6-12-2015

Web-Based Recruitment: Strategies for Attracting LGBT Employees

Daniel R. Abben
DePaul University, dabben@depaul.edu

Web-Based Recruitment: Strategies for Attracting LGBT Employees

A Thesis

Presented in

Partial Fulfillment of the

Requirements for the Degree of

Master of Arts

By

Daniel Richard Abben

November, 2014

Department of Psychology

College of Science and Health

DePaul University

Chicago, Illinois

Thesis Committee

Jane A. Halpert, Ph.D. Chairperson

Alice F. Stuhlmacher, Ph.D.

Acknowledgments

I would like to express my appreciation to Jane Halpert and Alice Stuhlmacher for their invaluable guidance during this project. I would also like to thank the two other members of my cohort, Mary Keegin and Stefanie Mockler.

Biography

The author was born in Waterloo, Iowa, on June 20, 1982. He graduated from Columbus High School, also in Waterloo, in 2000. He attended Clarke College, where he received his Bachelor of Arts in 2004. In 2011, he graduated with a Mater of Science degree in public service management from DePaul University in Chicago. He obtained a Master of Arts degree in psychology from DePaul University in 2015.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Abstract

Organizations are interested in workforce diversity for a variety of reasons. One way to foster employee diversity is through the use of targeted recruitment practices. While this topic has received attention in the literature, most of the work has examined the effectiveness of recruiting people whose minority status is apparent. Thus, the goal of this research is to explore the effectiveness of recruitment strategies targeted toward individuals whose minority status is not immediately obvious, namely lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender adults. Two specific recruitment strategies were used: providing information about domestic partner benefits and providing information about community partnerships. The results of this study suggest that the targeted recruitment strategies were equally effective in eliciting higher levels of perceived P–O fit and organizational attraction among a sample of LGBT adults. These findings suggest that organizations can effectively use targeted recruiting to influence LGBT people's perceptions of organizations. Future research can help identify whether targeted recruitment has a negative impact on straight people's perceptions of organizations that use recruitment strategies targeted toward members of the LGBT community.

Introduction

While there are mixed results regarding the business-related outcomes associated with workplace diversity, workforce homogeneity is still an important issue for organizations to consider (Jayne & Dipboye, 2004; McKay & Avery, 2005; Robinson & Dechant, 1997). Changes in workforce demographics, legal concerns regarding disparate treatment and disparate impact, and the desire to grow market share by attracting new customers are just a few of the reasons that help explain why organizations attend to this topic (Anand & Winters, 2008; Avery & McKay, 2006; Robinson & Dechant, 1997; Thomas, 1990; Williams & Bauer, 1994).

One way to foster workplace inclusion is by using targeted recruitment practices. Briefly, recruitment consists of the policies and practices used by organizations to attract a pool of candidates from which to select people into open positions (Allen, Mahto, & Otondo, 2007; Barber, 1998; Breaugh & Starke, 2000). The use of recruitment to facilitate workforce diversity has received attention in the literature. Most of this attention, however, has focused on recruiting potential employees whose minority status is visibly apparent. Examples of this include work on race (Avery, Hernandez, & Hebl, 2004; Goldberg & Allen, 2008; Ma & Allen, 2009), gender (Lyons & Marler, 2011; Van Hooft, Born, Taris, & Van der Flier, 2006; Williamson, Lepak, & King, 2003), and age (Doverspike, Taylor, Shultz, & McKay, 2000). Few researchers have explored efforts to recruit people whose minority status is not immediately obvious, such as people with a chronic illness, those who practice a stigmatized religion, or those who belong to the lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) community. To address the existing gap in the literature, researchers have called for work that explores the effectiveness of recruitment strategies directed toward these individuals (Breaugh, 2008; Lindsey, King, McClausland, Jones, & Dunleavy, 2013; Ployhart, 2006). Thus, the goal of this research is to explore the effectiveness of various recruitment strategies among a sample of LGBT adults.

Importance of Workforce Diversity

For a number of years, the popular management press has extolled the benefits of workforce diversity (Gilbert, Stead, & Ivancevich, 1999), which frequently has been presented as a panacea that will result in reduced turnover and increased problem solving, creativity, innovation, and performance (Jayne & Dipboye, 2004; Mannix & Neale, 2005; McCuiston, Wooldridge, & Pierce, 2004; Williams & O'Reilly, 1998).

While there is strong support for workforce diversity among practitioners, the research results have been mixed. Receiving an award from the Department of Labor for having an effective affirmative action program, for example, has been associated with an increase in stock prices (Wright, Ferris, Hiller, & Kroll, 1995). At the same time, there is some evidence that demographic diversity among workers is associated with increased turnover and higher rates of absenteeism (Robinson & Dechant, 1997; Sacco & Schmitt, 2005; Williams & O'Reilly, 1998). In a longitudinal study of student groups, Watson, Kumar, and Michaelsen (1993) found that at the beginning of the study, homogeneous groups had higher process and performance scores than heterogeneous groups. By the end of the study, though, both types of groups performed equally well. The authors of this study did note that at the end of the study, the heterogeneous groups performed better than the homogeneous groups on two tasks that measured group creativity (Watson et al., 1993).

Overall, the mixed results regarding the relationship between workforce diversity and organizational performance suggest the presence of moderators. In fact, researchers have found that the benefits of racial diversity are moderated by both business strategy and workers' perceptions of organizational support for diversity (Avery, McKay, Wilson, & Tonidandel, 2007; Richard, McMillan, Chadwick, & Dwyer, 2003). Similarly, in a multiyear study of Fortune 500 companies, Kochan et al. (2003) found few direct effects between diversity and performance. The authors suggested that the impact of diversity on performance is context dependent.

Despite the lack of strong empirical support regarding the direct benefits of workforce diversity, there are still reasons for organizations to attend to this issue. Domestically, statistics reveal that women and racial minorities comprise a growing segment of the workforce and that people who belong to the white majority are retiring at a steady rate (Avery & McKay, 2006; Doverspike et al., 2000; McCuiston et al., 2004; Roberson & Stevens, 2006; Williams & Bauer, 1994). These statistics suggest that diversity is an inevitable issue that organizations cannot ignore (Baruch, 2006; Cox & Blake, 1991; Kim & Gelfand, 2003). In other words, proactively managing employee diversity will enable organizations to remain competitive in an increasingly global marketplace (Anand & Winters, 2008; Thomas, 1990).

It is also important for organizations to pay attention to workforce diversity for legal reasons (Robinson & Dechant, 1997). There are a number of federal laws that protect minorities from discrimination in the workplace. For example, Title VII of the Civil Rights Act (1964) prohibits organizations from discriminating legally against people based on their race, color, religion, sex, or national origin when making hiring, training, or termination decisions. Likewise, the Americans with Disabilities Act (1990) offers employment discrimination protection to individuals who have or who are perceived to have a disability; the Age Discrimination in Employment Act (1967) offers similar protection to people aged 40 and older.

Currently, there are no federal laws that prohibit discrimination against LGBT individuals in the workplace. While various iterations of the Employment Non-Discrimination Act have been introduced in both houses of Congress, the legislation has yet to be enacted. A number of state, county, and municipal governments, however, have passed laws banning discrimination based sexual orientation and gender identity (Beatty & Kirby, 2006; Human Rights Campaign Foundation [HRCF], 2009).

In addition to the legal issues discussed previously, organizations have found that workforce diversity can be used to improve their public image, attract new customers, and better meet the needs of existing customers (Anand & Winters, 2008; McKay & Avery, 2006; Robinson & Dechant, 1997). As Richard

(2000) points out, companies hire employees who are representative of their customer base as a way to maintain a competitive advantage in the market.

Workplace Inclusion

Inclusion has been presented as one way to foster diversity in the workplace. When using this approach, organizations attempt to establish a culture in which employees are able to contribute to organizational goals, regardless of their minority status (Thomas, 1990; Williams & Bauer, 1994). This approach can be differentiated from affirmative action in that inclusion practices are generally undertaken voluntarily, whereas organizations are often legally obligated to participate in affirmative action programs (Gilbert et al., 1999).

An inclusion approach to workforce heterogeneity is especially beneficial to LGBT employees. Organizational policies (e.g., nondiscrimination in hiring and promotion, bereavement leave for the death of a partner), supervisor support, and coworker support are associated with positive outcomes that include increased life satisfaction, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment (Button, 2001; Huffman, Watrous-Rodriguez, & King, 2008; Ragins, Singh, & Cornwell, 2007; Velez & Moradi, 2012). In a sample of LGBT working adults, Griffith and Hebl (2002) found that lesbian and gay employees who worked for organizations that were perceived to be supportive of their sexual orientation reported higher levels of job satisfaction than employees who worked for organizations that were perceived to be unsupportive. In contrast, Ragins and Cornwell (2001) found that high levels of perceived discrimination based on one's sexual orientation were associated with reduced job satisfaction.

Organizations address diversity issues at various points in the human resource management process. When making personnel decisions, for example, organizations are concerned about disparate treatment and disparate impact. Disparate treatment occurs when organizations intentionally discriminate against someone who belongs to a protected class (e.g., refusing to promote someone based on his or her race; Green, 2003; Lindsey et al., 2013). Various strategies for reducing discrimination based on disparate treatment exist in the literature. For example, Lindsey et al. (2013) recommend that organizations provide compliance training to human resource personnel. The authors also suggested that organizations use standardized selection procedures, which will help reduce the opportunity for decision makers to make biased employment decisions.

Unlike disparate treatment, which refers to intentional discrimination, disparate impact refers to "unintentional forms of discrimination (e.g., using a selection measure that unintentionally selects substantially more individuals from one protected class than individuals from another"; Lindsey et al., 2013, p. 396). There are various strategies that organizations can use to reduce disparate impact. First, organizations should consider what predictor constructs to measure. One suggestion has been to use predictors that result in minimal subgroup differences (Lindsey et al., 2013; Ployhart, 2006). Second, Lindsey et al. (2013) recommend that organizations consider using video- and computer-based technology to administer selection instruments. Finally, Lindsey et al. (2013) suggested that organizations weight predictors in a way that reduces the detrimental impact of measures that could result in biased employment decisions.

Organizations also consider issues related to workforce diversity when addressing employee retention. This is important, as existing data suggest that turnover rates are higher for Blacks than for Caucasians and for women than for men (Robinson & Dechant, 1997). Given the high costs associated with employee turnover, it is important for organizations to retain qualified employees (Bauer, Erdogan, Liden, & Wayne, 2006; Dess & Shaw, 2001; Tziner & Birati, 1996). One way for organizations to retain minority employees is to make sure that the employees are compensated fairly, as pay dissatisfaction is a strong predictor of turnover intentions (Griffeth, Hom, & Gaertner, 2000).

Recruitment

Organizations use the employee recruitment process as a way to facilitate diversity among employees. Recruitment refers to the organizational policies and practices that help determine the size and the quality of the applicant pool (Rynes, 1991; Thomas & Wise, 1999). Barber (1998) suggested that there are three stages to the recruitment process. The first stage is to capture the attention of potential job applicants. The second stage is to maintain the interest of the potential applicants whose interest has been captured, and the third stage is to influence applicants' job-choice decisions.

Recruitment is important for many reasons. Fundamentally, it is a critical step in the employee selection process; people who do not engage in the recruitment process likely will not participate in the subsequent stages of the employee selection process (Barber, 1998; Rynes, 1991; Rynes & Barber, 1990). In addition, by creating the pool of applicants from which people are selected into open jobs, recruitment has a direct effect on the quality of the workforce (Cober, Brown, Levy, Keeping, & Cober, 2003). Finally, successful recruitment increases the utility of organizational selection systems (Boudreau & Rynes, 1985; Turban & Cable, 2003).

Effective recruitment processes foster applicant attraction in that they facilitate qualified candidates' interest in the organization as a place to work (Barber, 1998; Chapman, Uggerslev, Carroll, Piasentin, & Jones, 2005; Roberson, Collins, & Oreg, 2005). Strategies to enhance applicant attraction include improving characteristics of the job (e.g., salary, benefits) and the organization (e.g., culture), as well as improving the overall effectiveness of the recruitment process (Boswell, Roehling, LePine, & Moynihan, 2003).

