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Abstract

Previous research on recruitment sources has mostly focused on post-hire instead of pre-hire outcomes and has typically applied a very rudimentary classification of sources on the basis of the formal-informal distinction. The present study relied on a theory-driven taxonomy to identify four major types of recruitment sources (recruitment advertising, recruitment events, publicity, and word-of-mouth) and applied a source credibility perspective to predict differential relationships of these sources with organizational attractiveness. In a sample of 184 job seeking nurses in Belgium, characterized by a high labor market demand, it was found that job seekers who spent more time on receiving employment information through experiential recruitment sources such as events and word-of-mouth perceived this information as more credible. In addition, job seekers’ exposure to word-of-mouth was strongly positively related to their attraction to organizations as an employer. This relationship was partially mediated by the perceived credibility of the received employment information. Therefore, the results of this field study suggest that to enhance their attractiveness as an employer for job seekers, especially those in high demand on the labor market, recruiting organizations should provide credible employment information and stimulate the use of word-of-mouth as a recruitment source.
Recruitment Sources and Organizational Attraction: A Field Study of Belgian Nurses

Attracting and retaining the most talented employees is crucial for organizational success and survival (Chapman, Uggerslev, Carroll, Piasentin, & Jones, 2005). Recently, the focus of recruitment research has shifted towards studying the impact of early recruitment activities on organizational attraction (Collins & Stevens, 2002). This refers to the first phase of recruitment, in which organizations identify potential applicants and try to persuade them to apply through various recruitment practices (Barber, 1998). It is crucial to understand which factors influence job seekers’ initial attraction, because if they are not attracted at this first stage, they disappear from the recruitment process and will never enter the organization.

The source through which job seekers receive employment information is one of the key factors that might influence their initial attraction (Zottoli & Wanous, 2000). However, previous research on recruitment sources has mostly focused on post-hire outcomes such as job satisfaction instead of pre-hire outcomes such as organizational attractiveness (Barber, 1998). In addition, the choice of which sources to study has been rather arbitrary and has lacked theoretical justification beyond the formal-informal classification (Breaugh, 2008).

Therefore, the present study relies on Cable and Turban’s (2001) recent theory-driven taxonomy to identify four major types of recruitment sources (recruitment advertising, recruitment events, publicity, and word-of-mouth) and applies a source credibility perspective (Hovland, Janis, & Kelley, 1953; Pornpitakpan, 2004) to predict differential relationships of these sources with organizational attractiveness. In addition, the hypotheses were tested in the context of a high labor market demand, in which recruitment is most crucial for attracting new employees (Rynes & Barber, 1990). Specifically, many countries are experiencing substantial shortages of qualified nursing staff, as the growing demand for healthcare services contrasts sharply with the diminishing supply of healthcare professionals (Massey, Esain, & Wallis, 2009). Therefore, a field study was conducted in Belgium to investigate job seeking.
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nurses’ exposure to recruitment sources and their attraction to recruiting hospitals.

Theoretical Background

Job seekers learn about job openings through a wide array of sources such as advertising, websites, and job fairs. Although the effectiveness of these recruitment sources is one of the most intensely researched aspects of recruitment, the focus has been on post-hire instead of pre-hire outcomes (Barber, 1998). In addition, previous research has typically applied a very rudimentary classification of recruitment sources on the basis of the formal-informal distinction. Whereas formal sources such as job advertisements involve formal intermediaries that exist primarily for recruitment purposes, informal sources such as employee referrals do not rely on formal intermediaries to reach job seekers (Zottoli & Wanous, 2000). As such, for the past forty years, the main finding has been that employees recruited through informal sources show higher job satisfaction, better job performance, and lower turnover than employees recruited through formal sources (Breaugh, 2008).

