

International Journal of SELECTION AND ASSESSMENT

SHORT COMMUNICATION OPEN ACCESS

Attitudes Toward Cybervetting in Germany: Impact on Organizational Attractiveness Depends on Social Media Platform

Philipp Schäpers¹ 💿 | Franz W. Mönke¹ 💿 | Chiara-Maria Frieler¹ | Nicolas Roulin² 💿 | Johannes Basch³ 💿

¹Department of Psychology, University of Münster, Münster, Germany | ²Department of Psychology, Saint Mary's University, Halifax, Canada | ³Neu-Ulm University of Applied Sciences, Neu-Ulm, Germany

Correspondence: Philipp Schäpers (philipp.schaepers@uni-muenster.de)

Received: 21 February 2024 | Revised: 8 January 2025 | Accepted: 22 January 2025

Keywords: attitudes toward cybervetting | cybervetting | organizational attractiveness | social media assessments

ABSTRACT

Cybervetting, assessing social media in personnel selection, is widely used. However, individuals concerned often perceive this practice negatively. We propose that attitudes toward cybervetting may depend on the platform used and the cultural context. Thus, we transfer the attitudes toward cybervetting scale to a context with strict data regulations: Germany. In an online between-subjects experiment with platform users and non-users (N = 100 working professionals and students), we examined attitudes toward cybervetting on different social media platforms (professional: LinkedIn vs. personal: Instagram) and their relationship with organizational attractiveness. We found that German participants viewed cybervetting on professional platforms with more skepticism than American participants. Hierarchical regression analysis revealed higher perceived fairness, lower invasion of privacy, and higher organizational attractiveness when cybervetting was done on professional platforms.

Recruiters increasingly scrutinize the social media profiles of applicants during personnel selection. Latest surveys estimate that approximately two out of three recruiters make use of cybervetting, that is, they screen applicants' profiles on Facebook, LinkedIn, Instagram, or Twitter (X) as an initial assessment of hireability, fit, consistency, or trustworthiness (e.g., Hartwell and Campion 2020; Roth et al. 2019; Wilcox et al. 2022). However, cybervetting is discussed controversially: Beyond unclear validity and the danger of rating biases (Mönke, Lievens, et al. 2024; Mönke and Schäpers 2022; Roth et al. 2016), applicants' attitudes to such social media assessments have been reported as mostly negative (Manroop et al. 2022; Stoughton et al. 2015). That is, confronted with potential employers screening their personal social media profiles; many applicants described feelings of surveillance, unfairness, and privacy invasion (Stoughton et al. 2015). As a

consequence, cybervetting can lead to the withdrawal of applications and intentions to sue an organization for unlawful procedures (Açıkgöz et al. 2023; Stoughton et al. 2015; Suen 2018).

This study seeks to make two contributions to the cybervetting literature. First, given that social media use and cybervetting can depend on the cultural context (El Ouirdi et al. 2016; Roulin and Liu 2023), we test if prior findings transfer to a German sample: Will people who live and work in the context of the European Union's data protection legislation react to cybervetting similarly to North-Americans (Cook et al. 2020), Chinese (Roulin and Liu 2023), or Turkish participants (Akbulut et al. 2024)? Second, prior research suggested that attitudes toward cybervetting (ATC) depend on the assessed platform: Individuals have reported more positive attitudes or reactions

Philipp Schäpers and Franz W. Mönke contributed equally to this manuscript and share the first authorship.

This is an open access article under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

^{© 2025} The Author(s). International Journal of Selection and Assessment published by John Wiley & Sons Ltd.

Summary

- Participants often see cybervetting as an invasion of privacy: It is crucial for organizations to manage their cybervetting practices, as they are related to important outcomes (e.g., attraction to the organization).
- German participants viewed cybervetting on LinkedIn (but not Instagram) with more skepticism than Americans.
- Cybervetting is perceived more positively on professional platforms (e.g., LinkedIn) than on personal platforms (e.g., Instagram), even in a context with strict data protection regulations (Germany), and it impacts organizational attractiveness.

when their professional profiles (e.g., LinkedIn) rather than their personal profiles (e.g., Facebook, Instagram) are cybervetted (Aguado et al. 2016; Cook et al. 2020). However, it is unclear if more positive ATCs, rooted in using professional social media platforms for cybervetting, also attenuate the negative effect of cybervetting on perceptions of organizational attractiveness. This research seeks to fill this gap.

1 | Study Background

1.1 | Cybervetting: Social Media Assessments in Personnel Selection

Prior studies have characterized cybervetting as informal (i.e., unstructured), passive (i.e., without the applicant's knowledge), and asynchronous (i.e., no interaction with the applicant required; Berkelaar 2014; Hartwell et al. 2022). Such social media assessments aim to provide recruiters with a rapid and valid initial impression of an applicant's KSAOs and fit by targeting information that is not available in traditional selection methods, such as values and interests (Berkelaar 2014; Hedenus et al. 2021; Mönke, Roulin, et al. 2024). Beyond that, HR professionals often aim to evaluate an applicant's trustworthiness and reduce uncertainty through cybervetting: They also screen for red flags like unprofessional behavior or inconsistencies with impressions from the CV (Akbulut et al. 2024; Berkelaar 2014; McDonald et al. 2022; Wilcox et al. 2022).

But can cybervetting deliver on these promises? So far, prior studies have cautioned practitioners against relying on cybervetting (Mönke, Roulin, et al. 2024; Wilcox et al. 2022): Whereas there is substantial evidence that cybervetting ratings of the Big Five personality traits converge with self-ratings (e.g., Roulin and Levashina 2019), the criterion-related validity of cybervetting ratings seems to be rather low (Mönke, Roulin, et al. 2024; Van Iddekinge et al. 2016; Zhang et al. 2020). Reasons for this low validity might be unstructured rating approaches and overreliance on stereotypes based on personal information about the applicant (Hartwell et al. 2022; Mönke and Schäpers 2022). For example, many social media profiles include non-job-related information like the applicant's sexual orientation, marital status, religious beliefs, and political affiliation (Zhang et al. 2020). This can lead to rating biases, such as similarity attraction based on shared political beliefs (e.g., Mönke, Lievens, et al. 2024).

Thus, despite its popularity, cybervetting remains controversial (see Wilcox et al. 2022).

