

Prof. Dr. Inés Küster
Universidad de Valencia.
Spain.
Department: Marketing.
Facultat d'Economia. Av
Tarongers, s/n. 46022
Valencia, Spain
✉ ines.kuster@uv.es

Ms. Delaney Clinton.
Universidad de Valencia.
Spain
✉ dclinton97@gmail.com

Evaluating Social Networking Sites in Recruitment

Evaluación de las Redes Sociales en el Proceso de Selección de Personal

I. INTRODUCTION

Over the past three decades, the Internet has revolutionized how individuals search and apply for jobs. Talent acquisition—the process of sourcing, interviewing, and hiring candidates—has evolved alongside digital advancements (Bose & Mohanty, 2025), leading to the rise of recruitment marketing (RM) as a crucial strategy (Siddik et al., 2024). What was once the sole domain of human resources now incorporating marketing practices designed to help organizations attract top talent and build competitive advantage (Kandoth & Shekhar, 2022), and this is due to companies' concern about meeting their goal of attracting, motivating and retaining workers with talent (Comeche-Martínez & Ivars, 2020).

Online recruitment platforms have become essential to the hiring process (Seyedi et al., 2022). Through electronic recruitment (ER), companies establish career websites and maintain profiles on social networking sites (SNSs), broadening their talent reach (Siddik et al., 2024). SNSs enable organizations to control their messaging and connect globally, accessing virtually limitless candidate pools. According to a 2016 Glassdoor survey, 79% of job seekers use social media in their employment search, and 76% prefer submitting applications through online career sites (Micik & Micudova, 2018).

This study explores how the quality of an SNS (QS) influences users' intent to apply (IA) (Highhouse et al., 2003) within both professional (pSNSs) and non-professional SNSs (npSNSs). Previous research (Wadhawan & Sinha, 2018; Kaur & Kaur, 2022b) identifies four main variables that shape users' perceptions of SNSs: information quality (IQ), trustworthiness (TW), effectiveness (EF), and perceived ease of



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This study examines how information quality, trustworthiness, effectiveness, and perceived ease of use affect the quality of LinkedIn and Facebook in recruitment. Based on 200 participants, all four factors positively influence site quality, which in turn boosts intent to apply. The findings help employers choose effective SNSs for job postings and offer academic insight into integrating these platforms into recruitment marketing strategies.

RESUMEN DEL ARTÍCULO

Este estudio examina cómo la calidad de la información, la fiabilidad, la eficacia y la facilidad de uso percibida afectan a la calidad de LinkedIn y Facebook en la contratación. Según los datos de 200 participantes, los cuatro factores influyen positivamente en la calidad del sitio, lo que a su vez aumenta la intención de presentar una solicitud. Los resultados ayudan a los empleadores a elegir redes sociales eficaces para publicar ofertas de empleo y ofrecen una perspectiva académica sobre la integración de estas plataformas en las estrategias de marketing de contratación.

use (PEOU). The extent to which these variables are present affects the overall QS (Seyedi et al., 2022).

Despite considerable work on traditional marketing, recruitment marketing is still underexplored (Siddik et al., 2024). A bibliometric analysis revealed only 23 studies including the term “Recruitment Marketing” between 2000 and 2020 (Kandoth & Shekhar, 2022). More research is necessary to understand how organizations can integrate ER and SNSs effectively, particularly in relation to job seekers’ intentions to apply online (Kaur & Kaur, 2022a).

This paper contributes to RM literature by examining how LinkedIn, as a professional SNS, and Facebook, as a non-professional SNS, influence job seekers’ intentions to apply. The insights gained are relevant both for practitioners—helping employers identify which SNS best supports their recruitment strategy—and for scholars seeking to understand how SNSs can enhance recruitment marketing practices.

SNSs enable organizations to control their messaging and connect globally, accessing virtually limitless candidate pools.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Recruitment Marketing (RM)

Recruitment marketing (RM) focuses on attracting and developing skilled talent by strengthening employer brand, expanding outreach, identifying labor market gaps, and maintaining effective applicant communication (Kulkarni et al., 2022). Its goal is to build a strong talent pipeline for hiring qualified candidates (Alashmawy & Yazdanifard, 2019).

RM enhances the experience of both current and potential employees (Busa & Rutitis, 2023) through tactics such as content marketing, search engine optimization (SEO), employer branding, and social media engagement (Alashmawy & Yazdanifard, 2019). SEO boosts a website’s visibility and ranking in search results (Marbun et al., 2023). A central element of RM is the employer brand (EB), defined as a company’s strategic effort to position itself as an attractive workplace for present and future employees (Bose & Mohanti, 2025). Research shows that a firm’s EB significantly influences candidates’ decisions during final hiring stages, often more than its overall organizational brand (Busa & Rutitis, 2023).

