Brown & Campion, 1994).

**Stage three.** Stage three refers to the stage where candidates are extended offers and recruiters are charged with helping to influence candidate choices to accept (Barber, 1998). Within stage three, only two categories of behavior exist—communicating information and negotiation of employment contracts. Research by Rynes et al. (1991) focuses explicitly on recruiter delays during the third stage of recruitment, which impedes the communication of information among parties. This research showed that male applicants with high GPAs tended to be most negatively affected by such delays. Prior research has also investigated how recruiter and applicant power during negotiation impact matching processes and the quality of agreements realized (Sondak & Bazerman, 1989, 1991).

**Context.** Context factors refer to situational variables that influence relationships. As Johns (2006) explains, context wears many faces and exerts numerous types of effects. It can thus be defined and examined in a number of ways including: context as
salience of situational features, context as situational strength, context as a cross-level effect, context as a bundle of situational stimuli, context as a situational event, context as a shaper of meaning, and context as a constant. In addition, contextual variables can be categorized in a number of ways. For example, Johns (2006) proposes that there are two general dimensions to context—omnibus and discrete. Omnibus context refers to “an entity that comprises many features or particulars” (Johns, 2006, p. 391). Examples of omnibus contextual factors might include The Great Recession as an event (Kim & Ployhart, 2014) or the occupation or firm type examined (e.g., professional service firm, Malos & Campion, 1995). Discrete context, on the other hand, refers to “specific situational variables that influence behavior directly or moderate relationships between variables” (Johns, 2006, p. 393). Discrete context factors can be further subcategorized according to whether they represent dimensions of the task, social, or physical situation. Examples of such discrete context variables might include job autonomy (task), social density (social), or medium through which individuals communicate (physical). Finally, contextual factors can be categorized according to the level of theory at which they exist. While omnibus context factors refer to those at higher levels of theory, which might, in turn, have direct or moderating effects on relationships between variables at lower levels (Kozlowski & Klein, 2000), discrete contextual factors are not limited to the individual level, especially when constructs are considered isomorphic. For example, Johns (2006) argues that the discrete task context variable, uncertainty, can occur at more macro levels (i.e., environmental uncertainty) and at lower, more micro levels (i.e., role ambiguity).

To date, research on recruiters has devoted relatively little attention to contextual factors that influence recruiter behavior. Despite this oversight, I draw on the brief
summary above of Johns’ (2006) work on context to identify which contextual factors prior research has, in fact, explored that exhibit the potential to impact recruiter behavior and/or more downstream recruitment outcomes of recruiter behavior. Those identified in the following review can be seen in Table 2.3. In addition, their influence on various relationships can be seen in Figure 2.1, which also provides a general synopsis of the relative frequency with which they have been examined. I begin by identifying the omnibus contextual factors that exist at higher levels of theory that have been examined in prior research. These include labor supply for firms, organizational reputation, and firms’ use of quality-based compensation policies for recruiters (Dineen & Williamson, 2012). Research demonstrated that these factors all predicted the degree to which recruiters within firms stress the use of screening-oriented recruitment messages. However, it should be noted that these omnibus context factors have received very little attention as shown by the dotted line connecting items 1 and 4.

Next, I identify the discrete contextual factors examined in prior research. These factors have received more attention in the recruitment literature as moderators of relationships between recruiter characteristics and recruiter behaviors (dotted line from item 6 to dotted line between items 3 and 4 in Figure 2.1), and, more frequently, as predictors of recruiter behavior (dashed line between items 6 and 4 in Figure 2.1), moderators of relationships between recruiter characteristics and recruitment outcomes (solid line from item 6 to solid line between items 3 and 5), and moderators of relationships between recruiter behaviors and recruitment outcomes (dashed line from item 6 to dashed line between items 4 and 5). These discrete contextual factors are positioned in one of three theory-based categories: task, social, and physical. In terms of
task factors, prior research has examined the timing of incentives/compensation events at the individual level (Asch, 1990), unit-level interview focus (e.g., Barber et al., 1994; Turban & Dougherty, 1992), unit-level interview content (Barber et al., 1994), unit-level interview structure (Turban & Dougherty, 1992), unit-level employment offer longevity and quality of alternatives (Sondak & Bazerman, 1991), unit-level organizational recruitment support (e.g., Connerley & Rynes, 1997; Rynes & Boudreau, 1986), and individual-level firm investment in employee social capital (Fernandez et al., 2000). A number of important findings have arisen from this research. For example, one study showed that constraints on the longevity of employment offers and the quality of alternatives recruiters during employment negotiations influence recruiter characteristics (i.e., recruiter power), recruiter behavior, and recruitment outcomes (Sondak & Bazerman, 1991). This study is noteworthy as it highlights the value of considering a number of relatively unexplored contextual factors impacted by HR, line managers, and other stakeholders within firms. In another study, it was demonstrated that recruitment-oriented interviews were more capable of communicating information to applicants, particularly when they were low in cognitive ability (Barber et al., 1994). Finally, this research also provides evidence of fluctuations in recruiter effort, despite the use of incentive systems designed to maximize recruiter productivity (Asch, 1990).

Research on task factors has also examined how recruiters contend with information uncertainty while performing their jobs by focusing on how information regarding applicant characteristics conveyed through recruiter-applicant exchanges influences recruiter behavior (e.g., evaluations, recommendations to hire). Examples of such characteristics include work experience, gender, articulateness, appearance,
qualifications, and applicant social capital (Bretz et al., 1993; Graves & Powell, 1988; Nguyen, Allen, & Godkin, 2006). This research has generally shown that recruiters’ evaluations of fit are often only based on generally desirable characteristics (e.g., articulateness), rather than fit with organizational values, strategy, or culture (Bretz et al., 1993). Finally, research on task factors has also investigated how recruiter social networks, as individual-level resources, influence perceptions of their effectiveness (Ollington et al., 2013). This research is important as it highlights that recruiters not only consider their network positions to be valuable resources, but also that recruiters operate at the boundary of social networks (or systems).

In terms of social factors, prior research on recruiters has examined only two variables. These variables include applicant similarity to recruiters at the dyadic level (e.g., Graves & Powell, 1995) and applicant impression management tactics at the individual level (e.g., Chen & Lin, 2014; Higgins & Judge, 2004). These studies offer a number of insights. For example, they suggest that ingratiation behavior is likely to benefit applicants in that it improves recruiters’ perceptions of applicant fit and also exhibits a positive effect on recruiter hiring recommendations.

Finally, while there is no research examining how recruiters use technology to reach potential applicants, a number of studies have been published on organizations’ use of the World Wide Web to recruit applicants. Further, the definition of recruiters I propose below allows for those charged with developing and updating the organization’s website to be considered recruiters. Consequently, the medium through which organizational representatives (i.e., recruiters) communicate with applicants should also
be included as a significant contextual factor affecting recruiter behavior as well as the relationship between recruiter behavior and recruitment outcomes.

**Recruitment outcomes.** Table 2.4 displays the various recruitment outcomes examined in prior research on recruiters. These outcomes are, with only a few exceptions, individual level recruitment outcomes and have been organized into seven categories: applicant quantity, applicant quality, applicant intentions, applicant reactions, internal customer reactions (e.g., line managers), and negotiation. Beginning with applicant quantity, prior research has examined outcomes such as enlistments and/or contracts signed (Asch, 1990; Carroll et al., 1986), invitations for a second interview (Adkins et al., 1994), job offer acceptance (e.g., Fisher et al., 1979; Powell, 1984; Taylor & Bergmann, 1987), job offers extended (e.g., Cable & Judge, 1997; Fernandez & Weinberg, 1997; Fernandez et al., 2000), progression through assessment hurdles (e.g., Bagues & Perez-Villadoniga, 2012; Fernandez & Weinberg, 1997; Yakubovich & Lup, 2006), persistence in job pursuit following the initial interview (Barber et al., 1994), self-selection across recruitment stages (Yakubovich & Lup, 2006), subjective selection and/or manager hiring decisions (Yakubovich & Lup, 2006), survival rate (Fernandez et al., 2000), and economic returns (Fernandez et al., 2000).

Prior research on recruiters has also examined recruitment outcomes related to applicant quality. Recruitment outcomes subsumed within this category have been investigated at the unit, dyadic, and individual level. At the unit level, Dineen and Williamson (2012) examined applicant pool quality. At the dyadic level, Fernandez et al. (2000) investigated referrer-referral homophily. Finally, at the individual level, Marr and Cable (2014) investigated applicant success as a newcomer, which they defined in terms
of subsequent citizenship behavior, job performance, and fit. Their findings suggested that interviewers who devote too much of their attention to “selling” the organization and its jobs may be reducing the predictive validity of the interviews they use and that screening and recruitment oriented recruitment messages are developed by recruiters based not only on their consideration of the labor market, but also on the value of their firm’s recruiting reputation.

Research on recruiters has also examined applicant intentions as an outcome at the individual level. Examples of such outcomes include probability of accepting a job offer (e.g., Alderfer & McCord, 1970; Taylor & Bergmann, 1987), tenure intentions (e.g., Taylor & Bergmann, 1987), and willingness to accept a job offer (i.e., acceptance intentions) (e.g., Harn & Thornton, 1985; Harris & Fink, 1987; Liden & Parsons, 1986). Similar to results found in prior meta-analytic studies (Chapman, Uggerslev, Carroll, Piasentin, & Jones, 2005), findings from these studies suggest that, with some exceptions (e.g., tenure intentions, Taylor & Bergmann, 1987), applicants’ intentions to pursue employment within firms are impacted by recruiter characteristics and behaviors.

Applicant reactions at the individual level have also been investigated in prior research on recruiters. Examples of these include communication satisfaction (Ralston, 1993), information acquisition (e.g., Barber et al., 1994; Fernandez et al., 2000), inferences regarding the organization (e.g., Goltz & Giannantonio, 1995; Rynes et al., 1991), organizational attraction (e.g., Carless & Wintle, 2007; Chen et al., 2013; Stevens, 1998; Taylor & Bergmann, 1987; Turban & Dougherty, 1992; Walker et al., 2013), perceived desirability of the job (Rynes & Miller, 1983), perceived job attributes (Harris & Fink, 1987), perceptions of recruiter effectiveness (Rynes & Boudreau, 1986),
personalization of rejection notices (Rynes & Boudreau, 1986), regard for company and job (Harris & Fink, 1987), unintended signals perceived (e.g., Rynes et al., 1991), and application timing (Fernandez et al., 2000). By consistently demonstrating that applicants’ attitudes, beliefs, and inferences are related to recruiter characteristics and behavior, research in this area supplies perhaps the greatest amount of evidence for the importance of recruiters thus far.

Limited attention has also been devoted to the investigation of individual-level internal customer reactions. Johnson et al. (2014) examined line managers’ perceptions of outsourced recruitment quality of work, value add from outsourced recruitment, and satisfaction with outsourcing recruitment. While this study only served to report survey findings, its broader implication is in highlighting line managers’ perceptions as important drivers of firms’ recruitment activities and, thus, the manner in which recruiters are evaluated, which is an issue I return to below when discussing the limitations of prior research in this area.

Finally, recruitment outcomes have been investigated that relate to negotiation between recruiters and candidates. The outcomes examined in this research exist at the quasi-market and dyadic levels. At the quasi-market level, Sondak and Bazerman (1991) investigated market efficiency, which they defined as the degree of deviation from market optimality. Broadly speaking, this concept was examined using three indices: distribution of benefits accrued to recruiters and applicants based on their negotiated agreements, integrativeness of the agreements themselves, and the level of “match” recruiters and applicants achieved through contracts negotiated based on previously assigned preferences. At the dyadic level, Sondak and Bazerman (1991) examined quality
of recruiter-applicant agreements, which they, again using distribution of benefits, integrativeness of agreements, and level of match as focal outcomes, similarly defined as the degree of deviation from market optimality.

**Theoretical perspectives in recruiter research.** Scholars researching recruiters have invoked a number of theoretical perspectives in attempting to explain recruiter behavior. For example, the elaboration likelihood model has been adopted as a mechanism for explaining how recruiters impact attitude formation of job applicants (e.g., Larsen & Phillips, 2002). This theory proposes that individuals process information to a greater (lesser) degree when its content evokes controlled (peripheral) processing (Petty & Cacioppo, 1986). Information requiring higher levels of elaboration is thus considered more likely to impact beliefs, attitudes, and so on, and to a stronger degree. Research on recruiters has generally provided evidence in support of this theory.

In addition, signaling theory (Spence, 1973) became a popular approach in the 1980s and 1990s to explaining the relationship between recruiter behavior and job applicant attitudes and behaviors (e.g., Rynes et al., 1991; Rynes & Miller, 1983). Signaling theory is essentially a theory of relationships among actors with incomplete information and potentially misaligned goals (Connelly, Certo, Ireland, & Reutzel, 2011). Its power is in explaining how motives, behavioral intentions, and latent, unobservable characteristics (e.g., ability) play into actors’ attempts to reduce information asymmetry (Spence, 2002). In its simplest form, signaling theory posits the existence of a signal sender and a signal receiver, and argues that the signal senders attempt to reduce information asymmetry regarding, for example, their ability through costly investments (i.e. costly signals) that others with lower ability find difficult to make. To the extent that
signals are costly to emit, they are also reliable. This is because they more directly correspond to unobservable qualities and/or behavioral intentions of the senders (Stiglitz, 2000). These reliable signals are considered more valuable to the receivers when making subsequent decisions. While this theory is fairly nuanced, it has unfortunately only received attention in recruiter research insofar as it provides a way to theoretically justify findings suggesting that, because information asymmetry exists between recruiters and applicants, applicants draw inferences from recruiter behavior. Thus, the degree to which this theory is supported within this literature remains debatable.

Person–organization fit theory has been used to examine recruiter decision-making (e.g., Cable & Judge, 1997). Although research on person–environment fit dates back to over a century ago, person–organization fit theory is generally traced back to Schneider’s attraction-selection-attrition framework (1987), where he proposed that organizations and individuals are attracted to one another based on their similarity. Person–organization fit theory makes two distinctions with regard to fit. First, it distinguishes between supplementary and complementary fit. Supplementary fit occurs when a person “supplements, embellishes, or possesses characteristics which are similar to other individuals” within the organization (or environment) (Muchinsky & Monahan, 1987, p. 269). Complementary fit occurs when occurs when a person's characteristics add what is missing to the organization or environment (Muchinsky & Monahan, 1987; Kristof, 1996). Second, it distinguishes between needs-supplies and demands-abilities fit. From a needs-supplies fit perspective, person–organization fit is conceptualized as the degree to which “an organization satisfies individuals’ needs, desires, or preferences” (Kristof, 1996, p. 3). From a demands-abilities fit perspective, person–organization fit is
conceptualized as the degree to which an organization’s demands are met by an individual’s abilities (Kristof, 1996). Support has generally been found for the influence of these various perspectives on person-organization fit in explaining recruiter behavior and applicant reactions to recruiters.

Finally, a number of researchers have invoked the similarity-attraction paradigm (Byrne, 1971; Higgins & Judge, 2004) in an attempt to examine whether recruiters were biased in their evaluations of candidates (e.g., Graves & Powell, 1995). This theory’s general tenet is that “individuals are attracted to those with whom they share something in common” (Higgins & Judge, 2004, p. 623). Results for this theory have been mixed. For example, Higgins and Judge (2004) found that ingratiation led to positive evaluations of fit by recruiters and hiring recommendations, and job offers; however, they also found that self-promotion exhibited weak or nonsignificant effects on these outcomes. In addition, Graves and Powell (1995) found that gender-based similarity did not predict evaluations of candidates’ qualifications by recruiters.

By way of summary, Table 2.5 provides an overview of all of the information contained within Tables 2.1-2.4 as well as a list of the theoretical perspectives used in prior research on recruiters. Figure 2.2 attempts to place prior research on recruiter characteristics, recruiter behaviors, and contextual factors “in context” by mapping them onto the recruitment stages during which each construct has been examined. As Figure 2.2 indicates, Pre-Recruitment and Stage 3 of recruitment have rarely received research attention. On the other hand, recruitment Stages 1 and 2 have generally received the most research attention. Importantly, recruitment Stage 2 tends to only focus on recruiters
inasmuch as they are involved in performing screening interviews. However, this
neglects the numerous supportive roles they play during this stage (as well as Stage 3).

**Limitations of the Recruiter Literature**

Based on the above review, several important limitations of the recruiter literature can be observed. First, research on recruiters is applicant-centric. That is, it focuses primarily on applicants, how recruiter behaviors and characteristics influence them, and how their characteristics influence recruiter behavior. This emphasis on applicants to the neglect of recruiters has stifled theoretical progress towards developing a holistic understanding of recruiters in firms.

A second critical oversight of the literature on recruiters is the lack of attention to relationships among recruiters and other parties internal and external to their firms (e.g., line or hiring managers, HR staff, strategic decision-makers, educational institutions). Exchange and stakeholder theories suggest that these relationships with internal and external stakeholders create important economic and social obligations for recruiters (Blau, 1964; Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005; Freeman, 1984). Presently, this research focuses on people (i.e., recruiters, and, more frequently, applicants) as its basic unit of analysis. Unfortunately, this has resulted in research conceptualizing recruiter behaviors more narrowly as a function of individual differences, rather than more broadly as manifestations that are inherently more social and systemic in their origins. By not viewing the social system in which recruiters are embedded as a principal driver of their behavior (in addition to their individual differences), research has missed important opportunities to identify how such relationships are managed by recruiters and how they might hinder their performance. It has also missed an opportunity to identify whether and
how relationships can be adjusted by other parties within the firm to shape and constrain recruiter behavior, thus enabling the firm to realize desired outcomes despite these hindrances to recruiter performance. Examinations such as these would embed research on recruiters within more mainstream research on recruitment, HR, and OB.

Finally, although recruitment outcomes prior research on recruiters investigates vary quite widely, they all share one important characteristic. None of them, alone, fully capture the recruiter performance construct. Operationally, recruiter performance has been measured using time spent performing an activity (i.e., as a behavior) (Yakubovich & Lup, 2006) and productivity, defined as applicant yield (i.e., as a result or outcome) (Asch, 1990). Yet, in practice, recruiter performance evaluations often more closely reflect an internal customer satisfaction survey filled out by a hiring manager. Prior research using this construct has also examined it simultaneously as both a characteristic of recruiters and as an outcome. Thus, from a theoretical standpoint, no clear definition of recruiter performance exists in prior research, and there is little guidance as to where it belongs in the nomological network of recruiter behavior. Developing theory that reframes the recruiter performance construct as the fulfillment of a combination of expected behaviors and recruitment outcomes would enable key antecedents of recruiter performance to be identified and allow clear distinctions to be made between recruiter behaviors, outcomes, and performance. I argue that this issue is rooted in a much larger limitation associated with the recruiter literature to date. By neglecting the social system as a primary driver of recruiter behavior, recruiter research thus far has failed to identify that a fundamental dilemma is created when recruiters confronted with the need to fulfill the competing role expectations and interests of multiple parties internal and external to
the firm (e.g., strategic decision makers, HR, line managers, peers of the new-hire, educational institutions, applicants, etc.). Understanding what factors influence recruiters’ capacities to fulfill these numerous and often divergent obligations efficiently and effectively would afford insight into what constitutes recruiter performance within firms.

There are two assumptions within the recruiter literature that might be considered responsible for the lack of theoretical progress toward addressing these limitations. The first assumption is that recruiters are performing a well-defined job, rather than enacting an idiosyncratic role. The second is that recruiters are stewards of a single stakeholder—the firm. In other words, they differ from other managers of resources in that they lack agency and are not responsible for managing relationships with multiple stakeholder groups internal and external to the firm simultaneously. By accepting these assumptions, and neglecting the limitations outlined above, research on recruiters has continued its use of a small number of individual-oriented, psychology-based theories. These theories, however, only afford the ability to investigate and understand a small portion of the overall recruiter, because they render the recruiter largely invisible from the vantage point of the hiring process as a whole. The result is only a limited theoretical account of recruiters. Thus, a need exists to include concepts from parallel literatures in an effort to broaden our general understanding of recruiters and pursue important theoretical and practical questions related to what recruiter performance entails, what factors influence this outcome, and how stakeholders and firms can enhance the likelihood of this outcome being achieved.
Table 2.1 Recruiter Characteristics Previously Examined in Recruiter Research and Illustrative References

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recruiter Characteristics</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attitudes/Beliefs</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes/beliefs towards technology</td>
<td>(Oostrom et al., 2013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer self-efficacy</td>
<td>(Oostrom et al., 2013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employer-employee relationship</td>
<td>(Boswell et al., 2001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection Criteria</td>
<td>(Rynes &amp; Boudreau, 1986)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Demographic Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>(Rogers &amp; Sincoff, 1978; Taylor &amp; Bergmann, 1987)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree/Education</td>
<td>(Taylor &amp; Bergmann, 1987)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>(Connerley &amp; Rynes, 1997; Taylor &amp; Bergmann, 1987)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Function/Functional area</td>
<td>(Connerley &amp; Rynes, 1997; Fisher et al., 1979; internal vs. external)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>(Giles &amp; Field, 1982; Graves &amp; Powell, 1995; Taylor &amp; Bergmann, 1987)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job title</td>
<td>(Fisher et al., 1979; Johnson et al., 2014; Keenan, 1976; Rogers &amp; Sincoff, 1978)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational membership</td>
<td>(Carless &amp; Wintle, 2007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>(Rynes et al., 1980; Taylor &amp; Bergmann, 1987)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>(Taylor &amp; Bergmann, 1987)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>(Connerley, 1997; Connerley &amp; Rynes, 1997; Stevens, 1998; Taylor &amp; Bergmann, 1987)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Knowledge/Skills</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of the job</td>
<td>(Powell, 1991; Rynes &amp; Miller, 1983)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of the organization and jobs</td>
<td>(Rynes &amp; Boudreau, 1986)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal skills</td>
<td>(Rynes &amp; Boudreau, 1986)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening skills</td>
<td>(Harn &amp; Thornton, 1985)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation skills</td>
<td>(Rogers &amp; Sincoff, 1978)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personality/Dispositions</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuroticism</td>
<td>(Oostrom et al., 2013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness</td>
<td>(Oostrom et al., 2013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment/Screening orientation</td>
<td>(Stevens, 1998)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selling orientation</td>
<td>(Marr &amp; Cable, 2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggressiveness</td>
<td>(Harris &amp; Fink, 1987)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication style</td>
<td>(Ralston, 1993)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence</td>
<td>(Harris &amp; Fink, 1987)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credibility</td>
<td>(Fisher et al., 1979; Maurer et al., 1992; Rynes &amp; Boudreau, 1986)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enthusiasm for the organization</td>
<td>(Rynes &amp; Boudreau, 1986)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expertness</td>
<td>(DeBell et al., 1998)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruiter Characteristics</td>
<td>References</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendliness</td>
<td>(Goltz &amp; Giannantonio, 1995)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incompetence</td>
<td>(Turban et al., 1998)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informativeness</td>
<td>(Harris &amp; Fink, 1987; Powell, 1991)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal sensitivity</td>
<td>(Harn &amp; Thornton, 1985)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personableness</td>
<td>(Harris &amp; Fink, 1987)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsiveness</td>
<td>(DeBell et al., 1998; Powell, 1991; Rynes &amp; Miller, 1983)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social attractiveness</td>
<td>(DeBell et al., 1998)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thoughtfulness</td>
<td>(Harn &amp; Thornton, 1985)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthiness</td>
<td>(DeBell et al., 1998)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warmth</td>
<td>(DeBell et al., 1998; Turban et al., 1998)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>States</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affect</td>
<td>(Powell, 1991; Rynes &amp; Miller, 1983)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mood</td>
<td>(Chen &amp; Lin, 2014; Chen et al., 2013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruiter Job Performance or Value</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past output/productivity over time</td>
<td>(Asch, 1990; Carroll et al., 1986)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current job performance</td>
<td>(Yakubovich &amp; Lup, 2006)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruiter wage/value to the firm</td>
<td>(Fernandez et al., 2000)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2.2 Recruiter Behaviors Previously Examined in Recruiter Research and Illustrative References