1.2 | Applicants' Attitudes Toward Cybervetting

Beyond examining the validity of cybervetting practices, it is also important to consider the viewpoint of the individuals directly impacted by this popular hiring procedure and to understand their attitudes and reactions to it. Generally, applicant attitudes and reactions describe a job seeker's attitudes, affects, and cognitions about the hiring process, that is, how they perceive and respond to certain selection tools (e.g., Gilliland 1994; Hausknecht et al. 2004; Ryan and Ployhart 2000). For example, this includes applicants' perceptions such as face validity, job-relatedness of the assessed information, and fairness (Cook et al. 2020; Ryan and Ployhart 2000). Such perceptions can be attributed to two underlying concepts of fairness and justice: Distributive (fairness of outcomes) and procedural justice (fairness of the procedures used to determine the outcomes; Colquitt et al. 2001; Gilliland 1994). Decades of research have shown that organizations should consider fairness in choosing their selection systems because applicant perceptions of fairness are related to outcomes such as organizational attractiveness, recommending the employer to other job seekers, job satisfaction, commitment, and performance (e.g., Colquitt et al. 2001; Gilliland 1994; Hausknecht et al. 2004; Ryan and Ployhart 2000). As McFarland and Ployhart (2015) pointed out, using social media as a source in selection differs substantially from traditional interactions with applicants regarding latency, synchronicity, permanence, anonymity, and verifiability of the information. Consequently, cybervetting procedures differ substantially from traditional selection practices, making cybervetting an important context to revisit applicant reactions and attitudes toward this procedure (Berkelaar 2014; Manroop et al. 2022). So, how do job seekers react to organizations that screen their social media profiles?

Prior studies have described applicant attitudes toward cybervetting (ATC) as mostly negative: For instance, cybervetting Facebook profiles was associated with perceptions of privacy invasion and low procedural justice (Stoughton et al. 2015). In turn, these perceptions were associated with lower organizational attractiveness, withdrawal, and litigation intentions (Stoughton et al. 2015; see also Suen 2018). As another consequence, Wilcox et al. (2022) suggested that cybervetting might lead to impression management, self-censorship, and anxiety for job seekers.

Building on this seminal work, Aguado et al. (2016) and Cook et al. (2020) developed robust scales to measure the reactions of participants (e.g., job seekers) to cybervetting. Specifically, Cook et al. (2020) validated the ATC scale, a measure including three facets (perceived justice, privacy invasion, and face validity), allowing us to examine the antecedents and consequences of such attitudes. Building on this, studies showed that reactions to cybervetting depend on participant characteristics: That is, women, applicants with minority status, and low social media self-efficacy have more negative views of cybervetting than other individuals (Açıkgöz et al. 2023; Aguado et al. 2016; Stoughton et al. 2015; however, see also Akbulut et al. 2024, and Cook et al. 2020, who reported no effects of gender and age). Further, applicant ATCs depend on the platform type: Cybervetting on professional platforms like LinkedIn is viewed much more favorably than cybervetting on personal platforms like Facebook or Instagram (Açıkgöz et al. 2023; Cook et al. 2020). This might be attributed to the fact that personal platforms such as Facebook or Instagram include more personal and jobunrelated information, whereas platforms like LinkedIn tend to focus on job-related information (Mönke and Schäpers 2022; Roulin and Fernandez 2022).

1.3 | This Study

Social media use and cybervetting depend on the cultural context: For instance, Dutch recruiters' reactions to unprofessional content (e.g., informal selfies, controversial comments, activities in violation of workplace policy like drug abuse) were more negative than the reactions of their Italian colleagues (El Ouirdi et al. 2016). Further, a recent study by Roulin and Liu (2023) transferred the ATC scale of Cook et al. (2020) to the Chinese context: The Chinese scale achieved similar psychometric properties to the English version. Similar results were reported by Akbulut et al. (2024) in a Turkish sample. At the same time, Roulin and Liu (2023) underlined that cybervetting might operate differently in contexts outside of the US because different social media platforms are prevalent. This points to a gap in the literature: Whereas cybervetting and applicant attitudes to such social media assessments have been mostly studied with US or North American samples (e.g., Açıkgöz et al. 2023; Cook et al. 2020; Roulin and Levashina 2019; Stoughton et al. 2015; Van Iddekinge et al. 2016), much fewer studies have investigated other cultural contexts and parts of the world, such as Asia (Chinese; Roulin and Liu 2023; Taiwanese; Suen 2018) or Europe (Aguado et al. 2016; Akbulut et al. 2024; Balcerak et al. 2023). Hence, the first aim of this study was to investigate ATC in a population other than a North American sample (i.e., participants from Germany).

This is important because the latest German (Bundesdatenschutzgesetz, Federal Data Protection Act) and the European Union's data protection legislation (2018 General Data Protection Regulation, GDPR) present a different legal context compared to previous studies conducted in the US, Canada, China, and Turkey. The German federal legislation implements and specifies the EU's GDPR. Historically, and since the 2018 implementation of the GDPR, data protection in Germany has been much stricter than in other contexts (e.g., the US; Kumar and Reinartz 2018). Germany ranks among the nations with the strictest data protection regulations (heyData 2021); and no other European law enforcement agency had prosecuted more violations of the GDPR until 2021: In the first 3 years after the GDPR adoption, fines totaled €69 million (heyData 2021). This legislation mirrors that privacy concerns in Germany are often higher than in other contexts (Cecere et al. 2015)¹: For example, German Facebook users restricted social media use and self-disclosure in response to their privacy concerns more often than US users (Krasnova et al. 2012).

During personnel selection in Germany, organizations must comply with the Federal Data Protection Act and the GDPR. For instance, Article 5 of the GDPR requires organizations to ensure transparency, data minimization, purpose limitation, and accuracy in data processing. One might question whether cybervetting violates these rules. Hence, given that cybervetting leads to feelings of surveillance and its legality is at least debatable in a GDPR context, we argue that ATC in Germany might differ from the contexts investigated in prior research. German participants might react even more negatively to cybervetting than those in other cultural contexts (e.g., United States). We suppose that this context effect will be especially strong regarding personal platforms. While we anticipate that previously identified platform differences in ATC will persist, we also expect German participants to perceive cybervetting as a greater invasion of privacy compared to their American counterparts. Thus:

RQ1: Do German participants' attitudes toward cybervetting differ from those of North American participants?

H1: Attitudes toward cybervetting (perceived justice, privacy invasion, face validity) are more positive for professional platforms (LinkedIn) than personal platforms (Instagram).

Next, we turn to the consequences of participants' ATC. In the context of selection and assessment, applicant reactions and attitudes can have important implications for organizations: They influence the likelihood that applicants accept job offers, withdraw from a hiring process, choose to recommend the organization to other job seekers, and file complaints (see for other selection instruments, e.g., Colquitt et al. 2001; Gilliland 1994; Hausknecht et al. 2004; Manroop et al. 2022; Ryan and Ployhart 2000). In support of this reasoning, prior studies found that employers' use of cybervetting leads to lower organizational attractiveness, which can result in withdrawal and litigation intentions (Açıkgöz et al. 2023; Stoughton et al. 2015; Suen 2018).

However, an important gap in the field of applicant reactions and ATC remains: While prior studies suggested that applicant attitudes depend on the platform that recruiters use for cybervetting (Aguado et al. 2016; Cook et al. 2020; Roulin and Liu 2023) and applicant reactions to cybervetting influence organizational attractiveness (Açıkgöz et al. 2023; Manroop et al. 2022; Stoughton et al. 2015), we are aware of no study that investigated the link between those important outcomes. That is, would cybervetting on different platforms (professional vs. personal) also lead to substantial differences in perceived organizational attractiveness?