Signaling theory. Signaling theory has been used to explain why recruitment practices are important. Originally developed in the economics literature, this theory suggests that if job applicants are either unmotivated or unable to represent themselves honestly (e.g., job applicants may be unable to articulate their qualifications for a position with which they have no experience), organizations must use other sources of information to make inferences about whether or not to hire them. Spence (1973) posited that personal characteristics, such as level of education, prior work experience, sex, and race, serve as signals, or sources of information, that companies use when making hiring decisions.

From a recruitment perspective, signaling theory suggests that when job applicants lack information about organizations, they use signals to make inferences about organizational attributes (Braddy, Meade, & Kroustalis, 2008;

Rynes, 1991). As outsiders, potential applicants rarely have a fully nuanced view of organizations; thus, their interactions with various recruitment methods (e.g., recruiters, organizations' web sites, job advertisements) serve as signals that provide them with additional information about the organization and its values (Barber, 1998; Roberson et al., 2005; Rynes, 1991). The inferences that are made based on available signals are important because they shape potential applicants' decisions during later stages of the recruitment and selection process (Uggerslev, Fassina, & Kraichy, 2012). Some researchers have posited that signaling theory is especially helpful for explaining how potential applicants make employment decisions, such as determining which organizations to apply to, when they have access to limited information (Rynes, Bretz, & Gerhart, 1991; Thompson, Braddy, & Wuensch, 2008).

The use of signaling theory to explain the impact that recruitment has on applicant attraction is well established in the literature (Connelly, Certo, Ireland, & Ruetzel, 2011). Using a qualitative approach, Rynes et al. (1991) found that potential job applicants used recruitment experiences to formulate impressions of recruiting organizations. Similarly, in a study of recruiter effects, Goltz and Giannantonio (1995) found that participants who viewed a video that depicted a friendly recruiter were more likely to make positive inferences about organizational characteristics than participants who viewed a video that depicted an unfriendly recruiter.

Other types of signals have also surfaced in the literature. Some of these include organizations' overall reputations, information about environmental policies, corporate social performance, favorability of site-visit arrangements, and delays in the recruiting process (Aiman-Smith, Bauer, & Cable, 2001; Behrend, Baker, & Thompson, 2009; Boswell et al., 2003; Cable & Turban, 2003; Evans & Davis, 2011; Greening & Turban, 2000; Rynes et al., 1991; Rynes & Miller, 1983; Turban, Forret, & Hendrickson, 1998).

There are also findings suggesting that the amount of information available to potential applicants serves as a signal from which inferences are made. In a study of web-based recruitment, Allen et al. (2007) found a positive relationship between the amount of information presented on a web site and participants' attraction to an organization. Barber and Roehling (1993), who found similar results, concluded that applicants might see an organization's failure to provide an adequate amount of information as a sign of disorganization or lack of interest in the applicants.

A majority of signaling theory research has focused on traditional recruiting methods (e.g., recruiters, job advertisements) and organizational policies. Thompson et al. (2008) also found a positive relationship between web site design features and job pursuit intentions. Based on their findings, the authors suggested that it might be possible to generalize signaling theory to other types of recruitment, such as web-based recruiting.

Person-organization fit. Person-organization (P–O) fit is another concept that has been used to explain the impact that recruitment has on potential applicants' attraction to organizations. The notion of P–O fit is based on an interactionist approach to psychology, which posits that aspects of both the individual and the situation interact to shape a person's response to a particular stimulus (Chatman, 1989, Schneider, 1987). Fundamentally, P–O fit is based on the idea that people's preferences for organizational characteristics vary and as a result, people will be attracted to organizations that they perceive to share their values (Chatman, 1989; Kristof, 1996; Saks & Ashforth, 1997). In other words, applicants are often just as interested in choosing the best-fitting organization as they are in selecting the best job (Rynes & Cable, 2003). There is evidence that organizational attributes such as size, values, culture, and pay systems are all associated with fit perceptions (Rynes & Cable, 2003).

There are various ways in which P–O fit can be measured. Objective measures of P–O fit refer to "an individual's actual, or measured, values congruence with an organization, whereas subjective P–O fit refers to the level of perceived values congruence" (Dineen, Ash, & Noe, 2002. p. 724). Another way to measure this construct is by assessing perceived fit, which is done by asking people to describe themselves and the target organization on a variety of dimensions. The descriptions that are generated are then used to calculate a fit index (Verquer, Beehr, & Wagner, 2003). Some authors have suggested that subjective measures of P–O fit are better than measures of objective and perceived fit (Pfieffelmann, Wagner, & Libkuman, 2010; Rynes & Cable, 2003; Verquer et al., 2003).

Empirically, P–O fit is important because it is predictive of outcomes that include organizational attraction, organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and turnover (Arthur, Bell, Villado, & Doverspike, 2006; Judge & Cable, 1997;

O'Reilly, Chatman, & Cladwell, 1991; Turban & Keon, 1993). Likewise, in a meta-analysis exploring predictors of applicant attraction, P–O fit emerged as a strong predictor across various stages of the recruitment process (Uggerslev et al., 2012).

A P–O fit approach to recruitment suggests that people use the information they receive during the recruitment process to assess their fit with a particular organization. Potential applicants who perceive a better fit will likely be more attracted to an organization than people who perceive a weaker fit (Rau & Hyland, 2003). Empirical support for this approach can be found in the literature. The results of a study in which the authors manipulated the level of P–O fit feedback that participants received revealed that there was a significant positive relationship between the level of fit information that was provided and participants' perceptions of organizational attractiveness (Dineen et al., 2002). Likewise, at least two teams of authors have found that individuals with a high need for achievement prefer individually oriented reward systems versus organizationally oriented reward systems (Bretz, Ash, & Dreher, 1989; Turban & Keon, 1993).

In addition to the direct effects associated with P–O fit, there is evidence that this construct mediates recruitment-related relationships. Roberson et al. (2005), for example, found that P–O fit mediated the relationship between levels of job ad specificity and application intentions. Similarly, Judge and Cable (1997) found that subjective P–O fit mediated the relationship between objective P–O fit and organizational attraction.

Recruitment Methods

Organizations use various techniques to recruit potential applicants. Examples include job advertisements, employee referrals, recruiters, site visits, and career pages on corporate web sites. These methods are discussed below. The impact that these strategies have on recruiting minority applicants will be discussed later in the paper.

Job advertisements. Job advertisements are a common recruitment method used by organizations. One of the issues associated with this method is that organizations are somewhat limited in the amount of job-related information they can present in print ads. The literature suggests that the amount of information given in a job ad is associated with perceptions of ad credibility and attractiveness of the job (Allen et al., 2007; Allen, Van Scotter, & Otondo, 2004; Barber & Roehling, 1993). This method is also ineffective when organizations are interested in recruiting people who are not looking for a job (Breaugh, 2008). Finally, if organizations choose to use this method, they should remember that geographically focused advertisements tend to produce better results than blanket advertisements (Rafaeli, Hadomi, & Simons, 2005).

Employee referrals. The use of employee referrals is another recruitment method that organizations have used. There is some evidence that this method is especially effective if organizations are worried about voluntary turnover (Kirnan, Farley, & Geisinger, 1989; Zottoli & Wanous, 2000). A possible explanation for this is that people who are referred by existing employees may have a better understanding of the job and its requirements (Breaugh, 2008). The literature also suggests that people who are referred by current employees are more likely to receive job offers than candidates who are recruited by other methods (Breaugh, Greising, Taggart, & Chen, 2003; Fernandez & Weinberg, 1997). When discussing this recruitment method, it is important to note that Yakubovich and Lup (2006) found that there was a difference in the quality of incumbents' referrals as a function of their job performance; specifically, the referrals from high performers were of higher quality than the referrals from lower performing employees. Despite this finding, there is sufficient reason to believe that, overall, potential employees who are referred by job incumbents often have strong credentials and perform well on the job (Breaugh, 2008, 2013; Castilla, 2005).

Recruiters. Organizations also use recruiters to help develop their applicant pools. Applicant–recruiter similarity was one of the first aspects of this method that received attention in the literature. While the findings on this topic are mixed, the general consensus is that demographic differences between applicants and recruiters seem to have little impact on applicants' attitudes and behaviors (Breaugh, 2013; Rynes & Cable, 2003). There is evidence, however, that recruiter behavior is important. In a meta-analysis, Chapman et al. (2005) found that there is a relationship between applicants' rating of recruiter behavior and the applicants' perceptions of job attractiveness and acceptance intentions. Likewise, Connerley and Rynes (1997) found a main effect for recruiter experience such that applicants had better impressions of recruiters who had more job experience than recruiters who had less job experience. Interestingly, Connerley (1997) found nonsignificant results for recruiter experience in a study published around the same time.

Given the contradictory findings regarding this recruitment method, Breaugh (2008) has suggested that there are other types of recruiter differences that might be important. For example, he suggested that organizations might wish to consider the type of recruiter that they use (i.e., corporate recruiter versus other types of employees); specifically, he suggested that employees are likely to have more job-relevant information that they can share with potential recruits.

Site visits. Compared to the literature regarding the other recruitment methods that have been discussed, the literature exploring site visits is limited (Breaugh, 2008, 2013). The studies that have been published suggest that the ways in which applicants are treated during site visits and whether they have the opportunity to interact with high-status employees influences their perceptions of host organizations (Boswell et al., 2003; Rynes et al., 1991). There is also evidence that the likability of the site-visit host, especially when the host is someone with whom the recruit might eventually work, and the site-visit arrangements have an impact on recruits' perceptions of the host organization (Boswell et al., 2003; Turban, Campion, & Eyring, 1995).

Corporate web sites. As a result of advances in modern technology, web sites have become an important means by which to recruit potential job applicants (Cappelli, 2001; Williamson et al., 2003). In an analysis of the web sites of Fortune 100 companies, one researcher found that 94% of firms had a career page on their web sites (Lee, 2005).

Compared to traditional recruitment methods, the benefits of using web-based recruitment include reduced costs, unlimited space to provide information about the job and the organization, and the ability to communicate with people from disparate geographical locations (Allen et al., 2007; Braddy, Meade, & Kroustalis, 2006; Breaugh, 2008; Cober, Brown, Keeping, & Levy, 2004; van Birgelen, Wetzels, & van Dolen, 2008; Williamson et al., 2003). Allen et al. (2007) posited that some organizations intentionally use their web sites to provide information that potential applicants can use to assess P–O fit. One of the down sides to using web-based recruitment, especially during times of high unemployment, is that organizations might receive applicants from numerous people who are not qualified to fill open positions (Dineen, Ling, Ash, & DelVecchio, 2007).

Various aspects of web-based recruitment have been examined in the literature. In a study examining the relationships among firms' reputations, attributes of firms' web sites, and organizational attraction, Williamson, King, Lepak, and Sarma (2010) found a three-way interaction among firms' reputations, the amount of information provided on web sites, and site vividness such that web site vividness did not have an impact on attraction toward firms with poor reputations. Web site vividness was, however, influential for firms with positive reputations when the firms' web sites conveyed little information (Williamson et al., 2010). Similarly, other researchers have found that the level of information provided on web sites, site aesthetics, and site navigability are related to outcomes such as satisfaction with web searchers and job pursuit intentions (Cober et al., 2004; Feldman & Klaas, 2002; Williamson et al., 2003). Finally, van Birgelen et al. (2008) found that attraction toward organizations mediated the relationship between web site attitudes and job pursuit intentions.

Targeted Recruitment

In addition to selecting from among various recruitment techniques, organizations can also choose to focus their attention on a particular group of potential applicants. One of the benefits of targeted recruitment is bringing "job openings to the attention of individuals who are likely to be attracted to what a position offers" (Breaugh, 2008, p. 112).