2.2. The Importance of Social Networking Sites

SNSs are generally classified into professional (pSNSs) and non-professional (npSNSs) platforms (Aguado et al., 2016). pSNSs like LinkedIn enable users to share education, work experience, achievements, and career-related information (Aguado et al., 2016; Masa, 2015) and remain the leading pSNS with over 75 million users (Aguado et al., 2019; Arman, 2023).

npSNSs, such as Facebook, focus on personal connections, allowing users to share life events, photos, and updates (Aguado et al., 2016; Masa'd, 2015). Despite its social nature, Facebook—with over 500 million users worldwide (Masa'd, 2015)—is also used for recruitment. Both serve as recruitment tools, but recruiters must consider how job seekers perceive SNS quality (QS), as it can influence their intent to apply. Seven factors shape millennial job seekers' perceptions: information quality, prospective career information, perceived usefulness, system quality, ease of use, extended services, and perceived trustworthiness (Wadhawan & Sinha, 2018).

Given LinkedIn and Facebook's advantages, recruiters should understand their audience to choose the most effective platform. Following previous research (Aguado et al., 2016; Rodrigues & Martinez, 2020; Bose & Mohanty, 2025), the following research question is proposed:

RQ1: What attributes of social networking sites separate non-professional and professional social networking sites?

2.2.1. Quality of SNS

As stated before, based on previous literature, this paper evaluates the following four variables: information quality, trustworthiness, effectiveness, and perceived ease, which influence the quality of social networking sites.

2.2.1.1. Information Quality

Digitalization has accelerated information sharing through personal networks, corporate websites, and SNSs (Wijaya et al., 2023). Job seekers depend on credible, high-quality role and organization data (Kaur & Kaur, 2022a). Over 40% assess an SNS's usefulness based on information quality and accessibility, with consistent access enhancing perceived value (Kaur & Kaur, 2022b; Wijaya et al., 2023). Linking SNS profiles to employment webpages can further improve this (Panagiotidou & Mihail, 2022).

KEYWORDS

Facebook, intent to apply, LinkedIn, recruitment marketing, social networking site.

PALABRAS CLAVE

Facebook, intención de aplicar, LinkedIn, marketing de reclutamiento, redes sociales.

Candidates often verify third-party information through corporate sites and LinkedIn, considered more trustworthy owned media (Rodrigues & Martinez, 2020). All 21 participants in their study viewed LinkedIn as more credible and professional than Facebook. Likewise, information quality and quantity are crucial in job seekers' decisions when using e-recruitment platforms (Kaur & Kaur, 2022b). Based on these findings, the following hypothesis is proposed:

H1: Information quality within an SNS positively influences the quality of social networking sites

2.2.1.2. Trustworthiness

Wadhawan & Sinha (2018) identified perceived trustworthiness—defined by factors such as security and information privacy—as influencing applicants' reactions to job portals. In social media, trust reflects users' reliance on a platform to protect their data (Chang et al., 2017). Virtual trust includes perceived security, privacy, and system quality, which build user confidence (Chang et al., 2017). Greater security and transparency increase user comfort, while distrust reduces SNS usage (Chang et al., 2017). For recruiters, earning applicants' trust in the platform is crucial. Based on this, the following hypothesis is proposed:

H2: The trustworthiness of a SNS positively influences the quality of social networking sites

2.2.1.3. Effectiveness

In recruitment marketing (RM) and e-recruitment (ER), various strategies and tools shape how effectively organizations attract candidates (Kulkarni et al., 2022). Understanding candidate types is crucial. Social networking sites (SNSs) provide extensive job-related information, and when they offer detailed role and company insights, job seekers gain confidence and perceive them as more effective (Seyedi et al., 2022).

The Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) states that technology adoption depends on perceived usefulness and ease of use (Kaur & Kaur, 2022a; Kaur & Kaur, 2022b). Perceived usefulness reflects candidates' belief that the platform offers valid career information, improving job search outcomes (Seyedi et al., 2022). Adecco's 2014 Global Report found LinkedIn to be the only SNS effectively used in selection (Aguado et al., 2019), though perceptions differ by gender, age, and experience (Aguado et al., 2016). Moreover, perceived

effectiveness strongly influences users' attitudes toward and intention to use SNSs for job searching (Kaur & Kaur, 2022b). Based on these findings, the following hypothesis is proposed:

H3: The effectiveness of an SNS positively influences the quality of the social networking sites

2.2.1.4. Perceived Ease of Use

The Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) assesses online platforms using perceived usefulness (effectiveness) and perceived ease of use (PEOU) (Kaur & Kaur, 2022b). PEOU describes how easily users navigate a system, such as an SNS (Kaur & Kaur, 2022a). In e-recruitment, SNSs should be user-friendly, enabling candidates to quickly access job information, engage with recruiters, and apply for positions (Kaur & Kaur, 2022b).

Intuitive, efficient job portals encourage applications (Wadhawan & Sinha, 2018), while high-quality platforms provide fast loading, clear searches, and streamlined processes. Poor navigation, technical errors, or complex applications discourage use (Kaur & Kaur, 2022a; Kaur & Kaur, 2022b), with frustrated candidates often turning to better alternatives (Wadhawan & Sinha, 2018). Easy access to accurate, relevant information also motivates continued platform use (Seyedi et al., 2022). Based on this research, the following hypothesis is proposed:

H4: The perceived ease of use within an SNS positively influences the quality of the social networking sites

2.2.2. SNS & Intention to Apply

Intent to apply refers to a job seeker's active interest in pursuing employment with an organization, shaped by perceptions of the company and the SNS hosting the job posting (Wijaya et al., 2023). Using the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM), Seyedi et al. (2022) examined how perceived usefulness, ease of use, and SNS quality influence intention to use, supporting Highhouse et al.'s (2003) finding of a strong link between attitude and application intent. Highhouse et al. (2003) also demonstrated that organizational attraction significantly affects willingness to apply. Aguado et al. (2016) found that perceptions of SNSs influence how applicants use different platforms, with roles advertised on professional SNSs (pSNSs) receiving more positive responses than those on non-professional

SNSs (npSNSs). Based on these findings, the following research question and hypothesis are proposed:

RQ2: Is there a significant difference in intention to apply depending on the SNS used?

