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ABSTRACT

This study identifies key factors driving the organizational adoption of Social Recruiting (SR) technologies, such as LinkedIn, Facebook, and Twitter. The Technology, Organization and Environment (TOE) framework, as an initial exploratory approach, is used to identify underlying factors of new technology adoption. Qualitative evidence collected from twelve Australian firms serves to specifically categorise key determinants of the organizational adoption of social
recruiting technologies. It is found that, apart from several technology, organization and environment factors that significantly influence the organizational decision-making with reference to social recruiting, top management support is seen as imperative for successful adoption of recruiting technologies. Formalisation, comprehensiveness, and strategic orientation of organizational human resource departments are closely linked to adoption of social recruiting at the firm level. In addition, job applicants’ readiness and local success stories have driven firms to adopt social recruiting technologies. The study extends and modifies the TOE model to provide the theoretical foundations of social recruiting in the context of Australian organizations and help human resource professionals and practitioners to gain a better understanding of key drivers of organizational social recruiting.
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1. Introduction

In recent times, Social Network Websites (SNWs) such as LinkedIn, Facebook, and Twitter, have become increasingly popular among organizations and human resource (HR) practitioners and professionals as a way to identify, attract, and recruit potential employees. Among many SNWs, most individual users relied on Facebook (1.4 billion); LinkedIn (347 million) and Twitter (288 million) as their social network platform, as compared to less known recruitment tools such as Google+ (about 300 million), and Flikr (32 million) (The Statistics Portal 2015). A report by the Society for Human Resource Management (SHRM 2013) found that 77 per cent of participating companies in the United States have been using SNWs for recruitment purposes and 11 per cent of companies have plans to adopt these technologies in the
near future. According to Madia (2011), SNWs such as LinkedIn are not only the next generation of internet-based recruitment tools, but also a new pipeline for sourcing talent.

The main reason to use SNWs is the vast amount of information available on these platforms (Kluemper and Rosen 2009). Such information can be used to assess the potential fit between prospective employees' attitudes and personality (Faliagka, Tsakalidis, and Tzimas 2012) on one hand, and job requirements, organization values and culture on the other (Strohmeier 2013). Additionally, there are several other benefits for organizations to adopt SNWs. At the functional level, business-oriented SNWs may enable organizations to aggressively seek out potential applicants (Jansen, Jansen, and Spink 2005), engage in target recruiting, reach narrowly defined candidate types and niche skills, and source passive candidates (Davison, Maraist, and Bing 2011, Madia 2011, Tyagi and Tyagi 2012, Nikolaou 2014). At the strategic level, SNWs can transform the recruitment function by providing a platform to design and implement Candidate Relationship Management (CaRM) initiatives (Ollington, Gibb, and Harcourt 2013). Moreover, SNWs may enhance the strategic orientation of human resource management (HRM) functions, such as enhancing employers' reputation and image, communicating extant employees' experience, and attracting prospective employees (Bondarouk et al. 2013).

Despite the growing recognition of the benefits of social recruiting (SR) technologies, little theoretical discussion and empirical studies have been devoted to examining the organizational adoption of this recruitment method (Jansen et al. 2005, Roth et al. in press). The dearth of studies in the area calls for more theory-driven and scholarly research to investigate key facets of a successful organizational-level adoption.

Several prior studies have focused the adoption of other types of human resource
information technologies in organizations. For example, Bondarouk and Ruël (2013) studied several contextual factors facilitating electronic human resource management (e-HRM) usage and value creation. Troshani, Jerram, and Hill (2011) explored contextual factors to predict the organizational adoption of HRIS in the Australian public sector. The outcomes of these studies help improve our general understanding of issues related to new technology adoption. However, we believe that revolutionary properties and the unique structure of social recruiting technologies may have made the findings of these studies inapplicable to the Australian social recruiting context. As argued by Parry and Wilson (2009), today’s internet-based recruitment technologies are developed and mature enough to be studied as a single universal entity. Parry and Wilson (2009) further advised that future research should produce a distinct set of adoption drivers with particular attention on assessing the effectiveness of specific types of recruitment technologies.

Therefore, the current study adopts a qualitative approach to initially apply Tornatzky and Fleischer’s (1990) Technology, Organization and Environment (TOE) framework with aims to examine key adoption drivers among 12 Australian firms. The in-depth case analysis helps induce several variables to extend and modify the original TOE framework. The model developed in the current study not only serves to add new insights on the main factors that would influence organizational decision-making for social recruiting technology adoption, but also provides a bolster of empirical testing of the TOE model in new contexts.

2. Literature Review

2.1. Definition and issues of social recruiting

Social recruiting (SR) is defined as the process of sourcing, attracting, and initiating primary contacts with potential job candidates through the use of social network websites
(SNWs), such as LinkedIn, Facebook and Twitter (SHRM 2013). Extant literature on social recruiting tends to address several issues at individual, organizational, and societal levels. At the individual level, job applicants’ positive and negative reactions towards organizations’ use of SNWs were studied (Madia 2011). There was also a concern on information validity of applicants’ social profile exhibited on SNWs that might distort hiring decisions (Kluemper and Rosen 2009). At the organizational level, opportunities and challenges of using SNWs for human resource departments were examined, with a special focus on evaluation of SNWs’ effects on managing employer-employee relationships (Tyagi and Tyagi 2012), as well as using SNWs as attraction and screening tools (Ollington et al. 2013, Faliagka et al. 2012). At the societal level, concerns about legal, ethical, and privacy issues of using social recruiting technologies were extensively discussed (see Davison et al. 2011, Black, Stone, and Johnson 2015, Hugl 2011).

Nevertheless, research concerning the adoption drivers of social recruiting at the organizational level is limited. Adopting social recruiting technologies can be a challenging task for organizations, as it could necessitate an additional resource allocation (Jansen et al. 2005), yet it could be a ‘game changer’ as it could provide a new pipeline of talent that creates a sustainable competitive advantage (Madia 2011). Contemporary organizations and HRM professionals and practitioners need to understand key factors influencing the organizational adoption of social recruiting technologies so they are better prepared to meet the challenges of new technology applications.

2.2. Theoretical background and research framework

One of the most common streams of research in information systems literature is the understanding and examination of potential determinants of innovative adoption of new technology. It is argued that innovation arises from interactions among technological,
organizational, and environmental factors and that these interactive elements have direct influences on adoption decisions, as stated in Tornatzky and Fleischer’s (1990) generic TOE framework. Compared to other competing theories, such as diffusion of innovations (Rogers, 1995); technology acceptance model (Davis 1989); and unified theory of acceptance and use of technology (Venkatesh et al. 2003), the TOE framework is unique as it takes a multidimensional approach to fully explain the decision-making process of technology adoption in organizations (Lian, Yen, and Wang 2014).

