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ABSTRACT


Teams perform essential roles in many modern organizations and are therefore tied to organizational success. The purpose of the current study was to examine the recruitment of employees to work in teams through an investigation into the impact of perceptions of teams, teamwork KSAs, and recruitment source on pre-hire recruitment variables in team and individual positions. A 2 x 3 repeated measures design presented participants with team and individual job postings on three online recruitment sources (organizational websites, online site visits, and referrals). Results support the idea that perceptions of teams do influence pre-hire recruitment variables to team and individual positions. However, relationships were not observed between teamwork KSAs and pre-hire recruitment variables with the exception of perceptions of organizational honesty. Furthermore, results indicated that differences do exist between recruitment sources with organizational websites leading to higher per-hire recruitment variables than online site visits and referrals.
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Recruiting Employees to Work in Teams: The Impact of Perceptions, KSAs, and Recruitment Source on Pre-hire Recruitment Variables

Teams have become an increasingly important part of the business process for many organizations. As continued globalization, struggles for skilled labor, and other factors increase the competitive challenges faced by organizations, teams provide organizations with a flexible and adaptive solution to many of these obstacles (Kozlowski & Ilgen, 2006; Piña, Martinez, & Martinez, 2008). Although the exact number of organizations that use teams is difficult to determine, the literature suggests that more than 80% of organizations use teams in some way (Cohen & Bailey, 1997; Leach, Wall, Rogelburg, & Jackson, 2005; Sundstrom, 1999). More conservative research on the presence of “true” workplace teams in U.S. organizations places this estimate at approximately 50% (Devine, Clayton, Philips, Dunford, & Melner, 1999). In either case, these estimates illustrate the importance organizations place on teams and their contributions. This reliance on teams has largely contributed to improved organizational performance, specifically in efficiency and quality (Applebaum & Blatt, 1994; Banker, Field, Schroeder, & Sinha, 1996; Cohen & Ledford, 1994), and increased employee satisfaction and commitment to the organization (Cordery, Mueller, & Smith, 1991; Goodman, Devadas, & Hughson, 1988; Stewart & Barrick, 2000).

Although a plethora of investigations have been conducted over the past several decades into the benefits organizations receive from teams and the characteristics of teams that lead to increased performance and effectiveness, there are still areas of the team literature that have been virtually ignored. Much of the previous research on teams has focused on areas such as team selection, composition, performance, processes, and
effective team outcomes (Cohen & Bailey, 1997; Mathieu, Maynard, Rapp, & Gilson, 2008). Though these areas are of great importance to understanding the consequences associated with teams in organizations, researchers often neglect events that occur prior to the selection phase of the team creation process. This has resulted in researchers failing to consider the importance of an earlier stage in the team lifespan, the recruitment of individuals to teams.

Although the recruitment literature abounds with research on effective practices, researchers have virtually ignored the recruitment of individuals for teams. Despite the similarities that exist between recruiting individuals to team and non-team positions, the interdependent nature of teams and the unique characteristics necessary for individuals to be effective team members make the recruitment of individuals to teams theoretically different. For example, in order for team members to work together effectively, previous authors have suggested that team members require certain competencies that allow members to perform interdependent tasks well in order to complete team goals (Hertel, Konradt, & Voss, 2006; Stevens & Campion, 1994). These differences between team and non-team positions provide grounds for an investigation into how the recruitment of team members may differ from traditional recruitment practices.

Therefore, due to the unique nature of teams, the important consequences associated with teams, the significance of individual member’s contributions to teams, and the absence of literature on recruiting team members (Mathieu et al., 2008), the current study sought to investigate how the recruitment of team members differs from traditional recruitment practices. Of specific interest are the effects of applicant perceptions of teams and teamwork KSAs on applicant recruitment to teams and how
varying amounts of information affects applicant perceived fit. The current study also
aimed to examine the effect of recruitment sources on recruiting to team positions. The
current research sought to provide empirical evidence for how organizations can better
recruit effective team members through the use of recruitment sources and information.
Specifically, the current study contributes to the literature by examining how the
manipulation of information about the job, though the use of recruitment sources, affects
applicant perceptions of fit. By manipulating applicant perceptions of fit, organizations
can influence applicant variables (e.g., attraction to the job) and recruitment outcomes
(e.g., applicant acceptance of job offers).

The remainder of the Introduction is organized as follows. First, a discussion of
teams and how team positions differ from the individual positions is provided. Next, the
recruitment literature is reviewed with a focus on the applicant variables and recruitment
outcomes that relate to teams and team member recruitment. Lastly, popular recruitment
activities are discussed along with how each may impact team member recruitment.

Teams

Team research has become increasingly prominent in the fields of psychology and
business (Mathieu et al., 2008). Although research on groups and teams has been around
since the early 1900s, the recent increased need for organizations to run efficiently in
competitive markets has continued to drive new research into effective teams and their
processes (Mathieu et al., 2008; Piña et al., 2008). The recent shift from individuals to
teams in organizations is partially due to the ability of teams to increase an organization’s
flexibility and adaptability in ever changing markets and their recognized benefits of
increased employee satisfaction and organizational commitment (Piña et al., 2008;
Stewart & Barrick, 2000). Just as organizations have shifted towards greater reliance on teams, researchers have shifted their focus toward work teams in organizational settings (Kozlowski & Ilgen, 2006).

The definition of a team can take on many variations based on the type of team, individuals, and tasks involved. However, a very general definition of a team is a group of two or more individuals who interact to complete a common goal (Kozlowski & Ilgen, 2006; Mathieu et al., 2008). A more specific definition by Kozlowski and Ilgen (2006) refers to teams as:

two or more individuals who socially interact (face-to-face or, increasingly virtually); possess one or more common goals; are brought together to perform organizationally relevant tasks; exhibit interdependencies with respect to workflow, goals, and outcomes; have different roles and responsibilities; and are together embedded in an encompassing organizational system, with boundaries and linkages to the broader system context and task environment. (p. 79)

Kozlowski and Ilgen’s definition embodies what would most typically be referred to as a work team operating within a larger organization. Although this definition provides a reasonable foundation upon which to consider work teams, care should be taken to recognize that differences between work teams across situations are likely to be potentially meaningful. For present purposes, however, the Kozlowski and Ilgen (2006) definition will serve to focus the current research.

Though teams reflect an operationally different means for structuring work tasks from individuals, there are certainly many similarities. Both entities operate under the same fundamental process: receive inputs, process inputs, and produce outputs (Mathieu
et al., 2008). Outputs can take on a variety of forms including physical products, reports, or intellectual contributions such as strategies and ideas. These outputs generated by teams and individuals are then used by the organization to fulfill its business purpose. Both individual workers and teams represent a work unit that is part of the larger organizational entity made up of other teams and individuals that must work together in order to adapt to economic and competitive pressures. In fact, in many cases the basic tasks required for performing the job (e.g., creating reports or manufacturing a specific product) are the same for both individuals working alone and individual team members. Therefore both teams and individuals are an essential part of an organization’s ability to succeed.

However, per the definition of a team, teams do operate differently than individuals working alone. The differences that exist between individuals working alone and those working in teams are represented in the characteristics that are required for individuals to perform well as team members (i.e., accomplishing interrelated tasks or goals). Consequently, the very nature of teams, interdependence of members, is a key component to how team positions are different from non-team positions. In order to complete team tasks, team members must exhibit degrees of cooperation, social skills, and teamwork KSAs that, though helpful, are not essential to the completion of tasks for non-team positions (LePine, Hanson, Borman, & Morowidlo, 2000; Stevens & Campion, 1994). These competencies, expressed in detail later in the current paper, are unique to teamwork situations. Because of the unique competencies required by team members, selection of applicants for team positions should be based on the presence of teamwork
competencies (Stevens & Campion, 1999). Therefore, recruitment practices used for attracting applicants to team positions should catch the attention of applicants with the desired competencies.

Furthermore, individuals hired into traditional non-team positions are generally expected to complete the tasks associated with the job at the individual level with their outputs then being passed on to another unit (individual or team) of the organization. In contrast, team tasks require individuals to work together and combine inputs or ideas in order to complete a team level output that the organization can use. The interdependent nature of teams and their work help to illustrate just how different team and non-team positions can be and how individuals may be more attracted to or prefer one type of position over another.

Organizations use teams for a variety of reasons. By grouping individuals together to complete common tasks and goals, organizations can increase the output of all team members and make the team more adaptable, flexible, and resistant to individual and competitive pressures than individuals working alone (Kozlowski & Ilgen, 2006; Piña et al., 2008). Along with increased flexibility and adaptability, teams have also been shown to increase the satisfaction and commitment of employees to the organization (Stewart & Barrick, 2000) and increase organizational performance (Applebaum & Blatt, 1994). The basic reasoning behind the use of teams in organizations stems from research conducted in social psychology with groups. The social psychology and group literatures state that placing individuals into groups can have a variety of positive outcomes such as group facilitation, the increasing of group member performance by making them part of a social
group (Bond & Titus, 1983). These increased individual contributions are then passed along to the organization through the team’s outputs that then aid the organization in completing its business purpose.

Even though there are plenty of reasons why organizations use teams, many may choose to incorporate teams into their business structure because of social factors. Organizations may be influenced to use teams because of the increased exposure of companies already using teams. Organizations using teams tend to be those with large staffs, more sophisticated organizational structures, and that generate greater than average incomes (Devine et al., 1999). Businesses with these characteristics would have a larger profile and greater exposure to the public and other organizations than smaller organizations that may not use teams. When combined, these social and research supported factors illustrate why many organizations have chosen to incorporate teams into their organizational structure.

Whatever the reason organizations choose to use teams, the fact remains that companies are placing greater reliance on teams every year (Devine et al., 1999). Because of this reliance on teams, the success of many organizations is becoming more directly related to the effectiveness of its teams. Therefore in order for businesses to succeed they must have productive teams. Given that the consequences associated with team effectiveness can be very high, researchers have studied many of the areas related to team effectiveness such as the selection of team members and team composition (Mathieu et al., 2008). However, researchers have neglected how best to recruit effective team members. An investigation into this area would contribute to the literature and aid organizations in team member recruiting efforts.
Recruitment

According to Barber (1998), recruitment is broadly considered to be the activities carried out by an organization for the purposes of attracting and procuring potential employees. The recruitment process is generally divided into three phases: generating applicants, maintaining applicant interest, and influencing applicant job decisions (Barber, 1998; Breaugh & Starke, 2000). Recruitment can be further divided into internal (filling positions using current employees) and external (recruiting individuals to fill openings from outside the organization) practices. Breaugh (2008) defines external recruitment as employer actions designed to: (a) bring a job opening to the attention of potential applicants not currently employed by the organizations, (b) influence these individuals to apply for the position, (c) maintain their interest in the position, and (d) influence job offer acceptance. For the purposes of the current study, the focus of the recruitment process will be on external recruitment, particularly the processes of attracting qualified potential employees and ensuring their acceptance of job offers.

Because of the number of factors and variables involved in the recruitment process, typically authors use complex models to illustrate the process of recruiting applicants for jobs. In a recent review, Breaugh, Macan, and Grambow (2008) presented one such model (see Figure 1). This model illustrates the recruitment objectives held by organizations, the strategic development aspects of the process, the recruitment activates and methods used by organizations to recruit applicants, the applicant variables that can influence the process, and the results of the recruitment process. The complexity of this model and the scope of the current study limit the amount of attention that can be given to each of the proposed relationships. With the focus of the current study in mind, a
smaller segment of the broader recruitment model integrated with variables specific to the study of teams (perceptions of teams and teamwork KSAs) (illustrated in Figure 2) was considered.

Figure 2. Hypothesized Team Model of the Recruitment Process

Specifically, the model for the current study focuses on the effects of teamwork KSAs, perceptions of teams, and recruitment sources (recruitment activities) on applicant attraction, job pursuit intentions, perceptions of organizational honesty, and fit (applicant variables) that lead to acceptance of job offers (recruitment objective). By examining how various recruitment sources and applicant perceptions and competencies affect the recruitment process, the current study sought to investigate how organizations can
influence applicant variables that lead to the acceptance of job offers. Though previous models of recruitment have typically been focused on applicants in non-team positions or have not specified their target recruitment audience, the current study focused on a previously neglected recruitment audience, applicants for team member positions. Therefore the recruitment sources, applicant variables, and recruitment objectives related to the model used in the current study are discussed. Prior to this discussion, however, an explanation of targeted recruitment is warranted.

Targeted Recruitment

Although previous studies have investigated the targeted recruitment of other audiences, the current study is the first to examine the recruitment of team members. The targeting of certain types of individuals for recruitment is a relatively new and underrepresented area in the research literature (Ployhart, Schneider, & Schmitt, 2006). When organizations begin recruitment two important questions typically drive the process: Whom to recruit and Where to recruit (Breaugh, 2008)? Targeted recruitment is the answer to these two questions. Through targeted recruitment efforts organizations seek to recruit individuals who will fit with the organization and become productive employees. Few research efforts have investigated how organizations conduct targeted recruitment. To date, researchers have investigated the targeting of a variety of individuals including specific college graduates (Rynes, Orlitzky, & Bretz, 1997), seniors (Freudenheim, 2005), and applicants in specific geographical areas (Rafaeli, Hadomi, & Simons, 2005) for recruitment. Though these studies have focused on targeting experience, education, and other demographic variables, employers could target individuals with specific skills. By targeting qualified applicants with specific skills
needed for the job, organizations could improve the effectiveness of the recruitment process. Recruiting individuals for team positions is a form of targeted recruitment in that the nature of teams requires individual members of teams to have specific characteristics that allow them to successfully interact with team members and function in team settings.

Advantages to targeted recruitment are threefold (Breaugh et al., 2008). First, targeted recruitment should attract applicants; bring job openings to the attention of individuals who would be most attracted to the position. Targeted recruitment should target individuals who will value the position and what it has to offer them, presumably a good fit. Second, targeted recruitment will allow employers to target individuals who will be a better fit with the organization and will be better able to meet their expectations. Third, targeted recruitment allows for the recruitment of individuals with self-insight, those who know what the job entails and whether or not the will fit with the job. Targeted recruitment and its associated advantages have the potential to influence recruitment across a variety of jobs and industries. The targeting of individuals with specific skills, those needed for working in teams would be beneficial in the recruitment, selection, and composition of teams. As this discussion of targeted literature has illustrated, targeting recruitment is an essential part of the recruitment process that has not previously been examined in the context of recruiting individuals to team positions.

Applicant Variables

As illustrated in the definition of recruitment and the recruitment models presented earlier, applicant variables play an influential part in the recruitment process. Applicant variables, such as attraction to the organization, perceptions of fit, and perceptions of organizational honesty, have been suggested to influence measures of
recruitment success (Breaugh & Starke, 2000, Barber & Roehling, 1993). Though many applicant variables exist that can potentially affect the recruitment process, the current study focused on five variables of interest, applicant attraction, job pursuit intentions, perceived person-organization and person-job fit, and applicant perceptions of organizational honesty. The current study also sought to investigate how applicant perceptions of teams may influence recruitment to teams through applicant variables.

* Applicant Attraction

For nearly half a century, the recruitment literature has investigated the best ways to attract applicants. Attraction involves the critical task of influencing applicants to apply for a job and consider job offers (Barber, 1998, Breaugh, 1992, Rynes et al., 1991). Barber (1998) theorized that applicants determine their interest in job openings based on their preexisting knowledge of the organization and the information they gain through recruitment sources. This information provides applicants with the knowledge necessary to determine whether or not they wish to continue to seek employment with the organization. This self-selection decision is based in large part on how attracted the applicant is to the job and organization. Many definitions of attraction exist. In this study applicant attraction will be operationalized as viewing the organization as desirable place to work (Rynes, 1991). Therefore, attraction is expressed as positive affect towards the organization or job (Aiman-Smith, Bauer, & Cable, 2001).

Applicant attraction to the job and organization is based on the objective information and subjective considerations the applicant obtains from recruitment sources, preexisting perceptions, and experiences (Allen, Mahto, & Otondo, 2007). A meta-analytic review by Chapman and colleagues (2005) found evidence that job and
organizational characteristics, how recruiting is conducted, and perceptions of fit predicted level of applicant attraction. Attraction was found to be typically broken down and measured on three levels: (1) attraction to the job and its associated characteristics, (2) applicant attraction to the organization, and (3) applicant perceptions of attraction to the open position which includes elements of the job and organization (Chapman, Uggerslev, Carroll, Piasentin, & Jones, 2005). Research has also indicated that features of the sources used by organizations to recruit applicants may affect applicant attraction (Allen et al., 2007; Allen, Van Scotter, & Otondo, 2004). Because recruitment sources are typically the first contact made between applicants and the organizations, researchers suggest that recruitment sources would greatly influence the perceptions applicants develop about the position and organization (Allen et al., 2007). With this in mind, the current study argued that attraction to team positions occurs in approximately the same way as it does with individual positions with attraction to the organization or job being influenced by the recruitment source and information presented to applicants. Therefore, applicants interested in team positions will be more attracted to team job postings.

*Job Pursuit Intentions*

Job pursuit intentions and applicant attraction have traditionally been viewed as being somewhat interchangeable (Aiman-Smith et al., 2001; Rynes, 1991). Even though this has been the case in parts of the literature, researchers have operationalized distinctions between these two variables and found evidence indicating divergent construct validity (Aiman-Smith et al., 2001; Jatmiko, 2004). Rynes (1991) suggests the similarities between job pursuit intentions and applicant attraction stem from a focus on the first phase of the recruitment process, generating applicants, but that differences exist
in how these variables are derived. Where applicant attraction focuses on the affect applicants have towards the job and relates to phase one of recruitment. Job pursuit intentions are related to an applicant’s intent to take action towards acquiring a position (Aiman-Smith et al., 2001). Job pursuit intentions have been defined as applicant intentions to initiate or continue to pursue a position. Thus job pursuit intentions require the intent of behavior rather than simply developing interest or feelings of attraction for the position. These behaviors include intentions to submit an application, attend an interview or site visit, or a willingness to remain in the applicant pool (Chapman et al., 2005; Rynes, 1991). This operationalization reflects the distinction that job pursuit intentions relate more to the second phase of recruitment, maintaining applicant interest.