H5: A positive relationship exists between the quality of the site and jobseekers' intent to apply.

3. METHODOLOGY

3.1. Data Collection and Sampling Profile

A quantitative method was used to collect data and test the hypotheses through an online questionnaire distributed in the US. A pre-test with 5 participants ensured clarity and accuracy, leading to two added questions and edits to five others. The survey link was shared via social media (LinkedIn, Facebook, Instagram, Snapchat), email, and text messages, using non-probability convenience sampling to gather 200 valid responses. No filter questions were included to allow diverse participation, and a brief introduction outlined the study's purpose for job seekers with profiles on the mentioned SNSs. Although diverse social media platforms were used to get sample size for the study, the investigation focused on two social media platforms: Facebook (npSNS) and LinkedIn (pSNS), as stated in previous lines.

As **Table 1** shows, the largest age group was 21–30 (41.0%), followed by 51+ (19.5%). Most participants (94.5%) were from North America. Females comprised 67.0% of the sample. Education levels included college degrees (38.5%), graduate degrees or higher (29.0%), some college/associate's (20.0%), and high school or below (12.5%).

Employment status showed 141 employed respondents, with 48.0% not seeking and 22.5% seeking new positions. Among 59 unemployed participants, 15.5% were not seeking and 14.0% were actively seeking work. Regarding SNS usage, 89.5% had LinkedIn accounts, while Facebook had the highest share at 91.5%. This heterogeneity is inherent in studies of recruitment via social media, and previous literature indicates that such differences do not invalidate the results when clear descriptions are reported and limitations are discussed (i.e., Benedict et al., 2019; Carpentier et al., 2019).

Table 1. **Demographics of the Sample**

VARIABLE	RESPONSE	FREQUENCY	PERCENTAGE (%)
Age	20 or under	16	8.0%
	21-30	82	41.0%
	31-40	32	16.0%
	41-50	31	15.5%
	51 or above	39	19.5%
Gender	Female	134	67.0%
	Male	63	31.5%
	I prefer not to say	3	1.5%
Education Level	High School or below	25	12.5%
	Some College / Associate Degree	40	20.0%
	College Degree	77	38.5%
	Graduate Degree or higher	58	29.0%
Employment Status	Employed, not looking for new position	96	48.0%
	Employed, looking for a new position	45	22.5%
	Unemployed, looking for a new position	28	14.0%
	Unemployed, not looking for a new position	31	15.5%
Do you have a LinkedIn account?	Yes	179	89.5%
	No	21	10.5%
Do you have a Facebook account?	Yes	183	91.5%
	No	17	8.5%

3.2. Concepts Measurement and Statistical Tools

As **Table 2** shows, all the concepts follow previous works. In this sense, trustworthiness was measured using three items adapted from Wadhawan & Sinha (2018). Information quality and effectiveness were measured with four items, all eight based on the Wadhawan & Sinha (2018)’s scale. Similarly, perceived ease of use was measured with four items: 2 adapted from the proposal of Wadhawan & Sinha (2018) and 2 following the scale by Kaur & Kaur (2022b). The quality of social networking sites was measured with the fewest items, adapting 2 of the scale items from Seyedi et al. (2021). Comparatively, the intent to apply was measured with five items following the proposal of Highhouse et al. (2003).

Table 2. Concepts measurement

VARIABLE	ITEMS	AUTHORS
Information Quality (IQ)	IQ1: I find [SNS] provides accurate information about the posted jobs.	(Wadhawan & Sinha, 2018)
	IQ2: I find [SNS] provides relevant information about the posted jobs.	
	IQ3: I find [SNS] provides consistent information about the posted jobs.	
	IQ4: I find [SNS] provides appropriate information about the posted jobs.	
Trustworthiness (TW)	TW1: I trust that [SNS] is a secure site.	(Wadhawan & Sinha, 2018)
	TW2: I trust the ability of [SNS] to protect my privacy.	
	TW3: I trust the security of my personal information on [SNS].	
Effectiveness (EF)	EF1: Using [SNS] allows me to find more career information than I would through other sources of information.	(Wadhawan & Sinha, 2018)
	EF2: Using [SNS] is an effective way to look for a job.	
	EF3: Using [SNS] has made me more aware of potential career opportunities.	
	EF4: Using [SNS] increases my chances of finding an appropriate job.	
Perceived Ease of Use (PEOU)	PEOU1: I find it easy to navigate [SNS] to find job information.	(Wadhawan & Sinha, 2018)
	PEOU2: My interactions with [SNS] do not require much mental effort.	
	PEOU3: I find it easy to complete job applications on [SNS]	(Kaur & Kaur, 2022b)
	PEOU4: I find my interactions with [SNS] clear and understandable.	
Quality of Social Networking Site (QS)	QS1: I find [SNS] to be a reliable recruitment portal for jobseekers.	(Seyedi et al., 2022)
	QS2: I find [SNS] to be used and respected by well- known companies to publish their job opportunities.	
Intent to Apply (IA)	IA1: I would accept a job offered through [SNS].	(Highhouse et al., 2003)
	IA2: I would make [SNS] one of my first choices to try to find a job.	
	IA3: If, through [SNS], a company invited me for a job interview, I would go.	
	IA4: I would exert great effort to apply to roles through [SNS].	
	IA5: I would recommend [SNS] to a friend looking for a job.	