Organizations often use targeted recruiting to facilitate workforce diversity. They might do this by using minority recruiters, including EEO statements and information about affirmative action programs in recruitment materials, and depicting demographically heterogeneous employees on recruitment brochures and web sites (Avery, 2003; Kim & Gelfand, 2003; McKay & Avery, 2006; Young, Place, Rinehart, Jury, & Baits, 1997). Interestingly, there is some evidence that targeted recruitment does not have a detrimental effect on nonminorities' perceptions of organizational attractiveness (Greening & Turban, 2000).

Minority recruiters. Organizations might choose to use minority recruiters to attract demographically diverse applicants. Given the findings in the literature, however, this might not be necessary. When examining the impact of recruiter gender, for example, Turban and Dougherty (1992) found that men had higher valence perceptions (i.e., were more attracted to the job) when the recruiter was male; women, though, had similar valence perceptions regardless of recruiter gender. Likewise Thomas and Wise (1999) found that recruits gave less weight to recruiter characteristics than to job characteristics, organization characteristics, and the existence of diversity programs when making judgments about organizational attraction. Finally, in their 2005 meta-analysis, Chapman et al. concluded that recruiter gender did not have a significant impact on potential employees' job pursuit or acceptance intentions or their perceptions of organizational attraction.

Diversity statements. Many organizations target minority recruits by including diversity statements (i.e., EEO statements or information about affirmative action programs) in their recruitment materials. In one study, Kim and Gelfand (2003) reported that students who had higher rates of ethnic identity reacted more favorably to job advertisements that contained EEO statements then to job advertisements that did not. Additional studies have also found that minority applicants are more attracted to firms that advertise their EEO status and that use affirmative action policies in selection, training, and retention decisions (Highhouse, Stierwalt, Bachiochi, Elder, & Fisher, 1999; McNab & Johnston, 2002; Slaughter, Sinar, & Bachiochi, 2002).

Similarly, there is work suggesting that information about affirmative action programs draws favorable reactions from students who can benefit from these policies (McKay & Avery, 2006). Slaughter, Bulger, and Bachiochi (2005) provided a slightly more nuanced view of this finding. When using a sample of Black engineering students, the authors found that perceptions of affirmative action programs depended on how the programs were framed. Specifically, the authors found that a "preferential treatment" frame was perceived as being less fair than an "affirmative action recruitment effort" frame.

It is worth nothing that there are some contradictory findings in the literature regarding the effectiveness of diversity statements. Goldberg and Allen (2008), for example, found that the use of diversity statements was not related to participants' attitudes toward organizations.

Job advertisements. Research indicates that there are effective ways in which organizations can use job advertisements to attract minority applicants. Avery et al. (2004), for example, found that including pictures of minorities in recruitment materials increased attraction perceptions among Blacks and Latinos/Latinas. Depicting racial minorities in supervisory positions may strengthen this effect (Avery, 2003).

Rationale

Despite the attention that has been given to targeted recruitment as a means by which to develop a diverse workforce, there remains a gap in the literature. A majority of the existing studies have focused on recruitment strategies targeted toward individuals whose minority status is visible (e.g., gender, race, age). There is little work exploring targeted recruitment among individuals whose minority status is not immediately obvious (e.g., creed, chronic health conditions, sexual orientation). The primary goal of this study, therefore, is to respond to the calls to address this gap in the literature (e.g., Breaugh, 2008; Lindsey et al., 2013) by examining the effectiveness of various recruitment strategies directed toward members of the LGBT community. The secondary goal of this study is to further develop the recruitment literature by exploring how web sites can best be used to recruit potential job applicants (Lyons & Marler, 2011; Williamson et al., 2010). From a more practical perspective, this study will help identify recruitment strategies that organizations can use to encourage workforce diversity.

Statement of Hypotheses and Research Question

Hypothesis I: There is a main effect for recruitment strategy such that job postings targeted toward a specific minority population (i.e., members of the LGBT community) elicit higher levels of subjective P–O fit than non-targeted job advertisements.

Hypothesis II: There is a main effect for recruitment strategy such that job postings targeted toward a specific minority population (i.e., members of the LGBT community) elicit higher levels of organizational attraction than non-targeted job advertisements.

Research Question: Is one of the experimental manipulations more effective than the other?

Methods

Participants

The demographic characteristics of the LGBT population within the United States are relatively unknown (Blair, 1999). Many individuals, for example, do not self-identify as members of this population until after they have navigated aspects of the coming-out process (Eliason & Schope, 2007; Meyer &

Wilson, 2009). Even after people self-identify as LGBT, some may choose not to come out publicly; there are still areas in the country where sexual minorities are stigmatized (Meyer & Wilson, 2009). Another complication is that people vary in regards to the terms that they use to self-identify. One female, for example, might prefer the term *lesbian*, while another might prefer the term *queer*.

Finally, LGBT identity can be operationalized in more than one way, including sexual identity, sexual behavior, and attraction (Meyer & Wilson, 2009; Sells, 2007). While there is often overlap among these operationalizations, this is not guaranteed. For example, a man who self-identifies as gay might not engage in sexual behavior with other men. As a result of these issues, people who study LGBT-related topics often use convenience samples rather than true probability samples (Meyer & Wilson, 2009). This approach was taken for the present study. In terms of operationalization, the sexual-identity approach was used.

To recruit participants for this study, I contacted LGBT organizations across the country (see Appendices A and B); I identified these organizations by entering search terms such as "LGBT organizations AND Chicago" into Google. Examples of the organizations I contacted included LGBT community centers, local chapters of the LGBT Chamber of Commerce, and college and university LGBT student groups. I asked these organizations whether or not they would be willing to either post information about the study to their social media pages or send information about the study to people on their email distribution lists.

When planning this research, I hoped to gather data from 945 adult participants. This number was obtained by running an analysis in G*Power, inputting an alpha of .05 and a small effect size. Once I began recruiting participants, however, I realized it would be difficult to achieve my original goal in a timely manner. At the organizational level, many of the organizations that I contacted did not respond to my request. Some of the organizations that did respond opted not to assist with participant recruitment. Organizations generally provided three different reasons for this decision: Some organizations thought that assisting with recruitment would violate the privacy of their members, some organizations felt that they receive too many research requests and do not want to inundate their members with research requests, and some organizations felt that this project did not align with their specific goals. At the individual level, people may have felt that there was little incentive to participate in this study.

As a result of my initial experiences recruiting participants, I asked my committee members to allow me to cease data collection before having obtained data from 945 participants. After approximately 400 people completed the study, I ran some initial analyses to test my hypotheses. The results were statistically significant and in the hypothesized direction. Partially as a result of these findings, my committee members allowed me to cease data collection early.

Data for this study were collected from 612 participants; not all the data, however, were usable. After participants read the informed-consent information, they were asked whether or not they consented to participate in the study. Five participants did not consent, and five participants did not answer the question at all; the data from these ten participants were omitted from further analyses. Participants were also asked to indicate their sexual orientation. Eleven people identified as straight; the data from these participants were also excluded. To assess whether or not the participants had read the content of the experimental stimuli, participants were asked to answer two manipulation-check questions (i.e., there were two questions for each experimental condition). Data from 171 participants were omitted because the participants incorrectly answered one or both of the questions; 30 participants were omitted from the control condition; 34 participants were omitted from the domestic-partner-benefits condition, and 107 participants were omitted from the community-partnerships condition. This discrepancy will be discussed later. Finally, 88 participants were omitted from the study because they did not answer any of the survey questions.

Of the participants who were retained for this study, the mean age was 33.97 years (*SD* = 11.85). Of the final sample, 65.06% identified as Caucasian, 3.93% identified as Black, 6.63% identified as Hispanic or Latino/Latina, 3.01% identified as Asian or Pacific Islander, 1.81% identified as Native American or Alaskan Native, and 24.1% selected the "Other" option. Note that the percentages do not add up to 100; not all participants provided information about their ethnicity. A majority of the participants, 69.38% identified as lesbian or gay; 30.62% identified as bisexual.

The gender, ethnicity, and sexual orientation breakdown by experimental condition is reported in Table 1. Generally, there was a proportionate number of participants across the three conditions (i.e., there was not a disproportionately higher number of Blacks in one condition as compared to the two other conditions). It is worth noting that there were fewer people in the community-partnerships condition as compared with the other two conditions. People failed the manipulation-check questions for this condition as a disproportionate rate; this will be discussed later in the paper.

On average, participants reported spending 17.72 (*SD* = 10.73) hours per week on the Internet. When asked how many hours per week they work on average, 11.15% of the participants reported that they were unemployed, 11.15% reported that they worked fewer than 20 hours per week, 30.00% reported working between 21 and 40 hours per week, 38.46% reported working between 41 and 60 hours per week, and 9.24% reported working 61 hours per week or more.

Information about participants' employment status and education is reported in Tables 2 and 3. Regarding employment status, 1.16% of the participants reported that they were out of work and not looking for work, 3.09% reported that they were out of work and looking for work, 4.25% reported that they were self-employed, 21.62% reported that they were hourly employees, 42.27% reported that they were salaried employees, 22.39% reported that they were students, .39% reported that they were members of the military, 1.93% reported that they were retired, .77% reported that they were unable to work, and 1.93% selected the "Other" option. Finally, regarding obtained level of education, 1.54% of the participants reported completing grade school, 3.85% reported completing high school or a GED program, 13.46% reported that they had some college experience, less than 1% reported completing trade or technical school, 2.31% reported obtaining an Associate's degree, 28.46% reported

Table 1

Demographic Breakdown by Condition

Demographic Variables	Control	Domestic Partner	Community Partnerships	Total
Caucasian	88	85	43	216
Black	2	5	5	12
Hispanic, Latino/a	5	7	3	15
Asian, Pacific Islander	4	3	1	8
Native American, Alaskan Native	0	0	1	1
Other	4	1	2	7
Male	37	45	23	105
Female	65	56	31	152
Gay, Lesbian	71	73	35	179
Bisexual	31	28	20	79

Table 2

Employment Status

Employment Status	*N*	Percent of Participants
Out of work, not looking for work	3	1.16
Out of work, looking for work	8	3.09
Self-employed	11	4.25
Hourly	56	21.62
Salaried	110	42.27
Students	58	22.39
Military	1	0.39
Retired	5	1.93
Unable to work	2	0.77
Other	5	1.93

Note. $N = 259$. Percents do not add up to 100 because not all participants reported their employment status.

Table 3

Education Status

Level of Education Completed	*N*	Percent of Participants
Grade school	4	1.54
High school or GED	10	3.85
Some college	35	13.46
Trade School	1	0.39
Associate's degree	6	2.31
Bachelor's degree	74	28.46
Graduate or professional school	130	50.00

Note. $N = 260$. Percents do not add up to 100 because not all participants reported their education status.

obtaining a Bachelor's degree, and 50.00% reported that they completed a graduate program or professional school.

Materials

This survey was administered through Qualtrics, an on-line survey platform. The first page of the survey was comprised of the informed consent information (see Appendix C). On the second page of the survey (see Appendix D), participants were asked to imagine that they were looking for a job with a marketing firm and were told that they would be given a few moments to read a job ad that one might find on a company's web site.

Conditions. After the first two pages of the survey were displayed, the question-randomization feature in Qualtrics was used to randomly assign participants to one of the three research conditions. In all three conditions, the participants were provided with information about Creative Marketing, Inc., a fictitious organization that was developed for this study. The manipulations that were used are described below. To avoid potential confounds, the information that was presented to participants did not include references to job titles or Creative Marketing's geographic location (Avery et al., 2004).

Control condition. The stimulus for the control condition was an image of Creative Marketing's home page. The page included information about the history and mission of the company, the benefits offered to employees (e.g., insurance, 401k), and a list of non-descript community organizations that the company supports (e.g., The Margaret Nolan Foundation, Operation Holding Hands; see Appendix E).

Domestic-partner-benefits condition. The stimulus for the domestic-partner-benefits condition was an image of Creative Marketing's home page. The page included the same information that was included in the control condition. In addition, domestic-partner benefits was listed as one of the benefits offered to employees (see Appendix F).