Characteristics of the job (i.e., type of work) and organization (i.e., organizations image and reputation) and person-organization fit have been shown to predict job pursuit intentions (Behrend, Baker, & Thompson, 2009; Chapman et al., 2005; Schwoerer & Rosen, 1989). Accordingly, this study argued that information about the organization and the job (e.g., team position) will affect applicant job pursuit intentions. As information about the job increases in job advertisements so should applicant job pursuit intentions. Furthermore as information related to perceptions of fit with the job and organization, such as an applicant’s perceptions on working with teams and doing teamwork increase, so to should job pursuit intentions.

Fit

In the organizational literature, fit is typically used to refer to the degree to which an individual matches well or is compatible with an organization or job (Cable & Judge, 1997; Kristof, 1996, Resick, Baltes, & Shantz, 2007). Theories of fit argue that this
degree of compatibility between an individual and the organization or job is used by individuals to make job choice decisions. Specifically, applicants use this information to make job choice decisions (Saks & Ashforth, 1997) and employees may consider fit when deciding turnover intentions (Cable & Judge, 1996). Fit may also play a part in the interview process as interviewers develop perceptions of fit between applicants and the job and organization (Cable & Judge, 1997). Fit can be viewed from two perspectives: complimentary fit and supplementary fit. Complimentary fit manifests itself when an individual’s characteristics fill in gaps left by others in the organizations or when an individual’s needs are filled by the organization or the work (Resick et al., 2007). Supplementary fit refers to fit that is achieved when individuals and the organization share similar characteristics, values, or goals (Resick et al., 2007; Vogel & Feldman, 2009) and was the focus of the current study.

Fit can further be divided into objective and subjective (perceived) fit. Objective fit is measured by assessing the congruence between the individual and the organization independently (Cable & Parsons, 2001; Resick et al., 2007). Perceived fit involves gathering the individual’s perception or belief of how well they fit with the organization (Cable & DeRue, 2002; Lauver & Kristof-Brown, 2001, Resick et al., 2007). Research states that perceptions of fit are better predictors of individual behaviors than objective measures of congruence (Cable & DeRue, 2002; Cable & Judge, 1997; Kristof, 1996). Due to the prominence of using perceived fit measures in the literature and that larger effect sizes have been observed for perceived fit over objective fit in recent reviews (Kristof-Brown et al., 2005), the current study focused on measures of perceived fit.
Though several domains of fit have been identified, two primary domains (person-organization and person-job fit) are the most prominent in the literature.

*Person-Organization Fit.* Person-Organization (P-O) fit has been defined as “the compatibility between people and organizations when: (a) at least one entity provides what the other needs, or (b) they share similar fundamental characteristics, or (c) both” (Kristof, 1996). This compatibility is typically defined in terms of how well a person perceives a match between his/her values, goals, and culture and those of the organization (Cable & DeRue, 2002; Edwards, Cable, Williamson, Lambert, & Shipp, 2006; Kristof, 1996; Piasentin & Chapman, 2006; Resick et al., 2007). This idea is consistent with the attraction-selection-attrition (ASA) framework which suggests that applicants are attracted to organizations based on how well they fit with the organizations, organizations then select applicants that fit with the organizations goals, and finally applicants leave the organizations based on a lack to fit (Schneider, 1987). The literature supports the importance of fit in the workplace with observed relationships between P-O fit and job satisfaction, career success, role performance, turnover decisions, and citizenship behaviors (Bretz & Judge, 1994; Cable & DeRue, 2002; Kristof-Brown, Barrick, & Stevens, 2005). Relationships have also been observed between P-O fit and organizational attraction, retention, recruiter selection decisions, task and citizenship performance, and employee work-related attitudes and actions (Hoffman & Woehr, 2006; Kristof-Brown, Zimmerman, & Johnson, 2005; Verquer, Beehr, & Wagner, 2003). Based on the findings from the literature, P-O fit plays an important in both the recruitment applicants and their attitudes and behaviors on the job. Consequently, it can be assumed that an individual’s perceptions of organizations fit would be an important factor in the
recruitment of team members. In fact, if organizations can influence applicant perceptions of P-O fit, they may be able to improve applicant attraction to the job and acceptance decisions.

Person-Job Fit. Just as applicants seek to find congruence with an organization, so do applicants also seek to find compatibility with the requirements and inducements related to the job (Bretz, 1993; Edwards, 199, Vogel & Feldman, 2009). Fit between an applicant’s characteristics and those of the job is referred to as person-job (P-J) fit. P-J fit is divided into two dimensions: abilities-demand fit and needs-supplies fit. Abilities-demand fit refers to the congruence between the skills and abilities of the individual and the demands of the job (Vogel & Feldman, 2009). Individuals with the skills required to meet the demands of the job will more likely perform better and remain on the job. Needs-supplies fit occurs when the needs of the individual are provided by the job. An individual’s needs can take the form of needs for affiliation, autonomy, and financial security (Vogel & Feldman, 2009). In turn the job can supply the individual with colleagues, flexible schedules, and compensation. Though the literature has distinguished between these two dimensions of P-J fit, these dimensions of P-J fit are generally combined into an overall perception of P-J fit (Cable & DeRue, 2002). Overall P-J fit has been shown to positively with performance and tenure (Caldwell & O’Reilly, 1990; Kristof-Brown et al., 2005), satisfaction, and commitment (Bretz & Judge, 1994; Cable & DeRue, 2002; Kristof-Brown et al., 2005). From the preceding review, it can be assumed that perceptions of P-J fit may play an influential role in applicant recruitment. Specifically, in situations were applicant pre-existing preferences and skills match well with the job.
When organizations participate in the recruitment process they must disseminate information about themselves and their values. Applicants then use this information to make decisions about how well their values match with the organization through perceptions. Therefore the amount and type of information applicants have access to will affect their perceptions of fit. Based on this logic, organizations have the ability to influence applicant perceptions of fit based on the information they present about the organization and job.

Perceptions of Organizational Honesty

Perceptions of organizational honesty represent the degree to which the applicant perceives the organization as being honest and trustworthy, also referred to as climate for honesty (Phillips, 1998). Though a relatively new and understudied area of research, perceptions of organizational honesty have been hypothesized to influence applicant attraction to the organization, which in turn influences applicant acceptance (Breauh & Starke, 2000).

Most of the recruitment literature investigating perceptions of honesty has been examined with respect to realistic job previews (Breauh & Starke, 2000; Saks & Cronshaw, 1990). This line of research is based on the idea that since realistic job previews present applicants with a realistic (i.e., negative and positive) perspective of the job, applicants will develop perceptions that the organization is honesty and trustworthy (Phillips, 1998). This theory has received some support in the literature, with perceptions of honesty being weakly related to acceptance intentions and attraction (Phillip, 1998; Saks & Cronshaw, 1990). Although empirical support for this line of reasoning has not been strong, it does make intuitive sense that perceptions about the organization would
influence an applicant’s attraction, perceived fit, and intentions to accept a job offer. Therefore, because this study was interested in examining applicant perceptions and how they influence recruitment, specifically the recruitment of team members, an investigation into the role perceptions of organizational honesty plays in team member recruitment and how these perceptions relate to applicant perceptions of teams and teamwork KSAs is logical.

Perceptions of Teams

Just as individuals develop perceptions about fit and honesty, so to can individuals have pre-existing perceptions about job characteristics. One such characteristic prominent in team positions is the team itself and amount of teamwork required for the job. The current study defined perceptions of teams as an individual’s attitudes towards working with others in team situations. These perceptions are based on an individual’s preferences towards teamwork and general attitudes towards teams in general. Previous research has examined areas related to individual preferences towards working with others in team situations, collective orientation (Triandis, 1995), and teamwork, preference for teamwork (Campion, Medsker, & Higgs, 1993). These preferences have been shown to be predictors of to team performance (Bell, 2007). The idea of perceptions of teams incorporates these previously studied preferences towards teamwork with an individual’s attitudes towards teams. By incorporating the concept of attitudes towards teams and preferences for teamwork, this study seeks to investigate how perceptions of teams influence team outcomes.
Individuals continually develop perceptions about their world based on their experiences and their exposure to information (Rockwell, 1969). Group or team projects have become commonplace in education systems around the world (Payne & Monk-Turner, 2006). As such, by the time an individual is ready to enter the workforce there is a very good chance he or she has already been exposed to some degree of group or teamwork experience. Although these team project experiences are designed in part to better prepare individuals for working in teams, these classroom team experiences may not always be successful in simulating actual team experiences and may result in negative effects on an individual’s perceptions of teams (Hansen, 2006). Although student surveys of group work perceptions are generally positive, a percentage of student responses do typically indicate a variety of negative experiences and views on group activities (Duin, 1990; Morgan, Allen, Moore, Atkinson, & Snow, 1987; Payne & Monk-Turner, 2006). These negative perceptions of teams are generally associated with occurrences of social loafing, lack of leadership, and lack of team development (Hansen, 2006). Because these negative aspects of student teams may be common in many workplace teams, these early negative experiences with teams may discourage individuals from seeking positions in teams.

For some time researchers have considered perceptions of the job and organization to be an important part of the recruitment process (Breaugh & Starke, 2000; Rynes & Cable, 2003). Just as applicants have perceptions about an organization or job, so do individuals exposed to teams. Logically, applicants might choose not to apply for a position because of the amount of interdependence required. Therefore, the current study sought to investigate whether knowing that an individual will be working with others on a
team will influence attitudes towards a job and likelihood of job offer acceptance. Furthermore, the current study sought to determine if these negative or positive attitudes about the interdependent teamwork aspects of the job have any relationship with the individual’s ability to be an effective team member.

In review, simply attracting the attention of applicants with team competencies is not the only factor related to team member recruitment. Applicant perceptions and KSAs may influence the attraction, job pursuit intentions, fit perceptions, and acceptance decisions of applicants for both team and individual positions. By their nature, teams require their members to work together (Kozlowski & Ilgen, 2006). Yet, not everyone desires to work closely with others (Hansen, 2006, Payne & Monk-Turner, 2006). This being the case, an individual’s perceptions of teams may influence the desire to seek team positions whether or not the person has the necessary competencies to perform well. Therefore, because of the differences that exist between individual and team positions, the competencies required to perform individual and team work, and individuals’ perceptions of teams, the current study argued that differences may exist in the effectiveness of recruitment practices in attracting applicants to team positions. Although similarities exist between recruiting individuals with team competencies and the recruitment of individuals with other KSAs or competencies for non-team jobs, the amount of interaction required by team members and the perceptions and attitudes individuals may have about teams make the recruitment of teams unique. Therefore the current study hypothesized that:
Hypothesis 1: The relationship between perceptions of teams and attraction to position will be moderated by position type. Specifically, perceptions of teams will be positively related to attraction for team positions and negatively related to attraction for individual positions.

Hypothesis 2: The relationship between perceptions of teams and job pursuit intentions to position will be moderated by position type. Specifically, perceptions of teams will be positively related to applicant job pursuit intentions for team positions and negatively related to job pursuit intentions for individual positions.

Hypothesis 3: The relationship between perceptions of teams and P-O fit to position will be moderated by position type. Specifically, perceptions of teams will be positively related to applicant P-O fit for team positions and negatively related to P-O fit for individual positions.

Hypothesis 4: The relationship between perceptions of teams and P-J fit to position will be moderated by position type. Specifically, perceptions of teams will be positively related to applicant P-J fit for team positions and negatively related to P-J fit for individual positions.

Hypothesis 5: The relationship between perceptions of teams and perceptions of organizational honesty to position will be moderated by position type. Specifically, perceptions of teams will be positively related to applicant perceptions of organizational honesty for team positions and negatively related to perceptions of organizational honesty for individual positions.

Hypothesis 6: The relationship between perceptions of teams and acceptance to position will be moderated by position type. Specifically, perceptions of teams will be positively related to applicant acceptance for team positions and negatively related to acceptance for individual positions.

Recruitment Outcomes

Recruitment outcomes represent the goals of a recruitment process. These outcomes represent the means by which the success of a recruitment process can be determined. As has been discussed previously, applicant acceptance of job offers is critical to the effectiveness of a recruitment process. Of equal importance is that the quality of applicants generated by the recruitment process. In order for positions to be
filled and the organization to be successful, qualified applicants must accept offers of employment. Therefore applicant acceptance and applicant quality represent important recruitment outcomes.

*Applicant Acceptance*

Though attracting applicants is a necessary part of the recruitment process, it is meaningless if applicants attracted to the position fail to accept offers of employment. Applicant acceptance refers to applicants accepting job offers and is typically measured by acceptance rates, defined as the number of individuals presented with offers that accept offers of employment. Typically applicant acceptance is frequently measured using an applicants reported intentions to accept an offer of employment or the applicants actual job choice (Chapman et al., 2005). Even though an applicant’s attraction to the position does not guarantee the applicant will accept a job offer moderate positive relationships have been observed between organizational attractiveness and acceptance intentions (Chapman et al. 2005; Truxillo, Bauer, Campion, & Paronto, 2002).

Importantly, before an applicant can make a job choice the organization must first extend an offer of employment. During the selection process, an organization must determine which applicants meet the requirements of the job and would be potential good fits with the job and organizations (Barber, 1998, Breaugh & Starke, 2000). These applicants are then presented with job offers. Presumably applicants presented with job offers are the most qualified individuals from the applicant pool. Therefore in order for the recruitment process to be successful these qualified applicants must accept job offers and become employees in the organization. If the recruitment process attracts qualified applicants and does not ensure they accept offers, organizations will need to present job
offers to less qualified individuals to fill empty positions. Despite the fact that organizations can never hope to only recruit and hire qualified applicants, organizations seek to achieve a high acceptance ratio of qualified applicants.

*Applicant Quality*

As previously mentioned, a key component to effective recruitment is the quality of applicants generated by the recruitment process (Breagh & Starke, 2000). Organizations benefit from hiring qualified individuals who can and will perform their job well. When organizations hire unqualified or less-qualified applicants who may not perform the job at a satisfactory level, the organization becomes less able to meet its business purpose. This reduced ability to meet business purposes can be manifested in a variety of consequences such as decreased productivity, increased costs associated with training, and increases in withdrawal behaviors such as absenteeism and turnover.

Although recruiting qualified applicants is of vital importance to organizations, it has not been well documented in the literature. Previously, applicant quality has been determined using a variety of pre-hire (i.e., background questionnaires predictive of success and GPA) and post-hire measures (i.e., performance and survival) (Connerley, Carlsson, & Mecham, 2003; Kirnan et al., 1989). Researchers in the field have also proposed methods for organizations to design and implement programs for assessing applicant quality (Carlson, Connerley, & Mecham, 2002). With the small number of studies that have investigated applicant quality and the mixed results, conclusions about the ability of recruitment processes to influence applicant quality are limited at best (Breagh et al., 2003; Connerley, Carlson, & Mecham, 2003; Kirnan et al., 1989; Mason & Belt, 1986).
These studies, however, have indicated the potential for recruitment sources and their information to influence applicant quality and that applicant pool quality varies across job families.

As discussed previously, applicant quality in the recruitment of team members is based on the applicant possessing competencies related to working well with others (i.e., teamwork KSAs). A quality applicant will possess a high degree of teamwork KSAs which will result in a more productive individual team performer and ultimately a more effective team. As with attraction and acceptance, many of the applicant qualities in team and individual positions share similarities. By investigating the effectiveness of recruitment practices that have been previously investigated in individual positions on team positions, the current study seeks to identify differences that exist among practices and their effectiveness in recruiting qualified applicants for individuals and team positions. Before this task can be undertaken a discussion of quality applicants in the context of teams was necessary, namely applicants who have the competencies required to become effective team members

*Effective Team Members*

Organizations use teams because they have proven effective in increasing organizational performance (Applebaum & Blatt, 1994), are better able to tackle challenging problems than individuals working alone, and are more flexible than larger organizational entities (Kozlowski & Iglen, 2006; Piña et al., 2008). No matter the reason organizations use teams, in order for teams to fulfill their purpose and aid the organization they must be effective in accomplishing team tasks. Effectiveness is generally divided into three categories: performance, attitudes, and behaviors (Cohen &
Bailey, 1997). Of these three categories, performance is by far the most widely studied (Mathieu et al., 2008) and is arguably linked to the purpose of teams, to enact certain behaviors that provide organizations with useful outputs (Argote & McGrath, 1993; Goodman, 1986; Mathieu et al., 2008). Therefore, for the purpose of the current research, an effective team is one that exhibits certain behaviors that lead to outcomes and completed team tasks. These behavior led outcomes are related to the purpose and continuity of the team and to the effectiveness of the organization as a whole (Piña et al., 2008). Since team outcomes are dependent on the individual contributions (behaviors) made by team members, team effectiveness is therefore contingent on the individual effectiveness of team members in producing behaviors.

As such, the effectiveness of each individual member of the team influences the teams overall level effectiveness. Because of the interdependent nature of teams, an effective team member is an individual who works with other members of the team to accomplish team goals (Mathieu et al., 2008; Stevens & Campion, 1994). In order to accomplish goals, effective team members must exhibit behaviors and perform in ways that allow them to cooperate with and perform well with others. In other words, effective team members are individuals who add to a teams overall level of effectiveness by contributing behaviors that lead to team outcomes.

Before effective teams can be created there must first be an available pool of potentially effective team member applicants. This pool of applicants is typically generated through recruitment. The goal of recruitment is to attract qualified applicants who will accept offers of employment (Barber, 1998). These qualified applicants are individuals who possess certain competencies that enable them to successfully complete
job related tasks. In the context of teams, qualified applicants would be individuals who possess the knowledge, skills, and abilities that allow them not only to perform their job well but also to interact with others to complete team tasks and objectives. The competencies, skills, and traits that allow individuals to work with others to complete team tasks are essential to the success of the team. Therefore recruitment initiatives aimed at recruiting individuals for team positions should focus their efforts on attracting applicants with these desired attributes.

As previously discussed, team positions differ from individual positions, primarily because of the interdependent nature of teams. In theory, this interdependent nature of teams may lead to differences in the recruitment process of individuals to teams. Most noticeably teamwork KSAs and applicant perceptions of teams represent aspects of teams that may influence the recruitment of team members. The current study investigated the effect of applicant levels of teamwork KSAs and perceptions of teams on applicant recruitment to the organization.