Addressing calls for recruitment source research to be more theory-driven and to focus on organizational attraction (Breaugh, 2008; Zottoli & Wanous, 2000), Cable and Turban (2001) borrowed from the marketing literature to develop an innovative theoretical framework of the sources through which job seekers receive employment information. One of the most important premises of their model is that organizational attraction can be influenced by job and organizational information from a wide variety of sources, not restricted to the ones organizations intentionally incorporate in their recruitment activities. Their proposed taxonomy of recruitment sources consists of two major theoretical dimensions. First, the dependent-independent dimension refers to the degree of control the organization has over the source. Company-dependent sources such as advertising are part of the organization’s recruitment activities and can be directly managed to communicate the intended message to job seekers. On the contrary, company-independent sources such as word-of-mouth cannot be
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directly controlled by the organization but can only be influenced indirectly through other recruitment activities. Second, the experiential-informational dimension represents the degree to which the source allows job seekers to acquire information through personal, vivid media (e.g., recruitment event) versus impersonal, pallid media (e.g., publicity).

Combining these two dimensions results in four distinct categories of recruitment sources. First, recruitment advertising represents a company-dependent informational source and consists of any paid form of non-personal presentation and promotion of an organization as an employer by the organization itself (Van Hoye & Lievens, 2005). Examples include job advertisements, recruitment brochures, and recruitment websites. Second, as a company-dependent experiential source, recruitment events refer to events organized by the organization that allow job seekers to personally experience some aspect of the organization, for instance by meeting its representatives (Cable & Turban, 2001). Job fairs, open house events, and information sessions are examples of recruitment events. Third, publicity is a company-independent informational source and involves employment information disseminated through editorial media not paid for by the organization (Van Hoye & Lievens, 2005). It typically consists of non-personal mass communication such as newspaper articles and TV news items. Finally, as a company-independent experiential source, word-of-mouth refers to interpersonal communication, independent of the organization’s recruitment activities, about an organization as an employer or specific jobs (Van Hoye & Lievens, 2009). Examples are talks with friends and advice from family.

Even though information from all these types of recruitment sources can affect organizational attraction, some are likely to be more influential than others. In line with theoretical models of recruitment proposing credibility as an important explaining mechanism for the impact of recruitment activities on organizational attraction (Breaugh, 2008), the present study investigates how the characteristics of recruitment sources relate to credibility.
perceptions which in turn might explain their different effects on organizational attraction. A source credibility perspective suggests that more credible sources of information are more persuasive in both changing attitudes and gaining behavioral compliance (Eisend, 2004; Hovland et al., 1953; Pornpitakpan, 2004). Perceived credibility consists of the perceived truthfulness, trustworthiness, and believability of the communicated information (Allen, Van Scotter, & Otondo, 2004). Applied to recruitment, this implies that recruitment sources vary in the degree to which job seekers perceive them as providing credible employment information, allowing to predict differential relationships of these sources with organizational attractiveness (Cable & Turban, 2001). Compared to company-dependent sources, company-independent sources are likely to be perceived as providing more credible information because they do not have the explicit purpose to promote the organization (Van Hoye & Lievens, 2007a). In addition, job seekers tend to perceive information obtained through direct personal experience as more credible than indirect impersonal information, suggesting that experiential sources are more credible than informational sources (Allen et al., 2004).

Therefore, on the basis of Cable and Turban’s (2001) taxonomy of recruitment sources and a source credibility perspective (Hovland et al., 1953; Pornpitakpan, 2004), it is expected that of all recruitment sources, job seekers will perceive information received through word-of-mouth as most credible given that it is a company-independent and experiential source. In turn, because of this credibility, word-of-mouth is expected to have the strongest impact on job seekers’ attraction to organizations as employers. In other words, credibility is expected to mediate the relationship between word-of-mouth and attraction.

Empirical support for these theoretical assumptions is scarce, given that only a few previous studies have examined word-of-mouth as a recruitment source. In three laboratory studies using student samples, Van Hoye and Lievens found that word-of-mouth information had a strong effect on organizational attractiveness (2007b), was more positively related to
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attractiveness than the organization’s website (2007a), and enhanced attractiveness after being exposed to negative publicity (2005). Moreover, word-of-mouth was perceived as providing more credible employment information than recruitment advertising (Van Hoye & Lievens, 2005) and credibility mediated the effect of word-of-mouth on organizational attractiveness (2007a). Even though these results provide some preliminary support for the importance of word-of-mouth, these experimental studies lacked realism (e.g., use of fictitious recruitment sources and organization) and did not include all types of recruitment sources from Cable and Turban’s (2001) taxonomy.