Community-partnerships condition. The stimulus for the community-partnerships condition was an image of Creative Marketing's home page. The page included the same information that was included in the control condition. In addition, an identifiable LGBT organization (i.e., the fictitious Metropolitan Gay and Lesbian Caucus) was listed as one of the community organizations that the company supports (see Appendix G).

It is worth noting that during the first two weeks the survey was active, the wrong image was used for this condition. Rather than using the image associated with the community-partnerships condition, Qualtrics displayed the image associated with the control condition. This error, which was a result of a programming issue on my part, helps explain why a disproportionately higher number of people failed the manipulation-check questions for this condition as compared to the other two conditions.

Measures. This study used multiple scales to measure the dependent variables and the potential covariates.

Manipulation check. To assess the effectiveness of the experimental manipulation, the participants were asked to complete two true/false questions per condition (see Appendix H). For example, participants who were assigned to the control condition were asked whether Creative Marketing partners with local philanthropic organizations such as the Margaret Nolan Foundation. Participants who were assigned to the domestic-partner-benefits condition were asked whether Creative Marketing offers domestic partner benefits to its employees. The correct answer to all six questions was *true.* For each question, the data were coded such that participants who answered the question correctly were provided with a value of 1, and participants who answered the question incorrectly were given a value of 2. As has been noted, participants who answered any of the questions incorrectly were removed from further analyses.

Subjective P–O fit. To assess perceptions of P–O fit, the participants were asked to complete a 3-item measure adapted from Judge and Cable (1997; α = .83). Participants were asked to use a 7-point scale (1 = *Disagree Very Strongly* and 7 = *Agree Very Strongly*) to rate their agreement with each statement. As an example, one item stated, "My values, goals, and personality match or fit with the values and goals of Creative Marketing, Inc." One item had to be reverse scored before the data were analyzed. A scale score was calculated by averaging the participants' responses to the items (see Appendix I for the full scale).

Organizational attraction. To assess participants' level of organizational attraction, they were asked to complete an adapted version of the 5-item General Attractiveness subscale of the Organization Attraction Scale (Highhouse, Lievens, & Sinar, 2003). Participants were instructed to use a 7-point scale (1 = *Disagree Very Strongly* and 7 = *Agree Very Strongly*) to rate their agreement with each of the five items. As an example, one item stated, "If I were a job applicant, this company would be attractive to me as a place of employment." One item had to be reverse scored before the data were analyzed. The score for this subscale, which had an alpha of .92, was calculated by averaging the participants' responses to the items (see Appendix J for the full subscale).

Sexual-orientation identity. To assess the strength of the participants' sexual-orientation identity, they were asked to complete a modified version of the 5-item Identity Centrality subscale of the Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Identity Scale (Mohr & Kendra, 2011). Participants were instructed to use a 7-point scale (1 = *Disagree Very Strongly*; 7 = *Agree Very Strongly*) to rate their agreement with each of the five items. As an example, one item stated, "My sexual orientation is NOT a significant part of who I am." This item was reverse scored before the data were analyzed. The score for this subscale, which had an alpha of .83, was calculated by averaging participants' responses to the items (see Appendix K for the full scale).

Avery and McKay (2006) suggested that the efficacy of target recruitment material depends on the salience of job seekers' various identities. Kim and Gelfand (2003) reported data supporting this; specifically, they found that ethnic identity moderated participants' inferences about both an organization and their job-pursuit intentions. Thus, this scale was used as a covariate when testing the hypotheses.

Efficacy of web-based job searches. To measure participants' perceptions of the effectiveness of the Internet as a job-search tool, they were asked to complete a modified version of a 4-item measure developed by Williamson et al.

(2003), who found that job seekers' beliefs about the usefulness of the Internet to find a job predicted the job seekers' level of organizational attraction. As such, this scale was used as a covariate when testing the hypotheses. Participants were asked to use a 7-point scale (1 = *Disagree Very Strongly*; 7 = *Agree Very Strongly*) to rate their agreement with each of the four statements. As an example, one item stated, "The Internet is an effective way to look for a job." The score for this scale, which had an alpha of .88) was determined by averaging participants' responses across the items (see Appendix L for the full scale).

Qualitative questionnaire. To further develop the literature regarding recruitment strategies among LGBT adults, participants were invited to provide qualitative data about the issues that they consider when assessing whether organizations are LGBT-friendly (see Appendix M).

Demographic questionnaire. Participants were asked to provide responses to a number of demographic questions. For example, participants were asked to provide the year in which they were born, as well as identify their ethnicity, sex, and sexual orientation. In addition, participants were asked to identify the number of hours they work during the average week, their employment status, and their level of education (see Appendix N for the full questionnaire).

Procedure

As has been mentioned, participants for this study were recruited by contacting LGBT-friendly organizations across the country. During the initial contact, organizations were asked to consider either posting information about the study on their social media pages or forwarding information about the study to the people on their email distribution lists.

After the participants clicked on the study link, they were presented with information regarding informed consent. Then they were asked to imagine that they were applying for a job and that has part of their job search, they had run across an ad for Creative Marketing, Inc. The question-randomization feature in Qualtrics was used to assign participants to one of the three conditions. Participants were encouraged to spend a few moments reviewing the job information that corresponded with their condition. After they had done so, the participants were asked to complete the manipulation-check questions. Next, the participants were directed to the scales that assessed their perceptions of P–O fit and organizational attraction.

Next, the participants were directed to the items that measured the control variables (i.e., sexual-orientation identity, efficacy of web-based job searches). Then, the participants were directed to the open-ended questionnaire, after which they were directed to the demographic questionnaire. Next, the participants were directed to a debriefing page (see Appendix O). After the participants read the debriefing page, they were redirected to another Qualtrics survey, where they were invited to enter a raffle for one of three $25 gift cards; all that the participants had to do to enter the raffle was provide an email address. To help protect participant anonymity, the email addresses were not collected as part of the main survey.

Results

The scale reliabilities, means, standard deviations, and the correlations among the study variables are reported in Table 4. In general, the scales demonstrated acceptable reliability. In terms of normality, there was only one instance for which the value for the skewness and kurtosis statistics was greater than 1; the kurtosis statistic for the organizational attraction scale was 1.01. The scale means and standard deviations by condition are reported in Table 5.

Assumptions of ANCOVA

Analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) was the appropriate statistical technique for testing the study hypotheses. Before I ran the ANCOVA models, however, I examined whether the data confirmed to the two assumptions associated with ANCOVA, namely independence between the independent variable (IV) and the planned covariates, and homogeneity of regression slopes.

First, I ran an analysis of variance (ANOVA) model, using the experimental condition as the IV and the sexual-orientation identity (SOI) scale as the dependent variable (DV). The results were not significant, $F(2, 262) = 1.66$, $p = .19$, indicating that the assumption regarding independence had been met. I ran another model, using experimental condition as the IV and the scale assessing participants' effectiveness of the Internet as a job-search tool (EIJ) as the DV. Again, the results were not significant, $F(2, 262) = .58$, $p = .56$, suggesting that the assumption regarding independence had been met for this covariate.

Table 4

Scale Reliability and Variable Means, Standard Deviations, and Correlations

Variable	*M*	*SD*	1	2	3	4
1. P–O fit	4.99	.93	.83			
2. Organizational attraction	5.21	1.05	.72**	.92		
3. Sexual-orientation identity	5.39	.97	.12	.05	.83	
4. Efficacy of Internet as job-search tool	6.06	.88	.18*	.22**	-.01	.88

Note. *N* varies from 262 to 287 due to missing values. All scales used a 7-point scale. Scale reliability as Cronbach's alpha is presented in the diagonal. *M* = mean. *SD* = standard deviation. * = $p < .01$. ** = $p < .001$.

Table 5

Variable Means and Standard Deviations by Condition

Condition		*M*	*SD*
Control	P–O fit	4.50	0.76
	Organizational attraction	4.64	1.03
	Sexual-orientation identity	5.25	0.99
	Internet as a job-search tool	5.99	0.89
Domestic-partnership	P–O fit	5.26	0.89
	Organizational attraction	554	0.90
	Sexual-orientation identity	5.48	0.88
	Internet as a job-search tool	6.11	0.86
Community partnership	P–O fit	5.40	0.90
	Organizational attraction	5.67	0.88
	Sexual-orientation identity	5.47	1.06
	Internet as a job-search tool	6.10	0.93

Note. All scales used a 7-point scale.

Second, I tested the assumption regarding the homogeneity of regression slopes for both potential covariates. I ran a customized ANCOVA model, using experimental condition as the IV, P–O fit as the DV, and the SOI scale as the covariate. The interaction between experimental condition and the SOI scale was not significant, $F(2, 257) = .73$, $p = .48$, suggesting that the assumption had not been violated. I ran another ANCOVA model, this time using the EIJ scale as the covariate. For this model, the interaction between experimental condition and the covariate was significant, $F(2, 257) = 3.63$, $p = .03$, suggesting that the assumption had been violated. Finally, I ran two additional models, using organizational attraction as the DV. In the first model, in which the SOI scale was used as the covariate, the interaction term was not significant, $F(2, 256) = .13$, $p = .88$, suggesting that the assumption had been met. Likewise, the interaction term was not significant, $F(2, 256) = 2.14$, $p = .12$, in the model that used the EIJ scale as the covariate. Based on these results, I decided not to use the EIJ scale as a covariate when using P–O fit as the DV.

Hypothesis Testing

The first hypothesis stated that there is a main effect for recruitment strategy, such that targeted recruitment elicits higher levels of P–O fit than nontargeted recruitment. I tested this hypothesis by running a series of ANCOVA and ANOVA models. In the first model, I used experimental condition as the IV, P–O fit as the DV, and the SOI scale as the covariate. The results of Levene's test were not significant, $F(2, 260) = .87$, $p = .42$, suggesting that the assumption regarding homogeneity of variance had not been violated. While the overall model was significant, $F(2, 259) = 29.34$, $p < .001$, the covariate was not significant, $F(1, 259) = 1.64$, $p = .20$. Thus, I decided to run an ANOVA model. Again, the results of Levene's test were not significant, $F(2, 302) = 1.05$, $p = .35$. In support of the first hypothesis, there was a significant main effect for experimental condition, $F(2, 302) = 34.53$, $p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .19$.

Planned comparisons revealed that participants assigned to the control condition reported lower levels of P–O fit ($M = 4.50$, $SE = .08$) than participants assigned to either the domestic-partner-benefits condition ($M = 5.26$, $SE = .08$) or the community-partnerships condition ($M = 5.40$, $SE = .11$). Contrast results suggested that the differences between the control condition and the two experimental conditions were significant. Specifically, when comparing mean scores for participants in the control condition to participants in the domestic-partner-benefits condition, the contrast estimate (contrast estimate = .76, $SE = .11$, $p < .05$) was significant. Likewise, when comparing the mean scores for participants in the control condition to participants in the community-partnerships condition, the contrast estimate (contrast estimate = .90, $SE = .13$, $p < .05$) was significant.

The second hypothesis stated that there is a main effect for recruitment strategy, such that targeted recruiting elicits higher levels of organizational attraction than nontargeted recruitment. This hypothesis was tested by using a series of ANCOVA models. In the first model, experimental condition was used as the IV and organizational attraction was used as the DV; both covariates were included in the model. The results of Levene's test were significant, $F(2, 259) =$

3.32, $p = .04$, indicating that the assumption regarding homogeneity of variance had been violated. While the overall model was significant, $F(2, 257) = 30.40$, $p < .001$, the SOI scale was not a significant covariate, $F(1, 257) = .05$, $p = .83$. Thus, I reran the model, excluding the SOI scale as a covariate. Again, the results of Levene's test were significant, $F(2, 259) = 3.30$, $p = .04$. Given this finding, I then ran an ANOVA model (i.e., a model that did not include the EIJ scale as a covariate), using the Brown-Forsythe correction. Since the results were significant, $F(2, 250.92) = 35.12$, $p < .001$), I decided to continue my analysis of the ANCOVA results. In support of the second hypothesis, the overall model was significant, $F(2, 258) = 31.11$, $p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .19$. EIJ was also a significant covariate, $F(1, 258) = 11.88$, $p < .001$.