*Teamwork KSAs*

In order for individuals to perform effectively on the job, employees must have certain competencies that enable them to successfully complete job related tasks. Of particular interest to researchers have been the knowledge, skills, and abilities (KSAs) related to effective performance. Recently the KSAs required for effective individual performance in teams, teamwork KSAs, have come under investigation (Hertel et al., 2006; Stevens & Campion, 1994; Stevens & Campion, 1999; Weaver, Bowers, Salas, & Cannon-Bowers, 1997).
In the literature, KSAs are generally separated into taskwork KSAs, those related to task or job knowledge, and teamwork KSAs, those related to interpersonal and cooperative skills (Hertel et al., 2006). The idea of teamwork KSAs is relatively new with only a limited discussion of the topic present in the literature. A precursor of the teamwork KSA argument is contextual performance, which involves conceptual similarities with teamwork KSAs. Previous authors argued that contextual performance encompasses the “social, psychological, and organizational context in which work is performance” (Borman & Motowidlo, 1993). This argument led researchers to identify that interpersonal facilitation, which includes interpersonal skills, maintaining good working relationships, helping others, and behaviors, was related to team performance. The development of teamwork KSAs was furthered by a review conducted by Stevens and Campion (1994) that identified that the content domain of teamwork KSAs was composed of two main dimensions (i.e., interpersonal KSAs and self-management KSAs) at the team level and 14 KSA requirements for team members at the individuals level.

Based on previous team literature, it can be assumed that the interdependent nature of teams requires effective team members to possess a unique set of knowledge, skills, and abilities (KSAs). Teamwork KSAs are considered to be a unique set of competencies required for individuals to perform well in team situations where interdependence is high. Although these KSAs may be beneficial to all employees across job settings, teamwork KSAs are considered essential for individuals who must work with and alongside other individuals to complete a common goal (Stevens & Campion, 1994). Through the use of teamwork KSAs, effective individual performers enable their team to complete relevant tasks and produce outcomes that are required for the
organization’s success. Therefore, in team situations, qualified applicants are individuals who possess teamwork KSAs that eventually lead to effective team performance. Following this logic, the recruitment and selection of individuals with high degrees of teamwork KSAs should in turn lead to more effective teams.

Though using teamwork KSAs to select and place applicants is a relatively new step in the research, two such selection tools have been developed: the Teamwork Knowledge, Skills, and Ability Test (Teamwork KSA Test; Stevens & Campion, 1999) and the online Virtual Team Competency Inventory (VTCI; Hertel et al., 2006). Each test measures the teamwork KSAs required for effective individual performance in teams such as interpersonal and self-management KSAs. Both scales were shown to predict individual behavior within teams with high KSA scores predicting greater individual effectiveness within teams (Hertel et al., 2006; McCough & Rogelberg, 2003; & Stevens & Campion, 1999). Stevens and Campion (1999) reported that the Teamwork KSA Test had criterion-related validity with supervisory and peer ratings of teamwork ($r = .44$) and overall job performance ($r = .52$). A relationship was also found between the Teamwork Tests and employment aptitude tests ($r = .81$), general mental ability. Although related to aptitude tests, teamwork KSAs did account for additional variance above work aptitude tests (Stevens & Campion, 1999). These tools represent the early stages of a movement to integrate teamwork KSAs into the selection process.

Research into teamwork KSAs, though still at an early stage, has made arguments for the importance of considering teamwork KSAs when looking at teams and their members. This research has linked Teamwork KSAs to effective team member performance (Cooke, Kiekel, Salas, & Stout, 2003; Hirschfeld, Jordan, Field, Giles, &
Armenakis, 2005; McClough & Rogelberg, 2003; Stevens & Campion, 1994; Stevens & Campion, 1999). Therefore, individuals possessing teamwork KSAs will presumably be effective team performers. The more teamwork KSAs an individual has, the greater the individual’s performance. In theory, effective team member performance leads to better performing and effective teams. Recently teamwork KSAs have been investigated as potential means for identifying and selecting potentially high performing future team members (Hertel et al., 2006; Stevens & Campion, 1994; Stevens & Campion, 1999; Weaver et al., 1997). Based on these findings, the current study sought to use previously developed measures of teamwork KSAs as proxy indicators of future performance in teams. In theory, individuals with teamwork KSAs have the skills necessary to be effective in team positions and will therefore be more attracted to and accept positions involving teams. Based on the previous discussion the following hypotheses were derived.

Hypothesis 7: The relationship between teamwork KSAs and attraction to position will be moderated by position type. Specifically, teamwork KSAs will be positively related to applicant attraction for team positions and unrelated to attraction for individual positions.

Hypothesis 8: The relationship between teamwork KSAs and job pursuit intentions to position will be moderated by position type. Specifically, teamwork KSAs will be positively related to applicant job pursuit intentions for team positions and unrelated to job pursuit intentions for individual positions.

Hypothesis 9: The relationship between teamwork KSAs and P-O fit to position will be moderated by position type. Specifically, teamwork KSAs will be positively related to applicant P-O fit for team positions and unrelated for P-O fit to individual positions.

Hypothesis 10: The relationship between teamwork KSAs and P-J fit to position will be moderated by position type. Specifically, teamwork KSAs will be positively related to applicant P-J fit for team positions and unrelated for P-J fit to individual positions.
Hypothesis 11: The relationship between teamwork KSAs and perceptions of organizational honesty to position will be moderated by position type. Specifically, teamwork KSAs will be positively related to applicant perceptions of organizational honesty for team positions and unrelated to perceptions of organizational honesty for individual positions.

Hypothesis 12: The relationship between teamwork KSAs and acceptance to position will be moderated by position type. Specifically, teamwork KSAs will be positively related to applicant acceptance for team positions and unrelated for acceptance to individual positions.

Hypothesis 13: A positive relationship will exist between Teamwork KSA scores and perception of teams.

Recruitment Activities

Many factors play a part in the recruitment process. Characteristics of the job such as pay, workload, and work schedule have long been seen as factors that can greatly influence potential applicants (Rynes & Cable, 2003). Logically the characteristics of the job are of more importance to applicants and have greater impact on applicants than do recruitment variables (i.e., recruitment sources, content, and aesthetics). Despite this logic, recruitment variables have repeatedly been shown to broaden applicant pools and maintain applicant interest during the recruitment process (Boswell, Roehling, LePine, & Moynihan, 2003; Rynes et al., 1991). Therefore, recruitment variables have the potential to greatly influence the success of recruitment programs through attracting and maintaining future effective employees until a job offer can be given. One such recruitment variable, recruitment source, has been well documented as an influential factor of recruitment initiative success (Zottoli & Wanous, 2000).
Recruitment Source

Recruitment sources are the means by which organizations attempt to make contact with and attract potential applicants (Allen et al., 2007; Zottoli & Wanous, 2000) and have typically been divided into two categories: formal recruiting sources (employment agencies, trade unions, college placement centers, and advertisements) and informal recruiting sources (employee referrals and direct applicants) (Kirnan et al., 1989). Generally the recruitment literature has suggested that informal recruitment sources led to higher quality applicants and more successful hires than formal sources (Breaugh, 2008; Zottoli & Wanous, 2000, etc.). Although the literature may suggest the superiority of informal recruitment sources over formal sources, formal sources continue to be a popular recruitment source used by organizations (Rynes & Cable, 2003).

For well over half a century, investigations into the effectiveness of different recruitment sources have been a consistent feature in the recruitment literature (Breaugh, 2008). These investigations have led to a general understanding of recruitment source effectiveness across a variety of jobs. The most recent review on recruitment sources identified referrals by current employees, in house job postings, and the rehiring of former employers as the most effective recruitment sources resulting in lower voluntary turnover (Zottoli & Wanous, 2000). Zottoli and Wanous further identified newspaper ads, school placement services, and employment agencies as the least effect sources in recruiting applicants. Although this review did compare the effectiveness of a broad set of recruitment sources, only voluntary turnover was used to measure recruitment effectiveness, thereby, failing to consider the effects of recruitment sources on attracting applicants and maintaining applicant interest. This focus on post-hire outcomes rather
than pre-hire outcomes illustrates a common trend seen in the recruitment literature with few studies examining the relationship between recruiting source (e.g., college placement offices, newspaper ads, employee referrals, direct applicants, and job fairs) and pre-hire outcomes (percentage of qualified applicants generated, percentage of applicants hired) (Breaugh, Greising, Taggart, & Chen, 2003). As stated earlier these pre-hire outcomes (attraction and acceptance) are an essential part of the recruitment process.

In terms of external recruitment, three recruitment sources have warranted attention by researchers and practitioners: organizational websites, site visits, and referrals. Crispin and Mehler (2005) surveyed 40 organizations with nearly 7 million combined employees worldwide that in 2004 reported organizational websites produced 53.3 percent of all Internet hires. In a 2007 survey, 49 companies that filled over 300,000 positions reported that 28.7% of external hires came from referrals (Crispin & Mehler, 2008). As these statistics indicate, online recruitment sources (i.e., organizational websites and referrals) can be associated with the generation of a substantial segment of externally recruited new hires. Though traditional recruitment sources such as referrals and newspaper advertisements are still a topic of much research, recent shifts have been observed in the recruitment sources currently used by organizations. Using technology, particularly the Internet, has become a popular resource for organizations in recruiting applicants (Allen et al., 2007). Recently, e-recruitment, recruiting applicants through the use of electronic methods and sources, has become a major part of organizational recruitment practices (Capelli, 2001). Based on the impact online recruitment sources can
have on the recruitment of applicants, the current study sought to examine the affects of three types of online recruitment sources: organizational websites, online site visits, and referrals.

*Organizational Websites.* Capelli (2001) reported that more than 90% of large U.S. companies used their organizational website to communicate job openings and organizational information to potential applicants. The use of organizational websites as a means of communicating job openings and recruiting applicants was due in part to the increased preference of applicants in using the Internet as a means to search for employment (Capelli, 2001, Cober, Brown, Blumental, Doverspike, & Levy, 2000, Kuhn & Skuterud, 2000). Furthermore, surveys of HR practitioners have shown that organizations perceive websites as being a low cost way to attract a large applicant pool (Chapman & Webster, 2003; Stone, Lukaszewski, & Isenhour, 2005). These factors illustrate why many organizations tend to use organizational websites as recruitment sources and the relative importance of investigating their effects on recruitment outcomes.

The move by organizations towards using organizational websites as recruitment tools is based on their perceived benefits. Organizational websites allow companies to disseminate an almost unlimited amount of information about the organization and job openings through a variety of mediums (text, images, audio files, and interactive links with a large geographically dispersed audience at a relatively low cost) (Allen, et al., 2007; Cober, Brown, Blumental, Doverspike, & Levy, 2000; Cober, Brown, Keeping, & Levy, 2004). Websites also allow applicants to determine their own levels of content and information emersion. This differs from traditional types of sources in that organizational
websites (1) allow applicants access to more information and the ability to tailor the content presented than do formal passive sources (e.g., job ads), (2) allow applicants to access different types of information and a broader depth of content than formal active sources (e.g., job fairs) and (3) allow applicants access to information that’s content and presentation are controlled by the organization, unlike informal sources (e.g., referrals) (Allen et al., 2007).

As never before, organizations have the ability to deliver information about job opportunities to a large section of potential applicants at a fraction of the cost associated with traditional recruitment sources. Clearly these benefits are attractive to organizations that must compete for a limited pool of qualified applicants. While researchers have begun to investigate the factors associated with organizational websites and effective recruitment, there are still many unanswered questions (Ployhart, 2006). Allen and others (2007) illustrated the importance of information when they reported that direct information and indirect organizational information were related to intentions to pursue employment. Braddy, Meade, and Kroustalis (2006) reported that website design features ad information about organizational values, policies, awards, and goals affected viewer’s perceptions of organizational culture. These findings would support the idea that the increased amount of information provided by organizational websites would increase acceptance rates and positive organization perceptions. Additionally, content analyses of organizational websites and experimental simulations have shown that aesthetics, content, and function are all important to applicant reactions (Allen et al., 2007; Cober, Brown, & Levy, 2004). Although organizational websites are prominently used by
organizations for recruiting purposes, little research has examined the consequences associated with their use and their ability to attract applicants who accept job offers and remain on the job. (Allen et al., 2007; Dineen, Ash, & Noe, 2002).

*Online Site Visits.* Site visits occur when an applicant is given a chance to visit the actual job site or workplace before they accept the job offer (Turban, Campion, & Eyring, 1995). Site visits offer extensive contact between applicants and organization representatives (McKay & Avery, 2006). This presents applicants with a realistic preview of the workplace prior to their acceptance of an employment offer. Site visits can take many forms including interviews with supervisors and co-workers and worksite tours that allow applicants to observe the work and work environment. In line with signaling theory, this realistic preview provides applicants with information they can use to make develop perceptions of the organization and the job that will influence job pursuit intentions and job acceptance decision (Breugh & Starke, 2000; McKay & Avery, 2006). As the name implies, site visits involve applicants visiting the workplace and interacting with supervisors and coworkers. Site visits allow applicants to access to information about the job, environment, and employees interactions. Despite the fact that site visits have traditionally been limited to the physical world, it stands to reason that information about the job, environment, and employee interactions can be transferred to applicants through an online medium. With the current trend of organizations using more online recruitment sources and the benefits associated with online sources, the online site visits may offer organizations yet another way to recruit applicants. Because site visits focus on employee interactions, an online site visit may be particularly effective in the recruitment of team members.
Although research into the effects of site visits is limited, evidence does support the use of site visits in the recruitment process (Breaugh & Stark, 2000; McKay & Avery, 2006). Research has shown that aspects of the site visit, such as the host of the site visit, can influence the attitudes of applicants. If the host of a site visit can have this affect, it stands to reason the medium by which the site visit information is presented (online) may be a factor (Turban et al., 1995). Most research on site visits has focused on how the host or the people with whom the applicant interacts affect recruitment outcomes (Rynes, Bretz, & Gerhart, 1991; Taylor & Bergmann, 1987). In an online site visit, these components would be of less importance. However, an online site visit would focus more heavily on the information presented to applicants, particularly information about employee interactions. In teams, this information would focus on the interactions between the team members.

In relation to signaling theory, evidence suggests that site visits provide information that is used by applicants to make acceptance decisions (Rynes et al., 1991). The information presented in a site visit provides applicants with “signals” about aspects of the organization and job (Turban et al., 1995). Turban and others identified that overall evaluations of site visit, perceptions of the site visit, and host likeability were positively related to job acceptance decisions. The information presented or not presented signals to the applicant how they may be treated on the job. Generally the more information that is available the greater positive applicant outcomes: acceptance (Gatewood, Gowan, & Lautenschlager, 1993), attraction (Rynes & Miller, 1983), and intent to interview (Barber & Roehling, 1998). Illustrating the importance of the information delivered through site visits, Fink et al. (1994) reported that 75% of applicants changed their acceptance
intentions after a site visits. Clearly, site visits provide applicants with information that is important to the recruitment process. However, the effectiveness of site visits in team recruitment and various forms of site visits (online) have not been investigated.

*Referrals.* Referrals by current employers or direct applicants are considered by many to be the most effective recruitment sources (Breaugh, 2008). Studies have found that applicants generated by referrals are generally more qualified and more likely to receive job offers and accept them than individuals recruited through employment agencies, newspaper ads, and school placement offices (Breaugh et al., 2003; Kirnan et al., 1989; Rafaeli et al., 2005). Researchers have hypothesized that the reason for the success of referrals is due to the referral process itself. For the most part, referrals are individuals that have been given a recommendation to apply for a position within an organization. Typically, an individual is referred to the position by a current or previous employee that is familiar with the characteristics and values of the job and organization. Therefore, the applicant being referred for employment has access to realistic information about the job and organization from a reliable source. Because of this reason the applicant is exposed to the positive and negative aspects of the employment opportunity prior to applying for the job. This reasoning follows the met expectations hypothesis common to other recruitment practices such as the realistic job preview (Zottoli & Wanous, 2000). The met expectations hypothesis states that reducing the expectation discrepancies that occur between an individual pre and post employment lessens the applicants chances of being unhappy and leaving the organizations. Even though studies seem to indicate the superiority of referrals and direct applicants in generating applicant pools, job offers, and hires, when the bulk of the recruitment literature is considered
results tend to be inconsistent and less clear (Rynes & Cable, 2003). Due to the online nature of the current study when compared to traditional recruitment sources and referrals, differences in the effectiveness of referrals are expected.

As previously mentioned, organization websites provide applicants with more information about the organization than other recruitment sources such as referrals. Based on previous literature, the current study argued that sources providing more information to applicants led to greater applicant attraction and acceptance rates. Because of the popularity and common use of organizational websites to recruit applicants, the current study sought to investigate the effectiveness of this source on recruiting team members when compared to a traditionally effective recruitment source, (i.e., referrals) and to investigate how transferring a traditional recruitment process of the site visits translates to an online medium. Furthermore the current study sought to examine the effect participant level of teamwork KSAs has on the relationship between recruitment source, attraction, and acceptance in team recruitment settings. This investigation focused on identifying the recruitment practices associated with attracting and hiring productive team performers that presumably led to better performing teams, which in turn, led to greater organizational performance and success. Specifically, the current study sought to identify which recruitment sources are most effective in attracting effective team members and influencing their acceptance of job offers and how individual perceptions of teams affect the recruitment of team members in various recruitment sources.

As described in the recruitment literature, recruitment sources play an important part in attracting and procuring applicants (Breaugh, 2008). The use of three recruitment sources (organization websites, referrals, and online site visits) will allow researchers to
investigate the impact sources have on the recruitment of team members. Thus the following hypotheses are proposed.

Hypothesis 14: Recruitment source will have an effect on applicant attraction to team positions. Applicants will report greater attraction to jobs posted on organizational websites followed by jobs posted on online site visits and referrals.

Hypothesis 15: Recruitment source will have an effect on applicant job pursuit intentions to team positions. Applicants will report greater job pursuit intentions to jobs posted on organizational websites followed by jobs posted on online site visits and referrals.

Hypothesis 16: Recruitment source will have an effect on applicant perceptions of P-O fit to team positions. Applicants will report greater perceptions of P-O fit to jobs posted on organizational websites followed by jobs posted on online site visits and referrals.

Hypothesis 17: Recruitment source will have an effect on applicant perceptions of P-J fit to team positions. Applicants will report greater perceptions of P-J fit to jobs posted on organizational websites followed by jobs posted on online site visits and referrals.