The TOE framework has been tested in several prior studies in different contexts (see Zhu, Kraemer, and Xu 2006, Troshani et al. 2011, Chan, Chong, and Zhou 2012, Duan, Deng, and Corbitt 2012). For instance, Zhu et al. (2006) used the TOE model to test technological, organizational, and environmental contexts as prominent antecedents of the three-stage technology assimilation process, that is initiation $\rightarrow$ adoption $\rightarrow$ routinization. Their study results from testing a data set of 1,857 firms from 10 countries show that competition was the key factor for initiation and adoption, because of the perceived benefits of technology usage, and that large firms had more resources for new technology adoption. However, the differences rest in technology readiness to facilitate assimilation in developing and developed countries. This is because different economic environments would have shaped the assimilation stages of technology innovation. Thus, the findings offer insights into understanding of how technology innovation is influenced by different contextual factors. Nonetheless, the results are inconclusive about various effects of factors across different stages and in different environments.

In contrast, Duan et al.’s (2012) study of e-market adoption among 900 Australian small-and-medium sized enterprises (SMEs) with a structural equation modelling (SEM) based on the TOE framework showed that perceived benefit, size, and readiness were not significantly related
to the adoption of e-market in Australian SMEs, but top management support served as the most critical determinant of technology adoption. Similar to Zhu et al. (2006), Duan et al. (2012) examined a range of contextual factors such as perceived benefit, organization and technology readiness, management support, external and regulatory pressure, and firm size, grounded in the TOE framework.

Troshani et al. (2011) employed a qualitative approach and isolated the TOE factors that would influence the organizational adoption of human resource information systems (HRIS) among 11 Australian public sector organizations. Their findings show that organizational fit between adopted HRIS and business processes is most important for new technology adoption. In addition, management commitment and human capability and broader environmental factors, including regulatory compliance, were also found to have a deep impact on the success of HRIS adoption.

While Zhu et al. (2006) emphasise stage differences of the technology adoption and assimilation process caused by the external economic environment, Troshani et al. (2011), and to some extent Duan et al. (2012), see the importance of organizational internal factors, such as technology capability and management deliberation that would influence the effective adoption of new technology. Chan et al. (2012) believe that new technology adoption involves a multi-stage diffusion process; they critique the insufficiency of using the TOE framework alone, especially in the context of e-collaboration implementation by organizations in the supply chain and logistics business. Thus, they proposed an integration technology adoption model based not only on the TOE framework, but also on the inter-organizational relationships (IOR), and unified theory of acceptance and use of technology (UTAUT). Whilst the proposed model is
comprehensive, research effort to operationalize and test such a complex model is deemed to be challenging.

In summary, the outcomes of the empirical studies tend to derive different sets of factors that pertain to each technology, organization, and environmental context. Such results appear understandable. As argued by Baker (2012), a unique set of contextual factors should be developed when studying each specific technology or domain. Likewise, we expect that there would be a different set of contextual factors guiding organizations’ decision making in adopting social recruiting. Given the lack of a theoretical framework underpinning social recruiting, the more commonly adopted TOE model (see Figure 1) would provide a starting point to explore adoption drivers, hence it is initially used for the current study to identify key determinants of the social recruiting technologies adopted by Australian organizations.

INSERT FIGURE 1 ABOUT HERE

In Figure 1, the technological context refers to both new technologies and those technologies already in use inside the organization. It describes how characteristics of technology can limit or facilitate the process of technology adoption (i.e., social recruiting in the current study). The most significant technology attributes in predicting technology adoption were relative advantages (benefits), complexity and compatibility (Tornatzky and Fleischer 1990). Relative advantages are defined as “the degree to which an innovation is perceived as being better than the idea it supersedes” (Rogers 2003, 229). Thus, the term really denotes “perceived benefits”, representing the possible gains organizations expect to achieve upon adopting a new technology. Taking staff recruiting using social media as an example, perceived benefits of social recruiting may be to reduce costs of job advertisements in the traditional media outlets, such as newspaper, radio, or TV.
Complexity is defined by Rogers (2003) as “the degree to which an innovation is perceived as relatively difficult to understand and use” (p. 257). For instance, if organizational HR managers had always relied on conventional recruitment channels, they would have found recruiting via Facebook or LinkedIn as unmanageable and too complex, hence would resist the adoption. This attitude of resistance and response to uncertainties would likely induce potential barriers for a successful adoption (Rogers 2003). For an organization to successfully adopt a new technology, it also requires compatibility, that is, the extent to which an innovation is perceived as consistent with an organization’s existing values, needs and support of potential adopters (Rogers 2003, 240). As well expressed by Lin and Chen (2012), use of cloud computing to store massive data is cost effective, but unless such technology usage is compliant with organizational data security policy, gains the trust of both internal and external users and meets the overall business objectives, it would not be compatible, and thus may not be accepted and adopted (see the similar view by Lian et al. 2014).

Thus, there should be some interactive factors in play between technological and organizational contexts, which would influence the adoption decision. These interactive elements are currently unknown, hence marked in broken lines in Figure 1, of which the current study aims to further investigate.

According to Tornatzky and Fleischer (1990), the organization context describes different organizational aspects including structure, processes, and resources (see also Zhu et al. 2006). These factors represent the organization’s readiness to foster innovation adoption. In general, it is argued that large organizations are more likely to adopt new technologies as they typically have greater availability of both financial and human resources, thus, increase their ability to facilitate the adoption. In addition, top management support can also promote new technology
adoption by creating a positive organizational culture and context that rewards change and supports innovative arrangements (Lian et al. 2014).

The environment context is the arena in which an organization conducts its business (Tornatzky and Fleischer 1990). It consists of industry character, competitor pressures and market effects (Baker 2012, Chan et al. 2012). The environment context can present either favourable or detrimental effects on the technology adoption. For instance, some industries (e.g., information technology and communication) would be the vanguard of new technology adoption, whilst others (e.g., retail/wholesale) may be slow in catching up with new technology. However, the critical mass theory argues that once the number of adopters in a particular industry reaches a certain point (i.e., critical mass), the innovation is perceived as increasingly beneficial, creating extra pressure on non-adopters to consider their own competitiveness in the market place, if without new technology adoption (Troshani et al. 2011).

Furthermore, in an environment characterised with high levels of uncertainty, success stories can facilitate technology adoption as ‘every successful adoption may lead more organizations to strongly consider technology adoption’ (Troshani et al. 2011, 474). Greater market effects are also generated by critical mass when the sheer number of early adopters exerts bandwagon pressures on late adopters (Markus 1987). Market trends and expectations affect the likelihood of adopting new technologies, as they reflect the potential market volume and the extent to which technology adoption may produce future benefits for the organization (Chan et al. 2012).

In the current study, the TOE framework is used to explore the key drivers for social recruiting technology adoption. In particular, we identify underlying interactive factors that may
have a greater influence on organizational decision-making for adopting social recruiting technologies.