Planned comparisons revealed that when controlling for people's perceptions regarding the usefulness of the Internet as a job-search tool, participants assigned to the experimental condition reported lower levels of organizational attraction ($M = 4.67$, $SE = .09$) than participants assigned to either the domestic-partner-benefits condition ($M = 5.56$, $SE = .09$) or the community-partnerships condition ($M = 5.67$, $SE = .13$). When comparing the mean score for participants assigned to the control condition versus the mean score of participants assigned to the domestic-partner-benefits condition, the contrast estimate (contrast estimate = .76, $SE = .11$, $p < .05$) was significant. Similarly, when comparing the mean score for participants assigned to the control condition verses the score for participants assigned to the community-partnerships condition, the contrast estimate (contrast estimate = .90, *SE* = .13, $p < .05$) was significant.

Research Question

One of the goals of this research was to assess whether some targeted recruitment strategies are more effective than others. To assess this, I ran an ANOVA for each DV, and I interpreted the results of the Games-Howell post hot test. The Games-Howell test is appropriate when the sample sizes are unequal, as was the case in this study (Field, 2013). The first model, which used experimental condition as the IV and P–O fit as the DV, was significant, $F(2, 302) = 34.53$, $p < .001$. While the mean differences between the control condition and the domestic-partner-benefits condition (mean difference = -.76, *SE* = .11, $p < .05$) and between the control condition and the community-partnerships condition (mean difference = .90, *SE* = .13, $p < .05$) were significant, the mean difference between the domestic-partner-benefits condition and the community-partnerships condition was not significant (mean difference = .14, *SE* = .14, $p > .05$).

In the second model, I used organizational attraction as the DV. Overall, the model was significant, $F(2, 286) = 35.12$, $p < .001$. Similar to the first model, the results of the post hoc tests indicated that the mean differences between the control condition and the domestic-partner-benefits condition (mean difference = -.91, *SE* = .13, $p < .05$) and between the control condition and the community-partnerships condition (mean difference = -1.03, *SE* = .15, $p < .05$) were significant and that the mean difference between the targeted-recruitment positions was not significant (mean difference = -.12, $SE = .14$, $p > .05$). Overall, the results indicate that, statistically, both approaches to targeted recruitment were equally effective in eliciting higher levels of perceived P–O fit and organizational attraction.

Supplemental Analyses

Possible moderators. Out of curiosity, I was interested in whether there was an interaction between experimental condition and both sex and sexual orientation. I first ran a series of ANOVAs, using P–O fit as the DV. The first model included both condition and sex as the IVs. The interaction term was not significant, $F(2, 249) = .28$, $p > .05$. The second model included sex and sexual orientation as the IVs. Similarly, the interaction term was not significant, $F(2, 250) = 1.91$, $p > .05$. Next, I ran a series of ANCOVA models, using organizational attraction as the DV. The first model included experimental condition and sex as the IVs and the EIJ scale as the covariate. The interaction term was not significant, $F(2, 247) = .29$, $p > .05$. Finally, I ran an ANCCOVA model testing the interaction between experimental condition and sexual orientation; the interaction term was not significant, $F2, 248) = .19$, $p > .05$. Together, the results suggested that perceptions of P–O fit and organizational attraction were not moderated by participants' sex or sexual orientation.

Qualitative data. During part of the survey, participants were given an opportunity to provide information about the type of information they look for when assessing whether or not an organization is LGBT friendly. When asked specifically about the information they look for on organizations' web sites, participants reported looking for information about EEO and discrimination policies and whether sexual orientation and gender identity are specifically mentioned. Similarly, people reported looking for information about benefits, such as domestic partner benefits, leave for adoptive parents, and in-house resource groups for LGBT employees. Participants also suggested that the language companies use on their web sites is important. Participants reported feeling positively toward the use of gender-neutral language and the use of the term *partner* rather than *spouse* when referring to health benefits. People reported feeling negatively toward the use of terms such as *traditional* and *conservative*, especially when such terms were used in mission and values statements. Participants also indicated that the images organizations use on their web sites are important; specifically participants reported feeling positively toward images that included females and racial minorities as well as toward images traditionally associated with the LGBT community (e.g., rainbows, pink triangles). Finally, some participants indicated that they were less likely to apply to work for companies that partner with conservative organizations.

Participants were also asked to provide information about the other sources of information they use (i.e., beyond company web sites) to assess how LGBT-friendly an organization is. A high number of participants reported relying on word-of-mouth recommendations from friends, colleagues, and, when possible, organizational incumbents. Participants also reported conducting Internet searchers for information about companies (e.g., news stories, whether the company has been involved in litigation against the Affordable Care Act or women's reproductive rights) and their leaders (i.e., information about leaders' political donations). Some participants suggested that they had more favorable perceptions of companies that advertised in LGBT-friendly publications. Finally, participants reported using information from third parities, such as the Human Rights Campaign's Corporate Equality Index, an annual publication that lists LGBT-friendly companies based on the companies' self-reported policies and practices.

Discussion

Findings

While there are mixed results regarding the effectiveness of workforce diversity, organizations attend to this issue for many reasons. Modern workforces are inherently more diverse, organizations are concerned about litigation associated with diverse treatment and diverse impact, and diverse workforces can attract new customers. Organizations can foster diversity by developing pools of diverse, yet qualified, applicants.

In this study, there were two statistically significant main effects. First, participants assigned to the control condition reported lower levels of P–O fit than participants assigned to either of the targeted-recruiting conditions. Second, when controlling for participants' perceptions of the Internet as a job-search tool, participants assigned to the control condition reported lower levels of organizational attraction than participants assigned to either of the two targeted-recruiting conditions. Additional analyses indicated that the two targeted-recruiting conditions were equally effective in eliciting higher levels of perceived

P–O fit and organizational attraction. It is worth mentioning, however, that the effect sizes for both main effects were relatively small (i.e., less than .20; Cohen, 1992). These findings suggest that organizations can use targeted recruitment practices to increase potential job applicants' perceptions of P–O fit and organizational attraction, both of which are related to job-pursuit intentions (Chapman, Uggerslev, Carroll, Piasentin, & Jones, 2005).

There is some evidence that the strength of people's minority identity moderates their perceptions about organizations (Kim & Gelfand, 2003). For this study, the strength of participants' sexual-orientation identity was measured and used as a possible covariate in the main-effects analyses. Interestingly, the variable was not a significant covariate for perceptions of either P–O fit or organizational attraction. A possible explanation for this finding is that the sample was comprised of people who were actively involved in at least one LGBT organization. Thus, it is possible that the strength of the participants' sexual-orientation identities were similar, which may have reduced the variance associated with this variable. Consistent with existing research (Williamson et al., 2003), participants' perceptions of the effectiveness of the Internet as a job-search tool was a statistically significant covariate for P–O fit and organizational attraction.

Practical Implications

While the effect sizes for the main effects were small, the results suggest that organizations can use targeted recruitment strategies effectively. Organizations that want to foster a more diverse workforce should, if applicable, consider including information about domestic partner benefits and community partnerships in their recruiting materials. Organizations should not, however, engage in these practices disingenuously. Companies that only pay lip service to workforce diversity (i.e., that do not foster a strong diversity climate) may experience increased turnover (McKay & Avery, 2005).

Participants also provided qualitative comments regarding issues they consider when assessing whether or not an organization is LGBT friendly. Many of the comments aligned with the two issues addressed in this study (i.e., information about domestic partner benefits, information about community partnerships). The qualitative data provided by the participants, however, suggests that there are other practices in which organizations can engage. First, organizations can develop and provide information about their anti-discrimination policies, especially if the policies provide information about protection for employees who are sexual minorities. Second, organizations can be attentive to the language that they use. Specifically, organizations may want to consider using language that is gender neutral and using the term *domestic partner* rather than spouse when providing information about health benefits. At the same time, organizations may want to avoid using terms such as *traditional* or *conservative.* Third, organizations can use images that depict a diverse workforce. Participants suggested that images displaying women and ethnic minorities serve as a helpful signal of an organization's commitment to diversity. Finally, organizations that want to foster a more diverse workforce may want to consider advertising in publications aimed at LGBT individuals.

Limitations

Limitations to this study may inhibit its generalizability. First, a convenience sample rather than a probability sample was used to test the hypotheses. As has been mentioned, there is no list or registry for the LGBT population, which makes it difficult to conduct research using a true probability sample. The participants for this study were recruited through LGBT organizations. Including the perceptions of people not actively involved in the LGBT community may have attenuated the effect sizes that were found. Similarly, the results may have been affected by a volunteer bias; there may have been important differences between the participants who chose to participate in the study and those that did not.

Second, the data from a large number of people assigned to the community-partnerships condition had to be excluded from the analyses because the participants failed one or more of the manipulation-check questions. This was likely the result of a programming error on the part of the experimenter. During the first two weeks the study was active on Qualtrics, participants assigned to the community-partnerships condition first saw the job ad associated with the condition. However, on the web page that included the manipulation-check questions, the participants also saw the job ad associated with the control condition. While it is possible that the data from the participants who failed the manipulation-check questions would not have significantly altered the findings, I thought it more prudent to omit the data. The trade off associated with this decision was a reduction in power.

Third, usable data were collected from fewer participants than suggested by a G*Power analysis. This limitation is, in part, associated with the first limitation: The number of LGBT organizations in the United States is finite. Related to this is the fact that the organizations are not part of an umbrella organization and do not have an organizing structure. There is not, for example, a definitive directory of such organizations. In addition, many organizations that were contacted appeared to be not-for-profits. As is sometimes true of organizations in this sector, once the leaders' energy or funding is depleted, the organization may cease to exist. In fact, some of the organizations I found on line were no longer active, and the contact for some organizations was outdated. Together, these issues had a negative impact on my ability to recruit the desired number of participants.

Finally, the results of this study cannot be generalized to the transgender community. While the goal of this research was to explore the effectiveness of targeted recruitment strategies among sexual minorities, participants were only asked to identify their sex and their sexual orientation; they were not asked to identify their gender or whether or not they were transgender. Thus, it is impossible to identify whether or not the sample was comprised of transgender individuals, nor is it possible to run any analyses that explore the effectiveness of recruitment targeted toward the members of this community.

Future Research

While there is research suggesting that recruitment targeted toward women and racial minorities does not have a negative impact on Caucasian men's perceptions of organizations (Greening & Turban, 2000), no one has explored whether the use of recruitment practices targeted toward sexual minorities has an impact on straight people's perceptions of companies. This is something that can be addressed in future research.

The findings of this study suggest that both methods of targeted recruiting (i.e., including information about domestic partner benefits, including information about community partnerships) were equally effective in eliciting higher levels of perceived P–O fit and organizational attraction among the participants. Further research should explore whether the strategies are more or less effective than a general approach to recruiting, such as including an EEO statement in a job ad. Similarly, future research could explore the impact of using various types of strategies, such as the use of words and images, simultaneously.

Finally, additional research can explore the best way to recruit members of the transgender community. While researchers are beginning to explore the relationships between transgender employees and workplace issues (for examples, see Brewster, Velez, Mennicke, & Tebbe, 2014; Connell, 2010; Davis, 2009) most of this work is descriptive or qualitative in nature. Given the difficulty associated with sampling this population, it may be necessary for researchers to develop recommendations based on a qualitative methodology.

Summary

The results of this study suggest that job ads including information about domestic partner benefits and community partnerships were effective in electing higher levels of perceived P–O fit and organizational attraction among a sample of LGBT adults. These findings suggest that organizations can effectively use targeted recruitment to foster workforce diversity. Additional research may help identify other targeted recruitment strategies that can be used effectively, particularly among transgender individuals.

References

Age Discrimination in Employment Act, 29 USC. §§ 621–634 (1967).