Hypothesis 18: Recruitment source will have an effect on applicant perceptions of organizational honesty in team positions. Applicants will report greater perceptions of organizational honesty to jobs posted on organizational websites followed by jobs posted on online site visits and referrals.

Hypothesis 19: Recruitment source will have an effect on applicant acceptance intentions to team positions. Applicants will report greater acceptance intentions to jobs posted on organizational websites followed by jobs posted on online site visits and referrals.

The Current Study

Recruitment is an important component of an organization’s success. Because of recent trends in organizations to move towards using teams, the recruitment of team members should be investigated. As the preceding review suggests, the recruitment literature contains an abundance of information on attracting qualified applicants and ensuring their acceptance of job offers. However, much like the team literature, the recruitment literature has not addressed the question of whether or not recruiting
individuals to teams differs from recruiting individuals to become team members. By focusing on the recruitment practices that have proven effective in attracting qualified applicants and gaining their acceptance of job offers, this line of research sought to apply the knowledge contained in the recruitment and team literatures to the recruitment of team members. Therefore, the purpose of the current study was to investigate the effects of applicant perceptions of teams and teamwork KSAs on applicant variables and recruitment outcomes and examine the effects of recruitment source on applicant pre-hire outcomes in team positions.

Method

Participants and Design

Participants were undergraduate students at the University of Memphis recruited through the Department of Psychology participant pool. A total of 135 students initially participated, but 12 participates were removed from the study because they did not complete all surveys items. Thus the final sample size for primary analyses was 123. Participants included 68 freshman (55.3%), 35 sophomores (28%), 13 juniors (11%), and 7 seniors (6%). Responses indicated that 86% estimated graduation by May 2013. In this sample, 29% had full-time jobs, and 64% reported part-time employment. In the current sample, 74% of the sample had previously worked in teams both in classroom and work settings, and only 2% reported never working in a team in any context. This sample was predominantly women (i.e., 76%) with an approximately equal number of Caucasian/White (46%) and African American (43%) respondents. Mean age was 20.44 years ($SD = 4.07$ years) and ranged from 18 to 46 years old with 90% of participants being between the ages of 18 and 23. Participants were representative of the population
of undergraduate students in the participant pool. Class extra credit was given to individuals who completed the study through the department’s participant pool.

A 2 (posting type: individual or team position) x 3 (recruitment source: organizational website, online site visit, and referral) within-subjects factorial design was used in which all participants were exposed to all six conditions. To reduce carryover effects, a selected orders approach (i.e., Latin Squares) was used to determine the presentation sequence in which participants viewed job postings and recruitment sources. Participants were randomly assigned to recruitment source and job posting presentation sequence, completed an informed consent, and responded to demographics and perceptions of teams items. Participants then viewed recruitment source and job posting (source-posting) combinations, and completed measures of attraction, perceptions of organizational honesty, job pursuit intentions, acceptance intentions, and P-O and P-J fit. The current study collected self-report responses of individual perceptions of teams, recruitment variables (i.e., applicant attraction, job pursuit intentions, P-O fit, P-J fit, and perceptions of organizational honesty) and recruitment outcomes (i.e., acceptance intentions). All responses were collected and recorded online through the use of SurveyMonkey. See Appendix B for copies of measures used. Total participant time to complete the entire process was approximately 2 hours.

Stimuli and Measures

Recruitment Sources. Recruitment sources (organizational website, online site visit, and referral) were used to simulate actual job postings for individual and team positions. All recruitment sources contained identical types of general information about the job position and organization with the exception of basic descriptive information
(e.g., company name). The amount of information provided to applicants varied between source types due to the nature of each source. For example, organizational websites contained more information about the job and organization than referrals due to the space requirements of a referral email when compared to a simulated multi-webpage format. Two versions of each source were created with one version containing a job posting for an individual position involving an individual working alone and the other version containing a job posting for a team position requiring team member interdependence. Job postings within each recruitment source type contained identical general information about the position and organization and were created based on information presented in currently available job postings located on Wal-Mart.com and Monster.com. This general information included information such as a job title, job description, job requirements, recommended skills and KSAs, compensation, additional benefits, and general information about the organization. Job postings within the same source type only differed in the level of interdependence required on the job and basic descriptive information (e.g., job title). The amount of information contained in job postings across source types differed on the amount general information included about the job and organization due to the nature of the recruitment sources (i.e., organizational websites and referrals). Screen shots of each recruitment source are presented in Appendix A.

Organizational websites contained general information about the organization, its history, community impact, and purpose. Versions of the organizational website source differed only in their associated job posting (i.e., individual or team position). The
organizational website used in this study was based on the format used by existing organizations such as Wal-Mart. The website contained a home page, about the company page, and an employment opportunities page.

Online site visits were used to replicate the experience an applicant would receive on a worksite visit. The online site visit contained a detailed description of the job, organization, and workplace environment in an effort to reproduce the information about the work and workplace an applicant would obtain from the interactions experienced on a site visit. Particular attention was paid to include information about interactions or lack there of that applicants would experience on the job. Images illustrating the interdependence nature of the job supplemented the description of the environment, job, and position independence requirements. The combination of detailed information and images were used to recreate the sights and information applicants are exposed to on traditional worksite visits. Versions of the online site visit differed only in the information presented concerning the interdependence requirements of the job (i.e., individuals or team position). Because online site visits are a new concept based on traditional site visits, the online site visits used in the current study represent prototypes for a new type of web-based recruitment source.

Referral recruitment sources consisted of written text in the form of an email detailing to the applicant why the referee feels they would be a good fit with the job. The context of the referral is that of a current employee referring the applicant to a position open in their organization that the referee feels the applicant would enjoy. Although the amount of information presented to applicants was noticeably less, the email contained general information about the organization and job that matched with information
presented in the organizational website and worksite visit. The referral also contained information about what specific details of the position in which the referee feels the applicant would be attracted (e.g., interdependent nature of the team position). Although the use of email referrals as recruitment sources is absent from the literature, it can be assumed that due to the pervasive use of the Internet and email applicants are referred to job openings on a regular basis.

Teamwork KSAs. The Teamwork Knowledge, Skills, and Ability Test (Teamwork KSA Test, Stevens & Campion, 1999) was used to measure teamwork KSAs. Based on supporting relationships observed between individual team effectiveness and teamwork KSAs (Stevens & Campion, 1999), potential to be an effective team member was based on the presence of select teamwork KSAs. The internal consistency reliability reported for this 35-question scale by the test’s authors (Stevens & Campion, 1999) was .80. Coefficient alpha for the Teamwork KSA test in the current study was .70.

Perceptions of Teams. Measures of applicant perceptions of teams involved previously created scales and items. These measures included preference for teamwork items complied by Kiffin-Petersen and Cordery (2003) including two items from Kirkman and Shapiro’s (2001) scale of a person’s resistance to teams and Campion and others’ (1993) three-item measure of preference for working in groups. In the current study, coefficient alpha for this scale was 0.91. Survey items from Pineda, Barger, and Lerner’s (2009) survey regarding teamwork attitudes were also used to determine attitudes towards teams and their effectiveness. Team Survey items 1 through 15 in Appendix B were used to determine applicant perceptions of teams. Coefficient alpha for the scale used in the current study was .91.
Attraction. Applicant attraction to the organization was measured using a 5-item scale developed by Highhouse, Lievens, and Sinar (2003). All items were rated on a 7-point scale ranging from *strongly disagree* to *strongly agree* and were designed to collect preliminary attitudes about the applicant’s attraction to the organization and possible employment. Coefficient alpha reported by previous authors for the scale was .86. The current study used items 1 through 5 from Post Survey A in Appendix B to assess applicant attraction. Coefficient alpha for this scale in the current study were .92 for organizational websites with individual position, .94 for organizational websites with team position, .91 for site visits with individual position, .89 for site visits with team position, .89 for referral with individual position, and .89 for referral with team position.

Pursuit Intentions. Job pursuit intentions were measured using a 6-item scale developed by Bauer and Aiman-Smith (1996). All items were rated on a 7-point scale ranging from *strongly disagree* to *strongly agree* and were designed to collect attitudinal information about an applicants intentions to pursue the job. Post Survey A items 10 through 15 were used to assess job pursuit intentions. Coefficient alphas for this scale in the current study were .98 for organizational websites with individual position, .98 for organizational websites with team position, .97 for site visits with individual position, .98 for site visits with team position, .97 for referral with individual position, and .97 for referral with team position.

Perceived Fit. Fit items included measures of two types of perceived fit (person-organization fit and person-job fit). Perceived person-organization fit was measured using a 5-item scale developed by Resick et al. (2007) containing items from Cable and Judge (1996) and Saks and Ashforth (1997). See items 1 through 5 from Post Survey B in
Appendix B for a complete list of P-O fit items. Previously reported coefficient alpha for the person-organization fit scale was .97. Coefficient alphas for the P-O fit scale in the current study were .97 for organizational websites with individual position, .97 for organizational websites with team position, .96 for site visits with individual position, .97 for site visits with team position, .97 for referral with individual position, and .97 for referral with team position. Perceived person-job fit was measured using a person-job fit scale developed by Brkich, Jeefs, and Carless (2002). Coefficient alpha for this scale was .91. Coefficient alphas for the P-J fit scale in the current study were .95 for organizational websites with individual position, .95 for organizational websites with team position, .95 for site visits with individual position, .92 for site visits with team position, .94 for referral with individual position, and .93 for referral with team position. See items 6 through 14 from Post Survey B in Appendix B for a complete list of P-J fit items. The wording of both scales was altered to represent the perceived fit between an applicant and a potential job and organization.

Perceptions of Honesty. Applicant perceptions of organizational honesty were measured using two items based on honesty items used by Saks and Cronshaw (1990) (see Post Survey A items 6 and 7). These items, “How open and honesty do you feel the organization is in providing information to job applicants?” and “The organization was direct in dealing with me as a prospective employee?”, were rated on a 7-point scale ranging from very dishonest to very honest and strongly disagree to strongly agree. Previous authors reported the correlation between items for this scale to be .68. The correlation between items for this scale in the current study were .74 for organizational
websites with individual position, .76 for organizational websites with team position, .67 for site visits with individual position, .75 for site visits with team position, .79 for referral with individual position, and .77 for referral with team position.

**Offer Acceptance.** Two items designed to determine the likelihood applicants would accept potential job offers of employment were used to assess job acceptance intentions. These items were modified versions of items used by Saks and Cronshaw (1990). The item, “How likely are you to accept a job offer for this position?”, used a 7-point scale ranging from *very unlikely* to *very likely*. A dichotomous item, “Would you accept a job offer for this position”, was also used. Acceptance items, items 8 and 9, can be found in Post Survey in Appendix B.

**Demographics.** Survey demographics questions consisted of 8 items used to gather data related to participant university status (i.e., freshman, sophomore, junior, or senior), expected graduation date, employment status (i.e., full-time, part-time, or never employed), experience working in team situations (i.e., at work, in the classroom, both at work and in the classroom, and never), gender, ethnicity, and age.

**Procedure**

All participation occurred online. Participants were presented with popular recruitment sources containing job postings that varied based on level of job interdependence. Before participation could begin, all participants were presented with an informed consent detailing the potential risks of the study, the voluntary nature of the study, and that participants may withdraw from the study at any time without penalty. In order to continue and participate in the study, participants were forced to either give their consent and participate or withhold their consent and be sent redirected to the university’s
website. After agreeing to participate in the current study, applicants filled out a brief demographics questionnaire and the *perceptions of teams* survey (see Appendix B). Applicants then viewed each recruitment source and job posting combination, a recruitment source paired with either an individual or team position. Recruitment sources and postings were presented to applicants randomly until all source-posting combinations had been presented. Six combinations existed: (a) organizational website with individual position, (b) organizational website with team position, (c) online site visit with individual position, (d) online site visit with team position, (e) referral with individual position, and (f) referral with team position.

After viewing each source-posting combination, applicants completed items describing their attraction, perceptions of organizational honesty, fit, job pursuit intentions, and acceptance intentions related to the position and organization. Once applicants finished viewing all source-posting combinations, applicants ranked each combination based on attraction, perceptions of organizational honesty, fit, and acceptance intentions. The next stage of participation required applicants to fill out teamwork KSA measures. All materials and surveys were viewed and completed online. Once all measures were completed, participants were presented with a debriefing paragraph thanking them for participation and providing a summary of the study’s purpose.

Results

Results for the current study are presented for multivariate tests and are then followed by univariate tests arranged according to their related hypotheses divided into the three general categories presented in the Introduction: perceptions of teams,
teamwork KSAs, and recruitment source. An alpha level of .05 was used for all significance tests. However, observed alphas were reported for all significant results. Correlation results are presented with respect to their associated hypotheses with correlations for perceptions for teams and teamwork KSAs based hypotheses in Table 1 and recruitment source based hypotheses in Table 2. Means and standard deviations are provided in Tables 3, 4, 5, and 6 for posting type (team and individual positions), recruitment sources, source-posting combinations, and perceptions of teams and teamwork KSAs respectively. Repeated measures MANCOVA was used to test Hypotheses 1 through 6 (perceptions of teams), 7 through 12 (teamwork KSAs), and 14 through 19 (recruitment source) with perceptions of teams and teamwork KSAs entered as covariates, respectively.

Multivariate tests revealed that Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity was significant indicating the assumption of sphericity was violated, \( \chi^2 (20) = 1431.07, p = .00 \). Therefore Greenhouse-Geisser corrections were used for univariate tests. Results indicated a main effect for source, Pillai’s Trace = .07, \( F(6,115) = 2.21, p = .01, \eta^2 = .05 \). Interaction effects were observed between position and perceptions of teams, Pillai’s Trace = .12, \( F(6,115) = 2.68, p = .02, \eta^2 = .12 \), source and perceptions of teams, Pillai’s Trace = .15, \( F(12,109) = 3.24, p = .001, \eta^2 = .08 \), and source and teamwork KSAs, Pillai’s Trace = .09, \( F(12,09) = 1.82, p = .04, \eta^2 = .04 \) (see Table 7).
Table 1

Intercorrelations Between Perceptions of Teams and Pre-hire Variables for Team Individual Positions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Posting Type</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>
<th>9.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceptions of Teams</td>
<td>Team</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teamwork</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. KSAs</td>
<td>Team</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Attraction</td>
<td>Team</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Pursuit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Intentions</td>
<td>Team</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.95**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.93**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. P-O Fit</td>
<td>Team</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.73**</td>
<td>.70**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.81**</td>
<td>.75**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. P-J Fit</td>
<td>Team</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.90**</td>
<td>.88**</td>
<td>.73**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.88**</td>
<td>.88**</td>
<td>.77**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceptions of Organizational</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Honesty</td>
<td>Team</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.42**</td>
<td>.40**</td>
<td>.42**</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance (Likelihood)</td>
<td>Team</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.92**</td>
<td>.92**</td>
<td>.70**</td>
<td>.89**</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.90**</td>
<td>.92**</td>
<td>.71**</td>
<td>.88**</td>
<td>.40**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance (Actual)</td>
<td>Team</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.78**</td>
<td>.80**</td>
<td>.57**</td>
<td>.71**</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>.81**</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.78**</td>
<td>.82**</td>
<td>.63**</td>
<td>.77**</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>.84**</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *p < .05. ** p < .01.
Table 2

Intercorrelations Between Perceptions of Teams, Teamwork KSAs, and Pre-hire Variables for Team and Individual Positions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Posting Type</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>
<th>9.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceptions of Teams</td>
<td>Organizational Website</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Online Site</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Visit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Referral Email</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teamwork KSAs</td>
<td>Organizational Website</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Online Site</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Visit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Referral Email</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attraction</td>
<td>Organizational Website</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Online Site</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Visit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Referral Email</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Pursuit Intentions</td>
<td>Organizational Website</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.95**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Online Site</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Visit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Referral Email</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-O Fit</td>
<td>Organizational Website</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.80**</td>
<td>.80**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Online Site</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Visit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Referral Email</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-J Fit</td>
<td>Organizational Website</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.89**</td>
<td>.90**</td>
<td>.77**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Online Site</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Visit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Referral Email</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceptions of Organizational Honesty</td>
<td>Organizational Website</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>.46**</td>
<td>.48**</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Online Site</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Visit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Referral Email</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance (Likelihood)</td>
<td>Organizational Website</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.92**</td>
<td>.93**</td>
<td>.88**</td>
<td>.88**</td>
<td>.48**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Online Site</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Visit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Referral Email</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance (Actual)</td>
<td>Organizational Website</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.79**</td>
<td>.82**</td>
<td>.76**</td>
<td>.76**</td>
<td>.72**</td>
<td>.83**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Online Site</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Visit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Referral Email</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *p < .05. **p < .01.
Table 3

*Mean Pre-hire Variable Scores for Team and Individual Positions.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Team</th>
<th>Individual</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attraction</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>5.77</td>
<td>20.46</td>
<td>5.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Pursuit Intentions</td>
<td>24.29</td>
<td>8.19</td>
<td>23.97</td>
<td>7.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-O Fit</td>
<td>20.63</td>
<td>5.27</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>5.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-J Fit</td>
<td>31.95</td>
<td>10.25</td>
<td>32.21</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceptions of Organizational Honesty</td>
<td>9.89</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>9.74</td>
<td>1.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N = 123*

Table 4

*Mean Pre-hire Variables Scores for Recruitment Sources.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Organizational Website</th>
<th>Online Site Visit</th>
<th>Referral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attraction</td>
<td>21.34</td>
<td>7.02</td>
<td>20.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Pursuit Intentions</td>
<td>25.34</td>
<td>9.42</td>
<td>24.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-O Fit</td>
<td>22.27</td>
<td>6.56</td>
<td>20.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-J Fit</td>
<td>34.11</td>
<td>11.66</td>
<td>32.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceptions of Organizational Honesty</td>
<td>10.33</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>9.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>4.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N = 123*
Table 5

Mean Pre-hire Variable Scores for Source-posting Combination.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Organizational Website</th>
<th>Online Site Visit</th>
<th>Referral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Team Position</td>
<td>Individual Position</td>
<td>Team Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>$SD$</td>
<td>$M$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Pursuit Intentions</td>
<td>25.07</td>
<td>10.23</td>
<td>25.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-O Fit</td>
<td>22.08</td>
<td>6.94</td>
<td>22.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-J Fit</td>
<td>33.41</td>
<td>13.03</td>
<td>34.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceptions of Organizational Honesty</td>
<td>10.31</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>10.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>4.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $N = 123$
Table 6

*Mean Perceptions of Teams and Teamwork KSAs Scores.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceptions of Teams</td>
<td>76.24</td>
<td>13.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teamwork KSAs</td>
<td>15.72</td>
<td>5.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N = 123*

Table 7

*Multivariate Results for Perceptions of Teams, Teamwork KSAs, and Recruitment*  

*Source.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>Pillai's Trace</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>η²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Posting Type</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>6,115</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>2.21*</td>
<td>12,109</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Perceptions of Teams</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.377</td>
<td>6,115</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Teamwork KSAs</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>6,115</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Interaction 1 x 3</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>2.68*</td>
<td>6,115</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Interaction 1 x 4</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>6,115</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Interaction 2 x 3</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>3.24*</td>
<td>12,109</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Interaction 2 x 4</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>1.82*</td>
<td>12,109</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. *p < .05.