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recruiter Behaviors</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Recruitment Activities</td>
<td>(Ollington et al., 2013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of weak ties</td>
<td>(Ollington et al., 2013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage One: Recruiting Activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquiring Information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inferences regarding applicant individual differences (e.g., from resumes)</td>
<td>(Brown &amp; Campion, 1994; Cole et al., 2009; Mast et al., 2011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time spent fielding questions during interview</td>
<td>(Phillips &amp; Dipboye, 1989)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time spent gathering information during interview</td>
<td>(Macan &amp; Dipboye, 1990; Phillips &amp; Dipboye, 1989)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthening of social network ties</td>
<td>(Ollington et al., 2013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicating Information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation of realistic job information</td>
<td>(Saks, 1989; Wanous, 1992)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time spent communicating information about the organization/job</td>
<td>(Phillips &amp; Dipboye, 1989)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selling/Persuading</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselling</td>
<td>(Harn &amp; Thornton, 1985)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informing and selling</td>
<td>(Turban et al., 1998)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time spent recruiting applicant</td>
<td>(Phillips &amp; Dipboye, 1989)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage Two: Screening Activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicating Information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation of realistic job information</td>
<td>(Saks, 1989; Wanous, 1992)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delayed responses</td>
<td>(Rynes et al., 1991)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warm/cold behavior (e.g., eye contact, smiling versus frowning)</td>
<td>(Liden et al., 1993)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informing and selling behaviors</td>
<td>(Taylor &amp; Bergmann, 1987; Turban et al., 1998)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluating</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicants’ core self-evaluations</td>
<td>(Marr &amp; Cable, 2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant employability</td>
<td>(Adkins et al., 1994)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant information</td>
<td>(McKinney et al., 2003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant resumes</td>
<td>(Barr &amp; Mcneilly, 2002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>And/or judging fit</td>
<td>(Adkins et al., 1994; Bretz, Rynes, &amp; Gerhart, 1993; Cable &amp; Judge, 1997; Rynes &amp; Gerhart, 1990)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deception detection</td>
<td>(Mast et al., 2011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time spent</td>
<td>(Taylor &amp; Bergmann, 1987)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-Making</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiring recommendation</td>
<td>(Higgins &amp; Judge, 2004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of applicant information for screening decisions</td>
<td>(Brown &amp; Campion, 1994; McKinney et al., 2003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage Three: Negotiating Activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delayed responses</td>
<td>(Rynes et al., 1991)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiation of employment contracts</td>
<td>(Sondak &amp; Bazerman, 1991)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2.3 Context Factors Previously Examined in Recruiter Research and Illustrative References

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context Factors</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Omnibus Context</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor supply</td>
<td>(Dineen &amp; Williamson, 2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational reputation</td>
<td>(Dineen &amp; Williamson, 2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality-based compensation for recruiters</td>
<td>(Dineen &amp; Williamson, 2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrete Context</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit Level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview focus</td>
<td>(Barber et al., 1994; Turban &amp; Dougherty, 1992)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview structure</td>
<td>(Turban &amp; Dougherty, 1992)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment offer longevity</td>
<td>(Sondak &amp; Bazerman, 1991)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of recruiter alternatives</td>
<td>(Sondak &amp; Bazerman, 1991)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational recruitment support (i.e., administrative support, pre-interview activities, feedback, training, reinforcement, rewards, existence of HR information system)</td>
<td>(Connerley &amp; Rynes, 1997)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant characteristics (e.g., work experience, gender, articulateness, appearance, qualifications, applicant social capital, value congruence, etc.)</td>
<td>(Bretz et al., 1993; Cable &amp; Judge, 1997; Graves &amp; Powell, 1988; Nguyen et al., 2006)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timing of incentives/compensation events</td>
<td>(Asch, 1990)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firm investment in employee/recruiter social capital (i.e., referrer bonus)</td>
<td>(Fernandez et al., 2000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruiter social network</td>
<td>(Ollington et al., 2013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dyadic Level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant similarity to recruiters (in terms of gender)</td>
<td>(Graves &amp; Powell, 1995)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant impression management</td>
<td>(Chen &amp; Lin, 2014; Higgins &amp; Judge, 2004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium (e.g., via Web, in person)</td>
<td>(Ollington et al., 2013)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2.4 Recruitment Outcomes Previously Examined in Recruiter Research and Illustrative References

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recruitment Outcomes</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Applicant Quantity</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enlistments/contracts signed</td>
<td>(Asch, 1990; Carroll et al., 1986)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invitations for second interview</td>
<td>(Adkins et al., 1994)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job offer acceptance</td>
<td>(Fisher et al., 1979; Powell, 1984; Taylor &amp; Bergmann, 1987)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job offer extended</td>
<td>(Cable &amp; Judge, 1997; Fernandez &amp; Weinberg, 1997; Fernandez et al., 2000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progression through hurdles (or recruitment stages)</td>
<td>(Bagues &amp; Perez-Villadoniga, 2012; Fernandez &amp; Weinberg, 1997; Yakubovich &amp; Lup, 2006)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persistence in job pursuit following interview</td>
<td>(Barber et al., 1994)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-selection across recruitment stages</td>
<td>(Yakubovich &amp; Lup, 2006)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjective selection/manager hiring decisions</td>
<td>(Yakubovich &amp; Lup, 2006)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survival rate of referrals</td>
<td>(Fernandez et al., 2000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic returns (referral versus not)</td>
<td>(Fernandez et al., 2000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Applicant Quality</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit Level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant pool quality</td>
<td>(Dineen &amp; Williamson, 2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dyadic Level</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referrer-referral homophily</td>
<td>(Fernandez et al., 2000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individual Level</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant success as newcomer (citizenship, performance, and fit)</td>
<td>(Marr &amp; Cable, 2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Applicant Intentions</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probability of accepting offer</td>
<td>(Alderfer &amp; McCord, 1970; Taylor &amp; Bergmann, 1987)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure intentions</td>
<td>(Taylor &amp; Bergmann, 1987)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness to accept job offer (acceptance intentions)</td>
<td>(Harn &amp; Thornton, 1985; Harris &amp; Fink, 1987; Liden &amp; Parsons, 1986)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Applicant Reactions</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication satisfaction</td>
<td>(Ralston, 1993)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information acquisition</td>
<td>(Barber et al., 1994; Fernandez et al., 2000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inferences regarding organization</td>
<td>(Goltz &amp; Giannantonio, 1995; Rynes et al., 1991)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Organizational attraction | (Carless & Wintle, 2007; Chen et al., 2013; Stevens, 1998; Taylor &
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recruitment Outcomes</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceived desirability of job</td>
<td>Bergmann, 1987; Turban &amp; Dougherty, 1992; Walker et al., 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived job attributes</td>
<td>(Rynes &amp; Miller, 1983)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceptions of recruiter effectiveness</td>
<td>(Harris &amp; Fink, 1987)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personalization of rejection notices</td>
<td>(Rynes &amp; Boudreau, 1986)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regard for company and job</td>
<td>(Rynes &amp; Boudreau, 1986)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unintended signals perceived</td>
<td>(Harris &amp; Fink, 1987)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application timing</td>
<td>(Rynes et al., 1991; Rynes &amp; Miller, 1983)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived likelihood of receiving job offer</td>
<td>(Fernandez et al., 2000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived likelihood of receiving job offer</td>
<td>(Alderfer &amp; McCord, 1970)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Internal Customer Reactions</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individual Level</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line manager perceptions of outsourced recruitment quality of work</td>
<td>(Johnson et al., 2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line manager perceptions of value add from outsourced recruitment</td>
<td>(Johnson et al., 2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line manager satisfaction with outsourcing recruitment</td>
<td>(Johnson et al., 2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negotiation</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quasi-Market Level</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market efficiency (distribution of benefits, integrativeness of agreement, level of “match” based on assigned preferences)</td>
<td>(Sondak &amp; Bazerman, 1991)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dyadic Level</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of recruiter-applicant agreements (dyadic distribution of benefits, integrativeness of agreement, level of “match” based on assigned preferences)</td>
<td>(Sondak &amp; Bazerman, 1991)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2.5 Summary of Theoretical Perspectives, Recruiter Characteristics, Contextual Antecedents, Recruiter Behaviors, and Recruitment Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theoretical Perspectives</th>
<th>Recruiter Characteristics</th>
<th>Contextual Antecedents and Moderators</th>
<th>Recruiter Behaviors</th>
<th>Recruitment Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elaboration Likelihood Model</td>
<td>Attitudes/ Beliefs</td>
<td>Omnibus Context</td>
<td>Pre-Recruitment Activities</td>
<td>Applicant Quantity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signaling Theory</td>
<td>• Attitudes/ beliefs towards technology</td>
<td>• Labor supply</td>
<td>• Development of weak ties</td>
<td>Individual Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person-Organization Fit Theory</td>
<td>• Computer self-efficacy</td>
<td>• Organizational reputation</td>
<td>Stage One: Recruiting Activities</td>
<td>• Enlistments/ contracts signed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Similarity-Attraction Paradigm</td>
<td>• Employer-employee relationship</td>
<td>• Quality-based compensation for recruiters</td>
<td>Acquiring Information</td>
<td>• Invitations for second interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Selection Criteria</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Inferences regarding applicant individual differences (e.g., from resumes)</td>
<td>• Job offer acceptance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Demographic Variables</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Time spent fielding questions during interview</td>
<td>• Job offer extended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Age</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Time spent gathering information during interview</td>
<td>• Progression through hurdles (or recruitment stages)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Degree/Education</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Strengthening of social network ties</td>
<td>• Persistence in job pursuit following interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Experience</td>
<td></td>
<td>Communicating Information</td>
<td>• Self-selection across recruitment stages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Function/Functional area</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Presentation of realistic job information</td>
<td>• Subjective selection/manager hiring decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Time spent communicating information about the organization/job</td>
<td>• Survival rate of referrals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Job title</td>
<td></td>
<td>Selling/ Persuading</td>
<td>• Economic returns (referral versus not)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Organizational membership</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Counselling</td>
<td>Applicant Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Race</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Informing and selling</td>
<td>Unit Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Tenure</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Time spent recruiting applicant</td>
<td>• Applicant pool quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Training</td>
<td></td>
<td>Stage Two: Screening Activities</td>
<td>Dyadic Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knowledge/ Skills</td>
<td></td>
<td>Communicating Information</td>
<td>• Referrer-referral homophily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Knowledge of the job</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Presentation of realistic job information</td>
<td>Individual Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Knowledge of the organization and jobs</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Time spent communicating information about the organization/job</td>
<td>• Applicant success as newcomer (citizenship, performance, and fit)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Interpersonal skills</td>
<td></td>
<td>Selling/ Persuading</td>
<td>Applicant Intentions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Listening skills</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Counselling</td>
<td>Individual Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Presentation skills</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Informing and selling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Personality/Dispositions</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Time spent recruiting applicant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Neuroticism</td>
<td></td>
<td>Stage Two:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Openness</td>
<td></td>
<td>Screening Activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Recruitment/Screening orientation</td>
<td></td>
<td>Communicating Information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Selling orientation</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Presentation of realistic job information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Aggressiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Delayed responses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Communication style</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theoretical Perspectives</td>
<td>Recruiter Characteristics</td>
<td>Contextual Antecedents and Moderators</td>
<td>Recruiter Behaviors</td>
<td>Recruitment Outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence</td>
<td></td>
<td>recruiter social capital (i.e., referrer bonus)</td>
<td>Warm/cold behavior (e.g., eye contact, smiling versus frowning)</td>
<td>Probability of accepting offer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credibility</td>
<td></td>
<td>Recruiter social network</td>
<td>Informing and selling behaviors</td>
<td>Tenure intentions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enthusiasm for the organization</td>
<td></td>
<td>Social Dyadic Level</td>
<td>Evaluating</td>
<td>Willingness to accept job offer (acceptance intentions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expertness</td>
<td></td>
<td>Applicant similarity to recruiters (in terms of gender)</td>
<td>Applicants’ core self-evaluations</td>
<td>applicants’ core self-evaluations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendliness</td>
<td></td>
<td>Individual Level</td>
<td>Applicant employability</td>
<td>Applicant employability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incompetence</td>
<td></td>
<td>Applicant impression management</td>
<td>Applicant information</td>
<td>Applicant information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informativeness</td>
<td></td>
<td>Physical</td>
<td>Applicant resumes</td>
<td>Applicant resumes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal sensitivity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>And/or judging fit</td>
<td>And/or judging fit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personableness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Deception detection</td>
<td>Deception detection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Time spent</td>
<td>Time spent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social attractiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Decision-Making</td>
<td>Decision-Making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thoughtfulness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hiring recommendation</td>
<td>Hiring recommendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthiness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Use of applicant information for screening decisions</td>
<td>Use of applicant information for screening decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warmth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stage Three: Negotiating Activities</td>
<td>Stage Three: Negotiating Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>States</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Delayed responses</td>
<td>Delayed responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Negotiation of employment contracts</td>
<td>Negotiation of employment contracts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Performance/Value</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past output/productivity over time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Job performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruiter wage/value to the firm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| Social Dyadic Level       |                           |                                      |                    |                     |
| Applicant similarity to recruiters (in terms of gender) |                   |                                      |                    |                     |
| Individual Level          |                           | Applicant impression management       |                    |                     |
| Applicant                  |                           | Physical                              |                    |                     |
| Medium (e.g., via Web, in person) |             |                                      |                    |                     |
| Evaluating                |                           | Evaluating                           |                    |                     |
| Applicants’ core self-evaluations |               |                                      |                    |                     |
| Applicant employability   |                           |                                      |                    |                     |
| Applicant information     |                           |                                      |                    |                     |
| Applicant resumes         |                           |                                      |                    |                     |
| And/or judging fit        |                           |                                      |                    |                     |
| Deception detection       |                           |                                      |                    |                     |
| Time spent                |                           |                                      |                    |                     |
| Decision-Making           |                           |                                      |                    |                     |
| Hiring                     |                           |                                      |                    |                     |
| Recommendation            |                           |                                      |                    |                     |
| Use of applicant information for screening decisions |               |                                      |                    |                     |
| Stage Three: Negotiating Activities |             |                                      |                    |                     |
| Delayed responses          |                           |                                      |                    |                     |
| Negotiation of employment contracts |           |                                      |                    |                     |
| Applicant Reactions       |                           |                                      |                    |                     |
| Individual Level          |                           |                                      |                    |                     |
| Communication satisfaction |                           |                                      |                    |                     |
| Information acquisition   |                           |                                      |                    |                     |
| Inferences regarding organization |             |                                      |                    |                     |
| Organizational attraction |                           |                                      |                    |                     |
| Perceived desirability of job |                   |                                      |                    |                     |
| Perceived job attributes  |                           |                                      |                    |                     |
| Perceptions of recruiter effectiveness |             |                                      |                    |                     |
| Personalization of rejection notices |       |                                      |                    |                     |
| Regard for company and job |                           |                                      |                    |                     |
| Unintended signals perceived |                   |                                      |                    |                     |
| Application timing        |                           |                                      |                    |                     |
| Perceived likelihood of receiving job offer |             |                                      |                    |                     |
| Internal Customer Reactions |                      |                                      |                    |                     |
| Individual Level          |                           |                                      |                    |                     |
| Line manager perceptions of outsourced recruitment quality of work |       |                                      |                    |                     |
| Line manager perceptions of |                           |                                      |                    |                     |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theoretical Perspectives</th>
<th>Recruiter Characteristics</th>
<th>Contextual Antecedents and Moderators</th>
<th>Recruiter Behaviors</th>
<th>Recruitment Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>value add from outsourced recruitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Line manager satisfaction with outsourcing recruitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Quasi-Market Level</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Market efficiency (distribution of benefits, integrativeness of agreement, level of “match” based on assigned preferences)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dyadic Level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Quality of recruiter-applicant agreements (dyadic distribution of benefits, integrativeness of agreement, level of “match” based on assigned preferences)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 2.1 A Framework for Understanding Prior Research on Recruiters
Figure 2.2 Depiction of Previously Examined Recruiter Characteristics, Recruiter Behaviors, and Context Factors Mapped onto Recruitment Stages
CHAPTER 3
TOWARD A THEORY OF RECRUITER BEHAVIOR

Below, I provide an overview of role theory. This overview is intended to highlight components the theory that are relevant to the development of a theory of recruiters that, while also considering the individual and contextual factors that influence recruiters, underscores and explains the social foundations of recruiters’ roles and, in so doing, addresses the limitations identified above. Therefore, this overview will offer a brief background, followed by a discussion that focuses on the key concepts, assumptions, ideas, and predictions of the theory.

Role theory has been widely applied to examine a variety of social phenomena. As with most theories achieving this level of popularity, role theory has accumulated a number of somewhat divergent theoretical perspectives. At least five perspectives can be identified including: functional role theory, symbolic-interactionist role theory, structural role theory, organizational role theory, and cognitive role theory (Biddle, 1986). Despite the existence of these differing perspectives, however, their primary differences tend to lie only in their assumptions. In other words, the definitions of the core concepts (e.g., roles, role behaviors, role expectations) utilized remain fairly consistent across research streams. Organizational and symbolic-interactionist role theory perspectives will be the primary focuses of the review here given their more realistic assumptions.

Organizational role theory has its roots in seminal works by Gross, Mason, and McEachern (1958) and Kahn, Wolfe, Quinn, Snoek, and Rosenthal (1964). These books
were focused on documenting the development of a conceptual approach for understanding the nature of social systems in organizations, the issues they created for their organizational constituents, and their impact on the manner in which individuals behaved. Soon after this work, Katz and Kahn (1978) published their work, which, among other things, extended prior research by incorporating considerations of organizational environment and structure to produce a more comprehensive theoretical model of organizations as social systems of roles.

The defining characteristic of role theory is that it views organizations as social systems, where relationships among individuals are the basic unit of analysis. This is in contrast to viewing organizations as task/functional systems in which jobs or positions are the basic units of analysis (Ilgen & Hollenbeck, 1991). In a social system, relationships exist among individuals adopting roles, or exhibiting “behaviors characteristic of one or more persons in a context” (Biddle, 1979, p. 58). Role behaviors are thus defined as “recurring actions of an individual, appropriately interrelated with the repetitive activities of others so as to yield a predictable outcome” (Katz & Kahn, 1978, p. 189).

According to role theory, role behaviors individuals exhibit are governed by role expectations, or “expectations that are structured for the roles of positions within a social system” (Biddle, 1979, p. 256). Role expectations vary on two dimensions—a qualitative and a quantitative dimension (Naylor, Pritchard, & Ilgen, 1980). Quantitatively speaking, it is generally assumed that more of a role behavior is better, and that its demonstration is limited by time and individual differences of the role adopter (Ilgen & Hollenbeck, 1991). Role expectations are held for the role by the individual enacting it as well as
those whose activities interrelate with those of the focal role. These individuals whose activities interrelate with the focal role are referred to as the focal individual’s *role set*. Further, the set of role expectations communicated to the focal individual by his or her role set is considered the *sent role*. These role expectations are developed by the role set based on organizational factors, and the manner in which they are received and interpreted by the role adopter (i.e., the *received role*) is moderated by attributes of the focal individual as well as interpersonal factors present among the focal individual and his or her role set. Thus, context is a critical component to this theory because it not only influences the role expectations of the role adopters’ role set, but also moderates how sent roles are perceived, interpreted, and understood. The role adopter thus demonstrates role behavior as he or she understands it based on his or her received role, and these behaviors feed back into, and potentially lead to the adjustment of, the role set’s sent roles during the next role episode (Katz & Kahn, 1978). Based on the above concepts, scholars have argued that jobs can be differentiated from roles in that they are objective, bureaucratic (in the sense that their elements exist independently of those performing them), and quasi-static, while roles, on the other hand, account for the subjective, personal, and dynamic environment (Ilgen & Hollenbeck, 1991).

According to role theorists, this is the simplest form of the role episode; however, in reality, role sets of organizational constituents often contain multiple individuals/groups (e.g., Katz & Kahn, 1978). Thus, their roles are a compilation of multiple “micro roles” (also referred to as “sub-roles”). According to role theory, this can result in difficulties for role adopters (Goode, 1960). One example of which is *role conflict*, which is broadly defined as “any condition of common or attributed polarized...
dissensus which poses (usually unspecified) problems for object persons” (Biddle, 1979, p. 196). Role conflict thus serves as a generic term for a host of more specific types of conflict that have been identified including intersender conflict, intrasender conflict, person-role conflict, and interrole conflict (Kahn et al., 1964). Role conflict thus impedes role integration, or the consolidation of role expectations sent by different individuals/groups within the role set.

There are, however, potential benefits associated with individuals receiving role expectations from role sets containing multiple members/groups. For example, Sieber (1974) argues that one’s accumulation of roles leads to advantages such as resources for status enhancement and role performance as well as enrichment of the personality and ego gratification. Assuming the accumulation of more roles involves increases in the quantity of members/groups comprising one’s role set, status enhancement occurs when this increase leads to the formation of ties to others in positions with the power to influence the focal individual’s career and provide alternative rewards to their demonstration of role behaviors. In terms of personality and ego gratification, an increase in the quantity of members/groups comprising one’s role set is theorized to lead to personal development and, thus, the expansion of one’s personality to incorporate the capacity to exhibit a wider repertoire of roles.

It is important to highlight that role theory, as it has been discussed thus far, is perhaps overly deterministic, representing role-taking, which refers to a view that individuals adopting roles passively accept role expectations of the role set. In contrast to this, interactionist approaches to examining role development propose that individuals assuming roles are much more active in shaping the role itself. For example, Graen
(1976) and Graen and Scandura (1987) examined dyadic relationships in the context of leader-member exchange and developed a model of role-making. In this model, individuals adopting the role actively attempt to influence the role set(s) as the role develops over time. Role-making, according to the model (and others in the interactionist role theory literature), occurs over the course of three phases: role-taking, which is the same as Katz and Kahn’s (1978) model; role-making, which involves “sampling various behaviors, negotiating, persuading, and in general working out the nature of the role” (Ilgen & Hollenbeck, 1991, p. 189), and role routinization, which involves stabilization of relationships and role behaviors.

Finally, role theory indicates that roles fluctuate over time. Role theory suggests that the primary drivers of role change are changes to the role set’s role expectations, culture (or climate) changes, changes in organizational structure, and demographic/technological changes (Katz & Kahn, 1978; Turner, 1990). While above it was noted that context plays a critical role in role theory, it is important to point out that systems theory concepts such as partial inclusion (Allport, 1933), which propose that individuals are involved in system functioning on only a segmental basis, have been incorporated into role theory. This integration suggests that the degree to which individuals adopt a role and, indeed, the degree to which context factors (e.g., individual differences, interpersonal factors, etc.) “matter” depends on the degree to which individuals interact with others within the social system (Allport, 1933; Katz & Kahn, 1978).
A Theory of Full Life Cycle Recruiters

I define a full life cycle recruiter as a quasi-agentic broker of resources among parties internal and external to a firm who operates at the intersection of social systems, is involved in recruiting, assessment, and onboarding processes, and adopts multiple micro roles with the primary purpose of enabling human capital resource accumulation. The components of this definition highlight a number of critical points about full life cycle recruiters. First, full life cycle recruiters operate at the intersection of social systems. That is, they simultaneously interact with external stakeholders (e.g., applicants within the job market, educational institutions) and internal stakeholders (e.g., HR staff, line/hiring managers) who have one or more positions to fill. In this context, stakeholders are broadly defined as “…any group or individual who can affect or is affected by the achievement of [the recruiter’s] objectives” (Freeman, 1984, p. 46). Because of this, they are held accountable for achieving outcomes that align with the interests of multiple stakeholder groups both internal and external to the firm. Second, full life cycle recruiters are involved to some degree or another throughout the entire staffing/hiring process from the initial identification and/or attraction of applicants for a given job requisition or opening to onboarding new hires. The levels of influence and responsibility created by this degree of involvement are key factors that separate full life cycle recruiters from other types of individuals involved in recruitment in some corporate recruiting models (e.g., sourcers, part-time recruiters). Third, they adopt multiple micro roles. Micro roles differ from more macro roles in that they are more ephemeral, or short-lived, and are subsumed within an overall macro role. Macro roles, on the other hand, are defined as fairly permanent roles adopted. For example, the term, “full life cycle recruiter,”
represents a macro role as it often describes a full-time work role. Full life cycle recruiters adopt multiple micro roles because the constituencies with legitimate stake in their behaviors and the outcomes associated with their decisions have role expectations for them and interests regarding the outcomes they achieve. These role expectations and interests tend to differ between stakeholder groups at any given point in time. They also tend to fluctuate over time within each stakeholder group. They also are often incompatible. Fourth, recruiters are quasi-agentic. While their behaviors and decisions are subject to social constraints placed upon them by their stakeholders as well as task-oriented constraints created by organizational and departmental policies and practices, they do exhibit at least a degree of agency. That is, their personal interests, priorities, and outcomes influence the manner in which they both interpret stakeholder expectations and resolve inconsistencies and ambiguities among them. Further, similar to other managerial occupations, task performance is difficult to monitor and evaluate. Fifth, they are brokers of resources. They control and influence the nature and transmission of tangible and intangible resources between multiple internal and external stakeholders, attempting to create the greatest outcome for all parties involved. These resources include information, people, job opportunities, organizational and personal brands, and so on. Finally, their primary purpose is to enable human capital resource accumulation for their business units and firms. Human capital resources are defined as the subset of “human capital (or economically relevant KSAOs) that are accessible for a unit’s purposes” (Ployhart, Nyberg, Reilly, & Maltarich, 2014, p. 376, parenthetical added). As such, the value of full life cycle recruiters lies in their degree of influence over their units’ capacities to
achieve competitive outcomes (e.g., performance, efficiency, etc.) through leveraging its people.