2.3. **Australia as a context of study**

We use Australia as the context of the current exploratory study for two reasons. First, compared to companies in the United States, Australian companies have a relatively lower adoption rate of social recruiting. Despite the fact that the social network website has over 4 million Australian members; representing more than 80 per cent of Australia’s professional population, only 20 per cent of the top 200 companies listed in the Australian Stock Exchange (ASX) are currently using recruiting solutions offered by LinkedIn (LinkedIn 2013). The adoption rate is even less when it comes to Australian small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs). Furthermore, examining the presence of those organizations having official corporate web pages on LinkedIn, only 18 per cent of Australian SMEs were found to have such presence (LinkedIn 2012).

Second, there have been fewer systemic studies of Australian organizations to explore unknown reasons of lagging behind others in adopting social recruiting technologies. In view of the modern and distinct nature of social recruiting technologies (Jansen et al. 2005), an exploratory approach grounded in qualitative data can provide an insightful explanation for the low adoption and diffusion rate of these technologies in the Australian context. Therefore, using the technology, organization, and environment framework (TOE) (Tornatzky and Fleischer 1990), the current study intends to answer the key research question: “*What are the factors influencing an organization’s adoption of social recruiting technologies in Australia?*”
3. Research Method

Given the early and formative stage of the research in the area along with the contemporary, and ambiguous nature of social recruiting adoption in the Australian context, a qualitative exploratory approach was used in the current study. According to Patton (2002), in contrast to quantitative research – which depends on random sampling strategy – the qualitative research typically follows a purposeful sampling strategy in which the researcher seeks to identify information-rich cases, from which one can learn a great deal about the issues centrally important to the purpose of study (Patton 2002, 169). The logic of purposeful sampling is to ensure that the sample cases are selected because they are capable of providing a deep understanding of the research problem and the phenomena under inquiry (Creswell 2013).

There are several sampling techniques to purposefully select information-rich cases, including maximum variation, homogenous, critical case, theoretical, snowball, and convenience sampling (see Flick 2009, Creswell 2013, Patton 2002 for detailed explanations of each method). In this study, the maximum variation sampling was chosen for two reasons: first, the maximum variation sampling technique has a unique property of differentiating the information-rich cases from plain ones (Creswell 2013, 126), serving well for the purpose of the current study. Second, it allows the researchers to select a sample of great diversity in order to (a) obtain high-quality descriptions of different perspectives; and (b) detect significant common patterns that emerge from the heterogeneity of the sample (Patton 2002).

As a result of using the maximum variation sampling technique, Australia-based HR informants (i.e., HR managers or those responsible for the recruitment function in their respective organizations) were considered as the information-rich cases for the purpose of this study. Moreover, the adoption status defined as the key criteria for constructing variation in the
sample was used to increase the likelihood of obtaining diverse perspectives (Patton 2002). Thus, three categories of interviewees were selected to represent:

a) Adopters: HR informants representing organizations that have already adopted social recruiting (SR) technologies.

b) Laggards: HR informants representing organizations that have not adopted SR technologies but planned to do so in near future.

c) Non-adopters: HR informants representing organizations that have not adopted and had no plan to do so in future.

Furthermore, the criterion of ‘saturation’ (point of redundancy) in deciding the adequacy of sample size, in line with the maximum variation sampling method, was also set. As suggested by Patton (2002, 184), there are no rules for determining the appropriate sample size in a qualitative inquiry. Rather, it is the depth, not breath of information that matters the most (Creswell 2013). In qualitative inquiry, ‘saturation’ is reached when no additional data are being found or no new information is emerging from adding new cases to the sample (Flick 2009). Following these guidelines, an initial sample of 10 respondents was specified as reasonable, but we were open to adding more cases to the sample up to the point where saturation is reached (Flick 2009). As a result, a total of 15 key informants, representing twelve Australian organizations, were interviewed during March-April 2013. The face-to-face interviews were conducted mostly on the researchers’ working university campus, in cafes, or workplaces mutually chosen by the interviewees and the interviewers.

It is believed that technology adoption can be better explored and understood by investigating the viewpoints of relevant organizational actors (Troshani et al. 2011). Hence, semi-structured interviews were conducted. There are several benefits of using the semi-
structured interview approach for the current exploratory study. First, it helps the data collection process to be more systematic and comprehensive (Yin 2014). Second, it increases the comparability of responses as all interviewees answer the same set of questions (Patton 2005). Third, this approach facilitates the orderly analysis of the data by using a predetermined sequence and wording of questions (Myers and Newman 2007). Finally, this approach allows interviewers to use both specific and probing questions in order to explore dissimilar views in more depth, being consistent with the criteria set in the maximum variation sampling technique (Schultze and Avital 2011).

The organizations were chosen based on whether they had adopted or intended to adopt social recruiting technologies as a part of their recruitment strategies, as explained earlier. Seven organizations had already used social recruiting technologies, while two organizations had plans to adopt such technologies in the near future. In addition, three organizations were aware of this recruitment method yet decided not to adopt them for some undesirable reasons, and thus were treated as negative cases. The use of negative cases allows the researchers to consider alternative explanations of patterns and trends that have emerged from data. This would enhance the credibility of research findings (Patton 2005). In addition, it is important to use the responses from non-adopting organizations as a way to create an awareness of the possibilities that modern technologies could offer to a company and to explore reasons for distrusting the effectiveness of using social network websites. Table 1 provides some basic information about the interviewees and the nature of their respective organizations, including size and industry, adoption status, and interviewees’ position.

INSERT TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE
A set of 15 open-ended questions was developed to guide the interview process. These questions covered the organization’s background, reasons to (or not to) use social recruiting methods, the extent of current adoption and use, and the future prospect of adopting these technologies. Where necessary, interviewees were probed regarding the TOE’s contextual factors that they had not addressed. On average, each interview lasted between 40 to 60 minutes. Interviewees were assured that their responses would remain confidential and that they could discontinue the interview at any time. The interviews were audio-recorded, transcribed, and analysed thematically using NVivo 10.0. According to QSR International, the developers of NVivo, the software provides a set of tools that assist researchers in analysing qualitative data in an efficient and effective manner (Bazeley and Jackson 2013). NVivo is designed and developed to help researchers: (a) better handle and manage large volumes of data; (b) improve the rigor and transparency of the qualitative research; and (c) visually represent the relationships among key concepts in a range of displays (Bazeley and Jackson 2013, 3).