Organizational attractiveness refers to a job seeker's affective and attitudinal thoughts about companies as potential places for employment (attractiveness), intentions to actively pursue a job at a certain organization (intentions), and social references of fame and renown in the minds of those who hear of a company (prestige; Highhouse et al. 2003). Organizational attractiveness is related to applicant reactions in selection (Hausknecht et al. 2004); and several authors assumed a link between cybervetting practices and organizational attractiveness (e.g., Cook et al. 2020; Stoughton et al. 2015). However, this effect remained untested. Hence, the second aim of this study was to investigate if organizational attractiveness depends on the cybervetting platform type. Building on prior research, as a mechanism, we argue that cybervetting on personal platforms leads to more feelings of surveillance and privacy invasion (Stoughton et al. 2015). Such impressions lead to low perceptions of fairness in the hiring process, which then may hurt organizational attractiveness (Manroop et al. 2022). Therefore, we hypothesize:

H2: Organizational attractiveness is more positive when cybervetting on professional platforms (LinkedIn) than personal platforms (Instagram).

2 | Methods

All data, analysis code, and materials are publicly available in our electronic supplementary at the Open Science Framework, see https://osf.io/3htps/.

2.1 | Sample

Our convenience sample consisted of N = 100 German participants. 78% of our sample were women and 22% identified as men. Participants' age ranged between 18 and 60 (M = 31.4, SD = 11.7). Our sample was well-educated (41% had a university degree); 54% were working professionals and 38% were students. Notably, 79% of the participants regularly used Instagram, while 59% used LinkedIn, and 49% used both platforms. 94% of the total sample used at least some social media platforms (only 6% did not use any social media).

2.2 | Procedure

After informed consent, n = 54 participants were randomly assigned to the Instagram group, and n = 46 to the LinkedIn group (online between-subjects experiment). We informed participants about the nature of the social media platform they were assigned to (platform for personal or professional use: Instagram or LinkedIn) and showed them a generic example of a profile. These examples helped the participants unfamiliar with the respective SM platform to better understand what each platform contains. After being instructed to imagine that they apply to an organization that engages in cybervetting of their own Instagram or LinkedIn profile, respectively, participants were asked for their ATC as well as their attraction toward this fictional organization. All materials are available in the electronic supplementary (ES 04; http://osf.io/3htps/).

2.3 | Measures and Materials

We translated the scale by Cook et al. (2020) into German. For the translation, we followed the guidelines suggested by Klotz et al. (2023): First, we translated the ATC scale into German. Then, three research assistants independently translated the items back into English. Finally, we compared this backtranslation with the original items. In the case of disagreements, the translation team discussed until they reached a consensus on the (re)wording. This final version was presented to the participants, and the translated scale is available in the ES03.

2.3.1 | Attitudes Toward Cybervetting

We measured ATC with the German version of the 14 items by Cook et al. (2020; 5-point Likert scale). The dimension *perceived justice* consisted of six items (e.g., "It is fair for a potential employer to make a hiring decision based on information they acquired from my [social media] profile"), privacy invasion of five items (e.g., "I would be concerned if I knew a potential employer might access my [social media] profile"), and face validity of three items (e.g., "A potential employer could accurately assess how reliable I am based on [social media] profile"). As reliability estimates, we report α and ω in Table 2.

2.3.2 | Organizational Attractiveness

We measured organizational attractiveness with the scale by Highhouse et al. (2003; 5-point Likert scale). This scale consists of three dimensions, namely general attractiveness (e.g., "For me, this company would be a good place to work"), intentions to pursue (e.g., "I would accept a job offer from this company"), and prestige (e.g., "Employees are probably proud to say they work at this company"). We report reliability estimates in Table 3.

2.3.3 | Control Variables

As control variables, we assessed participants' age, gender, usage of Instagram and/or LinkedIn ("Please indicate on which social media platforms you have a profile", 2-point scale: yes/no), and their overall social media use ("How often do you use social media?", 4-point scale: daily, once per week, once per month, never). We assessed social media and platform use to address that some participants might be less familiar with the platform assigned to them.

2.4 | Data Analysis

First, to assess the scales and their translation, we conducted a multi-group confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) and tested the translated ATC scale for measurement invariance. The CFA indicated a good fit (see Tables 2 and 3). Then, to test our RQ and hypotheses, we applied Welch-corrected *t*-tests (because of heteroskedasticity) and hierarchical multiple regression analyses. In the first step of the regression analysis, we included control variables (age, gender, social media use, Instagram use, and LinkedIn use) as predictors and then added the platform as a predictor of ATC or organizational attractiveness. The ΔR^2 is the proportion of variance explained by the social media platform used for cybervetting. A visual inspection of the residual plot (linearity), Q–Q plot (normality), and scale location plot (homoscedasticity) suggested that assumptions for regression analysis were met.

For our analyses, we used *R* (4.4.0) and *RStudio* (2024.04.1). We used the packages *foreign* (R Core Team 2023), *psych* (Revelle 2024), *apaTables* (Stanley 2021), *MVN* (5.9; Korkmaz et al. 2014), *lavaan* (version 0.6-17; Rosseel 2012), *semTools* (Jorgensen et al. 2022), and *BSDA* (Arnholt and Evans 2023).

3 | Results

3.1 | Measurement Assessment

Descriptive statistics and intercorrelations are reported in Table 1. In line with Cook et al. (2020), Roulin and Liu (2023), and Akbulut et al. (2024), we found evidence for a 3-factor ATC structure (perceived justice, privacy invasion, and face validity) in both groups, multigroup χ^2 (148) = 189.28, p = 0.01; CFI = 0.91, TLI = 0.89, RMSEA = 0.08, SRMR = 0.097. Loadings ranged between $\lambda = 0.38$ and 0.97 (Instagram) and $\lambda = 0.31$ and 0.95 (LinkedIn) (see Table 2). Also, we found evidence for metric invariance, χ^2 (159) = 200.79, p = 0.01; CFI = 0.91, RMSEA = 0.076, SRMR = 0.11. However, in line with our assumption that ATC differs substantially between platforms, we found no evidence for scalar invariance, χ^2 (170) = 256.19, p < 0.001; CFI = 0.83, RMSEA = 0.101, SRMR = 0.123. We also conducted a CFA for the organizational attractiveness scale: Fit was good, χ^2 (166) = 236.68, p < 0.001; CFI = 0.91, TLI = 0.88, RMSEA = 0.10, SRMR = 0.074; and loadings ranged between $\lambda = 0.46$ and 0.90 (Instagram) and $\lambda = 0.46$ and 0.88 (LinkedIn) (see Table 3).