Data collected were further analyzed using IBM's Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) software. Specifically, correlation and multiple linear regression (MLR) tests were used to contrast H1-H5. Descriptive analyses and analysis of variance (ANOVA) tests were performed to answer the research questions and objectives.

4. RESULTS

4.1. Reliability Test

Reliability tests were conducted using Cronbach's Alpha to ensure that the scale items in this survey accurately measure the variables and that the constructs are internally consistent. **Table 3** shows that all of them follow Pallant (2011)'s criteria. According to the author, acceptable reliability values for short scales are usually 0.5 or 0.6 or higher, and values above 0.7 are considered good.

Table 3. Reliability Analysis

VARIABLE	PLATFORM	CRONBACH'S ALPHA
Information Quality (IQ)		0.738
	LinkedIn	0.934
	Facebook	0.915
Trustworthiness (TW)		0.796
	LinkedIn	0.931
	Facebook	0.865
Effectiveness (EF)		0.773
	LinkedIn	0.912
	Facebook	0.891
Perceived Ease of Use (PEOU)		0.653
	LinkedIn	0.908
	Facebook	0.801
Quality of SNS (QS)		0.460
	LinkedIn	0.800
	Facebook	0.839
Intent to Apply		0.756
	LinkedIn	0.868
	Facebook	0.900

4.2. Previous analysis: One-Way ANOVA

This paper examines how online users and potential job seekers perceive SNSs in relation to their intention to apply for jobs. As most respondents were not actively seeking employment, the study tested whether employment status influenced results. A one-way ANOVA, with employment status as the independent variable and intention to

apply as the dependent variable, showed homogeneous variances (Levene’s test: $p = 0.385 > 0.05$) and no significant differences between group means ($F = 0.61$; $p = 0.609$). This indicates employment status does not affect intention to apply, rendering a post-hoc Tukey test unnecessary.

4.3. Answer to RQ1

Table 4 presents the descriptive statistics of the variables in this study. The variables were again separated by the platform to answer RQ1: What attributes of an SNS separate an npSNS from a pSNS?

Table 4. Descriptive Statistics

VARIABLE	MEAN	STD. DEVIATION	MINIMUM	MAXIMUM
Information Quality	3.04	0.592	1.00	5.00
LinkedIn IQ	3.92	0.908	1.00	5.00
Facebook IQ	2.14	0.795	1.00	5.00
Trustworthiness	2.94	0.699	1.00	5.00
LinkedIn TW	3.96	0.981	1.00	5.00
Facebook TW	1.93	0.832	1.00	5.00
Effectiveness	2.97	0.597	1.00	5.00
LinkedIn EF	4.01	0.898	1.00	5.00
Facebook EF	1.93	0.789	1.00	5.00
Perceived Ease of Use	3.24	0.556	1.00	5.00
LinkedIn PEOU	4.03	0.874	1.00	5.00
Facebook PEOU	2.44	0.845	1.00	5.00
Quality of SNS	2.98	0.595	1.50	5.00
LinkedIn QS	4.11	0.894	1.00	5.00
Facebook QS	1.86	0.879	1.00	5.00
Intent to Apply	2.95	0.549	1.40	5.00
LinkedIn IA	4.01	0.833	1.00	5.00
Facebook IA	1.89	0.799	1.00	5.00

Across the six variables examined, perceived ease of use had the highest overall mean (3.24) and intent to apply the lowest (2.95). Given the Likert scale used, these averages suggest most responses were “Disagree” or “Neutral.” However, separating results by platform reveals clear differences between professional SNSs (pSNSs) and non-professional SNSs (npSNSs).

Under information quality (mean = 3.04), LinkedIn's mean rose to 3.92, while Facebook's dropped to 2.14. This pattern persisted across all other variables. Perceived ease of use showed the smallest gap—LinkedIn at 4.03 versus Facebook at 2.44—whereas quality of SNS displayed the largest disparity, with LinkedIn at 4.11 and Facebook at 1.86.

To determine if these differences were statistically significant, an ANOVA was conducted to compare platform means. **Table 5** presents the four variables identified as potential influencers of SNS quality.