I proceed below in developing my theory of full life cycle recruiters. Before I continue, however, it is important to note a boundary condition to my theory. For the purposes of my theory, and in the interest of parsimony, I will only focus on full life cycle recruiters (hereafter recruiters) that work for organizations for the purposes of finding individuals for employment within their own organizations. As such, part-time recruiters as well as recruiters working for recruiting firms, independent contractors, military recruiters, head hunters, and recruiters for religious organizations will not be considered. While this might be viewed as a potential limitation, most recruiters do not work in these more specialized areas. Similarly, these other types of recruiters often play no role in selecting candidates, and thus do not take part in the entire recruitment process (e.g., including influencing job choice in stage three). Finally, the contexts in which these other, more specialized types of recruiters work differ quite substantially from that which confronts the average recruiter.

A New Perspective: Recruiters as Stakeholder Managers

Role theory, much like other prominent theoretical lenses used to understand organizations in management and economics, emphasizes interdependence of parties. For role theory, organizations are structured systems of interdependent roles (Katz & Kahn, 1978). From a management perspective, stakeholder theory, for example, considers organizations to be the focal point of a set of interdependent obligations to external as well as internal constituents (Freeman, 1984). From an economic perspective, agency theory, for example, views the organization as a nexus of contracts among parties (Jensen
& Meckling, 1976). While role theory provides a useful basis for understanding recruiters in organizations by underscoring the social component to their work and proposing they be conceptualized as enacting a role rather than performing a job, additional perspectives from parallel areas of research such as those noted above each offer unique insights that flesh out the factors influencing and influenced by the social and role-oriented nature of their work. This enables the development of a more holistic theory of recruiters, one that begins with a more explicit focus on recruiters themselves, and then proceeds to provide a more generalizable explanation for their behaviors and their performance in light of how they contribute to their firms and the context in which they work.

To understand the nature of the recruiter role requires a deeper understanding of what lies at its foundation. According to role theory, the most basic unit of analysis is the dyadic relationship between two individuals. This dyadic relationship serves to communicate role expectations from one individual to another. Building on this notion, other perspectives such as stakeholder theory suggest that this dyadic relationship creates both a means of trade and an obligation, where one individual maximizes his or her outcomes by remaining accountable to the other.

The way in which these theories conceptualize this dyadic relationship have important implications for understanding both the foundation or “core” dyad that determines the recruiter role as well as the “fundamental building blocks,” or elements, that build atop this foundation. First, much like the social systems often examined in the role theory literature, a dyadic relationship lies at the foundation of the recruiter role. Further, because the role of recruiters begins with the demonstration of behaviors intended to lead to the identification and attraction of applicants on the behalf of others
within the firm, this dyadic relationship is between the recruiter and a single internal stakeholder as shown in Figure 3.1. This internal stakeholder is usually a hiring or line manager, and this dyadic relationship becomes salient (or manifests if the hiring manager has not previously been an internal customer for the recruiter) when a job requisition is received by the recruiter. This foundation in its simplest form represents a way for behavioral expectations to be communicated. It also suggests that, fundamentally, the recruiter is trading effort in exchange for using the internal stakeholder’s resources (e.g., information, technology) to fulfill the obligations specified by what agency theory scholars would refer to as his or her contract (Eisenhardt, 1989; Jensen & Meckling, 1976).

Second, because the recruiter role lies at the boundary of the firm, recruiters spend the majority of their time operating at the intersection of social systems. These two types of social systems enable a distinction to be made between stakeholders internal and those external to the firm. As such, the building blocks of the recruiter role come in two forms—recruiter-internal stakeholder dyads and recruiter-external stakeholder dyads.

These two types of dyadic relationships are added to the foundation of the recruiter role, creating a variety of recruiter-stakeholder relationship constellations as shown in Figure 3.2. Figure 3.2 highlights two important points about the recruiter role. First, as additional relationships are established between recruiters and individual internal and/or external stakeholders, role complexity increases. Increases in role complexity increase the cognitive load for recruiters. Thus, it becomes more difficult for recruiters to behave in accordance with, and satisfy, all stakeholder’s role expectations and interests. Second, additional relationships with stakeholders not belonging to the same general
stakeholder group (i.e., internal or external stakeholders) result in disproportionately more complex roles for recruiters. Thus, recruiters can be expected to economize their relationships by classifying individual stakeholders into stakeholder groups when possible and replacing relationships with individual stakeholders with a single relationship to the stakeholder group. Stakeholder theory suggests that individual stakeholders are classified into stakeholder groups based on whether they exhibit similar characteristics (Freeman, 1984). For example, applicants in stage two of recruitment are more similar to each other in terms of their role expectations and interests than they are to applicants in stages one or three of recruitment. Similarly, HR staff are often more similar to each other in terms of their behavioral expectations and interests than they are to line managers or employees with whom the new hire will work.

With the exception of the recruiter-applicant(s) relationship, prior research on recruitment has almost universally ignored these recruiter-stakeholder (group) relationships (see Johnson et al., 2014 for an exception). As a result, the issue of how recruiter performance is conceptualized remains a concern as it tends to closely parallel generic recruitment outcomes examined in research on other recruitment methods—when it is examined at all (Asch, 1990).

Viewing recruiters as stakeholder managers provides an inroad to beginning to better understand recruiter performance. For example, role theory emphasizes that the efficiency and effectiveness of social systems depend on whether role adopters behave in a manner consistent with role expectations of those with whom their work activities intersect as well as whether they achieve outcomes necessary for the continued performance of others within the system (Biddle, 1979; Katz & Kahn, 1978). Stakeholder
theory and research on principal multiplicity in agency theory (e.g., Child & Rodrigues, 2003; also see Lawless & Price, 1992) corroborate this perspective, extending it by suggesting that recruiters’ capacities to perform should depend on their ability to behave in a manner, and achieve outcomes, consistent with the role expectations and interests, respectively, of all stakeholders to which they should be attending at a given time (Lan & Heracleous, 2010; Lawless & Price, 1992; Parmar et al., 2010; Shapiro, 2005).

While this may seem fairly reasonable, it is somewhat more complex than it appears in the context of recruitment. As, for example, stakeholder and agency theories highlight, stakeholders can vary quite widely in terms of their role expectations and interests. Further, these role expectations and interests are often incompatible or competing. For example, line managers may expect recruiters to exhibit a screening orientation when interacting with applicants to ensure that only those of the highest quality apply. On the other hand, strategic decision-makers may expect recruiters to promote the organization at all times to ensure that the organization’s employment brand or reputation remains intact. Similarly, line managers are often more interested in the quality of applicants and the timeliness with which they are hired, while HR is often interested in other outcomes such as applicant diversity, applicant pool quantity, and low cost. However, diversity and timeliness, for example, are often difficult to achieve simultaneously. This, in turn, creates a fundamental dilemma for recruiters as they have to satisfy incompatible stakeholder obligations.

The ability to satisfy these often incompatible role expectations and interests of various stakeholders is thus the key to understanding what constitutes recruiter performance in organizations. Note that this more closely approximates how recruiter
performance is evaluated in practice. The typical practice is to use internal customer (i.e., hiring/line manager) satisfaction surveys. These surveys often are the only information used to evaluate performance, and only in some organizations are they combined with candidate satisfaction surveys and/or applicant tracking information.

Role theory research indicates that the ability to effectively balance the needs of multiple social systems depends in large part on the nature of individuals’ micro role hierarchies and the psychological conditions they create and processes they permit (e.g., Ashforth, Kreiner, & Fugate, 2000). In the same way, this ability to satisfy divergent obligations can likely be traced back to the characteristics or organization of recruiters’ micro role hierarchies. Further, prior research suggests that roles as well as the micro roles that comprise them should be conceptualized as resources to the role adopter (Callero, 1994). Thus, I offer the following:

Postulate 1: Recruiter performance depends on the ability to forge and manage internal and external stakeholder relationships in such a way that cooperative and competing obligations to all stakeholders and/or stakeholder groups to which one should be attending are efficiently and effectively fulfilled.

Postulate 2: Recruiters’ capacities to serve all stakeholders, and thus perform, are shaped and constrained by the organization of their micro role hierarchies.

Viewing the Recruiter Role as a Micro Role Hierarchy

Given the social and ever-fluctuating nature of their work demands, the notion of conceptualizing recruiters as enacting a role rather than performing a job with very particular and rigid tasks, duties, and so on is fairly easy to grasp. What is not obvious, however, is that the recruiter role may exist as a compilation of micro roles (or role-
identities) nested within a hierarchy (see Ashforth et al., 2000; Burke & Tully, 1977; Callero, 1985; Stryker, 1980; Turner, 1978). Broadly speaking, this has been alluded to in prior research. For example, Campion (2014) proposed that recruiters adopt “promoter,” “gatekeeper,” and “salesperson” roles, which correspond to the three phases of recruitment previously outlined by Barber (1998) (i.e., applicant generation, maintaining applicant interest/assessment, influencing job choice). As symbolic interactionist role theorists propose, the particular arrangement of this hierarchy differs across individuals and is shaped by forces at either end of recruiter-stakeholder (group) relationships as well as context over time (Callero, 1985; also see Ilgen & Hollenbeck, 1991; Graen, 1976; Graen & Scandura, 1987).

Prior research indicates that, although micro roles are situation-specific when they are initially adopted by individuals, they are eventually arranged into a hierarchy through repeated interaction with others within one’s social system (Callero, 1985; McCall & Simmons, 1978; Stryker, 1980; Turner, 1978). Although theorizing in sociology and social psychology suggests that the types of micro roles comprising individuals’ micro role hierarchies often differ greatly, there are numerous cases in which social consensus governs the existence of distinct types that all individuals have or use (e.g., sex/gender-role identity). Further, there are also certain contexts in which this is more likely to occur such as when one is examining roles in organizations and the world of work. For example, this research is often interested in understanding micro role hierarchies for individuals from a societal standpoint, rather than those of individuals sharing a specific occupation, which necessarily restricts the types of social influences involved in creating consensus around micro role types.
In an effort to identify a more exhaustive, but still fairly universal, set of micro roles for recruiters, I draw on other areas of research in organizational behavior to identify several more micro roles that encompass recruiter behaviors not subsumed within adopting promoter, gatekeeper, and salesperson roles. First, prior research on multiteam systems (Davison, Hollenbeck, Barnes, Sleesman, & Ilgen, 2012) and unit task interdependence (Sherman & Keller, 2011) highlight the importance of the liaison role, which is valuable because it enables coordinated action among constituents from separate social systems. A liaison role refers to one in which the individual enacting it serves as a single point of contact between two social systems (or individuals or a combination of the two). Recruiters adopt this role frequently in a boundary spanning capacity as they are often the single point of contact between applicants or candidates and internal stakeholders. They also often serve as a liaison between hiring managers and other departments (e.g., HR).

Second, prior research on training and development and project management highlights the importance of the facilitator role (e.g., Seifert, Yukl, & McDonald, 2003; Uhl-Bien & Graen, 1998). A facilitator role refers to one in which the individual enacting it behaves as a neutral or objective communicator of information who initiates, coordinates, and ensures completion of projects involving multiple constituents. This role is adopted frequently by recruiters. They are charged with managing all parties involved in filling a job requisition from start to finish. They initiate the project by meeting with internal customers, coordinate information communicated between applicant/candidate and internal stakeholders (e.g., HR and hiring managers), and help with onboarding the new hire.
Third, prior research on recruitment of mutual fund managers (Rao & Drazin, 2002) as well as boards of directors (Tuggle, Schnatterly, & Johnson, 2010) highlights the importance of the advisor role. An advisor role refers to one in which the individual enacting it usually has specialized knowledge, which he or she imparts to another and/or uses to guide, assist, or counsel them. Recruiters also adopt this role frequently. For example, when they first receive job requisitions from hiring managers they often meet with them in order to not only develop a strategy for recruiting for this particular job, but also to manage expectations regarding the feasibility of their requirements. Similarly, they often are sought out for their advice regarding candidate “fit” and job offer characteristics (e.g., compensation) given their knowledge of the labor market and competition.

In addition to these three micro roles, I also retain the three micro roles of promoter, gatekeeper, and salesperson. However, I do not retain the proposition that they are necessarily tied to any particular recruitment phase as I discuss later (cf., Campion, 2014). The promoter micro role encompasses behaviors that relate to endorsing or marketing the organization and job in general terms (e.g., attracting applicants, improving organization image, employer brand/reputation, etc.). The gatekeeper micro role encompasses behaviors that reflect a screening orientation (see Barber et al., 1994; Stevens, 1998). Finally, the salesperson micro role encompasses behaviors that reflect a stakeholder-specific orientation. For example, a recruiter adopting the salesperson micro role would tailor the information he or she conveys to the specific candidates with whom he or she interacts.
Research suggests that individuals’ micro role hierarchies can vary along at least two dimensions as shown in the model depicted in Figure 3.3 (e.g., Ashforth et al., 2000; Callero, 1985). First, they can vary in terms of micro role integration. Micro role integration refers to the extent to which micro roles within one’s hierarchy are integrated or segmented. Integrated micro role hierarchies are those that contain micro roles that “are weakly differentiated (low contrast), are not tied to specific places and times (flexible boundary), and allow cross role interruptions (permeable boundary)” (Ashforth et al., 2000, p. 479). For example, an individual with highly integrated promoter and gatekeeper micro roles would tend to view these micro roles as not entirely different and exhibit behaviors consistent with both micro roles simultaneously. Segmented micro role hierarchies are those that contain micro roles that are “highly differentiated (high contrast), tied to specific settings and times (inflexible), and permit few cross-role interruptions (impermeable)” (Ashforth et al., 2000, p. 476). For example, an individual with highly segmented promoter and gatekeeper micro roles would view these micro roles as very different and exhibit behaviors consistent with each in specific contexts and/or at specific times.

Second, individuals’ micro role hierarchies can vary in terms of their micro role dominance (Callero, 1985). Micro role dominance refers to the extent to which micro roles within one’s hierarchy are dominated or distributed. Dominated micro role hierarchies are those that contain a micro role that monopolizes the individual’s understanding of the overall macro role. For example, an individual with a micro role hierarchy dominated by the promoter micro role as shown in Figure 3.4 would view his or her role as a recruiter as essentially entailing the demonstration of behaviors consistent
with promoting his or her organization and/or the job to be filled. Distributed micro role hierarchies are those where all micro roles, in aggregate, contribute to the individual’s understanding of the overall macro role and are equally accessible to the individual at any given time when enacting it (see Fitzsimmons, 2013 for a similar dimension in the context of multicultural employees and identity patterns). For example, an individual with a distributed micro role hierarchy would view the recruiter macro role as entailing the demonstration of behaviors consistent with promoting, gatekeeping, selling, liaising, facilitating, and advising. Therefore, I offer the following:

Postulate 3: The recruiter macro role comprises six micro roles—promoter, gatekeeper, salesperson, liaison, facilitator, and advisor—which are arranged in a hierarchy that varies along two dimensions: integration and dominance.

Antecedents Influencing the Organization of Recruiters’ Micro Role Hierarchies

Role theory suggests that recruiter individual differences and behaviors, recruiter-stakeholder relationships, and organizational characteristics all contribute to the organization of recruiters’ micro role hierarchies (Katz & Kahn, 1978). Thus, individual, social, and contextual factors are all important to consider. However, there are myriad variables across these three categories with the potential to affect the organization of recruiters’ micro role hierarchies. Fortunately, role theory, prior research on recruitment, and prior research on the nature of relationships provide some direction by identifying micro role boundary permeability and flexibility, micro role content, stakeholder salience, and obligation differentiation as some of the principle theoretical mechanisms through which the organization of recruiters’ micro role hierarchies is likely influenced.
by individual, social, and contextual factors. In what follows, I therefore treat these mechanisms as providing inclusion criteria for those factors discussed.

**Individual.** According to role theorists, micro role integration and segmentation are a function of micro role boundaries (i.e., permeability and flexibility) and micro role content (e.g., Ashforth et al., 2000; Olson-Buchanan & Boswell, 2006). A micro role’s boundary is *permeable* when the individual enacting it can enact another micro role simultaneously. Micro role boundaries are *flexible* when they can be adopted in a variety of social settings and at any time. *Micro role content* refers to the role-identity comprising the micro role, and is usually examined in terms of its contrast with respect to other micro roles. As noted above, micro role integration is more likely when boundaries are permeable and flexible, and when there is low contrast between micro roles in terms of their content. On the other hand, micro role segmentation is more likely when boundaries are less permeable and less flexible, and when there is a higher level of contrast between roles in terms of their content.

Importantly, however, recruiters’ micro role hierarchies likely have a tendency to gravitate towards integration, particularly as stakeholder demands increase in number and/or variety. Research suggests that in order for recruiters’ micro role hierarchies to be segmented, they must engage in boundary work (Nippert-Eng, 1996). *Boundary work* refers to the act of “construct(ing) or modify(ing) the temporal, spatial, and other boundaries that demark (micro) roles” (Ashforth et al., 2000, p. 482, parentheticals added). This involves the strategic invocation of principles and practices or behaviors that reduce the permeability and flexibility of the boundaries of micro roles (Kossek, Lautsch, & Eaton, 2005). The benefit of role segmentation is that it enables individuals to more
fully adopt a given role at a given time and/or in a given context. Therefore, I propose the following:

*Proposition 1: Recruiters that engage in more boundary work will have micro role hierarchies that are more segmented.*

Of course, recruiter individual differences can also be expected to influence the organization of their micro role hierarchies. This is because micro role hierarchies do not exist independent of the individuals who enact micro roles (Callero, 1985); indeed, they are a product of experience interacting with individuals and groups within social systems over time (Mead, 1934). For example, prior research on role breadth self-efficacy and flexible role orientations has shown these non-cognitive individual differences to predict higher levels of proactive dimensions of job performance (e.g., taking initiative) and, depending on levels of autonomy, job performance overall (Griffin, Neal, & Parker, 2007; Parker, 2007). Findings such as these suggest that role breadth self-efficacy and flexible role orientations will be associated with more distributed micro role hierarchies for recruiters. Similarly, distributed micro role hierarchies are also likely to be positively associated with cognitive individual differences of recruiters. For example, research has shown cognitive ability and job-related skill to predict role breadth and job performance (Morgeson, Delaney-Klinger, & Hemingway, 2005). The primary reason why these individual differences are likely to result in more distributed micro role hierarchies for recruiters is because they expand the variety of behaviors comprising each micro role, which, in turn, renders each micro role more salient to the recruiter and likely results in greater contrast among micro roles.
Proposition 2: Role breadth self-efficacy, flexible role orientations, cognitive ability, and interpersonal skill will be positively associated with distributed micro role hierarchies for recruiters.

Social. Although the initial structural organization of recruiters’ micro role hierarchies can be traced back their life experiences and individual differences (McCall & Simmons, 1978; Stryker, 1980; Turner, 1978), the salience of different micro roles, and, to a lesser extent, the organization of the hierarchy itself, is also influenced by the social context. This is particularly likely when micro roles are fairly distinct, can be compartmentalized, and the social system(s) in which the individual operates continuously changes (Turner, 1978). These are precisely the situational characteristics confronting many recruiters.

According to prior research on role theory, at any given point in time, the particular micro role or roles that are primed for a recruiter depends on those with whom he or she is interacting (Callero, 1985). Stakeholder theory builds upon this notion by also suggesting that such priming is rooted in the characteristics of their stakeholder relationships. In most cases, relationships between recruiters and individual stakeholders and stakeholder groups do not dissolve entirely (with the exception being when relationships with individual stakeholders evolve into recruiter-stakeholder group relationships). Rather, according to stakeholder theory these relationships vary over time along three dimensions: the power stakeholders have over the recruiter, the legitimacy of their relationship with the recruiter, and the urgency of their claim on the recruiter (Mitchell, Agle, & Wood, 1997). This results, instead, in fluctuations in stakeholder salience. For example, staffing a job in engineering means schools with superior
engineering programs will increase in their power over recruiters, legitimacy of their relationships with the recruiter, and urgency of their claims on the recruiter. These external stakeholders thus become more salient to the recruiter. As another example, when staffing jobs in professional occupations (e.g., scientist), peer employees of the focal job, line managers, and HR managers often all have greater power, legitimacy, and urgency. This increases the salience of these stakeholders for the recruiter. As the number of stakeholders and stakeholder groups salient to the recruiter increases, a wider variety of interests, and thus role expectations, are present. The result, on average, is a broader, more differentiated conceptualization of the recruiter macro role for the recruiter. Note, however, that it is possible for the same outcome to occur even under conditions where the number of stakeholder groups salient to the recruiter does not change. For example, stakeholders can vary to greater or lesser degrees in terms of the homogeneity of their interests (Bridoux, & Stoelhorst, 2014).

The effects of these conditions are illustrated in Figure 3.4. In this figure, Recruiter A and B differ in terms of the organization of their micro role hierarchies. Recruiter A represents a recruiter with fewer salient stakeholder relationships and/or stakeholders with more homogeneous role expectations and interests on average, and thus a more dominated micro role hierarchy. This recruiter views the overall recruiter macro role as primarily involving demonstration of behaviors consistent with promoting the organization and, to a lesser extent, facilitating the recruitment process. Recruiter B, on the other hand, represents a recruiter with a greater number of stakeholder relationships and/or stakeholders with more heterogeneous role expectations and interests on average, and thus a more distributed micro role hierarchy. This recruiter views the overall recruiter
macro role as comprising behaviors consistent with promoting, selling, liaising, and
advising. Thus, I propose the following:

**Proposition 3:** *Quantity of salient stakeholders will be positively associated with
distributed micro role hierarchies for recruiters.*

**Proposition 4:** *Qualitative differences in terms of salient stakeholder interests will
be positively associated with distributed micro role hierarchies for recruiters.*

**Context.** Although role theory highlights that role expectations of stakeholders
can often be heterogeneous, it does not offer a general classification scheme for
categorizing obligations to stakeholders. Prior research on relationships in organizations
adopting the perspectives of stakeholder and social exchange theories, on the other hand,
do by indicating that obligations to stakeholders can be financial/economic or social
(Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005; Parmar et al., 2010). Running somewhat parallel to this,
prior research on recruiters suggests that certain micro roles may entail behaviors that
primarily address financial or social needs of stakeholders (Campion, 2014). Although
stakeholder theory suggests that financial and social obligations are (or should tend to be)
twined, some context factors preclude the need for recruiters to adopt micro roles
that fulfill both types of obligations to stakeholders. For example, a strong employment
brand or reputation already, at least in part, fulfills the social obligation of promoting the
organization. As another example, a large labor supply may prevent recruiters from
having to adopt the promoter role. Instead, it may prioritize the gatekeeper role for
recruiters. Similarly, training that emphasizes, for example, financial obligations to the
organization (i.e., all of a recruiter’s internal stakeholders), may reduce the likelihood that
recruiters will adopt micro roles that fulfill social obligations to stakeholders.
In addition to this distinction, an economic perspective on the recruiter role highlights the importance of information asymmetry. It is likely that some context factors impede recruiters’ abilities to adopt micro roles that depend on rich recruiter-applicant communication. For example, if it is not face-to-face, the medium through which recruiters interact with applicants may preclude recruiters from gaining enough information on applicants to adopt the gatekeeper, salesperson, or advisor micro roles. Therefore, I offer the following:

Proposition 5: Context factors that (a) prioritize financial (social) stakeholder obligations above social (financial) stakeholder obligations, (b) already fulfill financial (social) obligations to stakeholders, or (c) create information asymmetry in recruiter-stakeholder (group) relationships are positively associated with dominated micro role hierarchies for recruiters.