3.2 | RQ and Hypotheses Testing

First, to address our RQ1 about how German participants react to cybervetting in contrast to participants from North America, we compared the ATC factor scores to the mean scores reported by Cook et al. (2020): For this, we relied on the M, SD, and *n* reported in Study 3 of Cook et al. (2020). We tested group differences with Welch *t*-tests ($\alpha = 0.05$, two-sided). Notably, for cybervetting on LinkedIn, German participants reported lower perceived justice, t(76.7) = -9.62, p < 0.001; more feelings of privacy invasion. t(62) = 5.83, p < 0.001; and lower face validity, t(86) = -10.13, p < 0.001, than their American counterparts. For cybervetting on Instagram, we found no context differences for perceived justice, t(84.6) = -1.99, p = 0.05; privacy invasion, t(73) = 0.39, p = 0.70; and face validity, t(107.2) = -1.97, p = 0.05.

In line with Hypothesis 1, the hierarchical regression analyses revealed that ATCs were more positive when cybervetting was conducted on a professional platform (LinkedIn) in contrast to a personal platform (Instagram). That is, perceived justice was higher, b = 0.91, SE = 0.16, p < 0.001; $\Delta R^2 = 0.23$, F(1) = 32.40, p < 0.001; and privacy invasion was lower, b = -0.83, SE = 0.18, p < 0.001; $\Delta R^2 = 0.17$, F(1) = 20.57, p < 0.001, when cybervetting was conducted on LinkedIn (but not Instagram). However, we found no difference for face validity (b = 0.10, SE = 0.16, p = 0.54). This indicates partial support for Hypothesis 1 (see Table 4).

Hypothesis 2 proposed that organizational attractiveness was higher for organizations that rely on LinkedIn instead of Instagram during cybervetting. We found support for this hypothesis for all three dimensions of organizational attractiveness, that is, general attractiveness, b = 0.52, SE = 0.15, p < 0.001; $\Delta R^2 = 0.10$, F(1) = 11.90, p < 0.001; intentions to pursue, b = 0.46, SE = 0.13, p < 0.001; $\Delta R^2 = 0.10$, F(1) = 12.09, p < 0.001; and the organization's prestige, b = 0.48, SE = 0.12, p < 0.001; $\Delta R^2 = 0.14$, F(1) = 16.68, p < 0.001. For detailed results, please see Table 5.

The control variables had no significant effect on ATC and organizational attractiveness, but there were two exceptions: The more a participant used social media, the more they felt privacy invasion through cybervetting (b = 0.30, SE = 0.14, p = 0.04), and LinkedIn users perceived less organizational prestige (b = -0.26, SE = 0.12, p = 0.03).²

4 | Discussion

Cybervetting is a widely used practice in HR departments. However, given that various studies indicate mixed or low validity (e.g., Mönke, Roulin, et al. 2024) and ethical concerns (e.g., Wilcox et al. 2022), these social media assessments are discussed controversially. Consequently, applicants' attitudes toward cybervetting are often negative (e.g., Roulin and Liu 2023; Stoughton et al. 2015). However, the implications of cybervetting can depend on the social media platform (e.g., personal vs. professional platform) and cultural context (Cook et al. 2020; El Ouirdi et al. 2016). This study extended previous ATC research to Germany. That is, we examined how the general German public (i.e., a context with high data protection standards) perceives social media assessments and explored the relationship between cybervetting and organizational attractiveness for different social media platforms.

4.1 | Main Findings and Theoretical Implications

Our results partially confirm previous findings from other cultural contexts. First, we replicated the three-factor structure of the ATC scale developed in a North American context (Cook et al. 2020) and recently transferred to a Chinese (Roulin and Liu 2023) and Turkish context (Akbulut et al. 2024) with a German convenience sample (i.e., not only job-seekers). Second, reliability estimates were good and comparable to a North American sample (Cook et al. 2020).

Regarding platform differences, in line with Cook et al. (2020), German participants reported significant differences in fairness and invasion of privacy between LinkedIn and Instagram cybervetting. However, in contrast to Cook et al. (2020), German participants considered the face validity of Instagram and LinkedIn cybervetting as similarly low. Beyond that, comparing the mean scores of our sample to those of North Americans (Cook et al. 2020), we found an important context effect: German participants viewed cybervetting on professional platforms with substantially more skepticism than their North American counterparts. However, when it came to cybervetting on personal platforms like Instagram, views converged, with German participants expressing similarly negative perceptions. This suggests that, for certain contexts, even cybervetting on

| | Instagram M (SD) | LinkedIn M (SD) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 9 | 7 | 8 | 6 |
|---|-------------------------|--------------------|-------------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------|
| Demographics | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Age | 29.07 (10.43) | 34.17 (12.54) | Ĵ | -0.07 [-0.33, 0.21] | 0.37** [0.12, 0.58] | 0.28^{*} [0.01, 0.51] | 0.00 [-0.26, 0.27] | 0.10 [-0.17, 0.36] | -0.13 [-0.38, 0.15] | -0.21 [-0.45, 0.06] | -0.02 [-0.29, 0.25] |
| 2. Gender | Ĵ | $\overline{(}$ | -0.11 [-0.39, 0.19] | Ĵ | -0.03 [-0.29, 0.24] | 0.06 [-0.21, 0.33] | -0.15 [-0.40, 0.13] | -0.12 [-0.38, 0.15] | 0.11 [-0.17, 0.36] | 0.13 [-0.15, 0.38] | 0.16 [-0.12, 0.41] |
| 3. Social media use | 1.26 (0.76) | 1.46 (0.94) | 0.63^{**} $[0.41, 0.78]$ | -0.19 [$-0.45, 0.11$] | (-) | 0.03 [-0.24, 0.30] | 0.26 [$-0.01, 0.49$] | -0.10 [-0.36, 0.17] | -0.12 [-0.38, 0.15] | -0.14 [-0.39, 0.13] | -0.05 [-0.32, 0.22] |
| Attitudes toward cyberve | ting | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Perceived justice | 1.83 (0.75) | 2.71 (0.76) | -0.23 [-0.49, 0.07] | 0.04 [-0.25, 0.33] | -0.06 [-0.34, 0.24] | Ĵ | -0.53** [-0.70, -0.31] | 0.52*** [0.29, 0.69] | 0.51** [0.28, 0.68] | 0.49** [0.26, 0.67] | 0.50** [0.27, 0.68] |
| 5. Privacy invasion | 3.34 (0.92) | 2.63 (0.90) | 0.42** [0.15, 0.64] | -0.19 [-0.45, 0.11] | 0.31* [0.02, 0.55] | -0.57** [-0.74, -0.34] | Ĵ | -0.16 [-0.41, 0.11] | -0.63** [-0.77, -0.43] | -0.55** [-0.71, -0.33] | -0.52** [-0.69, -0.29] |
| 6. Face validity | 1.60 (0.68) | 1.74 (0.80) | 0.21 [-0.08, 0.47] | 0.01 [-0.28, 0.30] | 0.23 [-0.06, 0.49] | 0.28 [-0.01, 0.53] | -0.20 [-0.46, 0.10] | Ĵ | 0.14 [-0.13, 0.39] | 0.08 [-0.19, 0.34] | 0.17 [-0.10, 0.42] |
| Organizational attractiver | less | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7. General attractiveness | 2.62 (0.73) | 3.05 (0.75) | -0.35* [-0.58, -0.07] | 0.19 [$-0.11, 0.45$] | -0.17 [-0.44, 0.12] | 0.51** [0.26, 0.70] | -0.53* [-0.71, -0.28] | 0.34 * [0.05, 0.57] | Ĵ | 0.86** [0.77, 0.92] | 0.77** [0.63, 0.86] |
| 8. Intentions to pursue | 2.64 (0.68) | 3.02 (0.61) | -0.30^{*} [-0.55, -0.01] | 0.15 [-0.15, 0.42] | -0.20 [-0.46, 0.10] | 0.43** [0.16, 0.64] | -0.52*** [-0.70, -0.27] | 0.23 [-0.07, 0.49] | 0.89^{**} [0.81, 0.94] | Ĵ | 0.74** [0.59, 0.84] |
| 9. Prestige | 2.43 (0.58) | 2.85 (0.57) | -0.21 [-0.47, 0.08] | 0.10 [$-0.19, 0.38$] | -0.27 [-0.52, 0.03] | 0.40 *** [0.13, 0.62] | -0.50** [-0.69, -0.25] | 0.34 * [0.06, 0.57] | 0.65** [0.44, 0.79] | 0.73 ** [0.56, 0.84] | Ĵ |
| <i>Note:</i> Instagram above the ($*p < 0.05$; $**p < 0.01$. | diagonal, $n = 56$, an | d LinkedIn below | the diagonal, $n = 46$. | . Values in square | brackets indicate | the 95% confident | ce interval for each | correlation. | | | |