Aiman-Smith, L., Bauer, T. N., & Cable, D. M. (2001). Are you attracted? Do you intend to pursue? A recruiting policy-capturing study. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 16,* 219–237.

Allen, D. G., Mahto, R. V., & Otondo, R. F. (2007). Web-based recruitment: Effects of information, organizational brand, and attitudes toward a web site on applicant attraction. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 92,* 1696–1708.

Allen, D. G., Van Scotter, J. R., & Otondo, R. F. (2004). Recruitment communication media: Impact on prehire outcomes. *Personnel Psychology, 57,* 143–171.

Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, Pub L. No. 101-336, § 2, 104 Stat. 328 (1990).

Anand, R., & Winters, M. F. (2008). A retrospective view of corporate diversity training from 1964 to the present. *Academy of Management Learning and Education, 7,* 356–372.

Arthur, W., Jr., Bell, S. T., Villado, A. J., & Doverspike, D. (2006). The use of person-organization fit in employment decision making: An assessment of its criterion-related validity. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 91,* 786–801.

Avery, D. R. (2003). Reactions to diversity in recruitment advertising: Are differences black and white? *Journal of Applied Psychology, 88,* 672–679.

Avery, D. R., Hernandez, M., & Hebl, M. R. (2004). Who's watching the race? Racial salience in recruitment advertising. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 34,* 146–161.

Avery, D. R., & McKay, P. F. (2006). Target practice: An organizational impression management approach to attracting minority and female job applicants. *Personnel Psychology, 59,* 157–187.

Avery, D. R., McKay, P. F., Wilson, D. C., & Tonidandel, S. (2007). Unequal attendance: The relationships between race, organizational diversity cues, and absenteeism. *Personnel Psychology, 60,* 875–902.

Barber, A. E. (1998). *Recruiting employees: Individual and organizational perspectives.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Barber, A. E., & Roehling, M. V. (1993). Job postings and the decision to interview: A verbal protocol analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 78,* 845–856.

Baruch, Y. (2006). Career development in organizations and beyond: Balancing traditional and contemporary viewpoints. *Human Resource Management Review, 16,* 125–138.

Bauer, T. N., Erdogan, B., Liden, R. C., & Wayne, S. J. (2006). A longitudinal study of the moderating role of extraversion: Leader–member exchange, performance, and turnover during new executive development. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 91,* 298–310.

Beatty, J. E., & Kirby, S. L. (2006). Beyond the legal environment: How stigma influences invisible identity groups in the workplace. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal, 18,* 29–44.

Behrend, T. S., Baker, B. A., & Thompson, L. F. (2009). Effects of pro-environmental recruiting messages: The role of organizational reputation. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 24,* 341–350.

Blair, J. (1999). A probability sample of urban gay males: The tale of two-phase adaptive sampling. *Journal of Sex Research, 36,* 39–44.

Boswell, W. R., Roehling, M. V., LePine, M. A., & Moynihan, L. M. (2003). Individual job-choice decisions and the impact of job attributes and recruitment practices: A longitudinal field study. *Human Resource Management, 42,* 23–37.

Boudreau, J. W., & Rynes, S. L. (1985). Role of recruitment in staffing utility analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 70,* 354–366.

Braddy, P. W., Meade, A. W., & Kroustalis, C. M. (2006). Organizational recruitment website effects on viewers' perceptions of organizational culture. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 20,* 525–543.

Braddy, P. W., Meade, A. W., & Kroustalis, C. M. (2008). Online recruiting: The effects of organizational familiarity, website usability, and website attractiveness on viewers' impressions of organizations. *Computers in Human Behavior, 24,* 2992–3001.

Breaugh, J. A. (2008). Employee recruitment: Current knowledge and important areas for future research. *Human Resource Management Review, 18,* 103–118.

Breaugh, J. A. (2013). Employee recruitment. *Annual Review of Psychology, 64,* 389–416.

Breaugh, J. A., Greising, L. A., Taggart, J. W., & Chen, H. (2003). The relationship of recruiting sources and pre-hire outcomes: Examination of yield ratios and applicant quality. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 33,* 2267–2287.

Breaugh, J. A., & Starke, M. (2000). Research on employee recruitment: So many studies, so many remaining questions. *Journal of Management, 26,* 405–434.

Bretz, R. D., Jr., Ash, R. A., & Dreher, G. F. (1989). Do people make the place? An examination of the attraction-selection-attrition hypothesis. *Personnel Psychology, 42,* 561–581.

Brewster, M. E., Velez, B. L., Mennicke, A., & Tebbe, E. (2014). Voices from beyond: A thematic content analysis of transgender employees' workplace experiences. *Psychology of Sexual Orientation and Gender Diversity, 1,* 159–169.

Button, S. B. (2001). Organizational efforts to affirm sexual diversity: A cross-level examination. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86,* 17–28.

Cable, D. M., & Turban, D. B. (2003). The value of organizational reputation in the recruitment context: A brand-equity perspective. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 33,* 2244–2266.

Cappelli, P. (2001). Making the most of on-line recruiting. *Harvard Business Review, 79*(3), 139–146.

Castilla, E. J. (2005). Social networks and employee performance in a call center. *American Journal of Sociology, 110,* 1243–1283.

Chapman, D. S., Uggerslev, K. L., Carroll, S. A., Piasentin, K. A., & Jones, D. A. (2005). Applicant attraction to organizations and job choice: A meta-analytic review of the correlates of recruiting outcomes. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 90,* 928–944.

Chatman, J. A. (1989). Improving interactional organizational research: A model of person-organization fit. *Academy of Management Review, 14,* 333–349.

Civil Rights Act of 1964, § 7, 42 USC § 2000e et seq (1964).

Cober, R. T., Brown, D. J., Keeping, L. M., & Levy, P. E. (2004). Recruitment on the net: How do organizational web site characteristics influence applicant attraction? *Journal of Management, 30,* 623–646.

Cober, R. T., Brown, D. J., Levy, L. M., Keeping, L. M., & Cober, A. B. (2003). Organizational web sites: Web site content and style as determinants of organizational attraction. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 11,* 158–169.

Cohen, J. (1992). A power primer. *Psychological Bulletin, 112,* 155–159.

Connell, C. (2010). Doing, undoing, or redoing gender? Learning from the workplace experiences of transpeople. *Gender and Society, 24,* 31–55.

Connelly, B. L., Certo, S. T., Ireland, R. D., & Reutzel, C. R. (2011). Signaling theory: A review and assessment. *Journal of Management, 37,* 39–67.

Connerley, M. L. (1997). The influence of training on perceptions of recruiters' interpersonal skills and effectiveness. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 70,* 259–272.

Connerley, M. L., & Rynes, S. L. (1997). The influence of recruiter characteristics and organizational recruitment support on perceived recruiter effectiveness: Views from applicants and recruiters. *Human Relations, 50,* 1563–1586.

Cox, T., & Blake, S. (1991). Managing cultural diversity: Implications for organizational competitiveness. *Academy of Management Executive, 5,* 45–56.

Davis, D. (2009). Transgender issues in the workplace: HRD's newest challenge/opportunity. *Advances in Developing Human Resources, 11,* 109–120.

Dess, G. G., & Shaw, J. D. (2001). Voluntary turnover, social capital, and organizational performance. *The Academy of Management Review, 26,* 446–456.

Dineen, B. R., Ash, S. R., & Noe, R. A. (2002). A web of applicant attraction: Person-organization fit in the context of web-based recruitment. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87,* 723–734.

Dineen, B. R., Ling, J., Ash, S. R., & DelVecchio, D. (2007). Aesthetic properties and message customization: Navigating the dark side of web recruitment. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 92,* 356–372.

Doverspike, D., Taylor, M. A., Shultz, K. S., & McKay, P. F. (2000). Responding to the challenge of a changing workforce: Recruiting nontraditional demographic groups. *Public Personnel Management, 29,* 445–457.

Eliason, M. J., & Schope, R. (2007). Shifting sands or solid foundation? Lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender identity formation. In I. H. Meyer & M. E. Northridge (Eds.), *The health of sexual minorities: Public health perspectives on lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender populations* (pp. 3–26). New York, NY: Springer.

Evans, W. R., & Davis, W. D. (2011). An examination of perceived corporate citizenship, job applicant attraction, and CSR work role definition. *Business and Society, 50,* 456–480.

Feldman, D. C., & Klaas, B. S. (2002). Internet job hunting: A field study of applicant experiences with on-line recruiting. *Human Resource Management, 41,* 175–192.

Fernandez, R. M., & Weinberg, N. (1997). Sifting and sorting: Personal contacts and hiring in a retail bank. *American Sociological Review, 62,* 883–903.

Field, A. (2013). *Discovering statistics using IBM SPSS Statistics* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Gilbert, J. A., Stead, B. A., & Ivancevich, J. M. (1999). Diversity management: A new organizational paradigm. *Journal of Business Ethics, 21,* 61–76.

Goldberg, C. B., & Allen, D. G. (2008). Black and white and read all over: Race differences in reactions to recruitment web sites. *Human Resource Management, 47,* 217–236.

Goltz, S. M., & Giannantonio, C. M. (1995). Recruiter friendliness and attraction to the job: The mediating role of inferences about the organization. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 46,* 109–118.

Green, T. K. (2003). Discrimination in workplace dynamics: Toward a structural account of disparate treatment theory. *Harvard Civil Rights-Civil Liberties Law Review, 91,* 91–157.

Greening, D. W., & Turban, D. B. (2000). Corporate social performance as a competitive advantage in attracting a quality workforce. *Business and Society, 39,* 254–280.

Griffeth, R. W., Hom, P. W., & Gaertner, S. (2000). A meta-analysis of antecedents and correlates of employee turnover: Update, moderator tests, and research implications for the next millennium. *Journal of Management, 26,* 463–488.

Griffith, K. H., & Hebl, M. R. (2002). The disclosure dilemma for gay men and lesbians: "Coming out" at work. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87,* 1191–1199.

Highhouse, S. Lievens, F., & Sinar, E. F. (2003). Measuring attraction to organizations. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 63,* 986–1001.

Highhouse, S., Stierwalt, S. L., Bachiochi, P., Elder, A. E., & Fisher, G. (1999). Effects of advertised human resource management practices on attraction of African American applicants. *Personnel Psychology, 52,* 425–442.

Huffman, A. H., Watrous-Rodriguez, K. M., & King, E. B. (2008). Supporting a diverse workforce: What type of support is most meaningful for lesbian and gay employees? *Human Resource Management, 47,* 237–253.

Human Rights Campaign Foundation (2009). *The state of the workplace for lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender Americans: 2007–2008.* Retrieved from Human Rights Campaign website: http://www.hrc.org/files/assets /resources/HRC_Foundation_State_of_the_Workplace_2007-2008.pdf

Jayne, M. E. A., & Dipboye, R. L. (2004). Leveraging diversity to improve business performance: Research findings and recommendations for organizations. *Human Resource Management, 43,* 409–424.

Judge, T. A., & Cable, D. M. (1997). Applicant personality, organizational culture, and organization attraction. *Personnel Psychology, 50,* 359–394.

Kim, S. S., & Gelfand, M. J. (2003). The influence of ethnic identity on perceptions of organizational recruitment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 63,* 396–416.

Kirnan, J. P., Farley, J. A., & Geisinger, K. F. (1989). The relationship between recruiting source, applicant quality, and hire performance: An analysis by sex, ethnicity, and age. *Personnel Psychology, 42,* 293–308.

Kochan, T., Bezrukova, K., Ely, R., Jackson, S., Joshi, A., Jehn, K., Leonard, J., Levine, D., & Thomas, D. (2003). The effects of diversity on business performance: Report of the diversity research network. *Human Resource Management, 42,* 3–21.

Kristof, A. L. (1996). Person-organization fit: An integrative review of its conceptualizations, measurement, and implications. *Personnel Psychology, 49,* 1–49.

Lee. I. (2005). The evolution of e-recruiting: A content analysis of Fortune 100 career web sites. *Journal of Electronic Commerce in Organizations, 3,* 57–68.