Outcomes of Recruiter Micro Role Hierarchy Organization

The organization of recruiters’ micro role hierarchies can influence numerous outcomes. Below, I focus specifically on those outcomes that the literature on role theory and a stakeholder management approach to understanding recruiters would identify as most relevant to recruiter performance.

Micro role integration and segmentation. As indicated above, the micro roles within recruiters’ micro role hierarchies have a tendency to gravitate towards integrating as the complexity of the recruitment process increases. That is, as the quantity of, and qualitative differences among, recruiter-stakeholder relationships increase. Recruiters may be largely capable of performing to an adequate degree with integrated micro role hierarchies. However, highly integrated roles are prone to interruption and create
numerous difficulties for role adopters including an inability to contend with the ill
effects of role conflict (Ashforth et al., 2000), which occurs for recruiters due to the
fundamental dilemma associated with their work as described above. By creating
cognitive strain, confusion, and anxiety, highly integrated micro roles thus can be
expected to impede a recruiter’s capacity to fulfill his or her obligations to all
stakeholders to which he or she should be attending. Therefore, I propose the following:

Proposition 6: Recruiter micro role hierarchies that are more integrated will be
negatively associated with recruiters’ capacities to perform.

Segmented micro role hierarchies contain micro roles with relatively impermeable
and inflexible boundaries and high differentiation (or contrast) in terms of content
(Ashforth et al., 2000). Such micro role segmentation enables individuals to more fully
adopt a given role. Unfortunately, it also makes role transitions, or the process of
psychologically exiting, transitioning to, and adopting new micro roles more difficult.
Prior research suggests that individuals combat this issue by developing rites of passage,
or routines or rituals to facilitate this process (Ashforth et al., 2000; Rau & Hyland,
2002). This suggests that, by segmenting their micro roles through boundary work and
developing strong rites of passage enabling smooth transitions among roles, a recruiter
becomes capable of utilizing frequent role transitions, as opposed to relying on micro role
integration, to more successfully meet continuously fluctuating and often divergent
obligations to numerous stakeholders. This, in turn, likely renders the recruiter capable of
performing at a higher level. Therefore, I offer the following:
Proposition 7a: Recruiter micro role hierarchies that are more segmented will be associated with the development of rites of passage, enabling more frequent micro role transitions.

Proposition 7b: Role transitions for recruiters will be positively associated with their capacities to perform.

**Micro role dominance and distribution.** Recruiter micro role hierarchies dominated by a few, or worse, one micro role can be problematic. The reason for this is that they restrict the range of behaviors and obligations recruiters associate with their work. For example, Callero states that dominant micro roles “help establish individual perspectives used in perception and evaluation of others” (1985, p. 205). This selective attention towards others likely leads to the neglect of what should otherwise be salient stakeholder relationships, thus limiting the behaviors and obligations the recruiter seeks to exhibit and fulfill. Ignoring stakeholders also undermines recruiters’ abilities to correct, revise, or further develop their micro role hierarchies over time. This in turn, inhibits the recruiter’s capacities to perform overall, because stakeholders’ obligations are not satisfied in the end. Therefore, I propose the following:

*Proposition 8: Recruiter micro role hierarchies that are more dominated will be negatively associated with recruiters’ capacities to perform.*

**Moderators: Modifying Micro Role Hierarchies versus Mitigating Negative Outcomes**

Thus far recruiters’ micro role hierarchies have been discussed primarily in static terms. This suggests that micro role hierarchies are fairly stable for recruiters. However, according to organizational and interactionist perspectives on role theory, the
characteristics of the micro roles individuals adopt are subject to change (Graen, 1976; Graen & Scandura, 1987; Katz & Kahn, 1978), and this is particularly important to consider in light of the potential problems certain micro role hierarchy characteristics might create for both the recruiter and the organization as a whole. For example, as discussed above, more integrated micro role hierarchies may create role conflict for recruiters, thus impeding their performance. Similarly, the complexity associated with the recruiter role may result in recruiters more strongly imposing their preferences on both internal and external stakeholders (Lawless & Price, 1992). Prior role theory scholarship highlights this issue. For example, Callero states that “Any attempt to conceptualize social structure must ultimately confront the dilemma posed by the problem of agency” (1994, p. 228). Thus, it is important to identify the conditions under which it may be possible to influence or alter the organization of recruiters’ micro role hierarchies, and to distinguish these from the conditions under which it may be only possible to merely mitigating their ill effects. Accordingly, I integrate prior research on role theory with theory on the effects of events and time in organizations to develop a typology of moderating effects as they relate to the organization of recruiters’ micro role hierarchies themselves and the effects of these hierarchies on outcomes identified above.

According to role theory, micro role boundaries and content, which affect their integratedness and the number of micro roles that are subsumed within an overall macro role, are both influenced by the characteristics of role episodes and organizational events (i.e., Ashforth et al., 2000; Katz & Kahn, 1978). Organizational events are defined as happenings that “…are external [to individuals], bounded in time and space, and involve the intersection of different entities” (Morgeson, Mitchell, & Liu, 2015, p. 520). In a
recruitment context, events can take a number of forms. For example, meeting a new candidate, changes to the salience of recruiter-stakeholder relationships, changes to how a recruiter is incentivized, and receipt of a new job requisition would all be classified as events. Events, however, can differ in at least two ways that are important to consider in the present context. First, events can differ in strength. Strong events are those that are more novel, disruptive, and critical to an individual’s work or routine. Examples of strong events for a recruiter would include organizational development (OD) interventions that change the nature of leadership, culture, or climate, promotions to positions where different types of job requisitions are handled, large-scale changes in HR policies or practices related to the nature of performance evaluation, compensation, etc. Second, events can differ in terms of their duration. Some events are momentary, while others are more long-lasting. For example, an increase in the frequency with which a single stakeholder typically interacts with a recruiter over the course of filling a single job requisition would be considered an event of fairly short duration, while a wholesale increase in the frequency with which this stakeholder communicates his or her role expectations and provides feedback for present and future job requisitions would be considered a long-term event.

These dimensions of events are depicted in the typology presented in Figure 3.5. Cell 1 depicts a scenario wherein an event occurs that is high in strength and short in duration. For example, a recruiter might receive a job requisition for a type of job for which he or she has never recruited in the past. As another example, the recruiter might receive more frequent role expectation communication and feedback from a particular stakeholder. In these examples, these events are less likely to trigger changes to the
organization of the recruiter’s micro role hierarchy, because they are unlikely to induce a level of controlled information processing (Evans & Stanovich, 2013; Schneider & Shiffrin, 1977), as well as offer the amount of time, necessary to modify the recruiter’s micro role boundaries and content (Ashforth & Fried, 1988; Langer, 1989). Instead, it is more likely that the events will augment or reduce the relationships between the recruiter’s micro role hierarchy and outcomes (e.g., role conflict, development of strong rites of passage, performance), depending on the type of event that has transpired. In the former case, for example, this moderator is likely to exacerbate role conflict, thus reducing performance. In the latter case, this moderator is likely to reduce role conflict, thus enhancing performance. In addition, there is a high likelihood that relapse will occur once these events have ended. That is, the recruiter’s previous level of role conflict, use of rites of passage, and level of performance are likely to resume.

Cell 2 depicts a scenario wherein an event occurs that is high in strength and long in duration. For example, an organization may adopt the use of an applicant tracking system, enabling recruiter performance to be better monitored and measured. As another example, a recruiter might be promoted or transferred into a position where his or her job requisitions change entirely. In these examples, these events are likely to trigger changes to the organization of a recruiter’s micro role hierarchy. Their novelty, disruptiveness, and criticality as well as the duration with which their effects last can be expected to induce a level of controlled information processing and offer the amount of time necessary to modify the recruiter’s micro role boundaries and content. Of course, as with Cell 1, whether these events enhance or reduce the effects of the antecedents previously described (e.g., individual differences, effects of stakeholder relationships, context effects
such as those that prioritize or already fulfill certain types of obligations, effects of information asymmetry), depends on the type of event as well as the specific antecedent under consideration. In the former case, an applicant tracking system might be expected to enhance the relationship between stakeholder quantity and distribution of the recruiter’s micro role hierarchy. On the other hand, this system may reduce agency on the part of the recruiter, thus hindering the relationship between recruiter boundary work and micro role hierarchy segmentation.

Cell 3 depicts a scenario wherein an event occurs that is low in strength and short in duration. This scenario typifies most events confronting individuals within organizations. Examples in the recruitment context include routine interactions with colleagues, candidates, and internal stakeholders. Because such events, on average, are not novel, disruptive, or critical, and because they are relatively short in duration, they do not invoke controlled information processing. Rather, they activate automatic processing, where learned elements already in one’s long-term memory are used, often without the person actively attending to or controlling the process (Schneider & Shiffrin, 1977). As such they are likely to have little effect on both the organization of the recruiter’s micro role hierarchy and the outcomes that tend to manifest.

Cell 4 illustrates a scenario wherein an event occurs that is low in strength and long in duration. This scenario typifies most events confronting recruiters within organizations that tend to result in slow evolution and development of their micro role hierarchies. This is because events, by definition, are separated (psychologically) from the individuals experiencing them. For example, relatively mundane events for most recruiters that are a lasting part of their jobs such as receipt of job requisitions, ensuring
legal compliance with HR, managing internal stakeholder expectations, all invoke controlled information processing for a new recruiter or one that has recently been promoted, for example. Further, as noted by Morgeson et al. “Assuming equivalence in novelty, disruption, and criticality, events that last longer are more impactful on organizational entities than events that are shorter in duration” (2015, p. 527). The reason this is the case is because the longer an event lasts, the more likely it is to demand additional attention and resources to respond. For example, a candidate may attempt to negotiate with a recruiter for better compensation. This is a somewhat typical event for a recruiter. Yet, if a string of candidates over the course of a year or so exhibit a pattern of attempting to negotiate with a recruiter for better compensation more than other candidates have in the past, the recruiter’s micro role hierarchy may morph, becoming slightly more dominated by the salesperson and advisor micro roles as he or she continues to attempt to sell other aspects of the job to the candidates and manage expectations of the hiring manager(s). Of course, as with Cells 1 and 2 above, the particular direction (enhance versus reduce segmentation and distribution) of the effects associated with these events depends both on the types of antecedents under consideration and the type of event itself.

In addition, there is a possibility that bifurcation will occur during and after events that meet these conditions. This is because individuals will vary in terms of the amount of attention and resources they allocate to these events. For instance, research on stars suggests they have greater social capital than lower performers in organizations (Call, Nyberg, & Thatcher, 2015). One reason for this in the context of recruiters might be that
they devote greater attention to using these low strength, longer duration events to develop their micro role hierarchies. Therefore, I propose the following:

*Proposition 9a:* Recruiter events that are high in strength and low in duration will moderate relationships between recruiters’ micro role hierarchies and outcomes, such that relationships will be strengthened or weakened depending on the type of event that has occurred. There is a high probability of relapse during and after this type of event.

*Proposition 9b:* Recruiter events that are high in strength and high in duration will moderate relationships between antecedents to recruiters’ micro role hierarchies and the organization of their micro role hierarchies, such that relationships will be strongest or weakest depending on the type of event that has occurred.

*Proposition 9c:* Recruiter events that are low in strength and low in duration will exhibit no effects on the relationships between antecedents to recruiters’ micro role hierarchies and the organization of their micro role hierarchies or the relationships between recruiters’ micro role hierarchies and outcomes.

*Proposition 9d:* Recruiter events that are low in strength and high in duration will moderate relationships between antecedents to recruiters’ micro role hierarchies and the organization of their micro role hierarchies, such that relationships will be strengthened or weakened depending on the type of event that has occurred. There is a possibility of bifurcation during and after this type of event.
Figure 3.1 The Core of the Recruiter Role
Figure 3.2 Recruiter-Stakeholder Relationship Constellations

Note. RR = recruiter role, ES = external stakeholder, IS = internal stakeholder. Circles represent roles, squares represent stakeholder groups, solid lines represent relationships between roles or between roles and stakeholder groups.
Figure 3.3 Model of Recruiter Micro Role Hierarchy Dimensions

Note. P=Promoter, G=Gatekeeper, S=Salesperson, L=Liaison, F=Facilitator, A=Advisor
Figure 3.4 Micro Role Hierarchies for Recruiters
### Figure 3.5 Typology of Moderators Influencing the Organization of Recruiters’ Micro Role Hierarchies and the Effects of Recruiters Micro Role Hierarchies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event Strength</th>
<th>Event Duration</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Short</td>
<td><strong>Cell 1:</strong> Influences Effects of Recruiter’s Micro Role Hierarchy—Relapse Probable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Long</td>
<td><strong>Cell 2:</strong> Influences Organization of Recruiter’s Micro Role Hierarchy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Short</td>
<td><strong>Cell 3:</strong> No Effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Long</td>
<td><strong>Cell 4:</strong> Influences Organization of Recruiter’s Micro Role Hierarchy—Bifurcation Possible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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CHAPTER 4

TESTING A MODEL OF RECRUITER BEHAVIOR

Now that I have presented my theory of recruiters, this study will begin to empirically test its validity. Thus, the purpose of this study is to derive a testable set of predictions from this theory, prior research on recruitment, and a pilot study performed in which a number of recruiters and their supervisors were interviewed, and then to test them in a field study. The model derived from my theory is depicted in Figure 4.1.

Internal Stakeholder Obligations and Recruiter Performance

According to the theory developed above, internal (and external) stakeholders present recruiters with incompatible behavioral and outcome-oriented expectations. On the one hand, different stakeholders can hold different expectations for recruiters. For example, HR might expect a recruiter to exhibit behaviors consistent with promoting the organization and job to all potential applicants regardless of their individual characteristics, prioritizing diversity above all else. In contrast, a hiring manager may expect a recruiter to exhibit behaviors consistent with screening out potential applicants who are unqualified, prioritizing candidate quality above all else. Role theorists refer to these conditions as inter-sender role conflict (Biddle, 1979; Katz & Kahn, 1978; Van Sell, Brief, & Schuler, 1981). On the other hand, the same stakeholder(s) can also hold fundamentally incompatible expectations. For example, a hiring manager might expect a recruiter to simultaneously behave as a promoter and gatekeeper, prioritizing candidate diversity and quality above other objectives. In this case, these two micro roles and
recruitment outcomes are incompatible with one another (Barber et al., 1994; Stevens, 1998; Newman & Lyon, 2009). Role theorists refer to this condition as *intra-sender role conflict* (Biddle, 1979; Katz & Kahn, 1978; Van Sell et al., 1981).

These two types of role conflict are likely to inhibit recruiter performance. First, inter-sender (hereafter *inter-stakeholder*) role conflict creates competing obligations to different stakeholders. In so doing, recruiters lose their capacity to fully adopt a given micro role and fully prioritize a particular outcome or set of outcomes. These issues likely result in the need for tradeoffs and/or an inability to fully address all expectations. Second, intra-sender (hereafter *intra-stakeholder*) role conflict creates competing obligations when it comes to fulfilling the expectations of a single stakeholder, resulting in similar issues, which are likely exacerbated when multiple stakeholders hold multiple incompatible obligations. It should be noted, however, that prior meta-analyses tend to show no relationship between role conflict and job performance (Jackson & Schuler, 1985; Tubre & Collins, 2000). Yet, findings from these studies may not generalize to recruiters. For example, neither of them incorporated studies that examined recruiters. In addition, they are also based on studies that suffer from numerous methodological issues. Role conflict is often measured using judgments of role conflict as perceived by the role occupant, all types of role conflict are often measured simultaneously, and overall judgements of performance that do not differentiate between behaviors and outcomes (or results) are used. Recruiters, on the other hand, often have clearer competing obligations to more well-defined groups of stakeholders, and their performance is customer-oriented and often objectively quantifiable, particularly since the use of applicant tracking systems has become widespread in organizations today. Therefore, I hypothesize the following:
Hypothesis 1a: Inter-stakeholder role conflict will be negatively associated with recruiter performance.

Hypothesis 1b: Intra-stakeholder role conflict will be negatively associated with recruiter performance.

Moderating Effects of Micro Role Hierarchy Characteristics

Micro Role Hierarchy Segmentation

As described in the above theory, micro roles that are more segmented are those that include micro roles with less flexible and less permeable boundaries and higher levels of contrast (Ashforth et al., 2000). These characteristics are likely to offer recruiters at least two advantages when it comes to contending with role conflict. First, recruiters with more segmented micro role hierarchies are likely capable of drawing and preserving clearer connections between specific micro roles and behavioral and outcome-oriented obligations to stakeholders. Such connections reduce the likelihood that obligations will be forgotten or ignored. Second, although it is more difficult to transition among segmented micro roles, segmentation begets the development of rites of passage enabling the recruiter to transition more smoothly and quickly from micro role to micro role. This facilitates the recruiter’s ability to make tradeoffs among competing behaviors and objectives by designating specific times and places to obligations, which, in turn, enhances the likelihood that all or a greater number of obligations to stakeholders will be fulfilled. On the other hand, recruiters with micro role hierarchies that are more integrated have micro roles that are characterized by weak differentiation (low contrast), which are prone to interruption (high permeability) and are not tied to specific settings and times (high flexibility) (see Ashforth et al., 2000; Olson-Buchanan & Boswell, 2006).
Such characteristics may exacerbate the effects of role conflict, regardless of the type. For example, micro roles that are weakly differentiated result in an inability to enact a given role to the qualitative degree available to those with micro roles exhibiting higher contrast. Similarly, interruption and disconnection to settings and times disable full engagement in a given micro role. For these reasons, I hypothesize the following:

_Hypothesis 2a_: Recruiter micro role hierarchy segmentation will moderate the relationship between inter-stakeholder role conflict and recruiter performance, such that when recruiter micro role hierarchy segmentation is high the relationship between inter-stakeholder role conflict and recruiter performance will be weaker.

_Hypothesis 2b_: Recruiter micro role hierarchy segmentation will moderate the relationship between intra-stakeholder role conflict and recruiter performance, such that when recruiter micro role hierarchy segmentation is high the relationship between intra-stakeholder role conflict and recruiter performance will be weaker.

**Micro Role Hierarchy Distribution**

Micro role hierarchies that are more distributed offer a more complex and multidimensional understanding of a given macro role. While this can be advantageous for a number of reasons, it may worsen the effects of inter-stakeholder and intra-stakeholder role conflict on recruiter job performance. The reason for this is that viewing the recruiter role as encompassing a greater number of different types of micro roles results in the likelihood that given micro role will be primed at any given time increasing substantially. Prior research on role theory supports this by proposing that the effects of
micro roles on behavior strongly corresponds to their location within the hierarchy (Callero, 1985; Turner, 1984; Stryker, 1980). Thus, if all micro roles are relatively accessible and viewed as equivalent components to the overall recruiter macro role (i.e., they are all at the same level), then it can be expected that their adoption is strongly dependent on social cues from stakeholders. The concern here is that this would render incompatibility in expectations of stakeholders more apparent as recruiters continuously interact with, and juggle job requisitions for, different stakeholders within the firm as part of their daily activities. It can be expected to also result in recruiters being rendered unable to fully adopt micro roles and thus fully discharge obligations to stakeholders. On the other hand, recruiters with micro role hierarchies that are more dominated by a few or a single micro role may not recognize stakeholders who should be salient to them as well as their associated obligations. While this is likely to negatively impact their performance overall, it would result in those recruiters not feeling the levels of confusion and anxiety associated with attempting to discharge numerous competing obligations. For these reasons, I hypothesize the following:

*Hypothesis 3a:* Recruiter micro role hierarchy distribution will moderate the relationship between inter-stakeholder role conflict and recruiter performance, such that when recruiter micro role hierarchy distribution is high the relationship between inter-stakeholder role conflict and recruiter performance will be stronger.

*Hypothesis 3b:* Recruiter micro role hierarchy distribution will moderate the relationship between intra-stakeholder role conflict and recruiter performance, such that when recruiter micro role hierarchy distribution is high the relationship
between intra-stakeholder role conflict and recruiter performance will be stronger.

Methods

Pilot Study

Participants and procedure. Prior to measure development, I performed a pilot study where I interviewed 10 recruiters and four supervisors of recruiters. Of the recruiters, 6 (60%) were women. Of the supervisors, 2 (50%) were women. Of the recruiters, 8 (80%) were full life cycle recruiters. Participants in this pilot study were all from the public sector and represented organizations ranging from 300 employees to greater than 240,000 employees. Each interview lasted 30 minutes and was conducted via telephone.

There were four primary objectives that this pilot study was intended to accomplish. First, I wanted to gain insight into the nature of the recruitment function within organizations. This included soliciting information regarding the management structure and reporting relationships, where recruiters are typically located within this function, their influence and involvement throughout the entire hiring process, and whether the notion of viewing them as stakeholder managers was justified. Second, I wanted to investigate the initial degree to which the theory presented above adequately reflected how actual recruiters conceptualized their roles. That is, I asked them about the degree to which social forces determined their work activities (e.g., versus task-oriented factors). I also asked them about the major types of challenges they face as well as whether the different types of roles I proposed (e.g., promoter, gatekeeper, salesperson) adequately captured how they conceptualized their role as a recruiter.
Third, I wanted to better understand recruiter performance from both a conceptual and an analytical standpoint in organizations. As such, I asked them about what information is considered as part of their performance evaluations and what metrics were utilized, if any, by their organizations. Finally, I needed to determine whether the types of measures I was considering using were face valid. Tables A.1 and A.2 in Appendix A present the interview protocols for recruiters and their supervisors, respectively.

**Takeaways.** There were a number of major takeaways from these interviews. First, there was some variation in the nature of recruitment functions, and these differences were a function of organization size. Those with relatively few employees (e.g., 300) did not have full-time recruiters. When positions opened up or jobs were created at these organizations, a recruitment team was developed to fill the position. Second, recruiters viewed themselves as managing numerous “customers” (both internal and external) rather than as stewards of a single entity such as the firm. Third, with the exception of one recruiter who reported that she viewed herself as performing a job-role, recruiters viewed themselves as performing a role as opposed to a job with well-defined tasks. Fourth, recruiters all agreed that the promoter, gatekeeper, and salesperson micro roles reflected distinct behavioral sets associated with aspects of their work to some degree or another. However, several of the recruiters indicated that these micro roles did not adequately capture boundary spanning and internally directed behaviors they perform. In other words, they were too external stakeholder-oriented. Thus, they identified several other types of roles to fill this void. This finding resulted in the addition of the liaison, facilitator, and advisor micro roles described in the above theory. Fifth, in terms of measure development, recruiters and supervisors felt they could provide accurate
responses to the measures shown in Tables A.1 and A.2, with the exception of the negative affectivity measure, which was viewed as “unusual.” Note that the measures for recruiters and supervisors have been changed or revised based on revisions to the empirical model presented in this study. Additional email correspondence with five of the recruiters and two of the supervisors was used to confirm the face validity of the new or revised measures.

Finally, when discussing the challenges recruiters face when attempting to fulfill incompatible expectations of stakeholders, several recruiters identified additional contextual factors that exacerbate this issue including (a) workload (i.e., number of job requisitions), (b) variability in sequencing of candidates and job requisitions throughout the hiring process (e.g., all at once versus ordered one after another), and (c) variability in the rates at which candidates and job requisitions move through the hiring process (i.e., predictable progression versus not). Upon further discussion, recruiters indicated that they felt these factors impeded their ability to manage the process such that the needs and requirements of all relevant stakeholders (e.g., hiring managers, HR) were met. Instead, it resulted in what they referred to as “reactive recruiting.” They also noted that one useful tool towards dealing with this is an applicant tracking system. These systems also sometimes offer recruiters some latitude regarding how they prioritize or manage job requisitions and candidates. Because these three variables have never been considered in prior research on recruiters (or recruitment), but may be important, particularly given their potential relevance to more macro-level research on human capital resource flows (e.g., Ployhart, Van Iddekinge, & MacKenzie, 2011), they will be examined in the form of research questions as part of a set of post-hoc analyses in the results section below.
Also included in these analyses will be measures of whether an organization uses an applicant tracking system and whether they reorganize how the system prioritizes candidates and job requisitions.