TABLE 1 Descriptive statistics and correlations of study variables.

| FABLE 2 | Results from | the CFA-Attitudes | toward cybervetting |
|---------|--------------|-------------------|---------------------|
|---------|--------------|-------------------|---------------------|

| Factor/ | Instag | gram | Linke | edIn |
|---------------------|----------|---------------|------------------|---------------|
| items | λ (std.) | α/ω | λ (std.) | α/ω |
| Perceived justice | | 0.82/ 0.82 | | 0.74/ 0.75 |
| Item 1 | 0.80 | | 0.66 | |
| Item 2 | 0.72 | | 0.57 | |
| Item 3 | 0.51 | | 0.59 | |
| Item 4 | 0.59 | | 0.69 | |
| Item 5 | 0.67 | | 0.31 | |
| Item 6 | 0.71 | | 0.64 | |
| Privacy invasion | | 0.81/ 0.83 | | 0.82/ 0.81 |
| Item 1 | 0.78 | | 0.88 | |
| Item 2 | 0.97 | | 0.73 | |
| Item 3 | 0.69 | | 0.86 | |
| Item 4 | 0.56 | | 0.58 | |
| Item 5 | 0.38 | | 0.43 | |
| Face validity | | 0.71/ 0.67 | | 0.85/ 0.86 |
| Item 1 | 0.80 | | 0.78 | |
| Item 2 | 0.65 | | 0.95 | |
| Item 3 | 0.53 | | 0.69 | |

Note: Instagram, n = 54. LinkedIn, n = 46. $\chi^2(148) = 189.3$, p = 0.01; CFI = 0.91, TLI = 0.89, RMSEA = 0.08, SRMR = 0.097.

professional social media like LinkedIn is perceived as invalid or unfair. Germany's strict legislation and the GDPR seem to shift expectations, as German participants were less tolerant of cybervetting. Nonetheless, it appears that participants across various cultural contexts prefer to be cybervetted on professional rather than personal social media platforms (see also Roulin and Liu 2023).

A similar picture emerged for organizational attractiveness: Using professional social media platforms during cybervetting led to higher organizational attractiveness than cybervetting on personal platforms. This shows that the decision to cybervet a person on a certain platform can have important consequences for organizations. Organizational attractiveness was substantially related to ATC, indicating that attitudes toward cybervetting have important effects on recruitment (Hausknecht et al. 2004; Manroop et al. 2022). Regarding cybervetting, this link might be particularly evident in the context of the European Union, given its strict personal data protection regulations (GDPR). The GDPR could influence what participants consider as fair and appropriate practices.

4.2 | Practical Implications

Our study provides valuable insights for HR practitioners. First, German participants perceived the use of personal platforms (e.g., Instagram) as an unjustified invasion of their privacy (see

| | Instag | gram | Linke | edIn |
|----------------|----------|-------|------------------|-------|
| Factor/items | λ (std.) | α/ω | λ (std.) | α/ω |
| General | | 0.86/ | | 0.85/ |
| attractiveness | | 0.86 | | 0.82 |
| Item 1 | 0.84 | | 0.77 | |
| Item 2 | 0.67 | | 0.67 | |
| Item 3 | 0.82 | | 0.81 | |
| Item 4 | 0.62 | | 0.63 | |
| Item 5 | 0.78 | | 0.88 | |
| Intentions to | | 0.82/ | | 0.82/ |
| pursue | | 0.76 | | 0.81 |
| Item 6 | 0.55 | | 0.60 | |
| Item 7 | 0.72 | | 0.66 | |
| Item 8 | 0.60 | | 0.56 | |
| Item 9 | 0.79 | | 0.78 | |
| Item 10 | 0.70 | | 0.86 | |
| Organizational | | 0.78/ | | 0.84/ |
| prestige | | 0.81 | | 0.89 |
| Item 11 | 0.46 | | 0.84 | |
| Item 12 | 0.70 | | 0.73 | |
| Item 13 | 0.58 | | 0.77 | |
| Item 14 | 0.90 | | 0.88 | |
| Item 15 | 0.56 | | 0.46 | |

Note: Instagram, n = 54. LinkedIn, n = 46. $\chi^2(166) = 236.68$, p < 0.001; CFI = 0.91, TLI = 0.88, RMSEA = 0.10, SRMR = 0.074. We allowed residual variances between items 1 with 3; 6 with 8; 4 with 8; and 14 with 15.

also Wilcox et al. 2022). Second, individuals in contexts with strict data processing rules, such as the European Union or Germany, might be particularly sensitive to cybervetting practices. In consequence, even cybervetting on professional platforms might lead to negative attitudes and lower organizational attractiveness. Thus, it seems crucial for organizations to manage their cybervetting practices. HR departments that fail to do so might struggle to attract talent. In contrast, in contexts with less strict data processing rules, people may be more tolerant of cybervetting (but see Roulin and Liu 2023). Third, considering that various organizations screen the social media profiles of applicants, we recommend that job seekers who are uncomfortable with the prospect of being cybervetted exercise caution when posting content online, actively manage their online presence, and ensure that postings cannot be seen by unauthorized individuals.