Lindsey, A., King, E., McCausland, T., Jones, K., & Dunleavy, E. (2013). What we know and don't: Eradicating employment discrimination 50 years after the Civil Rights Act. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology: Perspectives on Science and Practice, 6,* 391–413.

Lyons, B. D., & Marler, J. H. (2011). Got image? Examining organizational image in web recruitment. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 26,* 58–76.

Ma, R., & Allen, D. G. (2009). Recruiting across cultures: A value-based model of recruitment. *Human Resource Management Review, 19,* 334–346.

Mannix, E., & Neale, M. A. (2005). What difference makes a difference? The promise and reality of diverse teams in organizations. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest, 6,* 31–55.

McCuiston, V. E., Wooldridge, B. R., & Pierce, C. K. (2004). Leading the diverse workforce: Profit, prospects and progress. *The Leadership and Organization Development Journal, 25,* 73–92.

McKay, P. F., & Avery, D. R. (2005). Warning! Diversity recruitment could backfire. *Journal of Management Inquiry, 14,* 330–336.

McKay, P. F., & Avery, D. R. (2006). What has race got to do with it? Unraveling the role of racioethnicity in job seekers' reactions to site visits. *Personnel Psychology, 59,* 395–429.

McNab, S. M., & Johnston, L. (2002). The impact of equal employment opportunity statements in job advertisements on applicants' perceptions of organisations. *Australian Journal of Psychology, 54,* 105–109.

Meyer, I. H., & Wilson, P. A. (2009). Sampling lesbian, gay, and bisexual populations. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 56,* 23–31.

Mohr, J. J., & Kendra, M. S. (2011). Revision and extension of a multidimensional measure of sexual minority identity: The Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Identity Scale. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 58,* 234–245.

O'Reilly, C. A., III., Chatman, J., & Caldwell, D. F. (1991). People and organizational culture: A profile comparison approach to assessing person-organization fit. *Academy of Management Journal. 34,* 487–516.

Pfieffelmann, B., Wagner, S. H., & Libkuman, T. (2010). Recruiting on corporate web sites: Perceptions of fit and attraction. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 18,* 40–47.

Ployhart, R. E. (2006). Staffing in the 21st century: New challenges and strategic opportunities. *Journal of Management, 32,* 868–897.

Rafaeli, A., Hadomi, O., & Simons, T. (2005). Recruiting through advertising or employee referrals: Costs, yields, and the effects of geographic focus. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 14,* 355–366.

Ragins, B. R., & Cornwell, J. M. (2001). Pink triangles: Antecedents and consequences of perceived workplace discrimination against gay and lesbian employees. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86,* 1244–1261.

Ragins, B. R., Singh, R., & Cornwell, J. M. (2007). Making the invisible visible: Fear and disclosure of sexual orientation at work. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 92,* 1103–1118.

Rau, B. L., & Hyland, M. M. (2003). Corporate teamwork and diversity statements in college recruitment brochures: Effects on attraction. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 33,* 2465–2492.

Richard, O. C. (2000). Racial diversity, business strategy, and firm performance: A resource-based view. *Academy of Management Journal, 43,* 164–177.

Richard, O., McMillan, A., Chadwick, K., & Dwyer, S. (2003). Employing an innovation strategy in racially diverse workforces: Effects on firm performance. *Group and Organization Management, 28,* 107–126.

Roberson, Q. M., Collins, C. J., & Oreg, S. (2005). The effects of recruitment message specificity on applicant attraction to organizations. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 19,* 319–339.

Roberson, Q. M., & Stevens, C. K. (2006). Making sense of diversity in the workplace: Organizational justice and language abstraction in employees' accounts of diversity-related incidents. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 91,* 379–391.

Robinson, G., & Dechant, K. (1997). Building a business case for diversity. *Academy of Management Executive, 11*(3)*,* 21–31.

Rynes, S. L. (1991). Recruitment, job choice, and post-hire consequences: A call for new research directions. In. M. D. Dunnette & L. M Hough (Eds.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (2nd ed., Vol. 2, pp. 399–444) Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Rynes, S. L., & Barber, A. E. (1990). Applicant attraction strategies: An organizational perspective. *Academy of Management Review, 15,* 286–310.

Rynes, S. L., Bretz, R. D., Jr., & Gerhart, B. (1991). The importance of recruitment in job choice: A different way of looking. *Personnel Psychology, 44,* 487–521.

Rynes, S. L., & Cable, D. M. (2003). Recruitment research in the twenty-first century. In I. B. Weiner (Series Ed.), *Handbook of Psychology: Vol. 12. Industrial and organizational psychology* (pp. 55–76).

Rynes, S. L., & Miller, H. E. (1983). Recruiter and job influences on candidates for employment. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 68,* 147–154.

Sacco, J. M., & Schmitt, N. (2005). A dynamic multilevel model of demographic diversity and misfit effects. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 90,* 203–231.

Saks, A. M., & Ashforth, B. E. (1997). Organizational socialization: Making sense of the past and present as a prologue for the future. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 51,* 234–279.

Schneider, B. (1987). The people make the place. *Personnel Psychology, 40,* 437–453.

Sell, R. (2007). Defining and measuring sexual orientation for research. In I. H. Meyer & M. E. Northridge (Eds.), *The health of sexual minorities: Public health perspectives on lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender populations* (pp. 355–374). New York, NY: Springer.

Slaughter, J. E., Bulger, C. A., & Bachiochi, P D. (2005). Black applicants' reactions to affirmative action plans: Influence of perceived procedural fairness, anticipated stigmatization, and anticipated remediation of previous injustice. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 35,* 2437–2472.

Slaughter, J. E., Sinar, E. F., & Bachiochi, P. D. (2002). Black applicants' reactions to affirmative action plans: Effects of plan content and previous experience with discrimination. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87,* 333–344.

Spence, M. (1973). Job market signaling. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics, 87,* 355–374.

Thomas, R. R., Jr. (1990). From affirmative action to affirming diversity. *Harvard Business Review, 68*, 479–492.

Thomas, K. M., & Wise, P. G. (1999). Organizational attractiveness and individual differences: Are diverse applicants attracted by different factors? *Journal of Business and Psychology, 13,* 375–390.

Thompson, L. F., Braddy, P. W., & Wuensch, K. L. (2008). E-recruitment and the benefits of organizational web appeal. *Computers in Human Behavior, 24,* 2384–2398.

Turban, D. B., & Cable, D. M. (2003). Firm reputation and applicant pool characteristics. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 24,* 733–751.

Turban, D. B., Campion, J. E., & Eyring, A. R. (1995). Factors related to job acceptance decisions of college recruits. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 47,* 193–213.

Turban, D. B., & Dougherty, T. W. (1992). Influences of campus recruiting on applicant attraction to firms. *Academy of Management Journal, 35,* 739–765.

Turban, D. B., Forret, M. L., & Hendrickson, C. L. (1998). Applicant attraction to firms: Influences of organization reputation, job and organizational attributes, and recruiter behavior. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 52,* 24–44.

Turban, D. B., & Keon, T. L. (1993). Organizational attractiveness: An interactionist perspective. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 78,* 184–193.

Tziner, A., & Birati, A. (1996). Assessing employee turnover costs: A revised approach. *Human Resource Management Review, 6,* 113–122.

Uggerslev, K. A., Fassina, N. E., & Kraichy, D. (2012). Recruiting through the stages: A meta-analytic test of predictors of applicant attraction at different stages of the recruiting process. *Personnel Psychology, 65,* 597–660.

van Birgelen, M. J. H., Wetzels, M. G. M., & van Dolen, W. M. (2008). Effectiveness of corporate employment web sites: How content and form influence intentions to apply. *International Journal of Manpower, 29,* 731–751.

Van Hooft, E. A. J., Born, M. P., Taris, T. W., & Van der Flier, H. (2006). Ethnic and gender differences in applicants' decision-making processes: An application of the theory of reasoned action. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 14,* 156–165.

Velez, B. L., & Moradi, B. (2012). Workplace support, discrimination, and person-organization fit: Tests of the theory of work adjustment with LGB individuals. *Theory of Counseling Psychology, 3,* 399–407.

Verquer, M. L., Beehr, T. A., & Wagner, S. H. (2003). A meta-analysis of the relations between person-organization fit and work attitudes. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 63,* 473–489.

Watson, W. E., Kumar, K., and Michaelsen, L. K. (1993). Cultural diversity's impact on interaction process and performance: Comparing homogeneous and diverse task groups. *Academy of Management Journal, 36,* 590–602.

Williams, M. L., & Bauer, T. N. (1994). The effect of a managing diversity policy on organizational attractiveness. *Group and Organization Management, 19,* 295–308.

Williams, K. Y., & O'Reilly, C. A. (1998). Demography and diversity in organizations: A review of 40 years of research. *Research in Organizational Behavior, 20,* 77–140.

Williamson, I. O., King, J. E., Jr., Lepak, D., & Sarma, A. (2010). Firm reputation, recruitment web sites and attracting applicants. *Human Resource Management, 49,* 669–687.

Williamson, I. O., Lepak, D. P., & King, J. (2003). The effect of company recruitment web site orientation on individuals' perceptions of organizational attractiveness. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 63,* 242–263.

Wright, P., Ferris, S. P., Hiller, J. S., & Kroll, M. (1995). Competitiveness through management of diversity: Effects on stock price valuation. *Academy of Management Journal, 38,* 272–287.

Yakubovich, V., & Lup, D. (2006). Stages of the recruitment process and the referrer's performance effect. *Organization Science, 17,* 710–723.

Young, I. P., Place, A. W., Rinehart, J. S., Jury, J. C., & Baits, D. F. (1997). Teacher recruitment: A test of the similarity-attraction hypothesis for race and sex. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 33,* 86–106.

Zottoli, M. A., & Wanous, J. P. (2000). Recruitment source research: Current status and future directions. *Human Resource Management Review, 10,* 353–383.

Appendix A

Recruitment Script

My name is Dan Abben, and I am a graduate student in psychology at DePaul University. As part of my program, I am conducting a study to explore the effectiveness of web-based recruitment strategies among LGBT adults. I am calling to see if you would be willing to forward the link to this study to people who are affiliated with your organization. If you agree, I would be happy to share with you a summary of the final results of this study.

Briefly, participants will be asked to imagine that they are applying for a job, review an organization's home page, and complete a series of questionnaires that assess the participants' perceptions of the organization. In addition, the participants will be asked to provide basic demographic information as well as information about the strength of their sexual-orientation identity. The study should take approximately 15 minutes to complete. The information that people provide will be anonymous; I will not be able to identify individual participants, and people's names will not be collected.

Do you have any questions about this study?

Are you willing to forward the link?

Appendix B

Recruitment E-mail

Hello,

My name is Dan Abben, and I am a graduate student at DePaul University in Chicago. <Name of organization> agreed to forward this e-mail on my behalf.

I am conducting a study to examine the effectiveness of various web-based strategies that organizations can use to recruit new employees. I am writing to see if you would be willing to participate in this study. Briefly, you will be asked to imagine that you are applying for a job. Then you will be asked to review a fictitious company's web site and complete a series of questionnaires that assess your perception of the organization. Finally, you will be asked to provide basic demographic information.

The responses of people who choose to participate in this study will be anonymous. I will not be able to identify individual participants, and people's names will not be collected. In addition, the results will only be reported in the aggregate.

This study will take about 15 minutes to complete. As an incentive, people who choose to participate may enter a drawing for one of three gift cards, each of which is valued at $25.

If you agree to participate, please click the following link. <link>

Please note, if you have received the link to this survey more than once, please only complete it one time.

If you have any questions about the survey or if you would like more information, please contact me.

Thank you,

Dan Abben

Daniel R. Abben, M.S.