**Main Study Participants**

The focus in the present study was on whether role conflict impedes recruiter performance and how the characteristics of recruiters’ micro role hierarchies influence this relationship. Several sources were used to generate a sample for this study. To generate a sample for my study, I obtained names and contact information of recruiters or recruiting personnel from four sources including SHRM’s membership directory, placement offices from two business schools (University of South Carolina and Purdue University), a Master’s in HR (MHR) alumni list at Purdue University, and several organizations, which were contacted on my behalf by a committee member. In total, 2,361 initial emails were sent to recruiters, and seven organizations contacted on my behalf indicated an interest in participating in my study. An effort was made to generate a sample of recruiters who differed in terms of organization size and industry as well as whether they worked in the public or private sector. Supervisors were sought out through referrals made by recruiters (i.e., snowball sampling). I requested that each recruiter send me the name and contact information of their primary supervisor. I then contacted these individuals directly via email explaining to them the purpose of my study and requesting their participation. Note that supervisors were used as the primary stakeholder for two reasons. First, they are better equipped to offer insight into both the overall degree to which expectations of their recruiters conflict. Second, they are more capable of offering insight into recruiter performance as they are generally the ones consolidating
information from different sources to come up with an overall evaluation of recruiter performance.

Of the 2,361 initial emails sent to recruiters, 220 usable responses were obtained (although a number of them did not include information necessary to reach their supervisors) for a response rate of 9.32%. Roughly 220 initial emails were then sent to supervisors. Of these emails sent, 98 usable responses were obtained for a supervisor response rate of approximately 44.55%. Thus, in the end, this study included 98 recruiter-supervisor matches, which is an overall response rate of approximately 3.80%. Note that recruiters and supervisors both received reminder emails in order to attempt to increase the size of the sample. Average organization size was 80,283.03 employees.

Approximately 2% of the organizations sampled were governmental. In terms of demographic characteristics, 43.18% of recruiters were male, average tenure was 4.43 years, average age was 38.26 years, 77.03% were White, 5.41% were Black, 5.41% were Hispanic, and 10.81% were Asian. Note that 24 (24.49%) recruiters chose not to respond to the sex, race, and age items. Of the recruiters, 86 (88.66%) identified themselves as full life cycle recruiters and 1 (1.03%) did not respond. In terms of demographic characteristics for supervisors, 20.29% were male, average tenure was 9.43 years, average age was 44.64 years, 66.67% were White, 15.94% were Black, 7.25% were Hispanic, and 8.70% were Asian, and 1.45% were Pacific Islander. Note that 29 (29.59%) supervisors chose not to respond to the sex, race, and age items. While a somewhat high percentage of recruiters and supervisors did not respond to the demographic items, the average age of the recruiters themselves is somewhat high when compared to prior research on recruiters. For example, prior research has largely focused
on college campus recruiters, which are often alumni and often only a few years out on
the job (see Barber, 1998; Breaugh & Starke, 2000). In terms of firm and industry
characteristics, this sample is somewhat representative of other research on recruiters as it
samples recruiters and supervisors spread across 54 organizations within 12 different
industries (e.g., Dineen & Williamson, 2012). Prior research in this area often examines
recruiters within a single organization (e.g., Taylor & Bergmann, 1987); however, studies
will also frequently examine recruiters from many different organizations and
industries—particularly when college campus recruiters are used (e.g., Turban &
Dougherty, 1992). To encourage participation in my study, recruiters and their
supervisors were all promised a detailed report on my findings. This report will discuss
the nature of the recruiter role, as well as identify effective ways to enhance recruiters
value to their firms. I also offered each participant a $10 Starbucks gift card.

**Main Study Procedure**

To test the hypotheses proposed in this study, separate surveys were designed for
recruiters and their supervisors. Recruiters were asked to respond to items concerning the
degree of role segmentation and distribution associated with their micro role hierarchies.
They were also asked to respond to items concerning the average number of job
requisitions they handled over the past year, the sequencing and synchronization of
candidates and job requisitions, the existence of an applicant tracking system at their
organization, and the degree to which they reprioritize candidates and job requisitions
using this applicant tracking system. Finally, they were asked about their perceptions of
inter and intra-stakeholder role expectations and conflict. The full survey for recruiters
can be seen in Table B.1 in Appendix B.
Supervisors were asked to respond to items concerning recruiter performance and the degree of inter and intra-stakeholder role expectation conflict that exists among and within their recruiter’s various stakeholders. They were also asked to respond to items regarding their recruiter’s average number of job requisitions that they had handle, the sequencing and synchronization of candidates and job requisitions for their recruiter, the existence of an applicant tracking system at their organization, and the degree to which their recruiter reprioritizes candidates and job requisitions using this applicant tracking system. This last set of scales was primarily used to examine differences between supervisors and recruiters in terms of their perceptions of these exploratory constructs. The full survey for supervisors can be seen in Table B.2 in Appendix B.

Next, I describe my measures. Table 4.1 provides a summary of how each hypothesis is operationalized and an indication of which participant will be receiving which measures. As discussed above, this research design is survey-based. As such, it has the potential to suffer from common method variance. Steps were taken to attempt alleviate these effects as much as possible. For example, the survey did not allow participants to return to previous portions of the survey. The survey was also broken up into distinct sections, with each section intending to measure only one construct. Also, the survey was ordered in such a way that portions of the survey with the greatest potential to impact others were placed at the end and separated to the greatest degree (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Lee, & Podsakoff, 2003).

As can be seen, the hypotheses make predictions about relationships among constructs that are somewhat similar to those seen in prior research in OBHR. They resemble, for example, relationships between attitudes, subjective evaluations, and
behaviors. Bosco, Aguinis, Singh, Field, and Pierce (2015) report the following effect sizes for similar relationships. For the relationship between attitudes/evaluations and performance behavior, they report a sample-weighted mean $|r| = .18$. For the relationship between attitudes/evaluations and role performance, they report a sample-weighted mean $|r| = .22$. For the relationship between attitudes/evaluations and subjective behavior, they report a sample-weighted mean $|r| = .25$. For the relationship between attitudes/evaluations and extra-role performance, they report a sample-weighted mean $|r| = .22$. For the relationship between behaviors and evaluations of job scope, they report a sample-weighted mean $|r| = .18$. Finally, for relationship between behaviors and evaluations of roles, they report a sample-weighted mean $|r| = .22$. In performing my power analysis to determine the minimum sample size required for my study, I used $\alpha = .10$ (one tailed because my hypotheses are directional), $\beta = .20$, and $r = .20$. As a result, the minimum sample size sought was $N = 153$ recruiter-supervisor pairs.

**Main Study Measures**

**Recruiter performance.** As shown in Table B.1 (Appendix B), recruiter performance was examined in four ways. First, I asked supervisors to indicate their recruiter’s most recent performance evaluation. These evaluations were requested primarily for exploratory purposes, and many supervisors did not report them (only 63 of the 98). Second, I asked supervisors to rate the extent to which they agreed with seven items adapted from Susskind, Kacmar, and Borchgrevink’s (2003) and Schneider, White, and Paul’s (1998) customer service scales on a scale of 1 to 7 (with 1 indicating strongly disagree and 7 indicating strongly agree). An example item is “Overall, hiring managers are happy with the services they receive from my recruiter.” The internal consistency
reliability for the items comprising this measure was \( \alpha = .91 \). Third, I asked supervisors to rate the extent to which they agreed with three items adapted from Greenley and Foxall’s (1998) scale of stakeholder orientation on a scale of 1 to 7 (with 1 indicating strongly disagree and 7 indicating strongly agree). An example item is “The recruiter engages in sufficient research to understand the interests of each stakeholder group within the organization.” The internal consistency reliability for the items comprising this measure was \( \alpha = .88 \). Finally, I asked supervisors to rate the extent to which they agreed with items developed to reflect the relative quality of services their recruiter offers relative to other recruiters they oversee on a scale of 1 to 7 (with 1 indicating strongly disagree and 7 indicating strongly agree). An example item is “Relative to other recruiters that I oversee with similar types of job requisitions, my recruiter generally attracts more highly qualified candidates.” The internal consistency reliability for the items comprising this measure was \( \alpha = .59 \).

These three scales were averaged to create an overall index of recruiter performance. Performance was modeled in this way because I conceptualize recruiter performance as a multidimensional construct based on theoretical grounds. From a theoretical standpoint, the content of the items comprising each measure each represent a conceptually distinct component of recruiter performance. First, these scales are intended to focus on the perceptions of different stakeholders within the organization. Customer service and relative quality of services speak to the perceptions of hiring managers and the supervisor, respectively, while stakeholder orientation focuses on the recruiter’s general, observable regard for all or most of his or her stakeholders. Second, these measures differ in terms of whether they focus on recruiter behaviors or outcomes.
Customer service and stakeholder orientation focus more generally on recruiter behaviors and stakeholder trait inferences about recruiters based on observations of their behaviors, while relative quality of services focuses specifically on recruitment outcomes. Relative quality of services also draws a comparison to other recruiters recruiting for similar jobs who likely have similar amounts of resources with which to perform their jobs within similar contexts (as compared to recruiters from another organization).

To provide empirical support for the view that recruiter performance is multidimensional, I correlated the performance measures used in this study. Results indicated that customer service is correlated with stakeholder orientation and relative quality of services at levels of $r = .54$ and $r = .40$ ($p < .01$), respectively, and stakeholder orientation is correlated with relative quality of services at a level of $r = .36$ ($p < .01$). I also performed a confirmatory factor analysis. Results indicated that the three-factor model exhibited mediocre fit based on the fit indices ($\chi^2 [86, N = 95] = 167.21$, root mean square error of approximation [RMSEA] = .10, normed fit index [NFI] = .82, non-normed fit index [NNFI] = .88, comparative fit index [CFI] = .90, goodness of fit index [GFI] = .81, adjusted goodness of fit index [AGFI] = .73). For example, Hu and Bentler (1998, 1999) suggest cutoff values of .90 for CFI and .06 (or .08) for RMSEA. (Note that they also did not recommend using NFI, GFI, and AGFI as fit indices.) Marsh and Hau (1996) suggested using a cutoff value of .90 for NFI, NNFI, CFI, and GFI was a useful rule of thumb in some cases. Given the mediocre fit of the three-factor model, two additional models were considered. First, I examined the fit of the one-factor model. This model exhibited poorer fit than the three-factor model ($\Delta \chi^2 [4, N = 95] = 205.05$; $\chi^2 [90, N = 95] = 372.26$, RMSEA = .18, NFI = .59, NNFI = .60, CFI = .65, GFI = .67, AGFI =
Second, I explored a two-factor model where stakeholder orientation and relative quality of services were specified to load on the same factor; however, the results here were similar ($\Delta \chi^2[1, N = 95] = 11.67; \chi^2[87, N = 95] = 178.88$, RMSEA = .11, NFI = .81, NNFI = .86, CFI = .89, GFI = .80, AGFI = .72). As a final consideration, I performed an exploratory factor analysis to check whether there were any problem items. I used varimax rotation, and the results indicated that the customer service items all loaded on a first factor, the stakeholder orientation items all loaded on a second factor, the first three relative quality of services items (applicant quantity, quality, and diversity) loaded on a third factor, and the remaining two relative quality of services items (low cost and timeliness) loaded on a fourth factor. These results make sense in light of the theory presented above, which highlights the incompatibility of recruitment outcomes in particular (versus role behaviors), and proposes that applicant quantity, quality, and diversity are difficult to achieve at low cost and in a timely manner.

These empirical findings support conceptualizing recruiter performance as a multidimensional construct for two reasons. First, the intercorrelations among the different measures are only moderate in size. Second, the three-factor model fit the data better than the one and two-factor models. Recognizing the multidimensional nature of recruiter performance, I combined the three measures into an overall composite to represent recruiter performance several reasons. First, the three dimensions, in tandem, provide a more holistic summary of recruiter performance, one that ensures more aspects of recruiter performance are considered. This is not uncommon in research in applied psychology and is similar to combining measures of self-esteem, generalized self-efficacy, neuroticism, and locus of control into a composite that offers a more holistic
summary of how one evaluates one’s self (Judge, Erez, Bono, & Thoresen, 2003). Second, collapsing these dimensions into one overall performance measure simplifies data analysis. (Note, however, that analyzing each relationship separately provides similar results. For example, the correlations between outcome-oriented inter-stakeholder role conflict and overall performance, customer service, stakeholder orientation, and relative quality of services are $r = -.25, p < .05$, $r = -.22, p < .05$, $r = -.13, p = .23$, and $r = -.24, p < .05$, respectively.) Finally, this should enhance the stability of performance as a criterion in this study, which may increase the generalizability and replicability of the findings.

Regarding recruiter performance, it should be noted that more objective measures of recruitment outcomes would also have been beneficial to include. However, these could not be obtained given the time constraints associated with this study (this limitation will be discussed later). It should be highlighted, though, that stakeholder theory suggests that it is perhaps the perception that obligations are fulfilled that is most important (Freeman, 1984; Parmar et al., 2010). This is an important point. As the review above indicates, the trend in prior research on recruitment and recruiters is generally towards attempting to connect psychological constructs to objective outcomes such as applicant quality. Yet, what is not known is whether higher levels of quality, for example, really were high enough to fulfill the needs of internal stakeholders, particularly in light of the fact that some of these outcomes are fundamentally incompatible—that is, they are difficult to achieve simultaneously. Thus, perceptions of behaviors and outcomes achieved are a critical extension to this literature.
**Inter-stakeholder and intra-stakeholder role conflict.** According to role theory, incompatibility in role expectations (behavior or outcome-based) can be examined as it relates to the initial “sent” roles communicated by stakeholders or to downstream “received” roles as it relates role holder perceptions (Katz & Kahn, 1978). Further, incompatibility can also be examined from an inter-stakeholder or intra-stakeholder perspective. In this study, I was interested in understanding incompatibility in a more objective, sent role sense—both from an inter-stakeholder and an intra-stakeholder perspective. Measuring incompatibility in this way involves identification of the stakeholders of each recruiter, identification of their expectations regarding both behaviors and results, and an analysis of inconsistencies among them both across and within stakeholders (Ford, Walker, & Churchill, 1975; Kahn et al., 1964; Van Sell et al., 1981).

Therefore, as shown in Table B.2 (Appendix B), inter-stakeholder and intra-stakeholder role conflict were operationalized by having the supervisor first identify which internal stakeholders directly influence, or are influenced by, the recruiter’s achievement of his or her goals. Then I asked them to rate the extent to which they agreed that each stakeholder held each type of role expectation for the recruiter (regarding both behaviors and outcomes) on a scale of 1 to 7 (with 1 indicated strongly disagree and 7 indicating strongly agree). Example items include “Human Resources expects the recruiter to behave as a Promoter,” and “Human resources emphasizes applicant quantity above all else.” Following this, I asked the supervisor to rate the extent to which they agreed that each individual stakeholder’s role expectations (regarding both behaviors and outcomes) were incompatible on a scale of 1 to 7 (with 1 indicated strongly disagree and
7 indicating strongly agree). To operationalize *inter-stakeholder role conflict for behaviors*, I computed standard deviations across all judgments of the same role (e.g., promoter) for each of the stakeholders identified and averaged these 6 standard deviations obtained to compute an overall index of inter-stakeholder role conflict for behaviors. *Inter-stakeholder role conflict for outcomes* was calculated in the same way using the judgments for outcome-oriented expectations. This method of operationalizing inter-stakeholder role conflict is considered an index of separation (Harrison & Klein, 2007). On the other hand, another option would be to compute the coefficient of variation, which also involves computing the standard deviation across stakeholders for each role or outcome, but then also dividing each expectation by the mean across the stakeholders for that same role or outcome. This allows one to create an index of disparity. I chose to use a standard deviation for three reasons. First, an index of separation is generally used to measure differences in opinion across individuals, while disparity is generally used to measure differences in the concentration of assets across individuals (Harrison & Klein, 2007). Second, indices of separation are assumed to have an interval scale, while indices of disparity are assumed to have a ratio scale (Harrison & Klein, 2007). The survey used for this study does not have a 0 point on it (i.e., one cannot have an absolute zero belief in the importance of a role or outcome). Finally, separation indices assume symmetric effects, while disparity indices attempt to capture asymmetric effects and model it (Harrison & Klein, 2007). In the present context, having one stakeholder rate a given role as very important while all others rate it as very unimportant does not create greater disparity than when the situation is reversed. However, to be comprehensive, I also computed the coefficient of variation to examine whether it might change the findings.
Results indicated that the differences between the two indices were negligible. For example, the effects of using the coefficient of variation to predict performance for behavior and outcome-oriented inter-stakeholder conflict were $\beta = -.08$ (ns) and -.22 ($p < .05$), respectively (versus $\beta = -.03$ $p = .77$ and -.29 ($p < .05$).

To operationalize *intra-stakeholder role conflict for behaviors*, I averaged the five judgments supervisors made regarding the incompatibility of behavioral role expectations. *Intra-stakeholder role conflict for outcomes* was calculated in the same way using the items asking about the level of incompatibility associated with each stakeholder’s expected outcomes.

It should be pointed out that role conflict has not been operationalized in this way in prior research. One reason for this is that only one study exists in which an attempt was made to examine role conflict in a more objective sense—that is, among role expectations sent by different role senders (Kahn et al., 1964). These operationalizations do share some commonalities with the manner in which role conflict was operationalized in that study. For example, an attempt was made to differentiate the expectations of different types of stakeholders. As another example, an attempt was made to differentiate among different types of expectations (i.e., behavioral and outcome-oriented). Finally, an attempt was made to create indices that capture overall variability across stakeholders (or role senders). On the other hand, Kahn et al. (1964) used multiple methods (interviews and questionnaires) and sought information from the actual stakeholders themselves rather than using a proxy (i.e., the supervisor) as was done here. To examine the construct validity one might consider correlating these measures of role conflict across surveys between recruiters and supervisors. However, this would be inappropriate given that the
theory developed in this dissertation (as well as role theory itself, Katz & Kahn, 1978) would suggest that there should not be a high level of agreement among the two as the recruiter’s micro role hierarchy influences whether role conflict is perceived in the first place. Thus, the construct validity of these measures presents an important potential limitation of this study as is discussed later in this dissertation, but, given the exploratory nature of this study, such a lack of agreement may also provide important insight into the differences between how recruiters and supervisors perceive recruiter work.

**Micro role hierarchy segmentation.** Recruiters were presented with the definitions of the six micro roles developed in the theory above. They were then asked to respond to items adapted from the role segmentation preferences scale (Kreiner, 2006; also see Chen, Powell, & Greenhaus, 2009), rating the extent to which they agreed with items concerning how they define their recruiter macro role (see Table B.1, Appendix B) on a scale of 1 to 7 (with 1 indicating very strongly disagree and 7 indicating very strongly agree). Sample items include “I don’t like to have to think about other roles while I’m performing one role,” and “I prefer to separate the roles I enact.” The internal consistency reliability was high (α = .84). An average was taken across the four items comprising this scale to create an index of *micro role hierarchy segmentation.*

**Micro role hierarchy distribution.** Recruiters were presented with the definitions of the six micro roles developed in the theory above. They were then asked to respond to items adapted from the role identity scale (Lobel & St. Clair, 1992; also see Honeycutt & Rosen, 1997) intended to identify where they believed themselves to lie on the continuum between micro role dominance and distribution. Specifically, they were asked to rate the extent to which they agree that each of the six micro roles (promoter,
gatekeeper, salesperson, liaison, facilitator, advisor) defines their work as a recruiter. Micro role hierarchy distribution was then operationalized by computing the standard deviation across all six items. Note that coefficient alpha was not calculated for this scale because the theory developed above suggests that recruiters will vary in terms of the degree to which each role is included as part of their micro role hierarchy.

**Main Study Control Variables**

In this study, industry, organization size, recruiter experience, recruiter tenure, the average number of job requisitions the recruiter handles at a given time, and the number of stakeholders supervisors identified for recruiters were all explored as potential control variables. These factors are potentially important because they might influence the nature of the recruitment function and, in turn, result in differences regarding, for example, the manner in which recruiters’ jobs are defined, how recruiters define their own jobs, and the resources they tend to have at their disposal. They also have the potential to influence the absolute levels of recruitment outcomes such as the costs required and quantity of candidates recruited. However, only supervisor-reported number of stakeholders exhibited a significant correlation with recruiter performance overall. Thus, this was the only control variable used when testing the hypotheses.

**Results**

Table 4.2 presents the means, standard deviations, and intercorrelations among the study variables. (Note: A full correlation table among all study variables is presented in Table C.1, Appendix C). Noteworthy initial observations regarding relationships presented in this table are that (a) there is significant, positive relationship between number of stakeholders and recruiter performance, (b) behavior-oriented inter-
stakeholder role conflict and behavior and outcome-oriented intra-stakeholder role conflict were not significantly related to performance, (c) micro role segmentation and distribution were not significantly related to the various forms of role conflict or recruiter performance, and (d) that outcome-oriented inter-stakeholder role conflict is negatively related to recruiter performance. On the one hand, the lack of significant relationships observed among these variables may be due to low statistical power. On the other hand, a larger sample does not necessarily guarantee that these relationships would be significant.

While observing the correlations among the variables that were developed specifically for the purposes of this study, it is noteworthy to point out that the two forms of intra-stakeholder role conflict are highly correlated \((r = .89, p < .01)\). One could potentially argue that this would suggest they should be combined. However, the content of these items differs in terms of what is referenced while making these judgments (i.e., micro role incompatibility vs. recruitment outcome incompatibility). As discussed later in a supplemental analysis, this may be because the mean level of incompatibility assigned to these micro roles and outcomes is relatively low, ranging from approximately 2 to 3.5 on a scale of 1-7. This suggests that it may just be that supervisors and recruiters do not view enacting various micro roles and achieving numerous recruitment outcomes as difficult to do simultaneously.

Note that, when testing some of the hypotheses and performing several of the supplemental analyses below, I use one-tailed tests for significance. This is done in an attempt to balance type I and type II error. Type II error rate, or the incidence of failing to detect an effect that is present, is reasonably high for small correlations with small sample sizes. Thus, by raising the acceptable rate for type I error, I am hoping to reduce
the likelihood that effects present in the data are not identified (Shadish, Cook, & Campbell, 2002). I also indicate when relationships are marginally significant as this is not uncommon in research in applied psychology and management.

It is also important to note that a general five-item measure adapted from Netemeyer, Boles, & McMurrian (1996) was included in the recruiter survey and explored as a potential alternative measure of role conflict. An example item from this measure was “The demands of enacting one role interfere with my ability to enact others” α = .87. Results when using this measure as opposed to those described above indicated that role conflict as measured in this way was not significantly related to recruiter performance overall (β = -.07, p = .51) or any of its individual dimensions (i.e., customer service, β = .01, p = .93, stakeholder orientation, β = .00, p = .98, and relative quality of services, β = -.15, p = .15).

**Hypothesis Tests**

Hypothesis 1a predicted that inter-stakeholder role conflict will be negatively associated with recruiter performance. This hypothesis was tested in two ways. First, recruiter performance was regressed onto behavior-oriented inter-stakeholder role conflict. Second, recruiter performance was regressed onto outcome-oriented inter-stakeholder role conflict. As Table 4.3 indicates, this hypothesis received mixed support, with only outcome-oriented inter-stakeholder role conflict exhibiting a significant, negative relationship to recruiter performance (β = -.29, p < .01).

Hypothesis 1b predicted that intra-stakeholder role conflict will be negatively associated with recruiter performance. This hypothesis was tested in two ways. First recruiter performance was regressed onto behavior-oriented intra-stakeholder role
conflict. Second, recruiter performance was regressed onto outcome-oriented intra-stakeholder role conflict. As shown in Table 4.3, support for this hypothesis was marginal, with only outcome-oriented intra-stakeholder role conflict exhibiting a marginally significant relationship to performance ($\beta = -.15, p = .08$, one-tailed).

Hypothesis 2a predicted that recruiter micro role hierarchy segmentation will moderate the relationship between inter-stakeholder role conflict and recruiter performance, such that when recruiter micro role hierarchy segmentation is high the relationship between inter-stakeholder role conflict and recruiter performance will be weaker. Because behavior-oriented inter-stakeholder role conflict was not significantly related to recruiter performance, this hypothesis was only tested for outcome-oriented inter-stakeholder role conflict. As shown in Table 4.4, this hypothesis was not supported ($\beta = -.02, p = .86$).