4.3 | Limitations and Directions for Future Research

Our findings were obtained from two social media platforms: Instagram and LinkedIn. While these platforms are among the most used for cybervetting (e.g., Bitkom 2018; Smith 2017), we recommend further investigations into applicant reactions on cybervetting other platforms, such as TikTok or Facebook (for

| 2.59 C 0.91 C -0.01 C | SE 2.59 2.16 2.16 2.01 | Perceive t 4.38 5.69 -0.71 | p P | F 5.95 <i>p</i> < 0.(| R ² 0.23 001 | b 2.64 -0.83 0.01 | SE 0.68 0.18 0.01 | Privacy t 3.88 -4.54 0.95 | <i>p</i> <i>p</i> <i>c</i> 0.001 <i>c</i> 0.34 | F p < 0. | R ² 0.18 001 | b 1.57 0.10 0.01 | SE 0.58 0.16 0.01 | Face va t 2.74 0.61 0.90 | P P 0.01 0.54 0.37 | F p = | R ² 0.03 0.71 |
|-----------------------------|------------------------------------|--|---------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------------------|---|-------------|--------------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|----------|---------------------------------------|
| 3 C 32 C | 0.19 0.16 0.30 | 0.15 -0.15 -1.71 | 0.09 0.09 | | | -2.0 0.11 0.21 | 0.22 0.18 0.34 | -1.12 0.60 0.60 | 0.26 0.55 0.55 | | | -0.06 -0.10 -0.10 | 0.19 0.16 0.29 | -0.36 -0.36 -0.36 | 0.66 0.72 0.72 | | |
| 12 0 | 0.12 | -1.00 | 0.32 | | | 0.30 | 0.14 | 2.10 | 0.04 | | | -0.03 | 0.12 | -0.24 | 0.81 | | |

TABLE 5 | Results from the regression analysis of organizational attractiveness toward cybervetting.

| | | Ğ | eneral ati | tractivene | SS | | | In | ntentions | to pursu | e | | | | Pres | tige | | |
|------------------|------------------|------|------------|------------|---------|---------|------------------|------|-----------|----------|---------|---------|------------------|------|-------|---------|---------|-------|
| | \boldsymbol{p} | SE | t | b | ${f F}$ | R^{2} | \boldsymbol{p} | SE | t | d | ${f F}$ | R^{2} | \boldsymbol{p} | SE | t | d | ${f F}$ | R^2 |
| | | | | | 2.83 | 0.10 | | | | | 3.08 | 0.11 | | | | | 3.70 | 0.14 |
| | | | | | b = c | .01 | | | | | p = 0 | 600 | | | | | = d | 0.002 |
| Intercept | 2.77 | 0.56 | 4.96 | < 0.001 | | | 2.70 | 0.49 | 5.51 | < 0.001 | | | 2.78 | 0.44 | 6.33 | < 0.001 | | |
| Platform | 0.52 | 0.15 | 3.45 | < 0.001 | | | 0.46 | 0.13 | 3.48 | < 0.001 | | | 0.48 | 0.12 | 4.09 | < 0.001 | | |
| Age | -0.01 | 0.01 | -1.33 | 0.19 | | | -0.01 | 0.01 | -1.16 | 0.25 | | | 0.00 | 0.01 | -0.47 | 0.64 | | |
| Gender | 0.22 | 0.18 | 1.20 | 0.23 | | | 0.18 | 0.16 | 1.13 | 0.26 | | | 0.11 | 0.14 | 0.79 | 0.43 | | |
| LinkedIn use | -0.13 | 0.15 | -0.85 | 0.40 | | | -0.14 | 0.13 | -1.08 | 0.28 | | | -0.26 | 0.12 | -2.17 | 0.03 | | |
| Instagram use | 0.12 | 0.28 | 0.44 | 0.66 | | | 0.19 | 0.25 | 0.76 | 0.45 | | | -0.06 | 0.22 | -0.26 | 0.80 | | |
| Social media use | -0.01 | 0.12 | -0.05 | 0.96 | | | -0.01 | 0.10 | -0.10 | 0.92 | | | -0.12 | 0.09 | -1.36 | 0.18 | | |

first thoughts on this, see Akbulut et al. 2024). This is important because social media platforms differ in features, purposes, and availability of job-related information (e.g., Mönke and Schäpers 2022).

Second, we acknowledge a power limitation in our sample. For example, as expected, the German sample tended to view cybervetting on Instagram with more skepticism than the American sample (Cook et al. 2020), but the mean comparisons fell just short of significance (perceived justice, face validity: p = 0.05). A post hoc sensitivity analysis in G*Power (Faul et al. 2009) revealed that we had enough power to detect medium or large effects in the regression models but not small effects (for this, more than 500 participants would be needed). We report this sensitivity analysis in the electronic supplementary (ES05a; http://osf.io/3htps/). Thus, to increase the power and generalizability of our findings, we recommend investigating larger and more diverse samples and applying within-person designs as well. This is important because we employed a vignette design and did not exclude participants who did not use the respective social media platforms. To address this, we included social media and platform use as control variables, finding no substantial effects. However, due to the small sample size of non-users, our additional analyses could not fully determine whether users and non-users differ in their response styles and attitudes. Thus, we cannot rule out potential differences among participants without social media profiles and encourage future research to explore whether nonusers hold different perspectives on cybervetting.

Further, in line with Akbulut et al. (2024) and Cook et al. (2020), but in contrast to Aguado et al. (2016), we found no effects of gender and age. Beyond that, our sample consisted of incumbents and students: While they might be passive job seekers, and targeting such individuals is one important purpose of cybervetting (Nikolaou 2014), we acknowledge that results might be different with individuals actively seeking employment. Further, to address common method variance, future research should aim to move beyond assessing applicant reactions just via self-reports, for example, by assessing nonverbal cues and behavior (Muralidhar et al. 2020). Finally, it remains to explore the decision processes surrounding cybervetting, both from the applicants' (Manroop et al. 2022) and the recruiters' perspective (Sallach et al. 2024). We hope that our translation of the ATC scale (Cook et al. 2020) can help researchers to address these questions.

5 | Conclusion

While cybervetting is widely used by organizations, it is often viewed negatively by job seekers. Our study transferred the ATC scale to the German context and revealed that using professional platforms like LinkedIn had a positive impact on organizational attractiveness, in contrast to relying on personal platforms such as Instagram. However, German participants still viewed cybervetting on professional platforms with more skepticism than North American respondents. This provides a more nuanced understanding of applicant reactions to cybervetting: They depend on the social media platform and context.

Acknowledgments

Franz W. Mönke and Philipp Schäpers thank the State of North Rhine Westphalia's Ministry of Economic Affairs, Industry, Climate Action, and Energy as well as the Exzellenz Start-up Center. NRW program at the REACH EUREGIO Start-Up Center for their kind support of our work. We also thank Ann-Kathrin Sterk and Elena Besserer for their support in the data collection. Open Access funding enabled and organized by Projekt DEAL.

Data Availability Statement

The data that support the findings of this study are openly available at the Open Science Framework, https://osf.io/3htps.

Supporting Information

The electronic supplementary, including all data, analysis syntax, and materials is publicly available at the Open Science Framework, http://osf.io/3htps/.

Endnotes

¹In contrast, Neubaum et al. (2023) reported that German social media users engage less in privacy protection than US users. This might be attributed to Germans feeling better protected by their context's strict legislation than US users. So, privacy concerns might have been reduced through the recent GDPR legislation (Neubaum et al. 2023).