Table 5. **ANOVA Descriptives, SNS Variables x Gender**

PLATFORM	VARIABLE	GENDER	N	MEAN	STD. DEV	STD. ERROR	95% CONFIDENCE INTERVAL FOR MEAN		MIN	MAX
							LOWER BOUND	UPPER BOUND		
LinkedIn	Information Quality	Female	134	3.899	0.935	0.081	3.739	4.059	1.00	5.00
		Male	63	3.972	0.844	0.106	3.760	4.185	1.00	5.00
		Other	3	3.833	1.258	0.726	0.708	6.959	2.50	5.00
		Total	200	3.921	0.908	0.064	3.795	4.048	1.00	5.00
	Trustworthiness	Female	134	3.915	1.045	0.090	3.737	4.094	1.00	5.00
		Male	63	4.116	0.769	0.097	3.923	4.310	2.00	5.00
		Other	3	2.667	1.155	0.667	-0.202	5.535	2.00	4.00
		Total	200	3.960	0.981	0.069	3.823	4.097	1.00	5.00
	Effectiveness	Female	134	3.961	0.953	0.082	3.798	4.124	1.00	5.00
		Male	63	4.123	0.759	0.096	3.932	4.314	2.50	5.00
		Other	3	4.083	1.155	0.667	1.215	6.952	2.75	4.75
		Total	200	4.014	0.898	0.063	3.889	4.139	1.00	5.00
	Perceived Ease of Use	Female	134	3.965	0.933	0.081	3.805	4.124	1.00	5.00
		Male	63	4.155	0.719	0.091	3.974	4.336	2.25	5.00
		Other	3	4.417	1.010	0.583	1.907	6.927	3.25	5.00
		Total	200	4.031	0.874	0.062	3.909	4.153	1.00	5.00
Facebook	Information Quality	Female	134	2.122	0.817	0.071	1.982	2.261	1.00	5.00
		Male	63	2.175	0.750	0.094	1.986	2.363	1.00	4.33
		Other	3	2.000	1.000	0.577	-0.484	4.484	1.00	3.00
		Total	200	2.137	0.795	0.056	2.026	2.248	1.00	5.00
	Trustworthiness	Female	134	1.848	0.830	0.072	1.706	1.990	1.00	5.00
		Male	63	2.085	0.821	0.103	1.878	2.291	1.00	5.00
		Other	3	2.000	1.000	0.577	-0.484	4.484	1.00	3.00
		Total	200	1.925	0.832	0.059	1.809	2.041	1.00	5.00

Facebook	Effectiveness	Female	134	1.871	0.788	0.068	1.737	2.006	1.00	5.00
		Male	63	2.048	0.784	0.099	1.850	2.245	1.00	4.75
		Other	3	2.083	1.010	0.583	-0.427	4.593	1.00	3.00
		Total	200	1.930	0.790	0.056	1.820	2.040	1.00	5.00
	Perceived Ease of Use	Female	134	2.394	0.859	0.074	2.247	2.540	1.00	5.00
		Male	63	2.571	0.804	0.101	2.369	2.774	1.00	5.00
		Other	3	2.000	1.000	0.577	-0.484	4.484	1.00	3.00
		Total	200	2.444	0.845	0.060	2.326	2.562	1.00	5.00

The Levene Statistic confirmed that six of the eight variables had significance levels above 0.05, allowing for ANOVA testing. However, LinkedIn trustworthiness ($p = 0.002$) and LinkedIn perceived ease of use ($p = 0.026$) fell below 0.05, requiring the Welch statistic and Games-Howell post hoc test.

Using the Welch test, trustworthiness ($p = 0.873 > 0.05$) and perceived ease of use ($p = 0.353 > 0.05$) showed no significant differences between groups. The other six variables—LinkedIn information quality ($p = 0.860$) and effectiveness ($p = 0.495$), plus Facebook information quality ($p = 0.871$), trustworthiness ($p = 0.176$), effectiveness ($p = 0.326$), and perceived ease of use ($p = 0.256$)—were tested via ANOVA. All had significance values above 0.05, indicating no statistically significant differences between group means.

After confirming significance among the means, the results indicate a difference in how job seekers and SNS users perceive LinkedIn and Facebook. For the remaining variables—information quality, trustworthiness, effectiveness, and perceived ease of use—no significant differences were found, yet all four can still be used to distinguish a professional SNS from a non-professional SNS, thereby answering RQ1.

Table 6. ANOVA, SNS Variables x Gender

PLATFORM	VARIABLE		SUM OF SQUARES	DF	MEAN SQUARE	F	SIG
LinkedIn	Information Quality	Between Groups	0.252	2	0.126	0.151	0.860
		Within Groups	163.695	197	0.831		
		Total	163.947	199			
	Effectiveness	Between Groups	1.142	2	0.571	0.706	0.495
		Within Groups	159.258	197	0.808		
		Total	160.400	199			
Facebook	Information Quality	Between Groups	0.176	2	0.088	0.138	0.871
		Within Groups	125.644	197	0.638		
		Total	125.820	199			
	Trustworthiness	Between Groups	2.412	2	1.206	1.754	0.176
		Within Groups	135.463	197	0.688		
		Total	137.875	199			
	Effectiveness	Between Groups	1.404	2	0.702	1.127	0.326
		Within Groups	122.741	197	0.623		
		Total	124.145	199			
	Perceived Ease of Use	Between Groups	1.954	2	0.977	1.373	0.256
		Within Groups	140.226	197	0.712		
		Total	142.180	199			

4.4. Answer to RQ2

An ANOVA was conducted to address the second research question (RQ2): whether intention to apply differs depending on the SNS used. **Table 7** presents the descriptive statistics and mean values for intent to apply by platform—LinkedIn (mean = 4.014) and Facebook (mean = 1.894)—with gender included as the independent variable.