Initially, three parent themes (i.e., technology, organization, and environment) were created based on the research framework rooted in the TOE literature (shown in Table 2 as the 1st level nodes). As the thematic analysis interviews were processed in NVivo, any emerging theme from data was incrementally classified under one of these three parent nodes (2nd level nodes). Where necessary, a 3rd level node was added to the analysis in order to elucidate different properties of the emerging themes in the 2nd level nodes. Throughout the process of data analysis, the triangulation of evidence was conducted by continually revisiting the literature in order to make sense of newly emergent themes from the qualitative inquiry and draw relevant conclusions.
The following steps were further taken to safeguard the credibility and validity of results. First, multiple sources of evidence were used (Yin 2014). That is, the sampling was conducted in a way to include both adopters and non-adopters’ interpretations of social recruiting technologies. This helps researchers to clarify the unknown aspects of the phenomenon under investigation from different perspectives (Patton 2005). Second, all three researchers participated in the process of data collection and analysis to minimise effect bias by a single evaluator (Patton 2005, Yin 2014). Third, an interview protocol was designed and used to ensure the consistency of the answers across cases during the data collection stage. Finally, data collection and analysis stages were operationalized and documented where possible, in order to keep the trace of the chain of activities leading to the study findings (Yin 2014).

4. Analysis and Results

Key factors found to be influential in the organizational adoption of social recruiting technologies are presented in Table 2. The strength of influences was measured by the number of times references were made by respondents, which also linked to key themes drawn from the first, second and third order nodes (Patton 2005). Subsequently, the analysis of the results was structured, based on these key themes, which are also embedded in the TOE framework (Tornatzky and Fleischer 1990) explained earlier. The following discussion of the results focuses on examining whether each contextual factor identified has enhanced, changed or built the direction of adopting social recruiting technologies among the Australian organizations examined.

INSERT TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE
4.1. Technology context

Among a total of 510 references to the contextual factors, technology factors (239/510=47%) were most often referred to, as compared to the others, such as organization and environment contexts (see Table 2). Of those factors mentioned, perceived benefits were found to be amongst the most significant factors in Australian organizations’ adoption decisions. Below we detail the responses made by the interviewees with regard to these factors.

4.1.1. Perceived benefits

All interviewees acknowledged the benefits of social recruiting technologies as a main driver for adoption decisions. Largely, social recruiting benefits could be divided into two categories: efficiency gains and strategic re-orientation. As direct benefits of the adoption, “efficiency gains” was referred to about 86 times by the informants to discuss their organizational recruitment function. “Efficiency gains” cover several elements, such as: greater accessibility to niche labour markets and skills; lower time-per-hire and cost-per-hire; greater ability to target specific job levels; and more effective dissemination of job-related information. Among these mentioned gains, the ability to use social recruiting to target passive candidates was unanimously agreed to be the differentiating factor that drove adoption. One interviewee noted:

LinkedIn in particular is one of the best ways of tapping into the passive job markets. So, for those people who are not necessarily looking, [social recruiting] allows us to […] tap people on the shoulder. Also with the ads that we place […] for specific roles, people would see them more than obviously if they were active candidates (Organization 1).
Another perceived benefit mentioned especially by those informants with HR responsibilities is ‘strategic re-orientation’ which was referred to 36 times. The informants regarded the use of SNWs as different from other internet-based recruitment methods, because these technologies provided HR with opportunities to engage in more strategic-level activities such as employer branding, and enhancing organization reputation and image. One interviewee claimed as follows:

\[\text{I definitely think that our social media presence has lifted our employer brand a lot.}\]
\[\text{It [social recruiting] is another way to promote ourselves as an employer of choice.}\]
\[\text{[…]}\text{ It has definitely lifted off what the organization does. Our YouTube channel and videos have definitely hit the mark (Organization 10).}\]

Thus, SNWs were used often by HR managers as tools for strategic re-orientation, allowing organizations to take a more proactive approach toward sourcing potential candidates, ‘rather than relying on applicants to keep checking back for available vacancies’ (Organization 2). This concept of ‘strategic re-orientation’ was further explained by the informant from Organization 2 as follows:

\[\text{One of the top reasons for using it [social recruiting] is to differentiate ourselves in the job market place. We use our social recruiting channels to really push what our ‘employee value proposition’ is; both by outright saying it, [and] also by living it (Organization 2).}\]

Another frequently mentioned benefit of adopting social recruiting methods was better ‘candidate relationship management’ (45 times). As pointed out by several informants, SNWs could be used to create the ‘right level of engagement’ (Organization 7) and to ‘track individuals’ career paths’ (Organization 3). Hence, SNWs are effective for organizations to
establish long-term relationships with potential job applicants, as stated by the informant from Organization 3:

[...] what we can use [social recruiting] for tracking individuals’ career paths. For instance, we can ‘tag’ our major clients [applicants] so if they move [from their current position or organization]; [...] you can see and contact them (Organization 3).

From the above discussion, it is evident that organizations adopting social recruiting technology tend to perceive several benefits, such as efficiency gain, strategic re-orientation, and effective management of candidate relationships. These perceived benefits were regarded as positive influences on the adoption decisions among the Australian organizations investigated.

4.1.2. Complexity

We found disagreement among interviewees’ perceptions toward the complexity of social recruiting (SR) technologies. More specifically, four interviewees representing three non-adopting organizations (Organizations #4, 6, and 9, see Table 1) unanimously believed that complexity is a key inhibitor of SR technology adoption. Their responses accounted for about 34 percent of 51 references coded under the ‘complexity’ node. Of the remaining interviewees, the majority (i.e., 6 out of 9 organizations including Organizations #1, 2, 5, 7, 10, and 12) saw no issue of complexity and believed that SR technology was easy and manageable; this group represented 48 percent of all references to the ‘complexity’ theme. The remaining interviewees from Organizations #3, 8, and 11 were more skeptical, rather than dismissive, of the complexities of SR technologies; this group represented 18 percent of all references. For example, one interviewee argued that these SR technologies were uncomplicated and easy to use ‘only in their very basic form’ (Organization 11). In the same vein, one interviewee indicated that exploiting
the benefits of SR technologies to the full potential was ‘a challenging task’ that required ‘specific knowledge’ and ‘ongoing support from vendors’ (Organization 3).

Social recruiting adoption costs were also mentioned as a potential barrier, which would increase the complexity of these technologies. Costs may include recruiter licensing, implementation and integration with in-house recruiting tools and databases, as well as the training of personnel. Therefore, complexity was induced when cost was regarded as an inhibitor of adopting SR technologies to their full potential. One informant stated that:

*LinkedIn [social recruiting] is a great tool once you spend money as well as training, but before that it gives you very little. [...] basic search and sourcing functions are available to everyone for free, but to fully integrate, it can be really cumbersome and incredibly expensive. So, it is a lot more challenging if you [as a recruiter] want to use it to its highest level* (Organization 3).

Therefore, the complexity of SR technology appears to connote hidden costs of training and learning prior to full adoption. Hence, it is believed that complexity is a constraining factor for adopting SR technologies.