Dan Abben, Industrial-Organizational Psychology

DePaul University | dabben@depaul.edu

Appendix C

Informed Consent

ADULT CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH

Effectiveness of Web-Based Recruitment Strategies

Principal Investigator: Daniel R. Abben, Graduate Student

Institution: DePaul University, Chicago, Illinois, USA

Department (School, College): Department of Psychology, College of Science and Health

Faculty Advisor: Jane A. Halpert, Ph.D., Department of Psychology, College of Science and Health

What is the purpose of this research?
We are asking you to be in a research study because we are trying to learn more about the effectiveness of various web-based recruitment strategies. This study is being conducted by Daniel R. Abben, a graduate student at DePaul University, as a requirement to obtain his Masters degree. This research is being supervised by his faculty advisor, Jane A. Halpert, Ph.D.

We hope to include about 275 people in the research.

Why are you being asked to be in the research?
You are invited to participate in this study because you are a member of our target population: gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender adults. You must be age 18 or older to be in this study. This study is not approved for the enrollment of people under the age of 18.

What is involved in being in the research study?
If you agree to be in this study, being in the research involves imagining that you are applying for a job, reviewing an organization's home page, and completing a series of questionnaires that assess your perceptions of the organization. In addition, you will be asked to provide basic demographic information as well as information about the strength of your sexual-orientation identity.

If you choose to participate in this study, you will be randomly assigned (like the flip of a coin) to one of four groups.

How much time will this take?
This study will take about 15 minutes of your time.

Are there any risks involved in participating in this study?
Being in this study does not involve any risks other than what you would encounter in daily life. You may feel uncomfortable or embarrassed about answering certain questions. You do not have to answer any question you do not want to. There is the possibility that others may find out what you have said, but we have put protections in place to prevent this from happening.

Are there any benefits to participating in this study?
You will not personally benefit from being in this study.

We hope that what we learn will help us develop recommendations that organizations can use when establishing employee recruitment strategies geared toward members of the gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender community.

Is there any kind of payment, reimbursement or credit for being in this study?
You will be given the chance to enter a drawing for one of three gift certificates valued at $25 each. We will collect your contact information for the drawing at the end of the survey on a separate page. The contact information will be kept separately from your survey responses in order to keep your survey responses anonymous.

Can you decide not to participate?
Your participation is voluntary, which means you can choose not to participate. There will be no negative consequences, penalties, or loss of benefits if you decide not to participate or change your mind later and withdraw from the research after you begin participating.

Who will see my study information and how will the confidentiality of the information collected for the research be protected?
The research records will be kept and stored securely. Your information will be combined with information from other people taking part in the study. When we write about the study or publish a paper to share the research with other researchers, we will write about the combined information we have gathered. We will not include your name or any information that will directly identify you. We will make every effort to prevent anyone who is not on the research team from knowing that you gave us information, or what that information is. However, some people might review or copy our records that may identify you in order to make sure we are following the required rules, laws, and regulations. For example, the DePaul University Institutional Review Board and/or the Data and Safety Monitoring Board may review your information. If they look at our records, they will keep your information confidential.

Who should be contacted for more information about the research?
Before you decide whether to accept this invitation to take part in the study, please ask any questions that might come to mind now. Later, if you have questions, suggestions, concerns, or complaints about the study or you want to get

additional information or provide input about this research, you can contact the researchers: Daniel R. Abben, dabben@depaul.edu; Dr. Jane Halpert, jhalpert@depaul.edu.

This research has been reviewed and approved by the DePaul Institutional Review Board (IRB). If you have questions about your rights as a research subject you may contact Susan Loess-Perez, DePaul University's Director of Research Compliance, in the Office of Research Services at 312-362-7593 or by email at sloesspe@depaul.edu.

You may also contact DePaul's Office of Research Services if:

- Your questions, concerns, or complaints are not being answered by the research team.
- You cannot reach the research team.
- You want to talk to someone besides the research team.

You may wish to print a copy of this information to keep for your records.

In your own words, please describe the purpose of this study. <open-ended>

I consent to participate in this research. <Yes No>

Appendix D

Introductory Scenario

Imagine that you are currently looking for a job in your field of interest—marketing and communications. As part of your search, you run across the website for Creative Marketing, Inc. You will be given three minutes to review the home page for this organization. Then you will be asked to complete a series of surveys. Click "Next" when you are ready to begin.

Appendix E

Control Condition

About Us: Creative Marketing, Inc., was founded in 1997. Our mission is to help organizations develop marketing materials that tell a story. Our employees can help you develop the print, radio, or web-based ad campaign that meets your needs.

Employment Opportunities: We currently have openings for people to work on our staff. Employee benefits include two-weeks paid vacation per year and the option to participate in both a health insurance plan and a 401k.

Community Partnerships: Creative Marketing, Inc., partners with local philanthropic organizations such as the Margaret Nolan Foundation and Operation Open Hands.

Appendix F

Domestic-Partner-Benefits Condition

About Us: Creative Marketing, Inc., was founded in 1997. Our mission is to help organizations develop marketing materials that tell a story. Our employees can help you develop the print, radio, or web-based ad campaign that meets your needs.

Employment Opportunities: We currently have openings for people to work on our staff. Employee benefits include two-weeks paid vacation per year and the option to participate in both a health insurance plan and a 401k. Creative Marketing, Inc., is proud to offer domestic partner benefits to our employees and their significant others.

Community Partnerships: Creative Marketing, Inc., partners with local philanthropic organizations such as the Margaret Nolan Foundation and Operation Open Hands.

Appendix G

Community-Partnerships Condition

About Us: Creative Marketing was founded in 1997. Our mission is to help organizations develop marketing materials that tell a story. Our employees can help you develop the print, radio, or web-based ad campaign that meets your needs.

Employment Opportunities: We currently have openings for people to work on our staff. Employee benefits include two-weeks paid vacation per year and the option to participate in both a health insurance plan and a 401k.

Community Partnerships: Creative Marketing is proud to partner with local philanthropic organizations that foster diversity in our community. Organizations that we have historically supported include the Margaret Nolan Foundation, Operation Open Hands, and the Metropolitan Gay and Lesbian Caucus.

Appendix H

Manipulation Check

The amount of attention that is given to a job ad might have an impact on a potential employee's perceptions of the organization. We want to determine whether you are able to recall information about Creative Marketing, Inc. Please answer the following questions.

Control Condition

1. Employees of Creative Marketing, Inc., receive two weeks of paid vacation per year. <**True**/False>
2. Creative Marketing, Inc., partners with local philanthropic organizations such as the Margaret Nolan Foundation. <**True**/False>

Domestic-Partner-Benefits Condition

1. Creative Marketing, Inc., offers domestic partner benefits to its employees and their partners. <**True**/False>
2. Creative Marketing, Inc., partners with local philanthropic organizations such as the Margaret Nolan Foundation. <**True**/False>

Community-Partnerships Condition

1. Employees of Creative Marketing, Inc., receive two weeks of paid vacation per year. <**True**/False>

2. Creative Marketing, Inc., partners with local philanthropic organizations such as the Metropolitan Gay and Lesbian Caucus. <**True**/False>

Appendix I

Subjective P–O Fit Measure

Participants will be asked to use a 7-point scale (1 = *Disagree Very Strongly*; 7 = *Agree Very Strongly*) to complete this scale. The score will be calculated by averaging participants' responses to the items.

- My values, goals, and personality match or fit with the values and goals of this organization.
- My values and personality would prevent me from fitting in at this organization because they might be different from most of the other employees' values and personalities. [reverse score]
- I think the values and personality of this organization reflect my own values and personality.

Appendix J

General Attractiveness Subscale of the Organization Attraction Scale

Participants will be instructed to use a 7-point scale (1 = *Disagree Very Strongly*; 7 = *Agree Very Strongly*) to rate their agreement with each of the five items. The score for this subscale, which has a reported alpha of .88, will be calculated by averaging participants' responses to the items

- If I was a job applicant, this company would be a good place to work.
- If I was a job applicant, I would not be interested in this company except as a last resort. [reverse score]
- If I was a job applicant, this company would be attractive to me as a place of employment.
- If I was a job applicant, I would be interested in learning more about this company.
- If I was a job applicant, a job with this company would be very appealing to me.

Appendix K

Identity Centrality Subscale of the Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Identity Scale

Participants will be instructed to use a 7-point scale (1 = *Disagree Very Strongly*; 7 = *Agree Very Strongly*) to rate their agreement with the following items. The score for this subscale, which has a reported alpha of .84 to .86, will be calculated by averaging participants' responses to the items.

- My sexual orientation is NOT a significant part of who I am. [reverse score]
- My sexual orientation is a central part of my identity.
- To understand who I am as a person, you have to know that I am a member of the gay, lesbian, bisexual community.
- Being a gay, lesbian, or bisexual person is a very important aspect of my life.
- I believe being gay, lesbian, or bisexual is an important part of me.
- I feel that it is important to work at a company that is LGBT affirming in its policies and practices.

Appendix L

Efficacy of Web-Based Job Searches

Participants will be asked to use a 7-point scale (1 = *Disagree Very Strongly*; 7 = *Agree Very Strongly*) to rate their agreement with the following statements. The score for this scale, which has a reported alpha of .92, will be created by averaging participants' responses to the items.

- The use of the Internet increases my chance of finding the perfect job.
- The use of the Internet increases the effectiveness of my job search.
- The Internet is a useful way to look for a job.
- The Internet is an efficient way to look for a job.

Appendix M

Qualitative Questionnaire

Participants will be asked to answer open-ended questions about signals they consider when assessing whether organizations are LGBT-friendly.

- What do you look for on organizations' web sites or in job advertisements to help you consider whether the organization is LGBT-friendly? <open-ended question>
- Besides web sites and job ads, what other sources of information do you use to help you assess how LGBT-friendly a particular organization is? <open-ended question>

Appendix N

Demographic Questionnaire

- What is your sex? <Male/Female/Other (Please identify)>
- What is your age? <open-ended>
- Please identify your ethnicity. Please check all that apply. <Caucasian, Black or African American, Hispanic or Latino/Latina, Asian or Pacific Islander, Native American, Other (Please describe)>
- Please identify your sexual orientation by using the following scale. (1 = *Straight*; 5 = *Bisexual*; 10 = *Gay or Lesbian*)
- Please indicate the number of hours you work during an average week. (1: Not employed; 2: Work fewer than 20 hours per week; 3: Work between 11 and 40 hours per week; 4: Work between 41 and 60 hours per week; 5: Work more than 60 hours per week.)>
- Please identify your employment status. <Unemployed; Hourly worker; Salaried worker; Other (Please describe)>
- Excluding work-related responsibilities, approximately how many hours per week do you spend on the Internet? <open-ended>

Appendix O

Debriefing Page

Thank you for participating in this research. In this study, you were asked to evaluate the impact that a job ad had on your level of attraction to a fictitious organization. Each person who agreed to participate in this study viewed one of three different job ads. Using three different ads will allow me to examine whether various employee recruitment strategies are more or less effective than other strategies.

As stated earlier, all of your responses are absolutely confidential. In return, we ask that you honor our confidentiality. Please do not tell others about the details of this study. If the other participants are aware of the details of this study, it will bias their responses.

We are very grateful for your participation in this research. If you have any questions or concerns, or if you'd like to receive a copy of the results once the study is complete, you may contact the primary researcher, Daniel R. Abben, at dabben@depaul.edu. If you have questions about your rights as a research subject, you may contact Susan Loess-Perez, DePaul University's Director of Research Protections at 312-362-7593 or by email at sloesspe@depaul.edu.

If you would like to learn more about this topic, the following articles are a good place to begin.

Breaugh, J. A. (2013). Employee recruitment. *Annual Review of Psychology, 64,* 389–416.

Chapman, D. S., Uggerslev, K. L., Carroll, S. A., Piasentin, K. A., & Jones, D. A. (2005). Applicant attraction to organizations and job choice: A meta-analytic review of the correlates of recruiting outcomes. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 90,* 928–944.

Lindsey, A., King, E., Dunleavy, E., McCausland, T., & Jones, K. (2013). What we know and don't: Eradicating employment discrimination 50 years after the Civil Rights Act. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology: Perspectives on Science and Practice, 6,* 391–413.

Thank you for your participation in this study!