Hypothesis 2b predicted that recruiter micro role hierarchy segmentation will moderate the relationship between intra-stakeholder role conflict and recruiter performance, such that when recruiter micro role hierarchy segmentation is high the relationship between intra-stakeholder role conflict and recruiter performance will be weaker. Because behavior-oriented intra-stakeholder role conflict was not significantly related to recruiter performance, this hypothesis was also only tested for outcome-oriented intra-stakeholder role conflict. Table 4.4 indicates that this hypothesis was not supported ($\beta = .14, p = .19$).

Hypothesis 3a predicted that recruiter micro role hierarchy distribution will moderate the relationship between inter-stakeholder role conflict and recruiter performance, such that when recruiter micro role hierarchy distribution is high the
relationship between inter-stakeholder role conflict and recruiter performance will be stronger. Because behavior-oriented inter-stakeholder role conflict was not significantly related to recruiter performance, this hypothesis was only tested for outcome-oriented inter-stakeholder role conflict. As shown in Table 4.5, this hypothesis was not supported ($\beta = .02, p = .86$).

Hypothesis 3b predicted that recruiter micro role hierarchy distribution will moderate the relationship between intra-stakeholder role conflict and recruiter performance, such that when recruiter micro role hierarchy distribution is high the relationship between intra-stakeholder role conflict and recruiter performance will be stronger. Because behavior-oriented intra-stakeholder role conflict was not significantly related to recruiter performance, this hypothesis was also only tested for outcome-oriented intra-stakeholder role conflict. As shown in Table 4.5, this hypothesis was not supported ($\beta = .14, p = .20$).

**Supplemental Analyses**

To better comprehend the results and gain a more nuanced understanding of the nature of recruiters’ work as well as how it relates to their effectiveness, several additional analyses informing a number of research questions were explored. These analyses relate to (a) supervisors’ and recruiters’ perceptions of role expectations, (b) recruiters’ micro role hierarchy characteristics and how they relate to differences between supervisor ratings of sent role expectations and recruiter ratings of received role expectations, (c) how recruiters’ micro role hierarchy characteristics and ratings of received role expectations relate to various dimensions of recruiter performance, (d) differences between supervisors and recruiters in terms of which types of individuals
each considers to be the recruiters’ stakeholders in the first place, (e) how the sequencing and synchronization of job requisitions and candidates relates to received role conflict reported by recruiters as well as various dimensions of their performance, and (f) whether recruiters reprioritize their job requisitions and candidates in response to factors such as role conflict and lack of sequencing and synchronization of job requisitions and candidate flow and whether doing so impacts their performance.

Table 4.6 identifies the specific research questions posed, explains how they were examined, and summarizes the findings. These research questions are important to examine for several reasons. First, Research Question 1 is important because it sheds light on the importance of various micro roles and recruitment outcomes for each stakeholder as well as whether supervisors and recruiters view them as incompatible. Second, Research Question 2 is important because it bears on whether the characteristics associated with recruiters’ micro role hierarchies are associated with differences between the levels of role conflict recruiters perceive and the more objective levels of role conflict associated with sent role expectations that supervisors may be capable of reporting. Third, Research Question 3 is important to consider because the results may shed light on whether the constructs discussed in the theory developed above are practically useful and why (e.g., by identifying which types of recruiter performance are more strongly affected by them). Fourth, Research Question 4 is important because it bears on who they consider to be stakeholders, which as an important precursor to effective recruitment strategy formulation. Fifth, Research Question 5 is important because it speaks to characteristics of recruiters’ workloads and whether there might be ways to better manage the process of recruitment such that recruiters do not have to confront as many conflicting expectations.
at a time, and thus can be more effective in fulfilling stakeholder obligations. Finally, Research Question 6 is important because may help shed light on the advantages and disadvantages of using applicant tracking systems in organizations today.

There are a number of important takeaways from the supplemental analyses performed. First, as Tables 4.7 and 4.8 indicate, all micro role behaviors tend to be perceived as generally important to all stakeholders. These tables also indicate there was more variability regarding which outcomes were more important for stakeholders. For example, quality, diversity, and timeliness were all viewed as highly important, whereas quantity and low cost were not. These findings are interesting in light of the fact that the latter two outcomes have received a great deal of attention in prior research on recruiters, and even more so on recruitment (e.g., Boudreau & Rynes, 1985; Collins & Han, 2004). Also, both supervisors and recruiters tended to view the micro role expectations and the recruitment outcomes or priorities as somewhat easy to demonstrate and achieve simultaneously. This was somewhat interesting in light of previous research on recruitment and personnel selection showing that at least some of these outcomes were difficult to achieve at the same time (e.g., Newman & Lyon, 2009; Pyburn, Ployhart, & Kravitz, 2008; Rynes et al., 1991). Second, micro role hierarchy distribution was positively associated with customer service for recruiters, behavior-oriented inter-stakeholder role conflict was negatively associated with customer service, relative quality of services, and overall performance, and outcome-oriented inter-stakeholder role conflict was negatively associated with relative quality of services. These findings suggest that performance can be improved when recruiters have more distributed micro role hierarchies and experience lower levels of inter-stakeholder role conflict. Third,
supervisors did not agree with recruiters regarding the number of stakeholders recruiters have. Recruiters tended to be more likely to view strategic managers and other employees within the firm as stakeholders. Finally, results suggest that recruiters may reorganize how their applicant tracking system prioritizes job requisitions when they are contending with more conflicting obligations to stakeholders and when they receive them at asynchronous time intervals. In terms of reprioritizing candidates, results suggested recruiters who engage in this practice may be more capable of achieving recruitment outcomes (e.g., high quality applicants, greater diversity) when compared to their peers.

Discussion

The purpose of this study was to test a model derived from the theory of recruiters developed in the preceding chapter. The results were largely unsupportive of the hypothesized model, with the exceptions being that outcome-oriented inter and intra-stakeholder role conflict exhibited significant and marginally significant, negative relationships with recruiter performance. Based on these findings, one might conclude that recruiters find it more difficult to reconcile incompatible recruitment outcomes expected by stakeholders, and that they may find it easier to enact the various role behaviors their stakeholders expect, even if they are incompatible or difficult to exhibit simultaneously. Other potential reasons for the lack of support for my hypotheses are discussed in the next chapter in the limitations section.

The supplemental analyses were slightly more informative. For example, the results suggest that behavior and outcome-oriented inter-stakeholder role conflict negatively impacted recruiter customer service (provided to hiring managers). Also, the results indicated the supervisors and recruiters exhibited little agreement when asked to
identify the number of stakeholders the recruiter has, as well as which types of
individuals or groups within the organization are stakeholders. Somewhat surprisingly,
the sequencing and synchronization of job requisitions and candidate flow did not
significantly relate to recruiter perceptions of role conflict or to their performance.
Finally, the results suggest that role conflict may increase the likelihood that a given
recruiter will reorganize how his or her organization’s applicant tracking system
prioritizes job requisitions and potentially candidates. They also suggest that doing so
may result in the recruiter being more effective at achieving various recruitment
outcomes when compared to their peers.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Operationalizations</th>
<th>Participant Receiving Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 1a: Inter-stakeholder role conflict will be negatively associated with recruiter performance.</td>
<td>Inter-Stakeholder Role Conflict: Supervisor ratings of degree to which role and outcome-oriented expectations are held by each internal stakeholder they identify as relevant to the recruiter. Recruiter Performance: - Customer Service (Schneider et al., 1998; Susskind et al., 2003) - Stakeholder Orientation (Greenley &amp; Foxall, 1997) - Quality of Services</td>
<td>Supervisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 1b: Intra-stakeholder role conflict will be negatively associated with recruiter performance.</td>
<td>Intra-Stakeholder Role Conflict: Supervisor ratings of degree to which role and outcome-oriented expectations held by each internal stakeholder they identify as relevant are incompatible. Recruiter Performance: - Customer Service (Schneider et al., 1998; Susskind et al., 2003) - Stakeholder Orientation (Greenley &amp; Foxall, 1997) - Quality of Services</td>
<td>Supervisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 2a: Recruiter micro role hierarchy segmentation will moderate the relationship between inter-stakeholder role conflict and recruiter performance, such that when recruiter micro role hierarchy segmentation is high the relationship between inter-stakeholder role conflict and recruiter performance will be weaker.</td>
<td>Inter-Stakeholder Role Conflict: Supervisor ratings of degree to which role and outcome-oriented expectations are held by each internal stakeholder they identify as relevant to the recruiter. Recruiter Performance: - Customer Service (Schneider et al., 1998; Susskind et al., 2003) - Stakeholder Orientation (Greenley &amp; Foxall, 1997) - Quality of Services Micro Role Hierarchy Segmentation: Recruiter ratings on adapted version of Kreiner’s (2006) Segmentation Preferences Scale.</td>
<td>Supervisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 2b: Recruiter micro role hierarchy segmentation will moderate the relationship between intra-stakeholder role conflict and recruiter performance, such that when recruiter micro role hierarchy segmentation is high the relationship between intra-stakeholder role conflict and recruiter performance will be weaker.</td>
<td>Intra-Stakeholder Role Conflict: Supervisor ratings of degree to which role and outcome-oriented expectations held by each internal stakeholder they identify as relevant are incompatible. Recruiter Performance: - Customer Service (Schneider et al., 1998; Susskind et al., 2003) - Stakeholder Orientation (Greenley &amp; Foxall, 1997) - Quality of Services</td>
<td>Supervisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis</td>
<td>Operationalizations</td>
<td>Participant Receiving Measure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| between intra-stakeholder role conflict and recruiter performance will be weaker. | **Micro Role Hierarchy Segmentation**  
Recruiter ratings on adapted version of Kreiner’s (2006) Segmentation Preferences Scale.  
**Inter-Stakeholder Role Conflict**  
Supervisor ratings of degree to which role and outcome-oriented expectations are held by each internal stakeholder they identify as relevant to the recruiter.  
**Recruiter Performance**  
• Customer Service (Schneider et al., 1998; Susskind et al., 2003)  
• Stakeholder Orientation (Greenley & Foxall, 1997)  
• Quality of Services  
**Micro Role Hierarchy Distribution**  
Recruiter classification of how they define their role based on adapted version of Lobel and St. Clair’s (1992) Role Identity Scale.                                                                 | Recruiter                     |
| **Hypothesis 3a**: Recruiter micro role hierarchy distribution will moderate the relationship between inter-stakeholder role conflict and recruiter performance, such that when recruiter micro role hierarchy distribution is high the relationship between inter-stakeholder role conflict and recruiter performance will be stronger. |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               | Supervisor                    |
| **Hypothesis 3b**: Recruiter micro role hierarchy distribution will moderate the relationship between intra-stakeholder role conflict and recruiter performance, such that when recruiter micro role hierarchy distribution is high the relationship between intra-stakeholder role conflict and recruiter performance will be stronger. |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               | Recruiter                     |
| **Intra-Stakeholder Role Conflict**  
Supervisor ratings of degree to which role and outcome-oriented expectations held by each internal stakeholder they identify as relevant are incompatible.  
**Recruiter Performance**  
• Customer Service (Schneider et al., 1998; Susskind et al., 2003)  
• Stakeholder Orientation (Greenley & Foxall, 1997)  
• Quality of Services  
**Micro Role Hierarchy Distribution**  
Recruiter classification of how they define their role based on adapted version of Lobel and St. Clair’s (1992) Role Identity Scale.                                                                 | Supervisor                    |
Table 4.2 Means, Standard Deviations, and Correlations among the Study Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Number of Stakeholders</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Inter-Stakeholder Role Conflict (B-O)</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.26*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Inter-Stakeholder Role Conflict (O-O)</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.39**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Intra-Stakeholder Role Conflict (B-O)</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Intra-Stakeholder Role Conflict (O-O)</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>.39**</td>
<td>.89**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Micro Role Hierarchy Segmentation</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Micro Role Hierarchy Distribution</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>.22*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Recruiter Performance</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>5.39</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.22*</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.25*</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. a from recruiter survey. b from supervisor survey. B-O = Behavior-Oriented, O-O = Outcome-Oriented. *p < .05. **p < .01. Reliability estimates are on the diagonal in parentheses.
Table 4.3 Recruiter Performance Regressed onto Inter and Intra-Stakeholder Role Conflict

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Recruiter Performance (Model 1)</th>
<th>Recruiter Performance (Model 2)</th>
<th>Recruiter Performance (Model 3)</th>
<th>Recruiter Performance (Model 4)</th>
<th>Recruiter Performance (Model 5)</th>
<th>Recruiter Performance (Model 6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td>$t$</td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td>$t$</td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td>$t$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Stakeholders</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>.22*</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>.26*</td>
<td>2.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-Stakeholder Role Conflict (B-O)</td>
<td>- .03</td>
<td>-.29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.29**</td>
<td>-2.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-Stakeholder Role Conflict (O-O)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.95</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intra-Stakeholder Role Conflict (B-O)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intra-Stakeholder Role Conflict (O-O)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-1.45</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$N$</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adj. $R^2$</td>
<td>.04*</td>
<td></td>
<td>.03</td>
<td></td>
<td>.11**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>.05†</td>
<td></td>
<td>.05</td>
<td></td>
<td>.13**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Coefficients are standardized. B-O = Behavior-Oriented, O-O = Outcome-Oriented. * $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. † $p < .10$. 
### Table 4.4 Interactions between Micro Role Hierarchy Segmentation and Outcome-Oriented Inter-Stakeholder Role Conflict

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Recruiter Performance (Model 1)</th>
<th>Recruiter Performance (Model 2)</th>
<th>Recruiter Performance (Model 3)</th>
<th>Recruiter Performance (Model 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( \beta )</td>
<td>( t )</td>
<td>( \beta )</td>
<td>( t )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Stakeholders</td>
<td>.25(^*)</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>.26(^*)</td>
<td>2.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-Stakeholder Role Conflict (O-O)</td>
<td>-.29(^**)</td>
<td>-2.84</td>
<td>-.29(^**)</td>
<td>-2.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intra-Stakeholder Role Conflict (O-O)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-1.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Segmentation</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-Stakeholder Role Conflict (O-O) X Role Segmentation</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intra-Stakeholder Role Conflict (O-O) X Role Segmentation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>( N )</th>
<th>( \text{Adj. } R^2 )</th>
<th>( R^2 )</th>
<th>( \Delta R^2 )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>89</td>
<td>.10(^**)</td>
<td>.13(^**)</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Coefficients are standardized. B-O = Behavior-Oriented, O-O = Outcome-Oriented. \(^*\) \( p < .05 \). \(^**\) \( p < .01 \). \(^\dagger\) \( p < .10 \).
Table 4.5 Interactions between Micro Role Hierarchy Distribution and Outcome-Oriented Inter-Stakeholder Role Conflict

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Recruiter Performance (Model 1)</th>
<th>Recruiter Performance (Model 2)</th>
<th>Recruiter Performance (Model 3)</th>
<th>Recruiter Performance (Model 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td>$t$</td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td>$t$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Stakeholders</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>.27*</td>
<td>2.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-Stakeholder Role Conflict (O-O)</td>
<td>-.33**</td>
<td>-3.24</td>
<td>-.33**</td>
<td>-3.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intra-Stakeholder Role Conflict (O-O)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Distribution</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-Stakeholder Role Conflict (O-O) X Role Distribution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intra-Stakeholder Role Conflict (O-O) X Role Distribution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| $N$ | 89 | 89 | 89 | 89 |
| Adj. $R^2$ | .14** | .13** | .06 | .07 |
| $R^2$ | .17** | .17** | .09 | .11 |
| $\Delta R^2$ | .00 | | | .02 |

Note. Coefficients are standardized. B-O = Behavior-Oriented, O-O = Outcome-Oriented. *$p < .05$. **$p < .01$. †$p < .10$. 
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
<th>Takeaways</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How important are different micro roles and recruitment outcomes to different</td>
<td>• Calculated Means and Standard Deviations for Supervisor and Recruiter</td>
<td>• Role expectations all rated as highly important to all stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stakeholders, and how incompatible are they perceived to be by supervisors and</td>
<td>ratings of stakeholder role expectations</td>
<td>• Importance of different recruitment outcomes/priorities of stakeholders more variable, with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recruiters?</td>
<td></td>
<td>quantity and low cost generally rated as less important, and quality, diversity, and timeliness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>rated as more important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Stakeholders varied in terms of which outcomes they considered more important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Incompatibility of role expectations and recruitment outcomes/priorities for each stakeholder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>was judged as fairly low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do micro role hierarchy segmentation and distribution result in differences</td>
<td>• Regressed recruiter-reported levels of stakeholder role conflict onto</td>
<td>• Micro role segmentation associated with increased likelihood of perceiving behavior-oriented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>between sent and received inter-stakeholder and intra-stakeholder role</td>
<td>recruiter-reported number of stakeholders, supervisor-reported levels of</td>
<td>intra-stakeholder role conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conflict?</td>
<td>stakeholder role conflict, and micro role segmentation</td>
<td>• Micro role segmentation associated with increased likelihood of perceiving outcome-oriented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Regressed recruiter-reported levels of stakeholder role conflict onto</td>
<td>intra-stakeholder role conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>recruiter-reported number of stakeholders, supervisor-reported levels of</td>
<td>• Micro role distribution associated with increased likelihood of perceiving outcome-oriented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>stakeholder role conflict, and micro role distribution</td>
<td>inter-stakeholder role conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Correlated micro role segmentation and distribution with general</td>
<td>• Micro role distribution associated with increased likelihood of perceiving outcome-oriented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>measure of role conflict perceived by recruiters</td>
<td>inter-stakeholder role conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Micro role segmentation and distribution both positively associated with general measure of role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do micro role hierarchy segmentation and distribution and recruiter-reported</td>
<td>• Correlated role segmentation and distribution with recruiter performance</td>
<td>conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>role conflict relate to various dimensions of recruiter performance?</td>
<td>dimensions (customer service, stakeholder orientation, and relative</td>
<td>• Micro role hierarchy distribution may be positively associated with customer service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>quality of services)</td>
<td>• Behavior-oriented inter-stakeholder role conflict negatively associated with customer service,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Correlated recruiter-reported stakeholder role conflict with recruiter</td>
<td>relative quality of services, and overall performance index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>performance dimensions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Question</td>
<td>Analysis</td>
<td>Takeaways</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Do supervisors and recruiters agree about the number and types of stakeholders recruiters have, and do supervisor and recruiter ratings of the number of stakeholders covary?** | • Computed t-test for supervisor and recruiter ratings of number of stakeholders  
• Computed t-test for supervisor and recruiter ratings of each stakeholder  
• Calculated correlation for supervisor and recruiter ratings of number of stakeholders | • Outcome-oriented inter-stakeholder role conflict negatively associated with relative quality of services  
• Supervisors did not agree on number of stakeholders recruiters have  
• Recruiters more likely to view top management/strategic managers and other organizational employees as stakeholders and less likely to view supervisor as a stakeholder  
• Supervisor and recruiter ratings of which individuals are stakeholders did not covary |
| **Are sequencing and synchronization of job requisitions and candidate flow negatively related to the levels of role conflict recruiters perceive and positively related to their performance?** | • Regressed recruiter-reported levels of stakeholder role conflict onto recruiter-reported number of stakeholders and supervisor-reported sequencing of job requisitions  
• Regressed recruiter-reported levels of stakeholder role conflict onto recruiter-reported number of stakeholders and supervisor-reported synchronization of job requisitions  
• Regressed recruiter-reported levels of stakeholder role conflict onto recruiter-reported number of stakeholders and supervisor-reported sequencing of candidate flow  
• Regressed recruiter-reported levels of stakeholder role conflict onto recruiter-reported number of stakeholders and supervisor-reported synchronization of candidate flow  
• Correlated recruiter-reported sequencing and synchronization of job requisitions and candidate flow with supervisor-reported performance (customer service, stakeholder orientation, relative quality of services, overall performance index) | • Synchronization of job requisitions negatively associated with behavior-oriented inter-stakeholder role conflict  
• Synchronization of job requisitions positively associated with relative quality of services |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
<th>Takeaways</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Do recruiters reprioritize their job requisitions and candidates in response to factors such as role conflict and lack of sequencing and synchronization of job requisitions and candidate flow, and does this behavior positively relate to their performance? | • Correlated supervisor-reported levels of stakeholder role conflict with recruiter-reported reprioritization of job requisitions and candidates  
• Correlated supervisor-reported sequencing and synchronization of job requisitions and candidate flow with recruiter-reported reprioritization of job requisitions and candidates  
• Correlated recruiter-reported reprioritization of job requisitions and candidates with supervisor-reported performance (customer service, stakeholder orientation, relative quality of services, overall performance index) | • Outcome-oriented inter-stakeholder role conflict, behavior-oriented intra-stakeholder role conflict, and outcome-oriented intra-stakeholder role conflict positively associated with recruiter reprioritization of job requisitions  
• Outcome-oriented intra-stakeholder role conflict positively associated with recruiter reprioritization of candidates |
Table 4.7 Supervisor Ratings of Stakeholder Role Expectations and Judgements of Expectation Incompatibility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Supervisor</th>
<th>HR</th>
<th>Hiring Managers</th>
<th>TM/Strategic Mgrs.</th>
<th>Other Employees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder (Y/N)</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micro Role</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter</td>
<td>6.34</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>6.08</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>5.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gatekeeper</td>
<td>6.03</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>6.29</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>6.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salesperson</td>
<td>6.21</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>5.78</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>5.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liaison</td>
<td>6.12</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>5.92</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>5.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitator</td>
<td>6.14</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>6.09</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>5.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisor</td>
<td>6.38</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>5.93</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>6.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incompatibility within Stakeholder (micro roles)</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>3.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantity</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>4.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>6.38</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>6.26</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>6.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>5.49</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>4.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Cost</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>3.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeliness</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>5.38</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>5.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incompatibility within Stakeholder (outcomes)</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>3.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Supervisor N = 89, HR N = 76, HM N = 85, TM = 59, Employees N = 30.
Table 4.8 Recruiter Ratings of Stakeholder Role Expectations and Judgements of Expectation Incompatibility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Supervisor</th>
<th>HR</th>
<th>Hiring Managers</th>
<th>TM/Strategic Mgrs.</th>
<th>Other Employees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>$SD$</td>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>$SD$</td>
<td>$M$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder (Y/N)</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micro Role</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoter</td>
<td>6.39</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>6.17</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>5.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gatekeeper</td>
<td>6.14</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>6.03</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>6.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salesperson</td>
<td>5.93</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>5.74</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>5.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liaison</td>
<td>6.04</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>6.11</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>6.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitator</td>
<td>6.19</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>6.26</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>6.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisor</td>
<td>6.33</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>6.04</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>6.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incompatibility within Stakeholder (micro roles)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantity</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>3.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>6.06</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>5.97</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>6.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>4.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Cost</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>3.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeliness</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>5.04</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>5.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incompatibility within Stakeholder (outcomes)</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>3.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Supervisor N = 84, HR N = 76, HM N = 87, TM = 73, Employees N = 53.
Figure 4.1 Theoretical Model
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Recruiter Performance
CHAPTER 5

GENERAL DISCUSSION

Recruiters play a key role in determining the types and amount of the human capital resources flowing into their firms. Yet, no general framework exists providing a basic set of principles that enhances our understanding of them and their work activities. Such a framework would be valuable as it would provide a common language useful towards both interpreting prior research on recruiters and enabling the development of a coherent stream of research on this topic moving forward. In line with Barber’s (1998) landmark book, which simply framed the recruitment process as involving three stages, and thus set the stage for how future scholarship would conceptualize, examine, and discuss recruitment, this dissertation quite simply attempts to make five general points. First, recruiters are more accurately conceptualized as stakeholder managers than stewards of their organizations. Second, the term, recruiter, more accurately applies to a macro role, rather than a well-defined job. Third, the recruiter macro role is comprised of six different types of micro roles. Fourth, recruiters are confronted with a fundamental dilemma associated with their work in that it involves the need to fulfill incompatible obligations. Finally, an important key to improving recruiter performance lies in how micro role hierarchies are organized.