²We also followed up on an anonymous reviewer's suggestion and provide an additional analysis in our electronic supplement (ES05b, http://osf.io/3htps/). Specifically, we examined the impact of participants' platform use (or non-use) on the results by rerunning our analyses with subsamples based on platform engagement (Instagram group–Instagram users: n = 44; Instagram group–Instagram nonusers: n = 10; LinkedIn group-LinkedIn users: n = 29; LinkedIn group–LinkedIn non-users: n = 17). We compared the means between platform and non-platform users for cybervetting attitudes and organizational attractiveness and found no significant differences between the respective groups (see Table ES1; http://osf.io/3htps/). Furthermore, the findings from the regression analyses remained stable for Instagram and LinkedIn users. However, no significant effects emerged in the subsample of Instagram and LinkedIn non-users, suggesting that platform usage may influence attitudes toward cybervetting (H1) and organizational attractiveness (H2). Given the small size of this subsample, the nonsignificant results could also reflect insufficient statistical power. Hence, we call for future research that examines whether non-users have a different perspective on cybervetting.

References

Açıkgöz, Y., K. Mollica, H. K. Davison, C. J. Hartwell, and S. M. Bergman. 2023. "Applicant Reactions to Social Media Assessments: Effects of Social Media Type, Social Media Self-Efficacy, and Minority Status." *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*. https:// doi.org/10.1007/s10672-023-09463-4.

Aguado, D., R. Rico, V. J. Rubio, and L. Fernández. 2016. "Applicant Reactions to Social Network Web Use in Personnel Selection and Assessment." *Revista De Psicología Del Trabajo y De Las Organizaciones* 32, no. 3: 183–190. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rpto.2016.09.001.

Akbulut, Y., İ. E. Yildirim Şen, and Y. L. Şahin. 2024. "Employer and Employee Perceptions of Cybervetting as a Selection Method." *International Journal of Selection and Assessment* 32, no. 2: 292–308. https://doi.org/10.1111/ijsa.12463.

Arnholt, A. T., and B. Evans. 2023. "BSDA: Basic Statistics and Data Analysis (Version 1.2.2) [Computer Software]." https://CRAN.Rproject.org/package=BSDA. Balcerak, A., J. Woźniak, and A. Zbuchea. 2023. "Predictors of Fairness Assessment for Social Media Screening in Employee Selection." *Journal of Entrepreneurship, Management and Innovation* 19, no. 2: 99–126. https://doi.org/10.7341/20231923.

Berkelaar, B. L. 2014. "Cybervetting, Online Information, and Personnel Selection." *Management Communication Quarterly* 28, no. 4: 479–506. https://doi.org/10.1177/0893318914541966.

Bitkom. 2018. "Zwei Von Drei Personalern Informieren Sich Online Über Bewerber [Two Out of Three Recruiters Screen Applicants Online]." Bitkom, July 30, 2018. https://www.bitkom.org/Presse/ Presseinformation/Zwei-von-drei-Personalern-informieren-sich-onlineueber-Bewerber.html.

Cecere, G., F. Le Guel, and N. Soulié. 2015. "Perceived Internet Privacy Concerns on Social Networks in Europe." *Technological Forecasting and Social Change* 96: 277–287. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2015.01.021.

Colquitt, J. A., D. E. Conlon, M. J. Wesson, C. O. L. H. Porter, and K. Y. Ng. 2001. "Justice at the Millennium: A Meta-Analytic Review of 25 Years of Organizational Justice Research." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 86, no. 3: 425–445. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.86. 3.425.

Cook, R., R. Jones-Chick, N. Roulin, and K. O'Rourke. 2020. "Job Seekers' Attitudes Toward Cybervetting: Scale Development, Validation, and Platform Comparison." *International Journal of Selection and Assessment* 28, no. 4: 383–398. https://doi.org/10.1111/ijsa.12300.

El Ouirdi, M., I. Pais, J. Segers, and A. El Ouirdi. 2016. "The Relationship Between Recruiter Characteristics and Applicant Assessment on Social Media." *Computers in Human Behavior* 62: 415–422. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2016.04.012.

Faul, F., E. Erdfelder, A. Buchner, and A.-G. Lang. 2009. "Statistical Power Analyses Using G*Power 3.1: Tests for Correlation and Regression Analyses." *Behavior Research Methods* 41, no. 4: 1149–1160. https://doi.org/10.3758/BRM.41.4.1149.

Gilliland, S. W. 1994. "Effects of Procedural and Distributive Justice on Reactions to a Selection System." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 79, no. 5: 691–701. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.79.5.691.

Hartwell, C. J., and M. A. Campion. 2020. "Getting Social in Selection: How Social Networking Website Content Is Perceived and Used in Hiring." *International Journal of Selection and Assessment* 28, no. 1: 1–16. https://doi.org/10.1111/ijsa.12273.

Hartwell, C. J., J. T. Harrison, R. S. Chauhan, J. Levashina, and M. A. Campion. 2022. "Structuring Social Media Assessments in Employee Selection." *International Journal of Selection and Assessment* 30, no. 3: 330–343. https://doi.org/10.1111/ijsa.12384.

Hausknecht, J. P., D. V. Day, and S. C. Thomas. 2004. "Applicant Reactions to Selection Procedures: An Updated Model and Meta-Analysis." *Personnel Psychology* 57, no. 3: 639–683. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2004.00003.x.

Hedenus, A., C. Backman, and P. Håkansson. 2021. "Whom Do You Know? Recruiters' Motives for Assessing Jobseekers' Online Networks." *International Journal of Human Resource Management* 32, no. 8: 1754–1777. https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2019.1579245.

heyData. 2021. "Data Protection Ranking in Europe." https://heydata. eu/en/studies/europa-im-datenschutz-ranking-en.

Highhouse, S., F. Lievens, and E. F. Sinar. 2003. "Measuring Attraction to Organizations." *Educational and Psychological Measurement* 63, no. 6: 986–1001. https://doi.org/10.1177/0013164403258403.

Jorgensen, T. D., S. Pornprasertmanit, A. M. Schoemann, and Y. Rosseel. 2022. "semTools: Useful Tools for Structural Equation Modeling (Version 0.5-6) [Computer Software]." https://CRAN.Rproject.org/package=semTools.

Klotz, A. C., B. W. Swider, and S. H. Kwon. 2023. "Back-Translation Practices in Organizational Research: Avoiding Loss in Translation." Journal of Applied Psychology 108, no. 5: 699-727. https://doi.org/10. 1037/apl0001050.

Korkmaz, S., D. Goksuluk, and G. Zararsiz. 2014. "MVN: An R Package for Assessing Multivariate Normality." *R Journal* 6, no. 2: 151–162. https://doi.org/10.32614/RJ-2014-031.

Krasnova, H., N. F. Veltri, and O. Günther. 2012. "Self-Disclosure and Privacy Calculus on Social Networking Sites: The Role of Culture: Intercultural Dynamics of Privacy Calculus." *Business & Information Systems Engineering* 4, no. 3: 127–135. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12599-012-0216-6.