*Perceptions of Teams*

Hypotheses 1 through 6 predicted that the relationship between perceptions of teams and applicant attraction, job pursuit intentions, P-O fit, P-J fit, perceptions of organizational honesty, and acceptance intentions would be moderated by position type (team or individual position). Specifically, that perceptions of teams would be positively
related to applicant attraction, job pursuit intentions, P-O fit, P-J fit, perceptions of organizational honesty, and acceptance intentions in team positions and negatively related to pre-hire recruitment variables in individual positions. Results provided partial support for Hypotheses 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6.

With respect to Hypothesis 1, MANCOVA results indicated that an interaction between posting type and perceptions of teams did have a significant effect on attraction, $F(1,121) = 11.39, p = .001, \eta^2 = .09$ (see Table 8 and Figure 3). A main effect was observed for posting type as a predictor of attraction, $F(1,121) = 5.399, p = .02, \eta^2 = .04$, but was not observed for perceptions of teams, $F(1,121) = .05, p = .83$. Non-significant relationships were observed between applicant perceptions of teams and attraction to team ($r = .11, p = .22$) and individual ($r = -.15, p = .09$) positions. However, relationships between perceptions or teams and attraction were in the hypothesized direction. Therefore, Hypothesis 1 was partially supported.

For Hypothesis 2, MANCOVA results indicated that an interaction between posting type and perceptions of teams did have a significant effect on job pursuit intentions, $F(1,121) = 16.13, p = .001, \eta^2 = .12$ (see Table 9 and Figure 4). A main effect was observed for posting type as a predictor of job pursuit intentions, $F(1,121) = 8.82, p = .004, \eta^2 = .07$, but was not observed for perceptions of teams, $F(1,121) = .22$,
Table 8

*GLM for Perceptions of Teams and Posting Type on Applicant Attraction.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>η²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Posting Type</td>
<td>193.69</td>
<td>5.40*</td>
<td>1,120</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Perceptions of Teams</td>
<td>7.27</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>1,120</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>408.76</td>
<td>11.39**</td>
<td>1,120</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* *p < .05, **p > .01.

*Figure 3.* Interaction between Perceptions of Teams and Posting Type on Attraction.
Table 9

**GLM for Perceptions of Teams and Posting Type on Job Pursuit Intentions.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>$df$</th>
<th>$\eta^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Posting Type</td>
<td>447.88</td>
<td>8.82**</td>
<td>1,120</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Perceptions of Teams</td>
<td>71.37</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>1,120</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>818.69</td>
<td>16.13**</td>
<td>1,120</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.** ** $p < .01$.  

*Figure 4.* Interaction between Perceptions of Teams and Posting Type on Job Pursuit Intentions.
p = .64. Non-significant relationships were observed between applicant perceptions of teams and job pursuit intentions to team (r = .09, p = .32) and individual (r = -.18, p = .051) positions. Again, relationships were in the hypothesized direction. These results provide partial support for Hypothesis 2.

Tests of Hypothesis 3 revealed that an interaction between posting type and perceptions of teams did have a significant effect on P-O fit, F(1,121) = 11.25, p = .001, \( \eta^2 = .09 \) (see Table 10 and Figure 5). A main effect was observed for posting type as a predictor of P-O fit intentions, F(1,121) = 8.62, p = .004, \( \eta^2 = .07 \), but was not observed for perceptions of teams, F(1,121) = .00, p = .99. Non-significant relationships between perceptions of teams and P-O fit for team (r = .14, p = .12) and individual (r = -.14, p = .14) positions. Although non-significant, these results were also in the hypothesized directions. Hypothesis 3 was partially supported.

With respect to Hypothesis 4, MANCOVA results indicated that an interaction between posting type and perceptions of teams did have a significant effect on P-J fit, \( F(1,121) = 11.17, p = .001, \eta^2 = .09 \) (see Table 11 and Figure 6). A main effect was observed for posting type as a predictor of P-J fit intentions, \( F(1,121) = 7.46, p = .01, \eta^2 = .06 \), but was not observed for perceptions of teams, \( F(1,121) = .42, p = .52 \). A negative relationship was observed between perceptions of teams and P-J fit to individual positions (r = -.18, p = .046). Even so, despite being in the hypothesized direction, a non-significant relationship was observed between perceptions of teams and P-J fit in team positions (r = .07, p = .45). These results provide partial support for Hypothesis 4 in that
### Table 10

*GLM for Perceptions of Teams and Posting Type on P-O Fit.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>η²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Posting Type</td>
<td>310.7</td>
<td>8.62**</td>
<td>1,120</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Perceptions of Teams</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1,120</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>405.44</td>
<td>11.25**</td>
<td>1,120</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* **p < .01.

### Figure 5

*Interaction between Perceptions of Teams and Posting Type on P-O fit.*
Table 11

GLM for Perceptions of Teams and Posting Type on P-J Fit.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$\eta^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Posting Type</td>
<td>809.08</td>
<td>7.46**</td>
<td>1,120</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Perceptions of Teams</td>
<td>217.13</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>1,120</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>1210.92</td>
<td>11.17**</td>
<td>1,120</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* ** $p < .01$.

Figure 6. Interaction between Perceptions of Teams and Posting Type on P-J fit.
the relationships between perceptions of teams and P-J fit was moderated by posting type, and perceptions of teams were negatively related to applicant P-J towards individual positions.

Regarding Hypothesis 5, tests revealed a significant interaction effect between posting type and perceptions of teams on perceptions of organizational honesty, $F(1,121) = 5.65, p = .02, \eta^2 = .05$ (see Table 12 and Figure 7). A main effect was not observed for posting type, $F(1,121) = .965, p = .33$, or perceptions of teams, $F(1,121) = .29, p = .59$, as predictors of perceptions of honesty. Non-significant relationships were observed between applicant perceptions of teams and perceptions of organizational honesty to team ($r = .13, p = .17$) and individual ($r = -.03, p = .74$) positions. Again, relationships were in the hypothesized directions. Based on these results findings partially supported Hypothesis 5.

Tests of Hypothesis 6 revealed a significant interaction between posting type and perceptions of teams did have a significant effect on acceptance, $F(1,121) = 12.34, p = .001, \eta^2 = .09$ (see Table 13 and Figure 8). A main effect was observed for posting type as a predictor of acceptance, $F(1,121) = 6.8, p = .01, \eta^2 = .05$, but was not observed for perceptions of teams, $F(1,121) = .07, p = .78$. Despite being in the hypothesized direction, non-significant relationships were observed between perceptions of teams and acceptance intentions for team ($r = .10, p = .26$) or individual ($r = -.15, p = .09$) positions.

**Teamwork KSAs**

Hypotheses 7 through 12 predicted that the relationship between perceptions of teams and applicant attraction, job pursuit intentions, P-O fit, P-J fit, perceptions of organizational honesty, and acceptance intentions would be moderated by position type
Table 12

*GLM for Perceptions of Teams and Posting Type on Perceptions of Organizational Honesty.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$\eta^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Posting Type</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>1,120</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Perceptions of Teams</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>1,120</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>15.29</td>
<td>5.65*</td>
<td>1,120</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* *p* < .05.

*Figure 7.* Interaction between Perceptions of Teams and Posting Type on Perceptions of Organizational Honesty.
Table 13

*GLM for Perceptions of Teams and Posting Type on Likelihood of Acceptance.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>η²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Posting Type</td>
<td>13.49</td>
<td>6.80**</td>
<td>1,120</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Perceptions of Teams</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>1,120</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>24.48</td>
<td>12.33**</td>
<td>1,120</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. ** p < .01.*

*Figure 8. Interaction between Perceptions of Teams and Posting Type on Likelihood of Acceptance.*
(team or individual position). Specifically, that teamwork KSAs would be positively related to applicant attraction, job pursuit intentions, P-O fit, P-J fit, perceptions of organizational honesty, and acceptance intentions in team positions and unrelated to pre-hire recruitment variables in individual positions. Partial support was observed for Hypothesis 11. No support was observed for Hypothesis 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, and 13.

With respect to Hypothesis 7, MANCOVA results did not reveal an interaction effect between teamwork KSAs and posting type on attraction, $F(1,121) = 2.61, p = .11$ (see Table 14 and Figure 9). A main effect was observed for posting type, $F(1,121) = 5.4, p = .02, \eta^2 = .04$, but was not observed for teamwork KSAs, $F(1,121) = .01, p = .93$ on attraction. Relationships were not observed between teamwork KSAs and attraction to team ($r = -.07, p = .46$) and individual ($r = .05, p = .55$) positions.

For Hypothesis 8, interaction effects between teamwork KSAS and posting type, $F(1,121) = .94, p = .33$, and a main effect for teamwork KSAs, $F(1,121) = .02, p = .90$, did not significantly predicted job pursuit intentions (see Table 15 and Figure 10). However, a main effect was observed to posting type on job pursuit intentions, $F(1,121) = 8.82, p = .004, \eta^2 = .07$. Additionally, non-significant relationships were observed between teamwork KSAs and job pursuit intentions to team ($r = -.04, p = .66$) and individual ($r = .02, p = .84$) positions. Therefore Hypothesis 8 was not supported.

Results for Hypothesis 9 revealed that interaction effects between teamwork KSAs and posting type, $F(1,121) = .04, p = .83$, and a main effect teamwork KSAs, $F(1,121) = .30, p = .58$, did not significantly predicted P-O fit (see Table 16 and Figure 11). A main effect for posting type was observed for P-O fit, $F(1,121) = 8.62, p = .004, \eta^2 = .07$. Furthermore, non-significant relationships between teamwork KSAs and P-O to
Table 14

GLM for Teamwork KSAs and Posting Type on Attraction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>(\eta^2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Posting Type</td>
<td>193.69</td>
<td>5.40*</td>
<td>1,120</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Teamwork KSAs</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>1,120</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>93.53</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>1,120</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. * \(p < .05\).

*Figure 9. Interaction between Teamwork KSAs and Posting Type on Attraction.*
Table 15

*GLM for Teamwork KSAs and Posting Type on Job Pursuit Intentions.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$\eta^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Posting Type</td>
<td>447.88</td>
<td>8.82**</td>
<td>1,120</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Teamwork KSAs</td>
<td>5.64</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>1,120</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>47.80</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>1,120</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.** **$p < .01$.**

*Figure 10. Interaction between Teamwork KSAs and Posting Type on Job Pursuit Intentions.*
Table 16

*GLM for Teamwork KSAs and Posting Type on P-O Fit.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$\eta^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Posting Type</td>
<td>310.70</td>
<td>8.62**</td>
<td>1,120</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Teamwork KSAs</td>
<td>41.34</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>1,120</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>1,120</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* **p < .01.

*Figure* 11. Interaction between Teamwork KSAs and Posting Type on P-O Fit.
team ($r = -.05, p = .57$) and individual ($r = -.04, p = .68$) positions were observed. Hypothesis 9 was not supported.

Furthermore, tests of Hypothesis 10 indicated that the interaction effect between teamwork KSAS and posting type, $F(1,121) = .28, p = .59$, and the main effect for teamwork KSAs, $F(1,121) = 2.46, p = .12$, were not predictors of P-J fit (see Table 17 and Figure 12). A main effect was observed for position on P-J fit, $F(1,121) = 7.46, p = .007, \eta^2 = .06$. Observed non-significant relationships between teamwork KSAs and perceived P-J fit to team ($r = -.15, p = .1$) and individual ($r = -.11, p = .22$) positions also do not provide support for Hypothesis 10.

With respect to Hypothesis 11, tests revealed teamwork KSAs ($F(1,121) = 20.66, p = .001, \eta^2 = .15$) significantly predicted perceptions of organizational honesty (see Table 18). However, an interaction effect between teamwork KSAs and posting type, $F(1,121) = 3.65, p = .06$, and main effect for position were not observed, $F(1,121) = .97, p = .33$ (see Figure 13). Positive relationships were observed between teamwork KSAs and perceptions of organizational honesty toward team ($r = .29, p = .001$) and individual ($r = .42, p = .001$) positions. These results indicated partial support for Hypothesis 11 in that a positive relationship existed between teamwork KSAs and perceptions of organizational honesty to team positions.

Regarding Hypothesis 12, main effects for posting type, $F(1,121) = .68, p = .01$, and teamwork KSAs, $F(1,121) = .29, p = .59$, and interaction effects, $F(1,121) = .76, p = .39$, were not significant predictors of acceptance (see Table 19 and Figure 14). Non-significant results were observed between teamwork KSAs and applicant acceptance to team ($r = -.07, p = .43$) and individual ($r = -.02, p = .86$) positions. Lastly Hypothesis 13
Table 17

GLM for Teamwork KSAs and Posting Type on P-J Fit.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$\eta^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Posting Type</td>
<td>809.08</td>
<td>7.46**</td>
<td>1,120</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Teamwork KSAs</td>
<td>1263.25</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>1,120</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>30.89</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>1,120</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. ** $p < .01$.

Figure 12. Interaction between Teamwork KSAs and Posting Type on P-J Fit.
Table 18

GLM for Teamwork KSAs and Posting Type on Perceptions of Organizational Honesty.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$\eta^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Posting Type</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>1,120</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Teamwork KSAs</td>
<td>296.81</td>
<td>20.66**</td>
<td>1,120</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>1,120</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. * $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$*

Figure 13. Interaction between Teamwork KSAs and Posting Type on Perceptions of Organizational Honesty.
Table 19

GLM for Teamwork KSAs and Posting Type on Likelihood of Acceptance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$\eta^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Posting Type</td>
<td>13.49</td>
<td>6.80*</td>
<td>1,120</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Teamwork KSAs</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>1,120</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>1,120</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. ** $p < .01$.  

Figure 14. Interaction between Teamwork KSAs and Posting Type on Likelihood of Acceptance.
was not supported. A non-significant relationship was observed between teamwork KSAs and perceptions of teams \((r = .02, p = .83)\).

**Recruitment Source**

Hypotheses 14 through 19 predicted that recruitment source would have an effect on applicant attraction, job pursuit intentions, P-O fit, P-J fit, perceptions of organizational honesty, and acceptance intentions to team and individual positions and were tested using repeated measures ANOVA. Furthermore, applicants would report greater pre-hire recruitment outcomes to jobs posted on organizational websites than online site visits followed by referrals. Support was observed for Hypotheses 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, and 19.

For Hypothesis 14, all recruitment source level applicant attraction scores (i.e., attraction to organizational websites, online site visits, and referrals) were correlated at \(p < .01\). Mauchly’s Test of Sphericity indicated that the assumption of sphericity was violated, \(\chi^2(14) = 10.36, p < .01\), therefore degrees of freedom were corrected using Greenhouse-Geisser estimates of sphericity (\(\varepsilon = .924\)). Results showed that there was a significant effect of recruitment source on attraction, \(F(1.85, 225.5) = 7.37, p = .001, \eta^2 = .06\). Post hoc tests indicated that attraction was significantly greater for organizational websites \((M = 21.34, SD = 7.02)\) than referrals \((M = 19.32, SD = 5.72), p = .003, \eta^2 = .02\). Although not significant, differences between organizational websites \((M = 21.34, SD = 7.02)\) and online site visits \((M = 20.18, SD = 5.47)\) were in the predicted direction, \(p = .053\).

All source-posting combination attraction scores were correlated at \(p < .05\). Mauchly’s Test of Sphericity indicated that the assumption of sphericity had been
violated, \( \chi^2 (14) = 52.45, p < .001 \), therefore degrees of freedom were corrected using Greenhouse-Geisser estimates of sphericity (\( \varepsilon = .859 \)). Results showed that there was a significant effect of source-posting combination on attraction, \( F (4.29, 523.74) = 3.84, p = .01, \eta^2 = .003 \). Post hoc tests indicated that attraction was significantly greater for organizational website with individual position (\( M = 21.83, SD = 7.63 \)) than referral with individual position (\( M = 19.57, SD = 6.52 \), \( p = .01, \eta^2 = .02 \), and referral with team position (\( M = 19.07, SD = 6.87 \), \( p = .01, \eta^2 = .03 \).

With respect to Hypothesis 15, all source level applicant job pursuit intentions (i.e., job pursuit intentions towards organizational websites, online site visits, and referrals) were correlated at \( p < .01 \). Repeated measures ANOVA revealed a significant effect of recruitment source on job pursuit intentions, \( F (2, 244) = 4.81, p = .001, \eta^2 = .04 \). Post hoc tests indicated that job pursuit intentions were significantly greater for organizational websites (\( M = 25.34, SD = 9.42 \)) than referrals (\( M = 22.96, SD = 8.76 \), \( p = .02, \eta^2 = .02 \).

All source-posting combination job pursuit intention scores were significantly correlated (\( p < .05 \)). Mauchly’s Test of Sphericity indicated that the assumption of sphericity had been violated, \( \chi^2 (14) = 37.97, p = .001 \), therefore degrees of freedom were corrected using Greenhouse-Geisser estimates of sphericity (\( \varepsilon = .896 \)). The results show that there was a significant effect of recruitment source on job pursuit intentions, \( F (4.48, 546.51) = 2.82, p = .02, \eta^2 = .02 \). However, post hoc tests did not indicate any significant differences.