The empirical study provided a modest test of some of the key tenets of the theory developed in this dissertation. Mixed results were found, many of which raise important questions for future research. There were several key findings of note. First, regarding the
main study hypotheses, it was found that inter and intra-stakeholder role conflict regarding the importance of recruitment outcomes tended to have a negative impact on recruiter performance. Second, the supplemental analyses indicated that all of the micro roles appeared to be important to all stakeholders, while greater variation was found regarding which specific recruitment outcomes were important. Third, regardless of whether behaviors or outcomes were the focus of investigation, both supervisors and recruiters did not appear to feel these expectations were highly incompatible. That is, they could be exhibited or achieved simultaneously with relative ease. Fourth, recruiters conceptualizing their macro role as encompassing a greater number of micro roles tended to perceive higher levels of outcome-oriented inter and intra-stakeholder role conflict. Fifth, behavior and outcome-oriented inter-stakeholder role conflict as perceived by recruiters was also associated with lower levels of recruiter performance. Sixth, recruiters were more likely to view top management/strategic managers and other organizational employees as stakeholders when compared to supervisors. Finally, recruiters tended to reprioritize job requisitions when they experienced higher levels of inter and intra-stakeholder role conflict.

**Theoretical Implications**

Viewing recruiters as stakeholder managers who enact a compilation of micro roles and are generally faced with a fundamental dilemma wherein they are charged with fulfilling incompatible obligations to a variety of stakeholders has broad implications for recruiter scholarship. First, the theory developed in this dissertation extends prior research on recruiters by relaxing the assumption that recruiters are stewards of their firms. In contrast, I propose that recruiters should be viewed as stakeholder managers.
Recruiters often must foster and maintain relationships with a variety of different individuals or entities external to their firms (e.g., educational institutions) in order to gain access to potential applicants. They also have to foster and maintain relationships with individuals and groups within their firms (e.g., hiring managers, HR) to access the information and resources necessary to identify and fulfill expectations regarding their behaviors and the outcomes they achieve. This view stands in stark contrast to prior research on recruiters, which effectively ignores individuals and groups who either influence or are influenced by the recruiter’s achievement of his or her goals (aside from applicants). This view generates many new directions for future research. For example, the notion of viewing recruiters as stakeholder managers highlights, rather than downplays, recruiter agency. Recruiter agency may be valuable or problematic for organizations. On the one hand, recruiters given latitude in precisely how they achieve recruitment outcomes expected by various stakeholders may be capable of developing more appropriate micro role hierarchies for fulfilling stakeholder obligations. On the other hand, some recruiters may impose their own interests on stakeholders and not strive to meet their actual expectations. Future research should continue this approach by examining the advantages and disadvantages of recruiter agency identified here in more detail as well as other types of advantages and disadvantages that can be derived from the theory developed above.

Second, the theory developed in this dissertation advances recruiter scholarship by leveraging the inherently social nature of recruiter work to develop a parsimonious, yet generalizable, framework for classifying and understanding the behaviors recruiters exhibit. This framework has the potential to not only explain why recruiters exhibit
various behaviors, but also to identify characteristics that differentiate high-performing (and potentially strategically valuable) recruiters from those that are less valuable to their organizations. The strength of this framework lies in its inherent simplicity. It identifies six micro roles that recruiters exhibit to greater or lesser degrees. Similar to Barber’s (1998) categorization of the recruitment process into three distinct stages involving different activities and objectives, each micro role encompasses a distinct set of behaviors recruiters need to exhibit to effectively fulfill obligations to their stakeholders (and thus exhibit high performance), and these micro roles cover the gamut of recruiter behaviors. Future research should examine the correspondence between the three stages of recruitment and these six micro roles. It may be the case that certain micro roles are more important at different recruitment stages. If this is the case, recruiters may be more or less effective during different stages of the recruitment process depending on the organization of their micro role hierarchies. For example, a recruiter with a micro role hierarchy dominated by the promoter micro role may be effective in stage one, where the objective is to attract applicants, but ineffective in stage two where their objective might be to screen applicants. It may also be the case that different types of micro roles are more or less useful when addressing obligations to different types of stakeholders (e.g., promoter and gatekeeper may be externally focused, while liaison and advisor may be inwardly focused). If this is the case, then more dominated micro role hierarchies may be more effective in certain contexts due to their reduced levels of complexity.

Third, the theory proposed advances scholarship on recruiters by shifting attention towards the importance of beginning to explore the incompatibility associated with behaviors and outcomes expected of recruiters. Presently, research exists in the broader
area of recruitment that highlights how recruitment outcomes are often incompatible and thus difficult to achieve simultaneously (Newman & Lyon, 2009). Yet, no research exists on how recruiters handle this issue, how this relates to variability in the behaviors they exhibit, and how this relates to their performance. Future research on this topic would not only provide insight into the value of recruiters to organizations, but also enable research on the topic of recruiters to be better integrated with research on recruitment as a whole.

Finally, the theory of recruiters proposed above advances recruiter and recruitment scholarship by providing a platform for future research to begin to integrate research on recruiters with broader research topics in HR and OB to begin to understand how to enhance recruiter effectiveness and performance across different contexts. For example, recruitment teams are often send to college campuses to recruit for their organizations. It is possible that the most effective teams contain recruiters with more dominated micro role hierarchies as each recruitment team member can specialize in exhibiting a different set of micro role behaviors. In terms of recruiter training, the micro role types provide a foundation for identifying and classifying behaviors recruiters may have to exhibit to achieve certain recruitment outcomes, and thus may be useful towards addressing the training needs of recruiters as well as developing the content of a training program. In terms of OD interventions, with the propositions offered regarding events that moderate relationships between either antecedents and micro role hierarchy characteristics, or micro role hierarchy characteristics and recruiter performance, insight might be gleaned into the types of OD intervention characteristics necessary to improve recruiter performance (e.g., high strength and long duration).
Practical Implications

This theory and empirical findings in this dissertation offer several important practical implications for organizations. First, recruiter performance should be measured along several dimensions, including those that are behavioral and those that are outcome-oriented. It is not enough to just have hiring managers fill out a customer service satisfaction survey as they are not the only stakeholders to which recruiters attend, and improving recruiter performance may require different perspectives and differentiating recruiter behaviors from recruiter outcomes achieved. Second, the general set of micro roles offered can be useful towards the development of a recruiter competency model. This model, in turn, could be valuable when used to determine training needs, promotion potential, and compensation. Third, recruiters have a more difficult time reconciling incompatible outcomes expected by stakeholders than incompatible behavioral expectations. One way to improve their capacities to do so may be for organizations to find ways to augment the number of discrete behavioral themes recruiters associate with their work and create a clear line of sight between each behavioral theme (i.e., micro role) and recruitment outcomes expected. This may include use of training programs and other types of OD interventions that are high in strength and long in duration. Fourth, organizations should search for ways to better align managers’ and recruiters’ perceptions of the stakeholders to which recruiters should be attending. The present study showed that supervisors and recruiters did not agree on either the number of stakeholders to which recruiters attend or their types. It also showed that recruiters tended to view themselves as having more stakeholders. It is unclear whether it would advantageous for recruiters to ignore top management/strategic managers and other organizational
employees as stakeholders. For example, it may reduce the complexity associated with their work. On the other hand, they may not then fulfill obligations to these groups that benefit the organization. Fifth, organizations may benefit from offering recruiters some latitude regarding how they prioritize their job requisitions and candidates. Recruiters with higher levels of role conflict may be capable of better managing their work activities in accordance with their micro role hierarchy characteristics.

**Limitations and Future Directions**

Although the empirical study was fairly exploratory given the present status of recruiter scholarship, its limitations are important to discuss. First, the relationships found between inter-stakeholder role conflict and performance may have been the result of common method bias. Supervisor responses were used for both measures (i.e., the independent variable and dependent variable) and they were both obtained on the same survey. Attempts were made to mitigate this issue as much as possible. For example, the measures were obtained at opposing ends of the survey with additional measures obtained between them, multiple measures were used to create indices for both measures, and supervisors were not allowed to go back to change their responses on a previous page of the survey after they had moved to the next page. Future research should attempt to explore these relationships using multiple methodologies. For example, Kahn et al. (1964) used surveys and interviews to explore inter-sender role conflict. As another example, objective outcomes (i.e., time to fill, assessment scores of candidates, etc.) should be considered in conjunction with perceptions of these outcomes.

Second, several of the measures may have lacked construct validity. For example, items asking about stakeholder expectations regarding the micro roles proposed in the
theory developed in this dissertation may not have been fully understood. Similarly, despite the use of a pilot study to identify the different micro roles comprising the recruiter macro role, the proposed list of micro roles may not have fully captured the recruiter macro role, and thus measures regarding the importance or variability among stakeholders in terms of the behaviors they expect may have been deficient. The manner in which inter-stakeholder role conflict was operationalized may also pose a concern. It was not possible to assess its reliability and construct validity using methods typically used in organizational research. For example, correlating the inter-stakeholder role conflict index created using supervisor responses with the same index created using recruiter responses should not (and did not) yield large correlations, given that one was intended to measure “sent” role expectations, while the other was intended to measure “perceived” expectations. Also, micro role hierarchy segmentation was measured using items that were worded using preferential and “like/dislike” terminology, rather than asking what actually occurs, which may have resulted in this measure not actually measuring its intended construct. As such, future research should further explore the construct validity of all the measures used in this study, which includes those that were largely exploratory. Finally, the extent to which supervisors are capable of providing useful or valid responses to items asking about different stakeholder expectations needs to be addressed in future research. For example, supplemental analyses showed that supervisor and recruiter ratings generally lacked consistency (i.e., exhibited low correlations) and exhibited little agreement regarding factors such as who stakeholders were. The same was the case when comparing the measures for inter and intra-stakeholder role conflict, although there were generally higher levels of agreement for
these individual items as both tended to rate the micro roles as highly important, for example.

One potential future direction to consider in light of these issues is a more specific focus on how differences in expectations between only two stakeholders (e.g., hiring manager and HR) regarding one or two outcomes (e.g., quality and diversity) relate to recruiter performance. This would involve a focus on how “fit” relates to recruiter performance, include surveying two different stakeholders (rather than the supervisor), and require the use of response surface methodology. This may be particularly interesting in light of the concerns noted above regarding the use of a separation index to operationalize inter-stakeholder role conflict and the fact that using the general measure of role conflict to predict recruiter performance also did not produce significant results as shown in the supplemental analyses. One could also consider using different dimensions of recruiter performance rather than an overall index as was used here, which would be selected based on the context under examination. For example, organizations often use candidate surveys to assess recruiter performance, which would shed light on the extent to which internal versus external constituents’ needs are being met by recruiters. One way to accomplish this might be to conduct detailed “exit interviews” after each of the three stages of the recruitment process with both applicants and the primary internal stakeholder (the hiring manager). These interviews would focus less on generic applicant/stakeholder reactions to the recruiter (e.g., trait inferences) as prior research has done (e.g., Taylor & Bergmann, 1987), and more on specific types of stakeholder management techniques recruiters utilized that each stakeholder observed.
Third, the sample size associated with this study may not have been large enough to detect any effects that might exist. For example, given a sample size of 90 recruiter-supervisor pairs, only correlations of \( r = .26 \) could be detected using a one-tailed test for significance. Future research on recruiters should attempt to generate sample sizes larger than that which was used in this study.

Fourth, the sample may have been too heterogenous in terms of characteristics such as organization type, industry, types of jobs for which recruiters recruit, the nature of the recruitment function, organizational and recruitment norms, and organizational policies, practices, and procedures. Factors such as these have the potential to create noise in the data, which would make relationships among the variables examined difficult to identify and/or detect. Some of these factors were explored were possible. For example, one organization only had 5 members, which may influence the supervisor’s ability to make a judgment regarding the recruiter’s relative quality (as there may have been no other recruiters to serve as a reference). However, testing the hypotheses while including and excluding this supervisor-recruiter pair did not change the results regarding this performance dimension. Future research should attempt to include, and control for, more contextual variables such as those listed above.

**Conclusion**

In conclusion, in this dissertation I defined full life cycle recruiters as quasi-agentic brokers of resources among parties internal and external to a firm who operate at the intersection of social systems, are involved in recruiting, assessment, and onboarding processes, and adopt multiple micro roles with the primary purpose of enabling human capital resource accumulation. I then attempted to address the theoretical void regarding
this topic by developing a theory to better understand recruiters and the nature of their work. Key arguments include that (1) recruiter performance depends on the ability to forge and manage internal and external stakeholder relationships in such a way that cooperative and competing obligations to all stakeholders and/or stakeholder groups to which they should be attending are fulfilled, (2) recruiters’ capacities to fulfill obligations to all stakeholders and/or stakeholder groups are shaped and constrained by the nature of their micro role hierarchies, and (3) whether contextual events modify relationships among antecedents and recruiters’ micro role hierarchies or recruiters’ micro role hierarchies and performance is determined by event strength and duration. A pilot study and an empirical study testing a model derived from this theory were somewhat supportive. However, given the exploratory nature of the qualitative and empirical studies involved, future research is needed to both assess the validity of this theory and extend its findings. It is my hope that this dissertation thus provides both an impetus as well as a platform for future research on this important topic.
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APPENDIX A

INTERVIEW PROTOCOLS FOR PILOT STUDY

Table A.1 Interview Protocol for Recruiters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.</th>
<th>I’d like to begin by gathering a little background information about you, your organization, and the recruitment function where you work.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>What is your current job title?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>How long have you been working for your organization?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>How long have you held your current position in your organization?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>What are the previous jobs you’ve held in recruiting?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Tell me about the recruiting function/department in your organization. For example, how is the recruiting department organized in terms of management structure and reporting relationships?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>How does the staffing process in your organization work? For example, does your organization support line management who makes the hiring decisions or does HR make some of the hiring decisions (especially in prescreening)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Does your organization use any external staffing firms (e.g., head hunters, temporary staffing agencies, etc.)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>What staffing tools does your organization use (e.g., anything besides the normal interviews and background checks, such as assessments)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Approximately how many recruiters do you have within your organization and how many jobs do they fill in a year?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>What are the types of jobs for which you recruit?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Next, I have some more detailed questions about the way in which you understand your work as a recruiter.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>How would you describe being a recruiter? For example, would you consider it to be a well-defined job with specific tasks to be performed, a role where much of...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
12. What are some of the major tasks you perform?

13. What are some of the major challenges you face?

14. As a recruiter, do you consider yourself accountable to a variety of different stakeholders internal to your organization (HR, line managers, other employees), or the organization as a whole?

15. Research suggests recruitment involves three general stages: attracting applicants, maintaining applicant status/screening, and influencing job choice. Based on your experience, do these seem accurate? Are there any changes you would make to them?

16. To what extent are you personally involved in each of these stages?

17. Research suggests recruiters may enact several somewhat different roles as part of their overall job. For example, they might behave as a promoter of jobs/the organization, as a gatekeeper to jobs/the organization, and as a salesperson of jobs/the organization. Do these role titles make sense to you? Are there any changes you would make to them?

18. Have you ever experienced situations where different internal stakeholders have or communicate conflicting expectations regarding your behavior? If so, how often does this occur?

19. What are the recruitment outcomes internal stakeholders expect of you? Do they differ across internal stakeholders?

20. To what extent do these outcomes or results conflict? For example, do some come at the expense of others?

21. How is your performance evaluated? For example, is it based on the behaviors you exhibit, or the recruitment outcomes you achieve, or both?

22. Are there other, broader outcomes at the operational or strategic level that you influence? If so, are there any metrics used by your organization to assess this broader impact?

23. How do conflicting expectations of internal stakeholders influence your behavior as a recruiter?
24. How do conflicting outcomes emphasized by internal stakeholders influence your behavior as a recruiter and the outcomes you are ultimately able to achieve? For example, do they require tradeoffs regarding what you attempt to achieve overall, or tradeoffs regarding where and when you allocated effort to fulfilling obligations to specific internal stakeholders?

25. How do conflicting internal stakeholder expectations regarding your behavior influence your performance as a recruiter?

26. How do conflicting recruitment outcomes emphasized by internal stakeholders influence your performance as a recruiter?

27. What types of other factors influence your ability to perform as a recruiter? Examples might include environmental factors such as the labor market, organizational factors such as structure, physical factors such as communication media and technology, and/or interpersonal factors such as relationship characteristics.

28. Are there any practices that individual stakeholders or the organization as a whole use in an attempt to make your job easier and/or enhance your performance? If so, to what extent do they work and why?

Now I’d like to talk a little bit about whether measures developed based on prior research make sense to you and what changes you might suggest.

29. If you were asked the following items as they relate to your work as a recruiter, would they make sense to you? (Role Conflict)
   - The demands of enacting one role interfere with my ability to enact others.
   - The amount of time required to enact one role makes it difficult to enact others.
   - Things I want to do while enacting one role do not get done because of the demands of other roles.
   - Enacting one role produces strain that makes it difficult to enact others.
   - Due to the requirements involved in enacting one role, I have to make changes to how I enact other roles.

30. If you were asked the following items as they relate to your work as a recruiter, would they make sense to you? (Segmentation Preferences)
   - I don’t like to have to think about other roles while I’m performing one role (e.g., promoter, gatekeeper, salesperson).
   - I prefer to separate the roles I enact.
   - I don’t like having to enact several roles at the same time.
   - I like to be able to focus on enacting one role when I’m out recruiting talent.

31. If you were asked the following items as they relate to your work as a recruiter, would they make sense to you? (Role Identity)
• I am primarily a Promoter.
• I am a Promoter and a Gatekeeper, but I lean more toward being a Promoter.
• I am a Promoter and a Salesperson, but I lean more toward being a Promoter.
• I am a Promoter, Gatekeeper, and a Salesperson but lean more towards being a Promoter.
• Etc. with different combinations.

32. If you were asked to respond to items concerning what roles you enacted while recruiting for a given opening, would you be able to do so?
• Promoter
• Gatekeeper
• Salesperson

33. If you were asked to indicate the extent to which you generally feel the following ways, would they make sense to you? (Negative Affectivity)
• Scared
• Afraid
• Upset
• Distressed
• Jittery
• Nervous
• Ashamed
• Guilty
• Irritable
• Hostile
I’d like to begin by gathering a little background information about your job, your organization, and the recruitment function where you work.

1. What is your current job title?
2. How long have you been working for your organization?
3. How many years of experience do you have in your current job?
4. Have you had any other jobs in recruiting?
5. Tell me about the recruiting function/department in your organization. For example, how is the recruiting department organized in terms of management structure and reporting relationships?
6. How does the staffing process in your organization work? For example, does your organization support line management who makes the hiring decisions or does HR make some of the hiring decisions (especially in prescreening)?
7. Does your organization use any external staffing firms (e.g., head hunters, temporary staffing agencies, etc.)?
8. What are the types of jobs you oversee recruitment for?
9. What was the most recent job you and your recruiters attempted to fill?
10. During your last recruitment effort, how many recruiters did you oversee?
11. During your last recruitment effort, how many internal stakeholders were your recruiters held accountable to (e.g., line managers, strategic decision makers, HR managers, other employees)?
12. During your last recruitment effort, to what extent were you in direct contact with these internal stakeholders?

Next, I’d like to ask you a few questions about your recruiters and how they are managed.

13. During your last recruitment effort, to what extent were your recruiters in direct contact with internal stakeholders?
14. How is the performance of your recruiters assessed? For example, is it behavior-based, outcomes/results-based, or both?
15. Does your organization, or any stakeholders within it, use any metrics to track recruiter behaviors?

16. Does your organization, or any stakeholders within it, use any metrics to track individual recruiter outcomes?

17. Does your organization, or any stakeholders within it, use any practices to enhance recruiter performance? If so, what are they?

18. During your last recruitment effort, what behavioral expectations did you personally have for your recruiters?

19. Research suggests recruiters may enact several somewhat different roles as part of their overall job. For example, they might behave as a promoter of jobs/the organization, as a gatekeeper to jobs/the organization, and as a salesperson of jobs/the organization. Do these role titles make sense to you? Are there any changes you would make to them?

20. During your last recruitment effort, to what extent did you observe internal stakeholders communicating conflicting or mutually exclusive behavioral expectations to your recruiters?

21. What outcomes did you personally emphasize for them?

22. During your last recruitment effort, to what extent did you observe internal stakeholders prioritizing conflicting or mutually exclusive recruitment outcomes for your recruiters?

23. Do your recruiters’ personal interests or priorities ever appear to play a role in how they resolve conflicting behavioral or outcome-oriented expectations internal stakeholders communicated to them?

24. What factors influence the behavioral expectations and recruitment outcome-related priorities you personally communicate to your recruiters? Examples might include environmental factors such as labor market, job factors such as the job being staffed, physical process/resource factors such as communication media or budgetary constraints, and recruiter individual differences such as their knowledge, skills, and abilities.

25. What impact do your recruiters have on your organization? For example, tell me about some of the key organizational, departmental, unit, team, and/or individual-oriented outcomes that recruiters influence while performing their jobs.

26. Which of these organizational outcomes do recruiters tend to improve and which do they tend to undermine in performing their jobs?
27. What broader impact do your recruiters have on your organization? For example, tell me about some of the key operational and strategic outcomes that recruiters influence in your organization (e.g., efficiency, performance, competitive advantage, increased market share)?

28. How do you think these operational and strategic outcomes are affected by your recruiters? Examples might include certain recruiter behaviors improving team dynamics or catalyzing team performance/effectiveness, recruiters staffing high priority positions with certain candidates thus ensuring strategic alignment.

29. Which of these operational or strategic outcomes do recruiters tend to improve and which do they sometimes undermine in performing their jobs?

30. If your recruiters do influence these operational and strategic outcomes, what metrics are used to monitor them?

Now I’d like to talk briefly about whether measures developed based on prior research make sense to you and what changes you might suggest.

31. If you were asked to rate the following items as they relate to a given recruiter’s outcomes, would you be able to do so accurately? (Perceptions of Recruiter Outcomes Achieved)
   • On average, the candidates the recruiter contributed to the applicant pool were qualified.
   • The recruiter contributed a large number of applicants to the applicant pool.
   • The candidates my recruiter contributed to the applicant pool were racioethnically diverse.
   • My recruiter was costly.
   • My recruiter required a lot of time to help fill the position.

32. If you were asked to rate the degree to which different internal stakeholders communicated behavioral expectations consistent with the following role titles, would you be able to do so accurately?
   • Promoter (Stage 1, Stage 2, Stage 3)
   • Gatekeeper (Stage 1, Stage 2, Stage 3)
   • Salesperson (Stage 1, Stage 2, Stage 3)

33. If you were asked to rate the extent to which specific recruitment outcomes achieved by a given recruiter were consistent with those emphasized by different internal stakeholders, would you be able to do so accurately?
   • Candidate quantity
   • Candidate diversity
   • Candidate quality
   • Low cost
   • Timeliness
34. If you were asked to rate the degree to which different internal stakeholders used the following practices to monitor or enhance recruiter performance, would you be able to do so accurately?
   • Training
   • Personal communication with the recruiter during recruitment process to clarify expectations
   • Feedback regarding recruiter’s behavior during recruitment and after process
   • Tracking recruiter’s behavior on the job (e.g., emails, internet use)
APPENDIX B

SURVEYS FOR EMPIRICAL STUDY

Table B.1 Recruiter Survey

**Initial Items**
1. Please indicate your email address. (Note: this information will only be used to send you your incentive provided you decide to complete the following survey, and to ensure your responses are correctly matched to your supervisor’s responses to his or her survey.)
2. Please indicate your supervisor’s email address. (Note: this information will only be used to match the information you supply below with your supervisor’s responses to his or her survey.)
3. Current job title:
4. Years experience in current job:
5. Company name:
6. Years working for current company:
7. Total years experience as Recruiter:
8. Average number of open job requisitions you handle at a time.
9. Are you a Full Life Cycle Recruiter, defined as a recruiter that is involved, to a greater or lesser degree, in recruiting, assessing, and onboarding candidates?

**Recruiter Micro Role Segmentation** (Segmentation Preferences adapted from Kreiner, 2006, JOB)

**Instructions for Recruiters:** For this portion of the survey we are interested in understanding your preferences from enacting different recruiter-oriented roles. There are no wrong answers.

After reviewing the six recruiter roles described below, please respond to the items below.

**Promoter Role:** Involves promoting the organization's brand, culture, and job characteristics. The primary goal of this role is to improve everyone's attitudes towards the organization and job.

**Gatekeeper Role:** Involves demonstrating person-specific behaviors that include making preliminary distinctions among applicants and then attempting to attract those that would add value to the organization and screen out those who would not.
Salesperson Role: Involves demonstrating person-specific behaviors that include tailoring the recruitment message you convey to the specific people with which you interact based on their needs, interests, and preferences.