4.1.3. Compatibility

Compatibility of an innovation with existing values, experiences, and needs can reduce the uncertainties surrounding the technology adoption decision (Rogers 2003). We found SR technologies as being compatible with adopters’ past experiences on one hand, and their recruiting needs on the other. First, the majority of interviewees acknowledged that they had already been familiar with business-oriented social network websites ‘*to connect with either peers in the industry or to share ideas and knowledge with other professionals within the network*’ (Organization 7) prior to adopting them as recruiting tools. Second, social recruiting
was perceived as highly compatible with the existing organizational web-based recruitment tools, such as corporate web pages and online job portals, despite the fact that the ‘integration and maintenance costs are extremely high’ (Organization 1). Third, social recruiting was regarded as going beyond simple recruitment channels and tools, and treated as the answer to strategic recruitment needs of the organization, as phrased by an informant in the following:

It [social recruiting] is not like an [online] job board nor like putting an ad in the paper. It [recruitment] is no longer about only sourcing candidates. I have witnessed a paradigm shift. Today, it [recruitment] is about the value proposition, building talent communities, and engaging with audience [...] and social media has made it all happen (Organization 12).

In summary, to facilitate effective SR technology adoption, there is a need for a high level of compatibility between social recruiting deliverables (i.e., sourcing candidates and building talent pools) and organizational HR professionals’ past experiences and strategic recruitment needs. Therefore, it is required to further explore the interactive effects between technology and organizational contexts.

4.2. Organizational context

When exploring the organizational elements that would determine the adoption decision, five important themes emerged. These themes cover organizational configuration of the human resource function – “HRM configuration” per se – which was mentioned 25 times; presence of a social media policy (24 times); HR capabilities (47 times); organization readiness (43 times); and top management support (30 times). Under the theme of “HR capabilities”, these further nodes were identified as: 1) recruitment expertise (mentioned 11 times); 2) social recruiting know-how (23 times); and 3) network skills (13 times). Under the theme of “organization readiness”,
financial resources (26 times) and human resources (17 times) were further identified. Below our discussion is centered on these five important themes within the organizational context.

4.2.1. Configuration of HRM

Most literature in the technology field points to the significance of the information systems (IS) unit and its configuration in adopting new technologies (Štemberger, Manfreda, and Kovačič (2011). However, in the current study, interviewees unanimously stated that rather it is the configuration of the HRM unit that drives the organizational adoption of SR technologies. HRM configurations were defined by Martín-Alcázar, Romero-Fernández, and Sánchez-Gardey (2005) as a HRM system with a multidimensional set of elements that can be combined in different ways to obtain both external and internal coherence to achieve organizational objectives. The presence of a formal HR department that performs a comprehensive range of HRM functions seems to help the coordination of such configurations and, therefore, increase the organization’s capacity to recognize and absorb social recruiting benefits. It is reasonable to believe that key deliverables of the social recruiting method are primarily targeted at HR. As one interviewee noted:

*Social media was born out of HR and then other departments got on board. In fact, recruiters saw the need and its potential then went for it [...]. So for us, it has been more a kind of pushing these [social recruiting] channels out of recruitment and then having other departments come on board* (Organization 2).

Therefore, it appears that prior experiences and knowledge of the HR department reduce the uncertainties of adoption, and serve as a link (*compatibility* discussed previously) to overall organizational adoption of SR technologies. The needs of the HR department must also be
compatible with the needs of other departments within the organization in order for full adoption to occur. Thus, HRM configuration positively influences the adoption decision.

4.2.2. Social media policy

Interviewees argued that presence of a formal policy, specifically designed for social media use, can guide the organizational HR unit on “how to use [SR technologies]” and “how to leverage it best for recruitment” (Organization 10). Additionally, the majority of interviewees argued that the main purpose of having a social media policy is not to address legal, ethical, or privacy issues concerning employee and employer relationships, but to “educate and monitor HR on how to effectively use [these technologies]” (Organization 3).

We are not really concerned about it [applicants’ privacy]. Because, if they are not smart enough to lock it down, that is their problem. It is a public forum and there are privacy settings there that you can choose to use or not to use. If you choose not to use them then you left yourself with that kind of scrutiny. That may sound harsh but that is it (Organization 1).

We need to put a policy in place if social recruiting is what we want […] to monitor our recruiters how effectively they use [recruiters’] licenses. Because each license is allocated to one recruiter and if they don’t know how to use it to the full potential, we would actually waste resources. […] there is a lot of monitoring as well as education involved (Organization 3).

Overall, it seems that a formal social media policy provides guidelines for HR professionals to fully use SR technologies in order to meet recruitment needs rather than to measure legal and ethical parameters that may need to be followed, as argued by several researchers in the field (e.g., Davison et al. 2011, Hugl 2011).
4.2.3. HR capabilities

When discussing critical HR capabilities in modern organizations, Ulrich et al. (2013) refer especially to HR capabilities as 1) transforming HR into a strategic partner, 2) mastering HR processes, 3) delivering on recruiting, 4) restructuring the organization, and 5) improving leadership development. In addition, they also highlighted the importance of HR capabilities to adopt social media technology (Ulrich et al. 2013, 461). Thus, it is not surprising to find in the current study that most interviewees (10 out of 15) agreed that human resource (HR) capability is a significant predictor of the successful adoption of SR technologies.

While Ulrich et al. (2013) did not point to what specific HR capabilities to use to implement the adoption of new technology and social media, we further probed the interview data, and found that HR capabilities with reference to SR technology adoption can be classified into three sub-categories: (1) knowledge of the recruitment domain (11 times); (2) social recruiting know-how (23 times); and (3) networking and communication expertise (13 times). The lack of HR capabilities had forced a number of participating organizations to outsource their recruitment processes to external specialists (i.e. recruiting and head-hunting agencies) which hindered their willingness to adopt any in-house recruiting technologies (Organizations 4 and 6).

In particular, social recruiting and communication skills were considered as the areas in which ‘the whole recruitment industry in Australia suffers the most’ (Organization 9). We found that the quality of recruitment over social recruiting channels directly depended on the ‘networking skills of individual consultants [recruiters]’ (Organization 3), as noted by another interviewee:

\[\text{It is a bit harder because they [recruiters] do not have the communication knowledge; [...] and Twitter is a social media that some recruiters have used well.}\]
But, it requires significant skill of the recruiter. [...] it comes down to the skill of the individual consultant [recruiter] which is what holds us back (Organization 8).

Consequently, interviewees argue that training is the key requirement to increase and sustain HR abilities to adopt and use social recruiting technologies (Organization 7). However, training on new technology adoption requires both organization readiness and top management support within the organization. These aspects are discussed next.

4.2.4. Organization readiness

Readiness reflects the amount of financial and human resources available for an organization to undertake the technology adoption. Some interviewees mentioned the lack of financial resources as the key barrier to fully implement SR technologies into their recruitment strategy; others argued for the lack of human resources as the major inhibitor of their organizations’ readiness for full adoption. For example, one interviewee noted that:

Well, it comes down to [financial] resources. And I believe if you want to take social recruiting seriously, you need at least [to] have a whole resource dedicated to social media [...] if we want to do it properly (Organization 3).