Table 7. **ANOVA Descriptives, Intent to Apply x Gender**

		N	MEAN	STD. DEV	STD. ERROR	95% CONFIDENCE INTERVAL FOR MEAN		MINIMUM	MAXIMUM
						LOWER BOUND	UPPER BOUND		
LinkedIn Intent to Apply	Female	134	3.985	0.861	0.074	3.838	4.132	1.000	5.000
	Male	63	4.076	0.702	0.089	3.899	4.253	2.400	5.000
	Other	3	4.000	1.562	0.902	0.120	7.880	2.200	5.000
	Total	200	4.014	0.822	0.058	3.899	4.129	1.000	5.000
Facebook Intent to Apply	Female	134	1.842	0.823	0.071	1.701	1.982	1.000	5.000
	Male	63	2.000	0.739	0.093	1.814	2.186	1.000	4.800
	Other	3	2.000	1.000	0.577	-0.484	4.484	1.000	3.000
	Total	200	1.894	0.799	0.057	1.783	2.005	1.000	5.000

Note: Welch test = 0.276 (p = 0.769); Levene test: F = 0.8654 (p = 0.423)

Levene's test for LinkedIn's intent to apply ($p = 0.013$) did not confirm homogeneity of variance, so a Welch statistic was used, showing LinkedIn's intent to apply as significant ($p = 0.769$). For Facebook, Levene's test ($p = 0.599$) supported using ANOVA, with Facebook's intent to apply also significant ($p = 0.423$). Since both platforms' intent-to-apply variables are significant, their means can be compared: LinkedIn's mean is 4.014 and Facebook's is 1.894. This reveals a clear and significant difference in users' intention to apply between the two SNSs, answering RQ2.

4.5. Testing the Hypotheses: Multiple Linear Regression Analysis

Two multiple linear regression (MLR) analyses were conducted to further test the proposed hypotheses. The first, testing H1–H4, used information quality, trustworthiness, effectiveness, and perceived ease of use as independent variables, with quality of SNS as the dependent variable. The second, testing H5, used quality of SNS as the independent variable and intent to apply as the dependent variable.

4.5.1. MLR, Variables Related to Quality of SNS

To assess the MLR, linearity was first verified ($R = 0.830$; $p < 0.001$), showing a positive, strong, and direct linear relationship. The histogram, P-P plot, and scatterplot confirmed normality and homogeneity assumptions. The R^2 value of 0.689 indicates that

68.9% of the variation in SNS quality is explained by the independent variables. **Table 8** also shows no autocorrelation issue, as the Durbin-Watson statistic is 1.946 (within the acceptable 1.5–2.5 range). Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) values were below 10 for all variables, and tolerance levels not near 1, suggesting low multicollinearity. The most influential variable on SNS quality is effectiveness, with a standardized beta coefficient of 0.692. Therefore, hypotheses H1 through H4 are supported.

Table 8. **MLR Coefficients, Variables Related to Quality of SNS**

MODEL		UNSTANDARDIZED COEFFICIENTS		STANDARDIZED COEFFICIENTS	T	SIG	COLLINEARITY STATISTICS	
		B	STD. ERROR	BETA			TOLERANCE	VIF
I	(Contant)	0.365	0.147		2.475	0.014		
	Information Quality	0.084	0.072	0.084	1.170	0.243	0.312	3.210
	Trustworthiness	0.106	0.041	0.125	2.588	0.010	0.684	1.462
	Effectiveness	0.689	0.065	0.692	10.560	<0.001	0.371	2.692
	PEOU	-9.610E-6	0.067	0.000	0.000	1.000	0.408	2.453

Note: R Pearson = 0.830 (p<0.001); R² = 0.689; Durbin-Watson = 1.94; F=107.768 (p<0.001)

4.5.2. **MLR, Variables related to Intent to Apply**

The second MLR analysis examined quality of SNS as the independent variable and intent to apply as the dependent variable, with both being metrical. Results confirmed the test’s suitability (R Pearson = 0.786, p < 0.001; R² = 0.618; Durbin-Watson = 1.924; F = 320.899, p < 0.001).

Table 9 reports a Tolerance of 1.000 and a VIF of 1.000, indicating no collinearity issues. As only one independent variable was used, the standardized beta of 0.786 cannot be compared with others. In this case, H5 is supported.