Kumar, V., and W. Reinartz. 2018. "Customer Privacy Concerns and Privacy Protective Responses." In *Customer Relationship Management*, edited by V. Kumar and W. Reinartz, 285–309. Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-662-55381-7_14.

Manroop, L., A. Malik, R. Camp, and E. Schulz. 2022. "Applicant Reactions to Social Media Assessment: A Review and Conceptual Framework." *Human Resource Management Review* 32, no. 3: 100853. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2021.100853.

McDonald, S., A. K. Damarin, H. McQueen, and S. T. Grether. 2022. "The Hunt for Red Flags: Cybervetting as Morally Performative Practice." *Socio-Economic Review* 20, no. 3: 915–936. https://doi.org/10.1093/ ser/mwab002.

McFarland, L. A., and R. E. Ployhart. 2015. "Social Media: A Contextual Framework to Guide Research and Practice." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 100, no. 6: 1653–1677. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0039244.

Mönke, F. W., F. Lievens, U. Hess, and P. Schäpers. 2024. "Politics Speak Louder Than Skills: Political Similarity Effects in Hireability Judgments in Multi-Party Contexts and the Role of Political Interest." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 109, no. 1: 1–12. https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0001124.

Mönke, F. W., N. Roulin, F. Lievens, M. T. Bartossek, and P. Schäpers. 2024. "Validity of Social Media Assessments in Personnel Selection: A Systematic Review of the Initial Evidence." *European Journal of Psychological Assessment* 40, no. 6: 445–460. https://doi.org/10.1027/1015-5759/a000835.

Mönke, F. W., and P. Schäpers. 2022. "Too Early to Call: What We Do (Not) Know About the Validity of Cybervetting." *Industrial and Organizational Psychology* 15, no. 3: 334–341. https://doi.org/10.1017/iop.2022.51.

Muralidhar, S., E. P. Kleinlogel, E. Mayor, A. Bangerter, M. S. Mast, and D. Gatica-Perez. 2020. "Understanding Applicants' Reactions to Asynchronous Video Interviews Through Self-Reports and Nonverbal Cues." *Proceedings of the 2020 International Conference on Multimodal Interaction*: 566–574. https://doi.org/10.1145/3382507.3418869.

Neubaum, G., M. Metzger, N. Krämer, and E. Kyewski. 2023. "How Subjective Norms Relate to Personal Privacy Regulation in Social Media: A Cross-National Approach." *Social Media* + *Society* 9, no. 3: 1–12. https://doi.org/10.1177/20563051231182365.

Nikolaou, I. 2014. "Social Networking Web Sites in Job Search and Employee Recruitment." *International Journal of Selection and Assessment* 22, no. 2: 179–189. https://doi.org/10.1111/ijsa.12067.

R Core Team. 2023. "Foreign: Read Data Stored by 'Minitab', 'S', 'SAS', 'SPSS', 'Stata', 'Systat', 'Weka', 'dBase',... (Version 0.8-86) [Computer Software]." https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=foreign.

Revelle, W. 2024. "psych: Procedures for Psychological, Psychometric, and Personality Research (Version 4.2.1) [Computer Software]." https://cran.r-project.org/package=psych.

Rosseel, Y. 2012. "lavaan: An R Package for Structural Equation Modeling." *Journal of Statistical Software* 48, no. 2: 1–36. https://doi. org/10.18637/jss.v048.i02.

Roth, P. L., P. Bobko, C. H. Van Iddekinge, and J. B. Thatcher. 2016. "Social Media in Employee-Selection-Related Decisions: A Research Agenda for Uncharted Territory." *Journal of Management* 42, no. 1: 269–298. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206313503018.

Roth, P. L., R. Roth, and M. A. McDaniel. 2019. "A Meta-Analysis of Social Media Assessment Frequency: Used a Lot, Studied a Little?" *Academy of Management Proceedings* 2019, no. 1: 10224. https://doi.org/10.5465/AMBPP.2019.10224abstract.

Roulin, N., and S. Fernandez. 2022. "Cybervetting: Facebook Is Dead, Long Live Linkedin?" *Industrial and Organizational Psychology* 15, no. 3: 365–370. https://doi.org/10.1017/iop.2022.45.

Roulin, N., and J. Levashina. 2019. "Linkedin as a New Selection Method: Psychometric Properties and Assessment Approach." *Personnel Psychology* 72, no. 2: 187–211. https://doi.org/10.1111/PEPS. 12296.

Roulin, N., and Z. Liu. 2023. "Job Seekers' Attitudes Toward Cybervetting in China: Platform Comparisons and Relationships With Social Media Posting Habits and Individual Differences." *International Journal of Selection and Assessment* 31, no. 2: 347–354. https://doi.org/10.1111/ijsa.12424.

Ryan, A. M., and R. E. Ployhart. 2000. "Applicants' Perceptions of Selection Procedures and Decisions: A Critical Review and Agenda for the Future." *Journal of Management* 26, no. 3: 565–606. https://doi.org/10.1177/014920630002600308.

Sallach, T., F. W. Mönke, and P. Schäpers. 2024. "Cybervetting of Organizational Citizenship Behavior Expectations: Profile Summary as a Key in Linkedin-Based Assessments." *Computers in Human Behavior* 154: 108113. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2023.108113.

Smith, M. 2017. "Disgracebook: One in Five Employers Have Turned Down a Candidate Because of Social Media." YouGov, April 10, 2017. https://yougov.co.uk/topics/politics/articles-reports/2017/04/10/ disgracebook-one-five-employers-have-turned-down-c.

Stanley, D. 2021. "apaTables: Create American Psychological Association (APA) Style Tables (Version 2.0.8) [Computer software]." https:// CRAN.R-project.org/package=apaTables.

Stoughton, J. W., L. F. Thompson, and A. W. Meade. 2015. "Examining Applicant Reactions to the Use of Social Networking Websites in Pre-Employment Screening." *Journal of Business and Psychology* 30: 73–88. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-013-9333-6.

Suen, H. Y. 2018. "How Passive Job Candidates Respond to Social Networking Site Screening." *Computers in Human Behavior* 85: 396–404. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2018.04.018.

Van Iddekinge, C. H., S. E. Lanivich, P. L. Roth, and E. Junco. 2016. "Social Media for Selection? Validity and Adverse Impact Potential of a Facebook-Based Assessment." *Journal of Management* 42, no. 7: 1811–1835. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206313515524.

Wilcox, A., A. K. Damarin, and S. McDonald. 2022. "Is Cybervetting Valuable?" *Industrial and Organizational Psychology* 15, no. 3: 315–333. https://doi.org/10.1017/iop.2022.28.

Zhang, L., C. H. Van Iddekinge, J. D. Arnold, et al. 2020. "What's on Job Seekers' Social Media Sites? A Content Analysis and Effects of Structure on Recruiter Judgments and Predictive Validity." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 105, no. 12: 1530–1546. https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000490.