Liaison Role: Involves behaving as a boundary spanner between entities such as human resources, business units, departments, hiring managers, educational institutions, and applicants, and serving as a broker of information between these different types of stakeholders.

Facilitator Role: Involves remaining neutral or objective, and demonstrating behaviors geared towards recruitment project management, as well as ensuring the recruitment process is fair, consistent, and expedient.

Advisor Role: Involves offering stakeholders guidance (e.g., regarding candidate fit, compensation) based on your technical or specialized knowledge, as well as managing expectations of stakeholders.

1. I do not like to have to think about other roles while I’m performing one role.
2. I prefer to separate the roles I enact.
3. I do not like having to enact several roles at the same time.
4. I like to be able to focus on enacting one role when I’m out recruiting talent.

**Recruiter Micro Role Distribution** (Adapted from Role Identity Scale, Lobel & St. Clair, 1992)

**Instructions for Recruiters:** For this portion of the survey we are interested in understanding how you personally conceptualize your role as a recruiter. There are no wrong answers.

Please indicate the extent to which you agree that each of the following role descriptions define your work as a recruiter on a scale of 1 to 7 (with 1 indicating strongly disagree and 7 indicating strongly agree).

Promoter Role: Involves promoting the organization's brand, culture, and job characteristics. The primary goal of this role is to improve everyone's attitudes towards the organization and job.

Gatekeeper Role: Involves demonstrating person-specific behaviors that include making preliminary distinctions among applicants and then attempting to attract those that would add value to the organization and screen out those who would not.

Salesperson Role: Involves demonstrating person-specific behaviors that include tailoring the recruitment message you convey to the specific people with which you interact based on their needs, interests, and preferences.
**Liaison Role:** Involves behaving as a boundary spanner between entities such as human resources, business units, departments, hiring managers, educational institutions, and applicants, and serving as a broker of information between these different types of stakeholders.

**Facilitator Role:** Involves remaining neutral or objective, and demonstrating behaviors geared towards recruitment project management, as well as ensuring the recruitment process is fair, consistent, and expedient.

**Advisor Role:** Involves offering stakeholders guidance (e.g., regarding candidate fit, compensation) based on your technical or specialized knowledge, as well as managing expectations of stakeholders.

1. Promoter
2. Gatekeeper
3. Salesperson
4. Facilitator
5. Advisor
6. Liaison

**Role Conflict Scale** (Work-home Conflict adapted from Netemeyer, Boles, & McMurrian, 1996, JAP)

**Instructions for Recruiters:** Please think about how you perform your work as a recruiter and respond to these items with this process in mind.

Please indicate the degree to which each of the following conditions exist for you on a scale of 1 to 7 (with 1 indicating very false and 7 indicating very true).

1. The demands of enacting one role interfere with my ability to enact others.
2. The amount of time required to enact one role makes it difficult to enact others.
3. Things I want to do while enacting one role do not get done because of the demands of other roles.
4. Enacting one role produces strain that makes it difficult to enact others.
5. Due to the requirements involved in enacting one role, I have to make changes to how I enact other roles.

**Sequencing and Synchronization of Job Requisitions**

Please rate the extent to which you agree with the following on a scale of 1 to 7 (with 1 indicating strongly disagree and 7 indicating strongly agree).

1. In general, my job requisitions move through the hiring process sequentially (i.e., one after another versus all at once).
2. In general, my job requisitions move at similar rates through the recruiting/hiring process.
3. In general, the job requisitions I receive come to me in sequence, rather than all at once.
4. In general, the job requisitions I receive come to me at the same rate.

Existence of Applicant Tracking System

Please answer the following items by responding yes or no.
1. Does your organization have an applicant tracking system?

Recruiter Reprioritization of Job Requisitions

Please rate the extent to which you exhibit the following behavior on a scale of 1 to 7 (with 1 indicating never and 7 indicating very often).
1. I reorganize the way in which my organization’s applicant tracking system prioritizes my job requisitions.
2. I change how my organization’s applicant tracking system arranges the job requisitions I am responsible for filling.

Sequencing and Synchronization of Candidate Flow

Please rate the extent to which you agree with the following on a scale of 1 to 7 (with 1 indicating strongly disagree and 7 indicating strongly agree).
1. In general, my candidates for a given job requisition move through the hiring process in sequence (i.e., one after another versus all at once).
2. In general, my candidates for a given job requisition move at similar rates through the recruiting/hiring process.

Recruiter Reprioritization of Candidates

Please rate the extent to which you exhibit the following behavior on a scale of 1 to 7 (with 1 strongly disagree and 7 indicating strongly agree).
1. I reorganize the way my organization’s applicant tracking system prioritizes my candidates.

Behavior and Outcome-Oriented Inter and Intra-Stakeholder Role Conflict

For this portion of the survey we are interested in understanding the stakeholder relationships and demands associated with your work as a recruiter.

Below we identify five different types of internal stakeholders that may or may not be relevant to how you perform your work. Please consider each type of stakeholder and provide the information requested.

Promoter Role: Involves promoting the organization's brand, culture, and job characteristics. The primary goal of this role is to improve everyone's attitudes towards the organization and job.
**Gatekeeper Role:** Involves demonstrating person-specific behaviors that include making preliminary distinctions among applicants and then attempting to attract those that would add value to the organization and screen out those who would not.

**Salesperson Role:** Involves demonstrating person-specific behaviors that include tailoring the recruitment message you convey to the specific people with which you interact based on their needs, interests, and preferences.

**Liaison Role:** Involves behaving as a boundary spanner between entities such as human resources, business units, departments, hiring managers, educational institutions, and applicants, and serving as a broker of information between these different types of stakeholders.

**Facilitator Role:** Involves remaining neutral or objective, and demonstrating behaviors geared towards recruitment project management, as well as ensuring the recruitment process is fair, consistent, and expedient.

**Advisor Role:** Involves offering stakeholders guidance (e.g., regarding candidate fit, compensation) based on your technical or specialized knowledge, as well as managing expectations of stakeholders.

---

**Your Direct Supervisor**
1. My direct supervisor directly affects or is affected by the achievement of my goals as a recruiter.

**Role Expectations**
1. My Direct Supervisor expects me to behave as a Promoter.
2. My Direct Supervisor expects me to behave as a Gatekeeper.
3. My Direct Supervisor expects me to behave as a Salesperson.
4. My Direct Supervisor expects me to behave as a Liaison.
5. My Direct Supervisor expects me to behave as a Facilitator.
6. My Direct Supervisor expects me to behave as an Advisor.

**Judgment of Role Expectations**
1. My Director Supervisor’s role expectations are incompatible with one another.

**Recruitment Priorities**
1. My Direct Supervisor emphasizes Applicant Quantity above all else.
2. My Direct Supervisor emphasizes Applicant Quality above all else.
3. My Direct Supervisor emphasizes Applicant Diversity above all else.
4. My Direct Supervisor emphasizes Low Cost above all else.
5. My Direct Supervisor emphasizes Timeliness above all else.

**Judgment of Recruitment Priorities**
1. My Direct Supervisor's recruitment priorities are incompatible with one another.

---

**Human Resources (as a function or division within your organization)**
1. Human Resources directly affects or is affected by the achievement of my goals as a recruiter.

**Role Expectations**
1. Human Resources expects me to behave as a Promoter.
2. Human Resources expects me to behave as a Gatekeeper.
3. Human Resources expects me to behave as a Salesperson.
4. Human Resources expects me to behave as a Liaison.
5. Human Resources expects me to behave as a Facilitator.
6. Human Resources expects me to behave as an Advisor.

**Judgment of Role Expectations**

1. Human Resources’ role expectations are incompatible with one another.

**Recruitment Priorities**

2. Human Resources emphasizes Applicant Quantity above all else.
3. Human Resources emphasizes Applicant Quality above all else.
4. Human Resources emphasizes Applicant Diversity above all else.
5. Human Resources emphasizes Low Cost above all else.
6. Human Resources emphasizes Timeliness above all else.

**Judgment of Recruitment Priorities**

1. Human Resources’ recruitment priorities are incompatible with one another.

---

**Hiring Managers (Non-HR)**

1. Hiring Managers directly affect or are affected by the achievement of my goals as a recruiter.

**Role Expectations**

1. Hiring Managers expect me to behave as a Promoter.
2. Hiring Managers expect me to behave as a Gatekeeper.
3. Hiring Managers expect me to behave as a Salesperson.
4. Hiring Managers expect me to behave as a Liaison.
5. Hiring Managers expect me to behave as a Facilitator.
6. Hiring Managers expect me to behave as an Advisor.

**Judgment of Role Expectations**

1. Hiring Managers’ role expectations are incompatible with one another.

**Recruitment Priorities**

1. Hiring Managers emphasize Applicant Quantity above all else.
2. Hiring Managers emphasize Applicant Quality above all else.
3. Hiring Managers emphasize Applicant Diversity above all else.
4. Hiring Managers emphasize Low Cost above all else.
5. Hiring Managers emphasize Timeliness above all else.

**Judgment of Recruitment Priorities**

1. Hiring Managers’ recruitment priorities are incompatible with one another.

---

**Top Management/Strategic Managers**

1. Top Management/Strategic Managers directly affect or are affected by the achievement of my goals as a recruiter.

**Role Expectations**

1. Top Management/Strategic Managers expect me to behave as a Promoter.
2. Top Management/Strategic Managers expect me to behave as a Gatekeeper.
3. Top Management/Strategic Managers expect me to behave as a Salesperson.
4. Top Management/Strategic Managers expect me to behave as a Liaison.
5. Top Management/Strategic Managers expect me to behave as a Facilitator.
6. Top Management/Strategic Managers expect me to behave as an Advisor.

**Judgment of Role Expectations**
1. Top Management/Strategic Managers’ role expectations are incompatible with one another.

**Recruitment Priorities**
1. Top Management/Strategic Managers emphasize Applicant Quantity above all else.
2. Top Management/Strategic Managers emphasize Applicant Quality above all else.
3. Top Management/Strategic Managers emphasize Applicant Diversity above all else.
4. Top Management/Strategic Managers emphasize Low Cost above all else.
5. Top Management/Strategic Managers emphasize Timeliness above all else.

**Judgment of Recruitment Priorities**
1. Top Management/Strategic Managers’ recruitment priorities are incompatible with one another.

**Other Non-HR (e.g., Business Unit) Employees and Managers**
1. Other Non-HR Employees and Managers directly affect or are affected by the achievement of my goals as a recruiter.

**Role Expectations**
1. Other Non-HR Employees and Managers expect me to behave as a Promoter.
2. Other Non-HR Employees and Managers expect me to behave as a Gatekeeper.
3. Other Non-HR Employees and Managers expect me to behave as a Salesperson.
4. Other Non-HR Employees and Managers expect me to behave as a Liaison.
5. Other Non-HR Employees and Managers expect me to behave as a Facilitator.
6. Other Non-HR Employees and Managers expect me to behave as an Advisor.

**Judgment of Role Expectations**
Other Non-HR Employees and Managers’ role expectations are incompatible with one another.

**Recruitment Priorities**
1. Other Non-HR Employees and Managers emphasize Applicant Quantity above all else.
2. Other Non-HR Employees and Managers emphasize Applicant Quality above all else.
3. Other Non-HR Employees and Managers emphasize Applicant Diversity above all else.
4. Other Non-HR Employees and Managers emphasize Low Cost above all else.
5. Other Non-HR Employees and Managers emphasize Timeliness above all else.

**Judgment of Recruitment Priorities**
1. Other Non-HR Employees and Managers’ recruitment priorities are incompatible with one another.

**Demographic Items (voluntary and for sample description purposes only)**
1. Race
2. Sex
3. Age
Table B.2 Supervisor Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Please indicate your email address. (Note: this information will only be used to send you your incentive provided you decide to complete the following survey, and to ensure your responses are correctly matched to your recruiter’s responses to his or her survey.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Please indicate your recruiter’s email address. (Note: this information will only be used to match the information you supply below with your recruiter’s responses to his or her survey.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Current job title:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Years experience in current job:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Company name:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Years working for current company:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Total years experience recruiting:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Number of recruiters you oversee:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Experience supervising this recruiter (in years):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Average number of open job requisitions this recruiter handles at a time:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recruiter Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. If your company uses a numeric job performance rating, please indicate your recruiter’s most recent performance evaluation and the scale used to rate him or her in the blanks provided.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Customer Service (items adapted from Schneider, White, &amp; Paul, 1998; Susskind, Kacmar, &amp; Borchgrevink, 2003)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructions for Supervisor: Please indicate on a scale of 1 to 7 the extent to which you agree with the following items (with 1 indicating strongly disagree and 7 indicating strongly agree).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall, hiring managers…
| 1. are happy with the services they receive from my recruiter. |
| 2. believe that my recruiter seems interested in providing excellent service. |
| 3. believe my recruiter to be very knowledgeable about their business unit. |
| 4. believe my recruiter performs the duties expected of him or her. |
| 5. consider my recruiter to appear cold and distant. |
| 6. believe my recruiter really focuses on customer service. |
| 7. consider my recruiter to be efficient. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder Orientation items adapted from Greenley and Foxall (1997):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Please indicate the degree to which you agree with the following items as they relate to your recruiter’s behavior and orientation on a scale of 1 to 7 (with 1 indicating strongly disagree and 7 indicating strongly agree).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. The recruiter engages in sufficient research to understand the interests of each stakeholder group within the organization.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. The recruiter plans strategies for addressing the interests of each stakeholder group within the organization.
3. The recruiter considers fulfilling the needs of each stakeholder group important to fulfilling the corporate recruiting mission.

**Quality of Services**

Please rate the extent to which you agree with the following statements as they relate to your recruiter on a scale of 1 to 7 (with 1 indicating strongly disagree and 7 indicating strongly agree).

Relative to other recruiters that I oversee with similar types of job requisitions…
1. my recruiter generally attracts more highly qualified candidates.
2. my recruiter generally contributes a larger number of applicants to the applicant pool.
3. the candidates my recruiter attracts are generally more racial/ethnically diverse.
4. the cost-per-hire for my recruiter is generally higher.
5. the time-to-fill for my recruiter is generally higher.

**Role Conflict Scale** (Work-home Conflict adapted from Netemeyer, Boles, & McMurrian, 1996, JAP)

**Instructions for Stakeholders:** For this portion of the survey please think about how your recruiter performs his or her work and respond to these items with this process and the following role descriptions in mind.

**Promoter Role:** Involves promoting the organization's brand, culture, and job characteristics. The primary goal of this role is to improve everyone's attitudes towards the organization and job.

**Gatekeeper Role:** Involves demonstrating person-specific behaviors that include making preliminary distinctions among applicants and then attempting to attract those that would add value to the organization and screen out those who would not.

**Salesperson Role:** Involves demonstrating person-specific behaviors that include tailoring the recruitment message you convey to the specific people with which you interact based on their needs, interests, and preferences.

**Liaison Role:** Involves behaving as a boundary spanner between entities such as human resources, business units, departments, hiring managers, educational institutions, and applicants, and serving as a broker of information between these different types of stakeholders.

**Facilitator Role:** Involves remaining neutral or objective, and demonstrating behaviors geared towards recruitment project management, as well as ensuring the recruitment process is fair, consistent, and expedient.
Advisor Role: Involves offering stakeholders guidance (e.g., regarding candidate fit, compensation) based on your technical or specialized knowledge, as well as managing expectations of stakeholders.
1. The demands of enacting one role interfere with my recruiter’s ability to enact others.
2. The amount of time required to enact one role makes it difficult for my recruiter to enact others.
3. Things my recruiter wants to do while enacting one role do not get done because of the demands of other roles.
4. Enacting one role produces strain that makes it difficult to enact others for my recruiter.
5. Due to the requirements involved in enacting one role, my recruiter has to make changes to how he or she enacts other roles.

Sequencing and Synchronization of Job Requisitions

Please rate the extent to which you agree with the following on a scale of 1 to 7 (with 1 indicating strongly disagree and 7 indicating strongly agree).
1. In general, my recruiter’s job requisitions move through the hiring process in sequence (i.e., one after another versus all at once).
2. In general, my recruiter’s job requisitions move at similar rates through the recruiting/hiring process.
3. In general, the job requisitions my recruiter receives come to him or her in sequence, rather than all at once.
4. In general, the job requisitions my recruiter receives come to him or her at the same rate.

Existence of Applicant Tracking System

Please answer the following item by responding yes or no.
1. Does your organization have an applicant tracking system?

Recruiter Reprioritization of Job Requisitions

Please rate the extent to which your recruiter exhibits the following behavior on a scale of 1 to 7 (with 1 indicating never and 7 indicating very often).
1. My recruiter reorganizes the way in which the organization’s applicant tracking system prioritizes his or her job requisitions.
2. My recruiter changes how the organization’s applicant tracking system arranges the job requisitions he or she is responsible for filling.

Sequencing and Synchronization of Candidate Flow

Please rate the extent to which you agree with the following on a scale of 1 to 7 (with 1 indicating strongly disagree and 7 indicating strongly agree).
1. In general, my recruiter’s candidates for a given job requisition move through the hiring process in sequence (i.e., one after another versus all at once).

2. In general, my recruiter’s candidates for a given job requisition move at similar rates through the recruiting/hiring process.

**Recruiter Reprioritization of Candidates**

Please rate the extent to which you exhibit the following behavior on a scale of 1 to 7 (with 1 indicating never and 7 indicating very often).

1. My recruiter reorganizes the way in which the organization’s applicant tracking system prioritizes his or her candidates.

**Behavior and Outcome-Based Inter and Intra-Stakeholder Role Conflict**

For this portion of the survey we are interested in understanding the stakeholder relationships and demands associated with your recruiter’s work.

Below we identify five different types of internal stakeholders that may or may not be relevant to how your recruiter performs his or her work. Please consider each type of stakeholder and provide the information requested.

**Promoter Role:** Involves promoting the organization's brand, culture, and job characteristics. The primary goal of this role is to improve everyone's attitudes towards the organization and job.

**Gatekeeper Role:** Involves demonstrating person-specific behaviors that include making preliminary distinctions among applicants and then attempting to attract those that would add value to the organization and screen out those who would not.

**Salesperson Role:** Involves demonstrating person-specific behaviors that include tailoring the recruitment message you convey to the specific people with which you interact based on their needs, interests, and preferences.

**Liaison Role:** Involves behaving as a boundary spanner between entities such as human resources, business units, departments, hiring managers, educational institutions, and applicants, and serving as a broker of information between these different types of stakeholders.

**Facilitator Role:** Involves remaining neutral or objective, and demonstrating behaviors geared towards recruitment project management, as well as ensuring the recruitment process is fair, consistent, and expedient.

**Advisor Role:** Involves offering stakeholders guidance (e.g., regarding candidate fit, compensation) based on your technical or specialized knowledge, as well as managing expectations of stakeholders.
You (as the Recruiter’s Direct Supervisor)
1. I directly affect or am affected by the achievement of my recruiter’s goals.

Role Expectations
1. I expect this recruiter to behave as a Promoter.
2. I expect this recruiter to behave as a Gatekeeper.
3. I expect this recruiter to behave as a Salesperson.
4. I expect this recruiter to behave as a Liaison.
5. I expect this recruiter to behave as a Facilitator.
6. I expect this recruiter to behave as an Advisor.

Judgment of Role Expectations
1. My role expectations are incompatible with one another.

Recruitment Priorities
1. I emphasize Applicant Quantity above all else.
2. I emphasize Applicant Quality above all else.
3. I emphasize Applicant Diversity above all else.
4. I emphasize Low Cost above all else.
5. I emphasize Timeliness above all else.

Judgment of Recruitment Priorities
1. My recruitment priorities are incompatible with one another.

Human Resources (as a function or division within your organization)
1. Human Resources directly affects or is affected by the achievement of this recruiter’s goals.

Role Expectations
1. Human Resources expects this recruiter to behave as a Promoter.
2. Human Resources expects this recruiter to behave as a Gatekeeper.
3. Human Resources expects this recruiter to behave as a Salesperson.
4. Human Resources expects this recruiter to behave as a Liaison.
5. Human Resources expects this recruiter to behave as a Facilitator.
6. Human Resources expects this recruiter to behave as an Advisor.

Judgment of Role Expectations
1. Human Resources’ role expectations are incompatible with one another.

Recruitment Priorities
1. Human Resources emphasizes Applicant Quantity above all else.
2. Human Resources emphasizes Applicant Quality above all else.
3. Human Resources emphasizes Applicant Diversity above all else.
4. Human Resources emphasizes Low Cost above all else.
5. Human Resources emphasizes Timeliness above all else.

Judgment of Recruitment Priorities
1. Human Resources’ recruitment priorities are incompatible with one another.

Hiring Managers (Non-HR)
1. Hiring Managers directly affect or are affected by the achievement of this recruiter’s goals.

Role Expectations
1. Hiring Managers expect this recruiter to behave as a Promoter.
2. Hiring Managers expect this recruiter to behave as a Gatekeeper.
3. Hiring Managers expect this recruiter to behave as a Salesperson.
4. Hiring Managers expect this recruiter to behave as a Liaison.
5. Hiring Managers expect this recruiter to behave as a Facilitator.
6. Hiring Managers expect this recruiter to behave as an Advisor.

**Judgment of Role Expectations**
1. Hiring Managers’ role expectations are incompatible with one another.

**Recruitment Priorities**
1. Hiring Managers emphasize Applicant Quantity above all else.
2. Hiring Managers emphasize Applicant Quality above all else.
3. Hiring Managers emphasize Applicant Diversity above all else.
4. Hiring Managers emphasize Low Cost above all else.
5. Hiring Managers emphasize Timeliness above all else.

**Judgment of Recruitment Priorities**
1. Hiring Managers’ recruitment priorities are incompatible with one another.

---

**Top Management/Strategic Managers**

1. Top Management/Strategic Managers directly affect or are affected by the achievement of this recruiter’s goals.

**Role Expectations**

1. Top Management/Strategic Managers expect this recruiter to behave as a Promoter.
2. Top Management/Strategic Managers expect this recruiter to behave as a Gatekeeper.
3. Top Management/Strategic Managers expect this recruiter to behave as a Salesperson.
4. Top Management/Strategic Managers expect this recruiter to behave as a Liaison.
5. Top Management/Strategic Managers expect this recruiter to behave as a Facilitator.
6. Top Management/Strategic Managers expect this recruiter to behave as an Advisor.

**Judgment of Role Expectations**

1. Top Management/Strategic Managers’ role expectations are incompatible with one another.

**Recruitment Priorities**

1. Top Management/Strategic Managers emphasize Applicant Quantity above all else.
2. Top Management/Strategic Managers emphasize Applicant Quality above all else.
3. Top Management/Strategic Managers emphasize Applicant Diversity above all else.
4. Top Management/Strategic Managers emphasize Low Cost above all else.
5. Top Management/Strategic Managers emphasize Timeliness above all else.

**Judgment of Recruitment Priorities**

1. Top Management/Strategic Managers’ recruitment priorities are incompatible with one another.

---

**Other Non-HR (e.g., Business Unit) Employees and Managers**

1. Other Non-HR Employees and Managers directly affect or are affected by the achievement of this recruiter’s goals.
Role Expectations
1. Other Non-HR Employees and Managers expect this recruiter to behave as a Promoter.
2. Other Non-HR Employees and Managers expect this recruiter to behave as a Gatekeeper.
3. Other Non-HR Employees and Managers expect this recruiter to behave as a Salesperson.
4. Other Non-HR Employees and Managers expect this recruiter to behave as a Liason.
5. Other Non-HR Employees and Managers expect this recruiter to behave as a Facilitator.
6. Other Non-HR Employees and Managers expect this recruiter to behave as an Advisor.

Judgment of Role Expectations
1. Other Non-HR Employees and Managers’ role expectations are incompatible with one another.

Recruitment Priorities
1. Other Non-HR Employees and Managers emphasize Applicant Quantity above all else.
2. Other Non-HR Employees and Managers emphasize Applicant Quality above all else.
3. Other Non-HR Employees and Managers emphasize Applicant Diversity above all else.
4. Other Non-HR Employees and Managers emphasize Low Cost above all else.
5. Other Non-HR Employees and Managers emphasize Timeliness above all else.

Judgment of Recruitment Priorities
1. Other Non-HR Employees and Managers’ recruitment priorities are incompatible with one another.

Demographic Items (voluntary and for sample description purposes only)
1. Race
2. Sex
3. Age