Table 9. **MLR Coefficients, Variables related to Intent to Apply**

MODEL		UNSTANDARDIZED COEFFICIENTS		STANDARDIZED COEFFICIENTS	T	SIG	COLLINEARITY STATISTICS	
		B	STD. ERROR	BETA			TOLERANCE	VIF
I	(Contant)	0.790	0.123		6.411	<0.001		
	QualitySNS	0.726	0.041	0.786	17.914	<0.001	1.000	1.000

Note: R Pearson = 0.786(p<0.001); R² = 0.618; Durbin-Watson = 1.924; F=320.899 (p<0.001)

6. CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, LIMITATIONS AND FURTHER RESEARCH

The main aim of this paper was to determine which SNS—LinkedIn or Facebook—produces better recruitment outcomes. To compare these platforms, attributes distinguishing professional (pSNS) from non-professional SNSs (npSNSs) were identified: information quality, trustworthiness, effectiveness, and perceived ease of use (Aguado et al., 2016; Wadhawan & Sinha, 2018). Results show that effectiveness has the strongest influence on SNS quality, while trustworthiness has the weakest. A positive relationship was also found between SNS quality and job seekers' intent to apply. Overall, findings indicate significant differences in application intention between platforms, with LinkedIn demonstrating more positive recruitment outcomes. All these findings, as well as the conclusions and implications derived from them, should be understood in the context of the conditions under which the study was conducted.

6.1. Academic & Theoretical Implications

Recruitment marketing remains under-researched despite significant technological advances over the past three decades. Social media plays a central role in daily life, and it is increasingly popular in recruitment and talent acquisition (Bose & Mohanty, 2025). Yet, research on maximizing recruitment potential and adapting to new technologies is limited. While Aguado et al. (2016) studied variables influencing SNS quality and Highhouse et al. (2003) identified factors affecting the intention to apply, gaps persist in examining the entire job selection process. In some way, this work has attempted to address that gap, contributing to academic understanding of job selection and application intent, although future research is needed in this line.

6.2. Managerial Implications

This research aimed to identify the most effective SNS for posting job openings, with findings indicating LinkedIn as the superior recruitment platform. Facebook's mean scores across all six variables were below 3.0, with its highest score being 2.44 for perceived ease of use. LinkedIn's scores were all above 3.0, with its lowest at 3.92 for information quality. Information quality and trustworthiness were LinkedIn's weakest areas, though organizations can address information quality more easily than trustworthiness. Selecting the most effective SNS enhances recruitment reach and optimizes

resources. LinkedIn not only facilitates job postings but also allows companies to manage profiles and showcase organizational and employee information. Regularly updating corporate profiles and career pages ensures control over accessible content, increasing job seekers' willingness to apply.

In sum, the rise of social media screening for personnel selection and the use of platforms such as Facebook and Instagram has made it much easier to recruit participants than with more traditional methods such as newspaper or radio advertisements, reducing costs for companies and candidates in terms of money and time (Oudat & Bakas, 2023; Massar & Ten Hoor, 2025).

6.3. Limitations & Future Research

The main limitation of this study stems from the sampling method. Although non-probability convenience sampling is common and effective, it restricted the survey's diversity. Moreover, individuals without LinkedIn or Facebook accounts were underrepresented since access required one of these platforms. Furthermore, the study focused on the US, which limits the generalizability of the results to other countries.

This study has focused on Facebook and LinkedIn. Because recent news suggests that Meta may relaunch Facebook's job search tool, it is uncertain how this development might affect the recruitment policies in the future. Further research should consider advances in this field with the incorporation of new platforms and technologies.

Recruitment marketing remains a developing field with limited research. While this study tested its hypotheses, more research is needed to understand what motivates applicants to apply. Future studies should include a more diverse and balanced sample across age, gender, location, education, employment status, and social media use, adding sample from diverse countries. Even more, it should be interesting to know how long those not currently seeking employment have been in this situation, as this may influence their responses. Additionally, with pay transparency laws becoming standard in the U.S., requiring employers to post salary ranges, future research should examine how such policies influence job seekers' SNS use and engagement with company profiles. Finally, it would be useful to include another professional platforms or by incorporating additional variables. Even more, and because of the rise of IA and its possible effects on employer branding, future investigations could consider these variables.