Results for Hypothesis 16 indicated that all recruitment source P-O fit scores (i.e., P-O fit to organizational websites, online site visits, and referrals) were significantly
correlated ($p < .01$). Repeated measures ANOVA revealed that there was a significant effect of recruitment source on perceived P-O fit, $F(2, 244) = 12.73$, $p = .000$, $\eta^2 = .09$. Post hoc tests indicated that P-O fit was significantly greater for organizational websites ($M = 22.27, SD = 6.56$) than online site visits ($M = 20.62, SD = 5.72$), $p = .013$, $\eta^2 = .02$, and referrals ($M = 19.41, SD = 5.56$), $p = .001$, $\eta^2 = .05$.

When investigating the relationships between P-O fit and source-posting combinations, all source-posting combination job pursuit intention scores were significantly correlated ($p < .05$) except for the relationship between online site visits with individual position and referral with team position ($r = .14, p = .14$). Mauchly’s Test of Sphericity indicated that the assumption of sphericity had been violated, $\chi^2 (14) = 28.65$, $p = .01$, therefore degrees of freedom were corrected using Greenhouse-Geisser estimates of sphericity ($\varepsilon = .921$). The results showed that there was a significant effect of recruitment source on P-O fit, $F(4.61, 562.08) = 6.19$, $p = .001$, $\eta^2 = .05$. Post hoc tests indicated that P-O fit was significantly greater for organizational website with individual position ($M = 22.46, SD = 7.72$) than referral with individual position ($M = 19.5, SD = 6.73$), $p = .002$, $\eta^2 = .03$, and referral with team position ($M = 19.32, SD = 6.84$), $p = .002$, $\eta^2 = .03$. Post hoc tests indicated that P-O fit was significantly greater for organizational website with team position ($M = 22.08, SD = 6.94$) than referral with individual position ($M = 19.5, SD = 6.73$), $p = .01$, $\eta^2 = .02$, and referral team position ($M = 19.32, SD = 6.84$), $p = .003$, $\eta^2 = .03$.

For Hypothesis 17, all source level P-J fit scores (i.e., P-J fit with to organizational websites, online site visits, and referrals) were significantly correlated ($p < .01$). Mauchly’s Test of Sphericity indicated that the assumption of sphericity was
violated, $\chi^2 (2) = 7.49, p = .02$, therefore degrees of freedom were corrected using Greenhouse-Geisser estimates of sphericity ($\varepsilon = .943$). The results show that there was a significant effect of recruitment source on P-J fit, $F (1.89, 230.19) = 12.83, p = .001, \eta^2 = .10$. Post hoc tests indicated that P-J fit was significantly greater for organizational websites ($M = 34.11, SD = 11.66$) than online site visits ($M = 32.09, SD = 10.37$), $p = .046, \eta^2 = .01$ and referrals ($M = 30.05, SD = 9.68$), $p = .001, \eta^2 = .04$. Differences in P-J fit were observed between online site visits ($M = 32.09, SD = 10.37$) and referrals ($M = 30.05, SD = 9.68$), $p = .01, \eta^2 = .02$.

When investigating the relationships between P-J fit and source-posting combinations, all source-posting combination job pursuit intention scores were significantly correlated ($p < .05$). Mauchly’s test of sphericity indicated that the assumption of sphericity had been violated, $\chi^2 (14) = 39.78, p = .001$, therefore degrees of freedom were corrected using Greenhouse-Geisser estimates of sphericity ($\varepsilon = .882$). The results show that there was a significant effect of recruitment source on P-J fit, $F (4.41, 537.97) = 5.52, p = .001, \eta^2 = .04$. Post hoc tests indicated that P-J fit was significantly greater for organizational website with individual job ($M = 34.8, SD = 12.9$) than referral with individual job ($M = 30.02, SD = 11.66$), $p = .001, \eta^2 = .03$ and referral team with team job ($M = 30.09, SD = 11.37$), $p = .002, \eta^2 = .03$. Post hoc tests indicated that P-J fit was significantly greater for organizational website with team job ($M = 33.41, SD = 13.03$) than referral with team job ($M = 30.09, SD = 11.37$), $p = .046, \eta^2 = .02$.

Regarding Hypothesis 18, all applicant perceptions of organizational honesty scores (i.e., perceptions of honesty to organizational websites, online site visits, and referrals) were significantly correlated ($p < .01$) at the source level. Mauchly’s Test of
Sphericity indicated that the assumption of sphericity was violated, $\chi^2 (2) = 15.48, p = .001$, therefore degrees of freedom were corrected using Greenhouse-Geisser estimates of sphericity ($\epsilon = .893$). The results indicate that there was a significant effect of recruitment source on perceptions of organizational honesty, $F (1.79, 217.84) = 12.404, p = .001, \eta^2 = .09$. Post hoc tests indicated that perceptions of organizational honesty were significantly greater for organizational websites ($M = 10.33, SD = 2.27$) than referrals ($M = 9.18, SD = 2.34$), $p = .001, \eta^2 = .04$. Differences in perception of organizational honesty were observed between online site visits ($M = 9.94, SD = 2.11$) and referrals ($M = 9.18, SD = 2.34$), $p = .01, \eta^2 = .02$.

All source-posting combination perceptions of organizational honesty scores were significantly correlated ($p < .01$) except for the source-posting combinations of organizational website with team position and referral with team position ($r = .16, p = .09$), organizational websites with team position and referral with individual position ($r = .09, p = .32$), organizational websites with team position and referral with team position ($r = .09, p < .31$). Mauchly’s Test of Sphericity indicated that the assumption of sphericity had been violated, $\chi^2 (14) = 73.29, p = .001$, therefore degrees of freedom were corrected using Greenhouse-Geisser estimates of sphericity ($\epsilon = .769$). The results show that there was a significant effect of recruitment source on perceptions of organizational honesty, $F (3.85, 469.15) = 7.86, p = .001, \eta^2 = .06$. Post hoc tests indicated that perceptions of organizational honesty were significantly greater for organizational website with individual job ($M = 10.35, SD = 2.49$) than referral with individual job ($M = 9.06, SD = 2.71$), $p = .001, \eta^2 = .04$, and referral with team job ($M = 9.30, SD = 2.60$), $p = .009, \eta^2 = .02$. Tests also indicated that perceptions of organizational honesty were
significantly greater for organizational website with team job \((M = 10.31, SD = 2.58)\) than referral individual job \((M = 9.06, SD = 2.71)\), \(p = .002, \eta^2 = .03\), and referral team job \((M = 9.30, SD = 2.60)\), \(p = .03, \eta^2 = .02\). Post hoc tests further indicated that perceptions of organizational honesty were significantly greater for online site visit with team job \((M = 10.07, SD = 2.54)\) than referral with individual job \((M = 9.06, SD = 2.71)\), \(p = .01, \eta^2 = .02\).

With respect to Hypothesis 19, all source level applicant acceptance intentions (i.e., acceptance intentions towards organizational websites, online site visits, and referrals) were significantly correlated \((p < .01)\). Repeated measures ANOVA revealed a significant effect of recruitment source on how likely applicants would accept a job offer, \(F(2, 244)\ 9.39, p = .001, \eta^2 = .07\). Post hoc tests indicated that likelihood of applicant acceptance of an offer was significantly greater for organizational websites \((M = 4.28, SD = 1.70)\) than referrals \((M = 3.67, SD = 1.52)\), \(p = .001, \eta^2 = .03\). Likelihood of acceptance was also higher for online site visits \((M = 4.04, SD = 1.53)\) than referrals \((M = 3.67, SD = 1.52)\), \(p = .02, \eta^2 = .01\).

All source-posting combination applicant acceptance intentions scores were correlated at \((p < .05)\). Mauchly’s Test of Sphericity indicated that the assumption of sphericity had been violated, \(\chi^2(14) = 34.49, p = .002\), therefore degrees of freedom were corrected using Greenhouse-Geisser estimates of sphericity \((\epsilon = .902)\). The results showed a significant effect of recruitment source on likelihood of applicant acceptance of a job offer, \(F(4.51, 550.48) = 5.61, p = .001, \eta^2 = .04\). Post hoc tests indicated that the likelihood of applicant acceptance was significantly greater for organizational website with individual job \((M = 4.33, SD = 1.91)\) than referral with individual position \((M =
3.74, SD = 1.75), p = .04, $\eta^2 = .02$, and referral with team position ($M = 3.60$, $SD = 1.84$), $p = .004, \eta^2 = .03$. Post hoc tests further indicated that likelihood of applicant acceptance was significantly greater for organizational website with team job ($M = 4.23$, $SD = 1.90$) than referral with team job ($M = 3.60$, $SD = 1.84$), $p = .013, \eta^2 = .02$. Results also indicated that the likelihood of applicant acceptance was significantly greater for online site visit with team job ($M = 4.22$, $SD = 1.78$) than referral with team job ($M = 3.60$, $SD = 1.84$), $p = .01, \eta^2 = .02$. Dichotomous acceptance intentions are presented in Table 20. Participant rankings of source-posting combinations from worst to best on attraction to the organization, attraction to the job, likelihood of job offer acceptance, P-O fit, P-J fit, and perceptions of organizational honesty are presented in Table 21.

**Demographic Correlates**

No demographic variables (i.e., university status, employment status, previous experience working in teams, gender, and race) were correlated with perceptions of teams or teamwork KSAs except for applicant age, which did have a positive relationship with Teamwork KSAs ($r = .26, p = .004$). ANOVA tests were used to investigate the effects of demographic variables on recruitment to team and individual positions. No differences were observed between university status, gender, race, or age, with respect to the primary outcome variables at the posting, source, or source-posting combination levels.

Differences were observed between employment status and applicant attraction ($F(2,122) = 4.56, p = .01, \eta^2 = .07$), likelihood of acceptance ($F(2,122) = 4.32, p = .02, \eta^2 = .07$), job pursuit intentions ($F(2,122) = 3.16, p = .046, \eta^2 = .05$), P-J fit ($F(2,122) = 3.75, p = .03, \eta^2 = .06$) to teams positions and job pursuit intentions ($F(2,122) = 3.79, p = .03, \eta^2 = .06$), P-O fit ($F(2,122) = 3.14, p = .047, \eta^2 = .05$), and P-J fit ($F(2,122) = 3.98, p$
Table 20

*Frequency of Acceptance Intentions for Source-Posting Combinations.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Posting Type</th>
<th>Acceptance Intentions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Website</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Team</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Site Visit</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Team</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referral</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Team</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N = 123*
Table 21

Percentage of Participant Rankings for Source-Posting Combinations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
<th>Organizational Website</th>
<th></th>
<th>Online Site Visit</th>
<th></th>
<th>Referral</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Team</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Team</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attraction to Organization</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23.3 (27)</td>
<td>27.6 (32)</td>
<td>30.2 (35)</td>
<td>30.2 (35)</td>
<td>31 (36)</td>
<td>31 (36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13.8 (16)</td>
<td>11.2 (13)</td>
<td>10.3 (12)</td>
<td>12.1 (14)</td>
<td>9.5 (11)</td>
<td>9.5 (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.6 (10)</td>
<td>12.1 (14)</td>
<td>10.3 (12)</td>
<td>10.3 (12)</td>
<td>12.1 (14)</td>
<td>12.9 (15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13.8 (16)</td>
<td>14.7 (17)</td>
<td>13.8 (16)</td>
<td>12.9 (15)</td>
<td>14.7 (17)</td>
<td>9.5 (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17.2 (20)</td>
<td>12.9 (15)</td>
<td>13.8 (16)</td>
<td>13.8 (16)</td>
<td>12.9 (15)</td>
<td>12.1 (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23.3 (27)</td>
<td>21.6 (25)</td>
<td>21.6 (25)</td>
<td>20.7 (24)</td>
<td>19.8 (23)</td>
<td>25 (29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.2 (13)</td>
<td>10.3 (12)</td>
<td>12.1 (14)</td>
<td>11.2 (13)</td>
<td>12.1 (14)</td>
<td>10.3 (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15.5 (18)</td>
<td>15.5 (18)</td>
<td>17.2 (20)</td>
<td>19.8 (23)</td>
<td>14.7 (17)</td>
<td>14.7 (17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21.6 (25)</td>
<td>22.4 (26)</td>
<td>21.6 (25)</td>
<td>24.1 (28)</td>
<td>30.2 (35)</td>
<td>26.7 (31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19.8 (23)</td>
<td>19.8 (23)</td>
<td>21.6 (25)</td>
<td>20.7 (24)</td>
<td>16.4 (19)</td>
<td>22.4 (26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16.4 (19)</td>
<td>16.4 (19)</td>
<td>15.5 (18)</td>
<td>11.2 (13)</td>
<td>13.8 (16)</td>
<td>13.8 (16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15.5 (18)</td>
<td>15.5 (18)</td>
<td>12.1 (14)</td>
<td>12.9 (15)</td>
<td>12.9 (15)</td>
<td>12.1 (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-O fit</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.5 (11)</td>
<td>12.9 (15)</td>
<td>11.2 (13)</td>
<td>12.9 (15)</td>
<td>7.8 (9)</td>
<td>12.9 (15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17.2 (20)</td>
<td>11.2 (13)</td>
<td>13.8 (16)</td>
<td>12.1 (14)</td>
<td>12.9 (15)</td>
<td>12.1 (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19 (22)</td>
<td>21.6 (25)</td>
<td>20.7 (24)</td>
<td>19.8 (23)</td>
<td>19 (22)</td>
<td>22.4 (26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23.3 (27)</td>
<td>22.4 (26)</td>
<td>26.7 (31)</td>
<td>21.6 (25)</td>
<td>26.7 (31)</td>
<td>22.4 (26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17.2 (20)</td>
<td>16.4 (19)</td>
<td>10.3 (12)</td>
<td>19.8 (23)</td>
<td>19 (22)</td>
<td>14.7 (17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13.8 (16)</td>
<td>15.5 (18)</td>
<td>17.2 (20)</td>
<td>13.8 (16)</td>
<td>14.7 (17)</td>
<td>15.5 (18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-J fit</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.9 (15)</td>
<td>13.8 (16)</td>
<td>9.5 (11)</td>
<td>10.3 (12)</td>
<td>11.2 (13)</td>
<td>13.8 (16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18.1 (21)</td>
<td>25 (29)</td>
<td>20.7 (24)</td>
<td>22.4 (26)</td>
<td>21.6 (25)</td>
<td>22.4 (26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19 (22)</td>
<td>12.1 (14)</td>
<td>13.8 (16)</td>
<td>12.9 (15)</td>
<td>14.7 (17)</td>
<td>12.1 (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17.2 (20)</td>
<td>13.8 (16)</td>
<td>15.5 (18)</td>
<td>19 (22)</td>
<td>13.8 (16)</td>
<td>16.4 (19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19.8 (23)</td>
<td>24.1 (28)</td>
<td>26.7 (31)</td>
<td>22.4 (26)</td>
<td>24.1 (28)</td>
<td>21.6 (25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.9 (15)</td>
<td>11.2 (13)</td>
<td>13.8 (16)</td>
<td>12.9 (15)</td>
<td>14.7 (17)</td>
<td>13.8 (16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceptions of Organizational Honesty</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>31.9 (37)</td>
<td>24.1 (28)</td>
<td>25.9 (30)</td>
<td>23.3 (27)</td>
<td>22.4 (26)</td>
<td>19.8 (23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.2 (13)</td>
<td>11.2 (13)</td>
<td>9.5 (11)</td>
<td>12.1 (14)</td>
<td>13.8 (16)</td>
<td>12.9 (15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.5 (11)</td>
<td>8.6 (10)</td>
<td>9.5 (11)</td>
<td>12.9 (15)</td>
<td>12.9 (15)</td>
<td>9.5 (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11.2 (13)</td>
<td>11.2 (13)</td>
<td>9.5 (11)</td>
<td>8.6 (10)</td>
<td>12.1 (14)</td>
<td>15.5 (18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14.7 (17)</td>
<td>17.2 (20)</td>
<td>21.6 (25)</td>
<td>16.4 (19)</td>
<td>12.9 (15)</td>
<td>17.2 (20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21.6 (25)</td>
<td>27.6 (32)</td>
<td>24.1 (28)</td>
<td>26.7 (31)</td>
<td>25.9 (30)</td>
<td>25 (29)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 116. Rankings are on a continuous scale with 1 representing the worst and 6 representing the best source-posting combination.
=.02, η² = .06) for individual positions. Post-hoc tests indicated that applicants with full-time (M = 18.74, SD = 6.11) and part-time jobs (M = 20.02, SD = 5.50) were less attracted to team positions than applicants currently not working (M = 24.23, SD = 4.72), p = .01, η² = .2 and p = .04, η² = .15, respectively. Post-hoc tests further indicated that applicants with full-time (M = 3.81, SD = 1.54) and part-time jobs (M = 3.92, SD = 1.39) were less likely to accept to team positions than applicants currently not working (M = 5.10, SD = 1.24), p = .02, η² = .18 and p = .02, η² = .17, respectively. Additional post-hoc tests indicated that applicants with full-time positions (M = 23.09, SD = 8.75) had lower job pursuit intentions towards team positions than applicants currently not working (M = 29.49, SD = 6.14), p = .048, η² = .16. Post-hoc tests also indicated that applicants with full-time (M = 31.03, SD = 10.64) and part-time jobs (M = 31.14, SD = 9.79) had less P-J fit to team positions than applicants currently not working (M = 39.15, SD = 9.70) p = .04, η² = .14 and p = .03, η² = .14, respectively, and that applicants with part-time jobs (M = 19.94, SD = 5.72) were less attracted to individual positions than applicants currently not working (M = 24, SD = 5.16), p = .049, η² = .12. Post-hoc tests results for job pursuit intentions indicated that applicants with full-time (M = 23.08, SD = 7.57) and part-time jobs (M = 23.44, SD = 7.66) had less job pursuit intentions towards individual positions than applicants currently not working (M = 29.47, SD = 7.28), p = .03, η² = .16, and p = .03, η² = .14, respectively. P-O fit post-hoc tests indicated that applicants with part-time jobs (M = 20.23, SD = 5.77) had less P-O fit towards individual positions than applicants currently not working (M = 24.26, SD = 4.70) p = .04, η² = .13. Finally, post-
hoc tests indicated that applicants with part-time jobs ($M = 30.90$, $SD = 10.33$) had less P-J fit towards individual positions than applicants currently not working ($M = 39.41$, $SD = 9.77$), $p = .02$, $\eta^2 = .15$.