In contrast to the above statement, another interviewee from Organization 6 did not think financial resources were as important as human resources. This informant believed that the capability of the human resource team within the organization was the key to drive the adoption.

There is so much you can do these days [using social recruiting technologies] and this kind of support [financial] is really good to have but not necessary. [...] It highly relies on human efforts. I believe that social media does not work in our case easily unless we have got a big team of HR dedicating to social recruiting (Organization 6).
Overall, it is found that organizations with substantial financial resources were more capable of absorbing the inherent risks of new innovations, and inclined to adopt and implement new recruiting technologies. However, the capability of human resources was identified as an even more important factor to facilitate and drive the successful adoption of new technologies.

4.2.5. Top management support

All interviewees agreed that top management support was indeed a crucial factor for a successful technology adoption. A supportive management team not only fosters a positive climate for HR to introduce new technology but also ensures the availability of necessary resources to adopt SR technologies (Troshani et al. 2011). It was noticed that top management teams of those organizations that had already adopted SR technologies were aware of the importance of technologies. They were, therefore, committed to support and fund the HR process of adoption. As one interviewee noted:

*I would say our company leaders were really on board with this. They understood the call and the need to be on their [social network websites]. I think it came out of a need from the recruitment manager and then got the ‘buy in’ from executives* (Organization 7).

On the other hand, the interviewees from non-adopter organizations tended to emphasise the lack of senior management support as a major inhibitor of the adoption. For example, as indicated by the interviewee from Organization 4 below, top management support is indeed a key enabler for adopting SR technologies among the Australian organizations investigated:

*They [managers] are still old fashioned in that sense. This morning I was talking to one of the executives at this seminar and he was talking about the same topic [social recruiting]. He said I’m sorry but you come to work for me, you come at nine o’clock,*
you leave at five. I expect you to work for that time in between. I’m not paying you to come in and tweet [via Twitter] and do social correspondence with everybody and [...] his mindset was exactly that. I pay you to do your job, not anything else (Organization 4).

4.3. Environmental context

Within the environmental context of SR technology adoption, two factors were consistently mentioned as significant: critical mass and applicant readiness. “Critical mass” is defined by (Markus 1987) as consisting of two elements, when addressing the adoption and diffusion of a piece of innovative technology, such as interactive media. These elements cover 1) widespread usage leading to universal access to new technology; and 2) use of interactive media generating reciprocal interdependence, in which earlier users are influenced by later users as well as vice versa (Markus 1987, 491). The current study identified two nodes related to this concept of ‘critical mass’: competitors’ pressure mentioned 31 times; and local success stories (28 times). In addition, applicant readiness was mentioned 43 times. Note that “applicant readiness” is one of the constructs that was not referred to or tested in the earlier TOE framework as it specifically addresses the mental and intellectual state of job applicants being prepared for adopting SNWs for job search purposes. Below we detail the discussion of these aspects within the environmental context.

4.3.1. Critical mass

The adoption was found to relate to the presence of a critical mass of organizations already using social recruiting (SR) technologies. It seems that as the number of organizations using such technology grows, more organizations become aware of the potential benefits and, therefore, decide to ‘jump on the [adoption] wagon’ mainly because of the fear of losing competitive
advantage (Organization 1). Moreover, interviewees argued that as more and more organizations start to use these technologies, they could build stronger business cases to convince decision makers in their organizations to adopt SR technologies (Organization 5).

Additionally, interviewees argued that in the absence of actual evidence to ensure the outcomes of adoption and the lack of criteria to measure the return on investment, early adopters’ success stories might have a positive effect on adoption decisions (Markus 1987). In particular, local success stories involving Australian organizations could trigger a spill-over effect of adoption from one organization to others, as noted by an interviewee:

"Among the recruiters’ community in Australia and New Zealand region, we regularly talk about how other companies are using it. And, wouldn’t be great if we could do what they are doing? So right now we are working on successful case studies to present to management board in order to convince them to invest more money" (Organization 5).

4.3.2. Applicant readiness

Different to ‘organizational readiness’, which is extrinsic and tends to focus on financial and human resources that an organization possesses for technology adoption (as discussed earlier), applicant readiness is more intrinsic, and defined as job applicants’ mental and intellectual capacity, as well as willingness to use SR technologies for their job search purpose. Applicant readiness was highlighted as a key determinant of SR technology adoption. When probing into applicant readiness, interviewees agreed that it is comprised of two additional aspects: (1) applicant willingness, which reflects the extent to which applicants actively use SNWs for job search purposes; and (2) social network websites’ (SNWs) penetration, defined as the level of usage of SNWs in the target labour market of a given organization. These two
aspects reflect whether there are enough applicants using SNWs for employment purposes that make the adoption worthwhile. As the higher level of usage would lead to universal access to SNWs and more interdependence between job searchers and recruiters, this is in line with the “critical mass” argument by Markus (1987). Thus, applicant readiness is also closely intertwined with competitive pressure and local success stories, as one interviewee noted:

_There is an expectation for us. Candidates and our future employees will look to see if we understand what is going on in the labour market. [...] I think the potential candidates and especially the young generation are the main force. [...] mainly this generation prefer to communicate with us on LinkedIn and Facebook_ (Organization 9).

A number of interviewees mentioned that the degree of social media penetration among their organizations’ target labour market could directly predict whether or not a minimum number of applicants could be identified via SR technologies (Organization 10). One organization argued that, due to the nature of their industry (i.e., manufacturing services), it is very unlikely to find qualified applicants via SNWs, making the adoption unjustifiable (Organization 6).

Despite the high penetration rate of the SNWs’ adoption among Australian job candidates (LinkedIn 2013), interviewees unanimously acknowledged that in most cases it is difficult to generate a sufficient pool of job applicants by solely relying on social recruiting channels. One explanation could be that the _social recruiting penetration rate_ may vary across different industry sectors. While some organizations might perceive these technologies as beneficial (e.g., technology, and telecommunication) – due to the nature of the industry, which demands a certain level of IT knowledge for job candidates – others may find SR technologies not so attractive
Moreover, interviewees consistently argued that applicant willingness, which reflects how informative (i.e. complete) a job applicant’s online profile is, can directly affect the quality of social recruiting outcomes in comparison to other recruitment methods. Despite the high level of social recruiting penetration rate amongst the Australian workforce, and the benefits of using the internet for a job search to get employment (Suvankulov, Lau, and Chau 2012), the applicant willingness to fully engage with social media as a job search method still appears lacking. This explains the low rate of adoption of SR technologies among the Australian firms investigated.