REFERENCES

- Aguado, D., Andres, J. C., Garcia-Izquierdo, A. L., & Rodriguez, J. (2019). LinkedIn "Big Four": Job Performance Validation in the ICT Sector. *Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 35(2), 53–64. <https://doi.org/10.5093/jwop2019a7>
- Aguado, D., Rico, R., Rubio, V. J., & Fernandez, L. (2016). Applicant reactions to social network web use in personnel selection and assessment. *Journal of Work and Organization Psychology*, 32, 183–190. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rpto.2016.09.001>
- Alashmawy, A., & Yazdanifard, R. (2019). A Review of the Role of Marketing and Recruitment and Talent Acquisition. *International Journal of Management, Accounting and Economics*, 6(7), 569–581. <https://doi.org/ISSN2383-2126>
- Arman, M. (2023). The Advantages of Online Recruitment and Selection: A Systematic Review of Cost and Time Efficiency. *Business Management and Strategy*, 14(1), 220–240. <https://doi.org/10.5296/bms.v14i1.21479>
- Benedict, C., Hahn, A. L., Diefenbach, M. A., & Ford, J. S. (2019). Recruitment via social media: Advantages and potential biases. *Digital Health*, 5, 2055207619867223. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2055207619867223>
- Bose, S. & Mohanty, S. (2025). Digital Transformation in Talent Acquisition. *UCJC Business and Society Review*, 3rd Quarter, 18-69.
- Busa, I., & Ruitis, D. (2023). Employer reputation building - a managerial challenge in HR marketing. In *Proceedings of the 14th International Scientific and Practical Conference*.
- Carpentier, M., Van Hove, G., & Weng, Q. (2019). Social media recruitment: Communication characteristics and sought gratifications. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 10, 1669. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.01669>
- Chang, S. E., Liu, A. Y., & Shen, W. C. (2017). User trust in social networking services: A comparison of Facebook and LinkedIn. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 69, 207–217. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2016.12.013>
- Comeche-Martinez, J. M., & Ivars, J. V. P. (2020). What kind of companies do future workers wish?. *UCJC Business and Society Review (formerly known as Universia Business Review)*, 17(3), 80-129.
- Highhouse, S., Lievens, F., & Sinar, E. F. (2003). Measuring Attraction to Organizations. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 63(6), 986–1001. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013164403258403>
- Kandath, S., & Shekhar, S. K. (2022). Recruitment Marketing - A Bibliometric Analysis. *International Journal of Professional Business Review*, 7(2), 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.26668/businessreview/2022.v7i2.0431>
- Kaur, D., & Kaur, R. (2022a). Does electronic word-of-mouth influence e-recruitment adoption? A mediation analysis using the PLS-SEM approach. *Management Research Review*, 46(6), 1–21. <https://doi.org/10.1108/MRR-04-2021-0322>
- Kaur, D., & Kaur, R. (2022b). E-recruitment Adoption among Job-seekers: Role of Vividness and Perceived Internet stress in shaping their Intentions. *International Journal of Business Information Systems*, 35(2/3), 115–136. <https://doi.org/10.1504%20/IJBIS.2021.10040825>
- Kulkarni, S., Yalamarti, R. P., & Sethumadhavan, R. (2022). Impact of Recruitment Marketing on Employment Generation. *International Research Journal of Modernization in Engineering Technology and Science*, 4(12), 739–743. <https://doi.org/10.56726/IRJMETS32117>
- Marbun, N., Pozilova, S. K., Shahadi, H. I., & Ghosh, A. (2023). Application of Preference Selection Index in Recruitment of Search Engine Optimization Specialist. *SAGA: Journal of Technology and Information Systems*, 1(4), 144–151. <https://doi.org/10.58905/SAGA.vol1i4.241>
- Masa'd, F. M. (2015). Deployment of Social Media in the Recruitment Process. *Journal of Knowledge Management, Economics and Information Technology*, 5(1), 1–24.
- Massar, K., & Ten Hoor, G. A. (2025). Social Media as Input for Recruitment: Does Women's Relationship History Affect Candidate Evaluations?. *Psychological Reports*, 128(2), 1187–1203.
- Micik, M., & Micudova, K. (2018). Employer Brand Building: Using Social Media and Career Websites to Attract Generation Y. *Economics and Sociology*, 11(3), 171–189. <https://doi.org/10.14254/2071-789X.2018/11-3/11>
- Opada, F. M. M., Ibrahim, M. B. H., Irawan, A., Akbar, M. A., & Rasyid, A. (2024). Talent acquisition strategies: A comprehensive examination of recruitment policies for organizational success. *Advances in Human Resource Management Research*, 2(2), 63-77.

- Oudat, Q., & Bakas, T. (2023). Merits and pitfalls of social media as a platform for recruitment of study participants. *Journal of medical Internet research*, 25, e47705.
- Pallant, J. (2011) SPSS survival manual: A step by step guide to data analysis using the SPSS program. 4th Edition, Allen & Unwin, Berkshire.
- Panagiotidou, S. A., & Mihail, D. M. (2022). Enhancing Employer Branding through corporate Innovation and Web communication. In *Proceedings of the 18th European Conference on Management Leadership and Governance*. ISTCE - Instituto Universitario de Lisboa Portugal 10-11 November 2022
- Rodrigues, D., & Martinez, L. F. (2020). The influence of digital marketing on recruitment effectiveness: a qualitative study. *European Journal of Management Studies*, 25(1), 23–44. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EJMS-09-2020-002>
- Seyedi, S. S., Darroudi, A., & Haghighinasab, M. (2022). Developing a Model and Questionnaire for Predicting Intention to Use Job Boards: A Jobseeker-Oriented Research on the E- Recruitment Adoption in Iran. *Foundations of Management*, 14, 65–88. <https://doi.org/10.2478/fman-2022-0005>
- Siddik, A. S. A., Soewignyo, T., & Mandagi, D. W. (2024). Click, Connect, Recruit: A Systematic Review of the Role of Social Media in Employee Recruitment. *Journal Informatika Ekonomi Bisnis*, 344-349.
- Wadhawan, S., & Sinha, S. (2018). Factors Influencing Young Job Seekers Perception towards Job Portals. *AIMS International Journal of Management*, 12(3), 199–212. <https://doi.org/10.26573/2018.12.3.5>
- Wijaya, N. H. S., Silalahi, A. A. S., & Lee, L. D. D. (2023). Attracting Digital Natives as Talents: Assessing the Strength of Good Employer, Product Quality, and Information Credibility Perceptions on Intent to Apply1. *Philippine Management Review*, 30, 1–14.