Previous experience working in teams was related to applicant P-O fit to team positions ($F(3,122) = 2.86$, $p = .04$, $\eta^2 = .07$) with post-hoc tests indicating that applicants who had previously worked in teams in the classroom ($M = 21.35$, $SD = 4.48$) and both on the job and in the classroom ($M = 20.93$, $SD = 5.25$) had greater P-O fit with team positions than applicants who had previously worked in teams on the job ($M = 15.33$, $SD = 5.09$), $p = .049$, $\eta^2 = .28$ and $p = .04$, $\eta^2 = .23$, respectively.

Additional Analyses

Additional analyses were conducted to further investigate the relationships between recruitment sources, perceptions of teams, teamwork KSAS and pre-hire recruitment variables using univariate results from the repeated measures MANCOVA. A main effect for source was observed for P-O fit, $F(2,237.84) = 5.1$, $p = .01$, $\eta^2 = .04$, but was not observed for attraction, $F(2,223.01) = 2.03$, $p = .13$, job pursuit intentions, $F(2,231.19) = 1.27$, $p = .28$, P-J fit, $F(2,121) = 229.06$, $p = .11$, perceptions of organizational honesty, $F(2,213.21) = .14$, $p = .85$, or acceptance, $F(2,229.25) = 1.45$, $p = .24$. Interaction effects were observed between source and perceptions of teams for attraction, $F(2,223.01) = 4.38$, $p = .01$, $\eta^2 = .04$, P-O fit, $F(1,237.84) = 4.83$, $p = .01$, $\eta^2 = .04$, P-J fit, $F(1,229.06) = 4.51$, $p = .01$, $\eta^2 = .04$, and acceptance, $F(1,229.25) = 3.15$, $p = .047$, $\eta^2 = .03$, but were not observed for job pursuit intentions, $F(1,231.21) = 1.95$, $p = .15$, or perceptions of organizational honesty, $F(1,213.21) = .63$, $p = .51$. Interaction effects were not observed between source and teamwork KSAs for any pre-hire variables.
Additional investigations were also conducted to examine the potential for relationships between source-posting combinations and pre-hire recruitment variables using bivariate correlations. Investigations into potential relationships between perceptions of teams and pre-hire recruitment variables revealed relationships between perceptions of teams and attraction to organizational website with a team position \((r = .18, p = .047)\) and attraction to referral with an individual position \((r = -.27, p = .003)\), job pursuit intentions towards referral with individual position \((r = -.24, p = .008)\), P-O fit towards online site visit with individual position \((r = -.21, p = .02)\) and referral with team positions \((r = .24, p = .008)\), P-J fit towards referral with individual position \((r = -.29, p = .001)\), and acceptance to referral with individual position \((r = -.25, p = .005)\) and the dichotomous item would they accept an offer \((r = -.24, p = .01)\).

Relationships were observed between teamwork KSAs and perceptions of organizational honesty towards organizational websites \((r = .27, p = .003)\), online site visits \((r = .36, p = .001)\), and referrals \((r = .24, p = .01)\) at the recruitment source level and organizational website with individuals position \((r = .29, p = .001)\), organizational website with a team position \((r = .19, p = .04)\), online site visit with individual position \((r = .35, p = .001)\), online site visit with team position \((r = .26, p = .004)\), and referral with an individual position \((r = .25, p = .01)\) at the source-posting combination level.

Discussion

The current study investigated the recruitment of individual’s to team positions. Although results did not support all of the hypothesized relationships between perceptions of teams and teamwork KSAs, support was observed for the moderating effect of position on the relationships between perceptions of teams and pre-hire
recruitment variables, the idea that recruitment to team and individual positions is different, and that recruitment source plays an influential role in team member recruitment. The following discussion presents summaries of the current findings pertaining to perceptions of teams, teamwork KSAs, and recruitment sources as well as discussions of theoretical contributions and limitations.

*Perceptions of Teams*

The results of the current study partially supported Hypotheses 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6, indicating that the relationship between perceptions of teams and applicant attraction, job pursuit intentions, P-O fit, P-J fit, perceptions of organizational honesty, and acceptance was moderated by posting type (team or individual position). However, perceptions of teams was not positively related to attraction, job pursuit intentions, P-O fit, perceptions of organizational honesty, and acceptance to team positions or negatively related to individual positions. However, a significant negative relationship was found between perceptions of teams and P-J fit towards individual positions, which does provide further support for Hypothesis 4. Of all pre-hire recruitment variables, perceptions of teams appear to have the strongest relationship with applicant perceptions of fit. Although correlational findings did not support the majority of “perceptions of teams” hypotheses, observed correlations were in the hypothesized directions. This does indicate potential relationships between perceptions of teams and applicant pre-hire recruitment variables that may be observed with a larger sample size.

Tests of the effect of posting type and perceptions of teams on pre-hire recruitment variables did indicate main effects for posting type and interaction effects for posting type and perceptions of teams on applicant attraction, job pursuit intentions, P-O
fit, P-J fit, and acceptance. Despite the fact that a main effect for perceptions of teams was not observed, the significance of the posting type and the interaction effect between posting type and perceptions of teams does provide support for the impact of perceptions of teams on pre-hire recruitment variables. With these results in mind, perceptions of teams appear to play at least a supplementary role in influencing pre-hire variables. These findings suggest that the effect of posting type on pre-hire variables is modified by applicant perceptions of teams. Thus, as perceptions of teams increase applicant attraction, job pursuit intentions, P-O fit, P-J fit, and acceptance to team positions increases. Conversely, pre-hire recruitment variables associated with individual positions increase as perceptions of teams decrease. These findings support the idea that applicant perceptions do influence applicant pre-hire variables. Therefore organizations may benefit from focusing recruitment practices on altering applicant perceptions to the job.

**Teamwork KSAs**

Results did not support the teamwork KSAs hypotheses presented in the current study with the exception of the observed relationship between teamwork KSAs and perceptions of organizational honesty. Position type was not found to moderate the relationship between teamwork KSAs and pre-hire recruitment variables. Furthermore, relationships were not observed between teamwork KSAs and applicant attraction, job pursuit intentions, P-O fit, P-J fit, or acceptance to team or individual positions. ANCOVA results examining the main effects of posting type and teamwork KSAs and their interaction on pre-hire recruitment variables did not result in significant effects for teamwork KSAs impact pre-hire recruitment courses. These findings indicate that although teamwork KSAs are supported in the literature as predictors of future team
performance (Stevens & Campion, 1999), they did not share relationships with pre-hire recruitment variables in the current study. Results support the idea that an individual’s ability to work in teams does not relate to his/her preferences towards team or individual jobs and are unrelated to both team and individual positions. In terms of the current study, an applicant’s level of teamwork KSAs does not affect their level of attraction, job-pursuit intentions, P-O fit, of P-J fit. Furthermore, a non-significant relationship was observed between perceptions of team and teamwork KSAs. Overall, these findings promote the idea that an applicant’s ability to perform on the job is unrelated to attraction or other pre-hire recruitment variables. This finding does match well with early research on vocational interests that applicant vocational interests are not related to future performance (Strong, 1943) but does conflict with other literature linking perceptions, such as organizational fit, with employee performance (Cable & Judge, 1997; Kristof, 1996).

In contrast, positive relationships were observed between teamwork KSAs and applicant perceptions of organizational honesty to team and individual positions thereby supporting Hypothesis 11. Therefore, as teamwork KSAs increase, applicant perceptions of organizational honesty increase for both team and individual positions. In addition, a significant main effect was observed for teamwork KSAs on perceptions of organizational honesty. This finding is surprising due to the lack of the observed impact teamwork KSAs had on other pre-hire variables. Although relationships and main effects were found for teamwork KSAs and perceptions of organizational honesty, the lack of evidence for relationships and main effects for teamwork KSAs and applicant attraction,
job pursuit intentions, P-O fit, P-J fit, and acceptance do not support the idea that applicant teamwork KSAs relate to applicant pre-hire recruitment variables.

Recruitment Source

Examination of the effects of recruitment sources on pre-hire recruitment outcomes provided support for Hypotheses 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, and 19. Across all pre-hire recruitment outcomes, organizational websites resulted in greater levels of attraction, job pursuit intentions, P-O fit, P-J fit, perceptions of organizational honesty, and acceptance than referrals and greater P-O fit and P-J fit than online site visits. Specifically, organizational websites for individual positions resulted in greater attraction, P-O fit, P-J fit, perceptions of organizational honesty, and acceptance than referrals for individual and team positions. Organizational websites for team positions resulted in greater P-O fit and perceptions of organizational honesty than referrals to individual and teams positions. Additionally, organizational websites for teams resulted in greater P-J fit and acceptance than referrals to team positions. Online site visits resulted in greater P-J fit, perceptions of organizational honesty, and acceptance than referrals. Specifically online site visits for team positions resulted in greater perceptions of organizational honesty than referrals for individual positions and acceptance than referral for team positions. These results indicate the existence of pre-hire recruitment outcome differences between organizational websites, online site visits, and referrals. As hypothesized, these differences resulted in greater pre-hire outcomes to organizational websites followed by online site visits and finally referrals. Although these findings conflict with previous literature indicating the superiority of referrals as the most effective recruitment source (Breaugh, 2008; Zottoli &
Wanous, 2000), when compared as online mediums, organizational websites outperformed referrals as the most effective recruitment source.

Investigations into potential relationships between perceptions of teams and teamwork KSAs and source and source-posting combinations revealed interesting results. In reference to teamwork KSAs, relationships were not found between teamwork KSAs and attraction, job pursuit intentions, P-O fit, P-J fit, and acceptance for any source-posting combinations. However, teamwork KSAs were positively related to perceptions of organizational honesty in organizational websites, online site visits, and referrals for team and individual positions with the exception referrals to team positions. As before, these results for perceptions of organizational honesty are surprising due to the lack of evidence for all of other pre-hire recruitment outcomes. Some relationships were observed between perceptions of teams and source-posting combinations. At the source level, perceptions of teams were negatively related to referrals. Perceptions of teams were positively related to attraction to organizational websites for team positions at the source-posting level. In addition, perceptions of teams were negatively related to attraction, job pursuit intentions, P-J fit, and acceptance to referrals for individual positions and positively related to P-O fit to online site visits to individual positions and referral to team positions. Although some relationships do support the hypothesized predictions, in general the relationships observed present conflicting results as to which sources are best for recruiting to team and individual positions. As with perceptions of teams, recruitment source has the greatest impact with applicant perceptions of fit.
Finally, the main effect of recruitment source on P-O fit and the interaction effect between source and perceptions of teams on attraction, P-O fit, P-J fit, and acceptance add further support to the importance of source on pre-hire recruitment variables. Furthermore, these results indicate that source and perceptions of teams play influential roles in applicant pre-hire variables. Therefore, organizations should focus on not only the recruitment source used but also the impact applicant perceptions may have on recruitment process success.

Primary Contributions

The nature of the current study allowed for the investigation of potential differences between recruitment for team and individual positions. Findings from the current study support the idea that similarities and differences exist between recruitment to team and individual positions. Significant main effects for posting type and the consistent but non-significant differences observed between pre-hire recruitment outcomes to team and individual positions provide support for the idea that recruitment differs between team and individual positions. If differences do exist between recruitment to team and individual positions, organizations must take care to address these differences. As results from the current study and previous literature illustrate (Breaugh, 2008, Zottoli & Wanous, 2000), recruitment source may be of particular interest to organizations when recruiting to individual and team positions.

Overall, the results observed for recruitment source did coincide with hypothesized predictions that organizational websites would result in greater pre-hire recruitment outcomes than online site visits and referrals. A potential reason for these results is the varying amount of information provided by each recruitment source with
organizational websites providing more information to applicants than online site visits, which in turn provided more information than referrals. Results from the current study match well with ideas set forth by signal theory. As previously mentioned, signal theory states that applicants make recruitment choices based on the amount of information with which they are presented. The current study adds evidence for this conclusion. Across posting types, organizational websites, which contained greater amounts of information, resulted in greater scores on pre-hire recruitment outcomes.

Furthermore, results from the current study indicate that individual perceptions, such as P-O and P-J fit, can be manipulated through the use of recruitment sources. Differences were observed between applicant perceptions across recruitment sources. Aside from the amount of information provided, all sources presented common aspects of the job. Therefore any differences between applicants perceptions must be due to either the amount of information, presented in the discussion of signal theory, or influential effects of recruitment source on applicant perceptions. Although a direct effect cannot be claimed at this time, future study into this area would be beneficial to organizations. However, based on the results of this study, the potential exists for organizations to influence applicant perceptions of fit through the manipulation of recruitment sources and information provided to applicants.

The current study provides support for the idea that perceptions of teams may impact applicant pre-hire recruitment variables for team and individual positions. Therefore applicant perceptions represent an important perception variable, which organizations should take into account when recruiting for team positions. Surprisingly, hypothesized results were not found for teamwork KSAs. These findings go against
common reasoning that individuals teamwork KSAs would have greater pre-hire recruitment outcomes to team positions. Furthermore, results indicated that an individual’s ability to work in team settings is not related to the applicant’s perceptions of teams or other applicant variables with the exception of perceptions of organizational honesty. If there is truly no relationship between perceptions and ability to do the job, further research must be done to determine the relationship between these factors and actual job performance. Because this is the first study of its kind, further investigations are necessary before claims and assumptions can be made about the relationships, effects, and implications presented within the current study. However findings from the current study do provide some evidence that further investigation and discussion of recruitment to team positions is warranted.

Lastly, relationships were observed between applicant employment and previous experience with teams and pre-hire recruitment variables, particularly to fit. Results indicated that applicants that were not currently working and had previous experience with teams in the classroom or at work and in classroom settings had greater perceptions of P-O fit with team jobs. This finding provides encouraging results to organizations looking to hire recent college graduates. Because most college students will have had prior experience with teams from classroom setting, organizations may find a readily available pool of applicants with greater levels of P-O fit towards team jobs.

Limitations

Although recruitment sources used in the current study were based on real jobs and mimic those used in the real settings, these recruitment sources were nonetheless artificial. All information presented in each source was created by the researcher and may
differ from information presented in recruitment sources. The artificial nature of the
sources is particularly true of the online site visits and referral email. Similar
manipulations of the online site visits used in the current study have not appeared in the
organizational literature. Although based on elements provided in traditional work site
visits, the transfer of information from a live to online medium may have influenced its’
effectiveness as a recruitment source. However, in keeping with the purpose of the study
and the use of online recruitment sources the online site visit did incorporate information
that was assumed to most influence the recruitment to teams, information on employee
interactions. The referral email was based on a referral from an individual that assumes
the participant would enjoy this job. In the confines of this study the referral was created
with no knowledge of the applicant’s actual interests or previous work experience. The
artificial nature of the referral is exacerbated if the individual has no interest in the type
of position presented. Because both sources (i.e., online site visits and email referral) are
relatively absent from the literature, further research should be conducted on their
effectiveness as recruitment sources in both team and individual recruitment situations.

As with many studies conducted in psychology, this study used an undergraduate
population. Though this could be seen as an advantage due to the fact that these
individuals will be in entering the workforce in the near future, undergraduate
populations do not always accurately mimic the current workforce or applicant pool. The
undergraduate participants used in the current study were passive applicants who did not
seek out these companies or positions. Participants were motivated by class extra credit
unlike actual applicants who may be motivated by compensation and various other
factors.
Conclusions

The current study investigated the previously ignored area of team member recruitment. Results were mixed in providing support for the primary hypotheses. Although relationships were not observed for the effect of teamwork KSAs on pre-hire recruitment variables, observed moderating effects of position type on the relationship between perceptions of team and pre-hire recruitment variables and recruitment source differences between team and individual positions do provide evidence for future study in the area of team member recruitment. Of particular interest are the differences observed in the effectiveness of organizational websites, online site visits, and referrals across position types. Furthermore, the present study provided some evidence for the perspective that information presented to applicants and the source used may influence applicant perceptions of fit. Manipulation of these variables would allow organizations to influence applicant perceptions through recruitment processes.
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Appendix A

Individual Position Organizational Website – Home page.

GAMM supplies professional business services to companies across the United States. GAMM provides data collection, data analysis, and data interpretation services designed to improve client performance and efficiency. Our clients represent a variety of industries including banks, investment firms, consultant product companies, and retailers.

Located At 691 Main St, Memphis, Tennessee
Phone: 1-800-758-7474
Individual Position Organizational Website – About the company page.

GAMM

Mission Statement:

In today’s competitive and high-performance market, it is crucial to have a cadre of educated, well-seasoned team members and individuals strategizing, coordinating, and implementing effective plans that will pull together the skills and talents needed to meet our client’s needs. We believe that if our clients are successful, we will be successful. GAMM’s mission is to help clients make substantial improvements in their performance and to build a goal driven firm that is capable of attracting, developing, motivating, and retaining exceptional people. We believe that resolving the most difficult problems requires the coordinating effort of exceptional people. Our firm was built around that belief. We believe you cannot offer exceptional service without exceptional people. It is our belief that these two tenets of our mission reinforce each other and make GAMM strong and enduring.

Community Service:

At GAMM we encourage our employees to become involved with, and make a difference through, a wide variety of community and environmental programs. Here at GAMM, we have a strong commitment not only to our clients but also to our community. We place community service at the heart of our business, which is reflected in our efforts in helping communities build sustainable jobs, our commitment to improving processes at non-profit organizations, and our dedication at working to understand and reduce our own environmental footprint.

History:

GAMM was founded in 1980 by a group of experienced entrepreneurs seeking to build a company that would provide vital professional services to organizations seeking to succeed. They could not have imagined the reach their small consultant firm would eventually have on Memphis area businesses. Almost 30 years later, the firm has grown into a global partnership serving four of the nation’s top Fortune 500 companies. GAMM’s commitment to hiring and retaining the most optimal employees opened the doors to other intelligent, motivated, and aspiring graduates who helped shape the company as it has become one of the Mid-South’s best-known professional services firm. Although the company has grown over the years, our original mission remains the same: to help clients in a manner that leaves a distinctive, lasting, and substantial impression of GAMM’s capacity to significantly make improvements in our client’s performance and to offer incomparable, high quality service.