In summary, the findings from the current study show that technology factors (i.e. perceived benefits, complexity and compatibility) are the most important factors influencing Australian organizations’ adoption decisions. It is also found that technology factors interacted with organizational and environmental factors, and this interaction led us to identify several important factors, which were not indicated in the earlier TOE model developed by Tornatzky and Fleischer (1990). These factors are organization readiness, HR capabilities, top management support and applicant readiness, which significantly shaped the degree of organizations’ adoption of social recruiting technologies.

5. Discussion

The results of the qualitative data analysis of 12 Australian organizations, on one hand, support the notion that the adoption of social recruiting (SR) technologies among small and large organizations depends on their technological, organizational and environmental contexts and interactions of these contextual factors. On the other hand, the current study modifies the TOE framework earlier developed by Tornatzky and Fleischer (1990). The extended TOE model with several different factors contributes to the theoretical development in the areas of technology
acceptance, adoption and diffusion (Davis 1989, Lian et al. 2014, Rogers 2003, Tornatzky and Fleischer 1990, Venkatesh et al. 2003). It helps enhance the understanding of the decision-making process of SR technology adoption in Australia, and potentially in other contexts. Hence, in the remaining section, we discuss both theoretical and practical implications of our research findings.

5.1. Theoretical contributions

Based on the initial TOE framework, Figure 2 is depicted to summarize key drivers for social recruiting technology adoption, as a result of the current case study of several Australian organizations. The sign displayed on each arrow in Figure 2 represents the direction of influence on adoption decisions, i.e. negative or inhibiting effect (-), and positive or enabling effect (+). Where both (+/-) signs are used, the direction can be inferred as commonly enabling, although occasionally inhibiting.

INSERT FIGURE 2 ABOUT HERE

In the context of technology, three identified factors (i.e., perceived benefits, complexity and compatibility) identified were similar to those stated in the earlier TOE framework (Tornatzky and Fleischer 1990). However, complexity was found to be either an enhancing or inhibiting factor to drive adoption. At its very basic form, social recruiting adoption may be considered as a straightforward task that does not require allocating significant financial and human resources. However, to fully embed this recruiting method into the firm’s overall recruitment strategy, it may impose a significant financial burden on firms, and thus increase the complexity of adoption. This is mainly due to licencing costs, staff training, and assimilation of integrated recruiting systems in the post-adoption stage within adopting firms.

In addition, three factors were more specific when applied to social recruiting
technologies in the current study. For instance, adoption benefits perceived by the interviewees vary from reduction in time-per hire or cost-per-hire (i.e. *efficiency gains*) to more strategically oriented gains, such as more effective candidate relationship management and improvement in employer brand image and reputation.

Within the organizational context, our findings differ from the earlier TOE model in several respects. First, exploring through various factors of organizational structure, process and resources (Tornatzky and Fleischer 1990), HRM *configuration* was found to have a crucial role in increasing the organizational capacity to realise adoption benefits. According to absorptive capacity theory, the domain-specific knowledge of organizational functions increases the ability to better appreciate and apply new innovations into different domains (Strohmeier and Kabst 2009). As human resources in an organization become more institutionalised, their tasks grow into a more comprehensive set of HR functions, resulting in the development of the organization’s domain-specific knowledge of each HR function, including the recruitment function.

Second, the configuration of HR appeared to serve two purposes: 1) creating *organizational readiness* for adoption; and 2) developing *HR capabilities*, especially in adopting new recruitment methods, i.e. social recruiting technologies. Both factors were specifically identified with reference to SR technology adoption process and would directly affect the HR capacity to realise both administrative and strategic benefits of SR technologies.

Third, *top management support* was identified as another important factor as it warranted the allocation of both financial and human resources required for adoption initiatives (Lian et al. 2014) and led the decision to set up appropriate social media policy for organizations.

The current study also points to specific environmental factors, which differ from the
earlier model (see Tornatzky and Fleischer 1990). In particular, critical mass that covers both competitive pressure and local success stories, and applicant readiness, were found to have a wider impact on adoption decisions than expected. Applicant readiness was found to be crucial as it determines whether social recruiting could be translated into successful recruitment of potential candidates.

Our results also show that a critical mass of adopters acts as a catalyst for further diffusion of SR technologies, as adopters discovering the benefits could also be industry competitors, creating extra pressures on non-adopters. Successful adoption stories also serve as strong business cases to convince top management to provide support (MacLennan and Belle 2014). Specifically, local success stories can provide valuable sources of information on the benefits of social recruiting technologies, particularly in Australia where adoption benefits are less documented and verified.

Finally, the initial TOE framework posits that in explaining the adoption process, the interaction among organizations’ contextual factors are as equally important as their direct influences on the adoption decision (Tornatzky and Fleischer 1990). Thus, using a concept mapping approach (Novak and Cañas 2006), several interactions among contextual factors of social recruiting adoption decisions are depicted in Figure 3. This provides additional insights on theoretical development of factors driving social recruiting technology adoption.
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In Figure 3, oval shapes depict technological factors, while rounded rectangles and rectangles each represent organizational and environmental drivers of adoption decisions, respectively. Moreover, we labeled the relationships among these contextual factors in order to track the direction of interactions among them (Novak and Cañas 2006).
From the concept map, it is clear that complexities of social recruiting technologies can act as a barrier. Specifically, adoption costs inhibit decision makers’ willingness to commit to adoption. However, having a social media policy in place not only reduces the complexities of use but also guides HR to better harness the benefits of such technologies. Moreover, compatible infrastructure in terms of existing technologies, experiences and needs encourages management support by limiting the adoption complexities.

Among the organizational factors, the availability of financial and human resources (i.e. organization readiness) impacts the extent to which top management is able to support the adoption. Readiness is also built on HR configuration. A formal HR department with strategic orientation that performs a wide range of functions reflects a high degree of human resource capability and readiness for adoption (Strohmeier and Kabst 2009).

Finally, a critical mass of adopters can generate local awareness of the potential outcomes of SR technologies, resulting in an increased number of successful adoption stories. Taken together, critical mass of local success stories, plus awareness of potential competitive pressures, form a valuable source of information for HR professionals and recruitment practitioners to get top management on board. However, low levels of applicant readiness, which is less mental and intellectual preparedness to use SNWs for job search purposes, can restrict the extent to which social recruiting outcomes can be observed.

In summary, it is possible to use the modified TOE model, assisted by the concept map developed from the current study, to test relationships between those key variables (i.e., technology, organization, and environment) in future studies with larger sample sizes. The outcomes will further inform the strength of each variable and provide practical advice to HR professionals and practitioners who might be thinking of using SNWs for recruitment purposes.
5.2. Practical implications

The findings from the current study suggest that the perceived benefits are the most important drivers for SR technology adoption. Thus, it appears critical that HR professionals and recruiting practitioners within organizations need to demonstrate clearly the benefits of SR technologies in order to justify the adoption costs and associated complexities.

Second, for an organization to realise the strategic benefits from social recruiting, having capable human resource practitioners who have recruitment domain knowledge as well as social recruiting skills is crucial. Developing HR capabilities and configuring HR functions at the organizational level with strategic orientation are also important. This suggests that ongoing training, as well as vendor support, are essential components for successful SR technology adoption at the organizational level.

Third, top management support is seen as a crucial driver of social technology adoption. While administrative results (e.g., recruitment efficiency) and strategic outcomes (e.g., CaRM, organization reputation and image) of adoption can drive the support from top management, internal organization readiness and external job applicant readiness to use social media are also important factors to induce management support. Hence, HR professionals and practitioners keen on social recruitment technologies must devote energy to harness organization readiness and to collect relevant data about the local environment, especially those competitors’ success stories of adoption. In addition, data about job applicant readiness to use social media is also important to convince the management team about the feasibility of adopting SR technology for talent attraction.

Last, it is important that HR professionals and practitioners are capable of linking all recruitment activities with organizational business strategic direction. It is found in the concept
map of the current study that one of the perceived benefits (i.e., strategic re-orientation) positively drives management support. Similar to any HRM decisions, HRM strategies need to be in line with organizational business strategies (Davison et al. 2011). Until HR departments can demonstrate the close association of social recruiting with organizational business goals, it would be hard to convince top management to invest and adopt social recruiting technologies at the firm level.

6. Limitations and Future Direction

The current study extends the TOE framework and identifies specific factors driving social recruiting technology adoption. However, several limitations remain. First, a small sample of informants in Australia helped us identify and explore, in depth, key factors and their interactive effects on organizational adoption of social recruiting technologies. But, this sample potentially undermines the generalizability of our findings. It is suggested that future studies test the factors generated from the current study, using larger samples in a wider range of industry sectors, across Australia or even in other countries.

Second, this study has used both adopters and non-adopters of social recruiting technologies in order to examine the reasons of adoption and non-adoption. This approach helps increase the credibility and validity of findings. Nonetheless, the focus was to identify the key drivers of adoption, without further assessment of the relative significance of each driver to the adoption decision. The significance of those factors related to non-adoption should also be evaluated. However, these can only be examined in future quantitative studies with data collected from a larger sample size.

Third, as previously noted, results of this study have several implications for human resource practitioners, recruiters, and organizations. Factors identified in the modified TOE
model can assist an organization’s decision makers facilitate the process of acceptance and implementation of social recruiting technologies, potentially leading to improved attraction and retention of staff. Thus, in future studies, it is important to isolate and evaluate each adoption factor that could help HR managers design intervention mechanisms (i.e., training, policy making, and changing strategies) in order to achieve greater efficiencies in the process of social recruiting technology adoption.

Finally, the study tends to focus on identifying the potential benefits of social recruiting technologies prior to their adoption – e.g., the approach would enable organizations to better utilise their resources to achieve desired recruitment goals. However, social recruiting may result in harmful outcomes apart from the legal, ethical, and privacy aspects discussed in the existing literature (e.g., Davison et al. 2011, Hugl 2011). Other questions arise, such as the reasons why applicants were not ready, despite a high level of social recruiting penetration rate amongst the Australian workforce. Also, what are the key reasons for organizations and individuals not participating in social recruiting? These important and related questions require further studies in this new and emerging field of social recruiting.
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Figure 1. Research framework (adopted from Tornatzky and Fleischer, 1990)
Figure 2. Key drivers of social recruiting technology adoption among Australian organizations
Figure 3. Interactions among factors influencing organizations’ adoption of social recruiting technologies

Note: In this figure, the following labels convey similar meanings and, therefore, can be used interchangeably: ‘Facilitate’, ‘Enhance’, ‘Drive’, and ‘Build’ on one hand and ‘Inhibit’ and ‘Reduce’ on the other.
Table 1. Company and interviewee descriptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry type</th>
<th>Organization Size</th>
<th>Adoption status</th>
<th>Number of interviews</th>
<th>Interviewee’s job title</th>
<th>Identifier</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>Large (&gt;10,000 employees)</td>
<td>Adopter</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Senior talent acquisition specialist</td>
<td>Organization 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management consulting</td>
<td>Large (&gt;10,000 employees)</td>
<td>Adopter</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>National employer brand manager</td>
<td>Organization 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffing and recruiting services</td>
<td>Medium (200-499 employees)</td>
<td>Adopter</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Human resource manager / Human resource specialist</td>
<td>Organization 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemical</td>
<td>Large (1000-4999 employees)</td>
<td>Non-adopter</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Regional IT manager (Line manager)</td>
<td>Organization 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal services</td>
<td>Small (&gt;20 employees)</td>
<td>Adopter</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Chief executive officer</td>
<td>Organization 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing services</td>
<td>Small (&gt;20 employees)</td>
<td>Non-adopter</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Human resources director</td>
<td>Organization 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human resource services</td>
<td>Large (1000-4999 employees)</td>
<td>Adopter</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Recruitment consultant</td>
<td>Organization 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media/Publishing</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Planning to adopt</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Human resource acting</td>
<td>Organization 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector</td>
<td>Size</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Position/Role</td>
<td>Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Non-adopter</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Administration manager / Human resources coordinator</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1000-4999 employees)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Planning to adopt</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>General manager (People and safety) / Manager (Strategy and HR)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(500-999 employees)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telecommunications</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Adopter</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Manager (HR performance analyst)</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(&lt;10,000 employees)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public services</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Adopter</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Recruitment manager</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1000-4999 employees)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Organization size is defined according to the Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) definition of small, medium and large businesses.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1st level Nodes</th>
<th>No. of interviewees</th>
<th>No. of references</th>
<th>Coverage percentage</th>
<th>2nd level Nodes</th>
<th>No. of interviewees</th>
<th>No. of references</th>
<th>Coverage percentage</th>
<th>3rd level Nodes</th>
<th>No. of interviewees</th>
<th>No. of references</th>
<th>Coverage percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Technology context</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>46.86</td>
<td>Perceived benefits</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>32.75</td>
<td>Efficiency gains</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>16.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strategic re-orientation</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>7.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Candidate relationship management</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>8.82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Complexity</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Compatibility</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation context</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>33.14</td>
<td>HRM configuration</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Social media policy</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HR capabilities</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>9.22</td>
<td>Recruitment expertise</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Social Recruiting know-how</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Networking skills</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Organisation readiness</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>8.43</td>
<td>Financial resources</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Human resources</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment context</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>Critical mass</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>11.56</td>
<td>Competitor pressure</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>6.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Applicant readiness</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>8.43</td>
<td>Local success stories</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5.49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Coverage percentage was calculated as: (number of references in each node)/(total number of references)×100

Total number of references = 510