Located At 691 Main St, Memphis, Tennessee
Phone: 1-800-755-7474
GAMM Job Opportunity

Job Title: Project Consultant
Job ID: 224
Location: Memphis, TN
Job Type: Full Time Employee
Career Level: Entry Level
Education Level: Bachelor's Degree
Date Posted: January 18, 2010

Company Information:

GAMM is a major supplier of business services in the United States that provides data collection, data analysis, and data interpretation services to business executives from a variety of industries. Our major clients consist of banks, investment firms, consultant product companies, and retailers. Currently GAMM is expanding both the scope of our services and customer base. We are seeking recent college graduates for entry-level positions in business administration. Positions are available in functional areas and at all levels of responsibility.

Job Description and Responsibilities:

Major job responsibilities include analyzing companies' financial and marketing performance, presenting findings to senior management and client representatives, and outlining quality improvement plans. Consultants work primarily independently and will be required to complete projects virtually on their own. High performing consultants are individuals who actively complete individual goals and excel in individual responsibility environments. Salaries for entry-level employees range from $45,000 to $55,000, depending on qualifications and previous experience. We offer successful employee opportunities for advancement.

Job Requirements:

- Bachelor's degree or equivalent combination of education and experience. Familiarity with Microsoft Office products and basic computer operation.
- Taskwork skills and an ability to work effectively independently of others.
- Good communication, presentation, and organizational skills.
- Ability to identify and react to changing business needs and identify problems.

Located At 691 Main St. Memphis, Tennessee
Phone: 1-800-758-7474
TRIO supplies professional business services to companies across the United States. TRIO provides data collection, data analysis, and data interpretation services designed to improve client performance and efficiency. Our clients represent a variety of industries including banks, investment firms, consultant product companies, and retailers.

Located At 101 1st Ave. Memphis, Tennessee
Phone: 1-800-758-5924
Mission Statement:

In today’s competitive and high-performance market, it is crucial to have a cadre of educated, well-seasoned team members and individuals strategizing, coordinating, and implementing effective plans that will pull together the skills and talents needed to meet our client’s needs. We believe that if our clients are successful, we will be successful. Our mission here at TRIO is to help clients make substantial improvements in their performance and to build a goal driven firm that is capable of attracting, developing, motivating, and retaining exceptional people. We believe that resolving the most difficult problems requires the coordinating effort of exceptional people. Our firm was built around that belief. We believe you cannot offer exceptional service without exceptional people. It is our belief that these two tenets of our mission reinforce each other and make TRIO strong and enduring.

Community Service:

At TRIO we encourage our employees to become involved with, and make a difference through, a wide variety of community and environmental programs. Here at TRIO, we have a strong commitment not only to our clients but also to our community. We place community service at the heart of our business, which is reflected in our efforts in helping communities build sustainable jobs, our commitment to improving processes at not-for-profit organizations, and our dedication at working to understand and reduce our own environmental footprint.

History:

TRIO was founded in 1980 by a group of experienced entrepreneurs seeking to build a company that would provide vital professional services to organizations seeking to succeed. They could not have imagined the reach their small consultant firm would eventually have on Memphis area businesses. Almost 30 years later, the firm has grown into a global partnership serving four of the nation’s top Fortune 500 companies. TRIO’s commitment to hiring and retaining the most optimal employees opened the doors to other intelligent, motivated, and aspiring graduates who helped shape the company as it has become one of the Mid-South’s best-known professional services firm. Although the company has grown over the years, our original mission remains the same: to help clients in a manner that leaves a distinctive, lasting, and substantial impression of TRIO’s capacity to significantly make improvements in our client’s performance and to offer incomparable, high quality service.

Located At 101 1st Ave, Memphis, Tennessee
Phone: 1-800-756-5924
TRIO Job Opportunity

Job Title: Project Team Consultant
Job ID: 635
Location: Memphis, TN
Job Type: Full Time Employee
Career Level: Entry Level
Education Level: Bachelor's Degree
Date Posted: January 10, 2010

Company Information:

TRIO is a major supplier of business services in the United States that provides data collection, data analysis, and data interpretation services to business executives from a variety of industries. Our major clients include banks, investment firms, consultant product companies, and retailers. Currently TRIO is expanding both the scope of our services and customer base. We are seeking recent college graduates for entry-level positions in business administration. Positions are available in functional areas and at all levels of responsibility.

Job Description and Responsibilities:

Major job responsibilities include analyzing companies’ financial and marketing performance, presenting findings to senior management and client representatives, and outlining quality improvement plans. Consultants work primarily in teams and will be required to complete projects in team situations. High performing consultants are individuals who actively contribute to the completion of team goals and excel in shared-responsibility environments. Salaries for entry-level employees range from $45,000 to $55,000, depending on qualifications and previous experience. We offer successful employee opportunities for advancement.

Job Requirements:

- Bachelor’s degree or equivalent combination of education and experience. Familiarity with Microsoft Office products and basic computer operation.
- Teamwork skills and an ability to work effectively with others in teams.
- Good communication, presentation, and organizational skills.
- Ability to identify and react to changing business needs and identify problems.

Located At 101 1st Ave. Memphis, Tennessee
Phone: 1-800-758-5924
Individual Position Online Site Visit

Welcome to the ARC online site visit,

ARC provides professional business services to organizations both locally and across the United States. ARC provides data collection, data analysis, and data interpretation services to organizations and is currently seeking new college graduates to fill positions as full-time project consultants. Suspective applicants should be able to identify problems and react to changing business needs. Consultant positions involve working on projects individually with the majority of the work being completed independently from others.

This description will provide you with information about working for ARC as a project consultant.

ARC project consultants are full-time employees that typically work on 8 to 5, 40 hours a week schedule. All consultants are provided with individual workspace that facilitates their individually based work tasks. Laptops, mileage, and travel expenses are also provided for consultants when travel to client sites is required.

As a project consultant at ARC, you would be responsible for completing various tasks related to determining how best ARC can serve its clients. These tasks will be project based and will follow a three-stage approach that is designed to aid clients in improving their performance. All project consultants work independently from others and will be solely responsible for all elements of the project that need to be completed.

First, project consultants need to analyze client financial and marketing performance to determine how ARC can best serve its client. Typically this is done by reviewing the client's financial and sales records and meeting with client executives and personnel to develop an overall picture of the organization and its current standings. Project consultants use this information to identify the client's current strengths and weaknesses and how best ARC can aid the client in meeting its business purpose.

The second stage of the process involves preparing documentation that illustrates findings from stage one and creating an outline of the client's quality improvement plan that will allow ARC to better serve its client. During this stage, consultants develop a report and executive summary that presents their findings in an easy to follow and understandable manner. The primary purpose of this stage is to prepare and present a well researched plan of action that outlines how ARC will aid the client in improving their ability to effectively conduct business.

The final stage of the consulting process involves the presentation of findings to senior management and client representatives. This stage involves the project consultant speaking to a select group of ARC management and client executives about how ARC can best serve the client's needs. The presentation stage of project is vital because it represents the culmination of the consultant's work up to this point, which is followed by the client deciding whether or not to purchase services from ARC.

Performance on the job is based on an individual's ability to actively complete individual goals and excel in individual responsibility environments. Therefore, successful ARC consultants are individuals who excel at working independently on tasks and completing solo projects. Consultants are evaluated on their ability to collect and prepare supporting documentation for developing improvement plans, create strong client improvement plans, and to present their findings and plans to executives. Salaries range from $45k to $55k. In addition, ARC provides opportunities for advancement.

We at ARC appreciate the time you took to read this description of a project consultant job and hope that interested parties will contact us for employment opportunities.

Sincerely,
ARC Management Team
Welcome to the CIRR online site visit,

CIRR provides professional business services to organizations both locally and across the United States. CIRR provides data collection, data analysis, and data interpretation services to organizations and is currently seeking new college graduates to fill positions as full-time project consultants. Successful applicants should be able to identify problems and react to changing business needs. Project team consultant positions involve working on projects in teams with the majority of the work being completed in team situations.

This description will provide you with information about working for CIRR as a project consultant.

CIRR project team consultants are full-time employees that typically work an 8 to 5, 40 hours a week schedule. All consultants are provided with team workspace that facilitates team-based work tasks. Laptops, mileage, and travel expenses are also provided for consultants when travel to client sites is required.

As a project team consultant at CIRR, you would be responsible for completing various tasks related to determining how best CIRR can serve its clients. These tasks will be project-based and will follow a three-stage approach that is designed to aid clients in improving their performance. All project team consultants work in project teams with others and will be responsible for completing shared team goals and tasks with fellow team members.

First, the project team analyzes client financial and marketing performance to determine how CIRR can best serve its client. Typically this is done by reviewing the client's financial and sales records and meeting with client executives and personnel to develop an overall picture of the organization and its current standing. The project team uses this information to identify the client's current strengths and weaknesses and how best CIRR can aid the client in meeting its business purpose.

The second stage of the process involves preparing documentation that illustrates findings from stage one and creating an outline of the client's quality improvement plan that will allow CIRR to better serve its client. During this stage, the team develops a report and executive summary that presents their findings in an easy to follow and understandable manner. The primary purpose of this stage is to prepare and present a well-researched plan of action that outlines how CIRR will aid the client in improving their ability to effectively conduct business.

The final stage of the consulting process involves the presentation of findings to senior management and client representatives. This stage involves the project team speaking to a select group of CIRR management and client executives about how CIRR can best serve the client's needs. The presentation stage of the project is vital because it represents the culmination of the team's work up to this point, which is followed by the client deciding whether or not to purchase services from CIRR.

Performance on the job is based on an individual's ability to actively contribute to the completion of team goals and excel in shared-responsibility environments. Therefore, successful CIRR consultants are individual who excel at working with others on tasks and completing team projects. Consultants are evaluated on their ability to collect and prepare supporting documentation for developing improvement plans, create strong client improvement plans, present their findings and plans to executives, and work well with team members. Salaries range from $45k to $85k. In addition, CIRR provides opportunities for advancement.

We at CIRR appreciate the time you took to read this description of a team project consultant job and hope that interested parties will contact us for employment opportunities.

Sincerely,

CIRR Management Team
Hi,

I recently came across a position in our company that I think may interest you. Our company, ERN, provides professional business services to organizations. ERN is currently seeking new college graduates who identify and react to changing business needs and identify problems. The available position is for a full-time project consultant. The job involves working on projects individually with the majority of the work being completed independently from others. Performance on the job is based on an individual's ability to actively complete individual goals and excel in individual responsibility environments. Specific tasks include analyzing companies' financial and marketing performance, presenting findings to senior management and client representatives, and outlining quality improvement plans. Salaries range from $45k to $55k, and the company provides opportunities for advancement. I believe that based on your experience and interests, ERN may be just the place for you to pursue your career.

Let me know if you are interested in the job opportunity.
Tom Roberts
Hi,

I recently came across a position in our company that I think may interest you. Our company, VUU, provides professional business services to organizations. VUU is currently seeking recent college graduates who can identify and react to changing business needs and identity problems. The available position is for a full-time project team consultant. The job involves working with other employees in teams with the majority of work taking place in team situations. Performance is based on the individual's ability to actively contribute to the completion of team goals and excel in shared responsibility environments. Specific tasks include analyzing companies' financial and marketing performance, presenting findings to senior management and client representatives, and outlining quality improvement plans. Salaries range from $45k to $55k, and the company provides opportunities for advancement. I believe that based on your experience and interests, VUU may be just the place for you to pursue your career.

Let me know if you are interested in the job opportunity.

Bob Trebor
Appendix B

Team Survey:

Answer the following questions about teams by selecting the response with which you most identify.

1. I generally prefer to work as part of a team.
   
   Strongly disagree  Disagree  Slightly disagree  Neutral/No opinion  Slightly agree  Agree  Strongly Agree

2. I am eager to be working with other employees in a team.
   
   Strongly disagree  Disagree  Slightly disagree  Neutral/No opinion  Slightly agree  Agree  Strongly Agree

3. I find that working as a member of a team increase my ability to perform effectively.
   
   Strongly disagree  Disagree  Slightly disagree  Neutral/No opinion  Slightly agree  Agree  Strongly Agree

4. I feel that is given a choice. I would prefer to work in a team rather than work alone.
   
   Strongly disagree  Disagree  Slightly disagree  Neutral/No opinion  Slightly agree  Agree  Strongly Agree

5. I support the use of teams.
   
   Strongly disagree  Disagree  Slightly disagree  Neutral/No opinion  Slightly agree  Agree  Strongly Agree

6. A team is a group of individuals working together toward common goals.
   
   Strongly disagree  Disagree  Slightly disagree  Neutral/No opinion  Slightly agree  Agree  Strongly Agree

7. Team members have common tasks to perform and share responsibility for team outcomes.
   
   Strongly disagree  Disagree  Slightly disagree  Neutral/No opinion  Slightly agree  Agree  Strongly Agree

8. Teams can accomplish better outcomes than individuals working alone.
   
   Strongly disagree  Disagree  Slightly disagree  Neutral/No opinion  Slightly agree  Agree  Strongly Agree

9. Teams can accomplish more than individuals working alone.
   
   Strongly disagree  Disagree  Slightly disagree  Neutral/No opinion  Slightly agree  Agree  Strongly Agree

10. Team members have common tasks to perform and share responsibility for team outcomes.
   
   Strongly disagree  Disagree  Slightly disagree  Neutral/No opinion  Slightly agree  Agree  Strongly Agree

11. Teams can solve problems faster than individuals working alone.
12. Working in a team is more satisfying to me than working alone.

13. My experiences with teams make me want to work in teams again.

14. Working in a team improves my ability to work in teams in the future.

15. Working in a team would allow me to learn new things.
Post Survey A:

1. For me, this company would be a good place to work.
   - Strongly disagree
   - Disagree
   - Slightly disagree
   - Neutral/No opinion
   - Slightly agree
   - Agree
   - Strongly Agree

2. I would not be interested in this company except as a last resort.
   - Strongly disagree
   - Disagree
   - Slightly disagree
   - Neutral/No opinion
   - Slightly agree
   - Agree
   - Strongly Agree

3. This company is attractive to me as a place for employment
   - Strongly disagree
   - Disagree
   - Slightly disagree
   - Neutral/No opinion
   - Slightly agree
   - Agree
   - Strongly Agree

4. I am interested in learning more about this company
   - Strongly disagree
   - Disagree
   - Slightly disagree
   - Neutral/No opinion
   - Slightly agree
   - Agree
   - Strongly Agree

5. A job at this company is very appealing to me.
   - Strongly disagree
   - Disagree
   - Slightly disagree
   - Neutral/No opinion
   - Slightly agree
   - Agree
   - Strongly Agree

6. How open and honesty do you feel the organization is in providing information to job applicants?
   - Very dishonest
   - Dishonest
   - Slightly dishonest
   - Neutral/No opinion
   - Slightly honest
   - Honest
   - Very honest

7. The organization was direct in dealing with me as a prospective employee?
   - Strongly disagree
   - Disagree
   - Slightly disagree
   - Neutral/No opinion
   - Slightly agree
   - Agree
   - Strongly Agree

8. How likely are you to accept a job offer for this position?
   - Very unlikely
   - Unlikely
   - Slightly unlikely
   - Neutral/No opinion
   - Slightly likely
   - Likely
   - Strongly Likely

9. Would you accept a job offer for this position?
   - No
   - Yes

10. I would accept a job offer from this company.
    - Strongly disagree
    - Disagree
    - Slightly disagree
    - Neutral/No opinion
    - Slightly agree
    - Agree
    - Strongly Agree

11. I would request more information about this company.
    - Strongly disagree
    - Disagree
    - Slightly disagree
    - Neutral/No opinion
    - Slightly agree
    - Agree
    - Strongly Agree

12. If this company visited campus I would want to speak with a representative.
    - Strongly disagree
    - Disagree
    - Slightly disagree
    - Neutral/No opinion
    - Slightly agree
    - Agree
    - Strongly Agree

13. I would attempt to gain an interview with this company.
    - Strongly disagree
    - Disagree
    - Slightly disagree
    - Neutral/No opinion
    - Slightly agree
    - Agree
    - Strongly Agree
14. I would actively pursue obtaining a position with this company.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly disagree</th>
<th>Neutral/No opinion</th>
<th>Slightly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

15. If this company was at a job fair I would seek out their booth.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly disagree</th>
<th>Neutral/No opinion</th>
<th>Slightly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Post Survey B:

1. I feel my values “match” or fit this organization and the current employees in this organization.
   Strongly disagree  Disagree  Slightly disagree  Neutral/No opinion  Slightly agree  Agree  Strongly Agree

2. I think the values and personality of this organization reflect my own values and personality.
   Strongly disagree  Disagree  Slightly disagree  Neutral/No opinion  Slightly agree  Agree  Strongly Agree

3. The values of this organization are similar to my own values.
   Strongly disagree  Disagree  Slightly disagree  Neutral/No opinion  Slightly agree  Agree  Strongly Agree

4. My values match those of current employees in this organization.
   Strongly disagree  Disagree  Slightly disagree  Neutral/No opinion  Slightly agree  Agree  Strongly Agree

5. I feel my personality matches the “personality” or image of this organization.
   Strongly disagree  Disagree  Slightly disagree  Neutral/No opinion  Slightly agree  Agree  Strongly Agree

6. This job is not really me (R)
   Strongly disagree  Disagree  Slightly disagree  Neutral/No opinion  Slightly agree  Agree  Strongly Agree

7. This job is not really what I would like to be doing (R)
   Strongly disagree  Disagree  Slightly disagree  Neutral/No opinion  Slightly agree  Agree  Strongly Agree

8. All things considered, this job suits me
   Strongly disagree  Disagree  Slightly disagree  Neutral/No opinion  Slightly agree  Agree  Strongly Agree

9. I feel like this is not the right type of work for me (R)
   Strongly disagree  Disagree  Slightly disagree  Neutral/No opinion  Slightly agree  Agree  Strongly Agree

10. I feel that my goals and needs will be met in this job
    Strongly disagree  Disagree  Slightly disagree  Neutral/No opinion  Slightly agree  Agree  Strongly Agree

11. I will find this job motivating
    Strongly disagree  Disagree  Slightly disagree  Neutral/No opinion  Slightly agree  Agree  Strongly Agree

12. My abilities, skills, and talents are the right type for this job
    Strongly disagree  Disagree  Slightly disagree  Neutral/No opinion  Slightly agree  Agree  Strongly Agree

13. I’m sure there must be another job for which I am better suited (R)
14. I will be able to use my talents, skills, and competencies in my current job

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly disagree</th>
<th>Neutral/No opinion</th>
<th>Slightly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>