In a field study, Collins and Stevens (2002) observed that students were more attracted to organizations when information was provided through word-of-mouth than through recruitment advertising and publicity. Similarly, Van Hoye and Lievens (2009) found that time spent on receiving word-of-mouth information was more positively related to job seekers’ attraction to the Military than time spent on recruitment events and publicity. However, these field studies did not investigate credibility as a mediating mechanism. Moreover, given the scarcity of this research, we do not yet know whether these findings will generalize to other types of job seekers, organizations, and labor markets.

Therefore, the present study extends previous research by investigating in the field how job seekers’ attraction to real recruiting organizations relates to their actual exposure to all four types of recruitment sources from Cable and Turban’s (2001) taxonomy as well as to the credibility of the received employment information. In addition, given that labor market demand is an important context variable affecting the impact of recruitment on organizational attraction (Rynes & Barber, 1990), the present study contributes to the literature by focusing on the recruitment of nurses, a population characterized by a continuously tight labor market (Massey et al., 2009). As such, the generalizability of previous research findings to other types of job seekers (nurses), organizations (hospitals), and labor markets (high labor market
demand) can be examined. The following hypotheses are tested.

*Hypothesis 1:* Word-of-mouth will be more positively related to organizational attractiveness than recruitment advertising, recruitment events, and publicity.

*Hypothesis 2:* The relationship between word-of-mouth and organizational attractiveness will be mediated by credibility.

**Method**

**Participants and Procedure**

Participants were approached at two job fairs organized by two hospitals located in a major Belgian city to inform job seeking nurses about the organization and job opportunities. Both employed nurses and last-year nursing students attended these job fairs. As is typical for the healthcare industry (Massey et al., 2009), both hospitals reported shortages of qualified nursing staff and consequently invested a lot of time and effort into the recruitment of nurses, relying on all recruitment sources investigated in the present study. Moreover, these hospitals had to compete with numerous other employment options available to nurses, as there are three other hospitals located in the same city and thirteen more within a radius of 30 kilometers, illustrating the high labor market demand for the job seeking nurses in this study. A research assistant visited each job fair to introduce the study and distribute the questionnaires. It was stressed that participation was voluntary and anonymous, that answers would be used for research purposes only, and that participants should answer honestly on the basis of their own opinion or experiences, as there were no right or wrong answers.

Of the 184 participating nurses, 79% were women and 21% were men. Age ranged from 20 to 47 years ($M = 25.20, SD = 6.70$). With respect to education, 40% had or was about to achieve a Certificate Degree of Nursing (3 years of secondary education in the fourth grade) and 60% a Bachelor Degree of Nursing (3 years of higher education). Finally, 21% of the participants were currently employed.
Measures

Recruitment sources. To measure recruitment sources, a scale from Van Hoye and Lievens (2009) was adapted from a military to a hospital context. Each recruitment source was measured with two items assessing how much time job seeking nurses had spent on receiving employment information about the hospital through that source. All items were preceded by the stem question “How much time have you spent on …?” and were rated on a 5-point rating scale, ranging from 1 = no time at all to 5 = very much time. Given that job seekers are likely to vary in the extent to which they receive information from a particular source (Zottoli & Wanous, 2000), the use of such a Likert-type scale is more appropriate than a simple yes/no response scale (Van Hoye & Lievens, 2009). Recruitment advertising was measured by the items “Going through job advertisements of the hospital” and “Going through recruitment brochures/website of the hospital” (α = .72). The items “Attending events or job fairs where the hospital was present” and “Attending information sessions or open house events of the hospital” assessed recruitment events (α = .72). Publicity was measured by the items “Going through media messages about the hospital” and “Going through information about the hospital on/in TV, radio, newspapers, or magazines” (α = .85). The items “Talking to people you know about the hospital” and “Inquiring about the hospital of family, friends or acquaintances” measured word-of-mouth (α = .81). A principal components analysis with varimax rotation yielded four components corresponding to the intended scales and explaining roughly similar proportions of variance: recruitment advertising (20%), recruitment events (19%), publicity (22%), and word-of-mouth (21%).

Credibility. Three items from Van Hoye and Lievens (2005) were used to measure the perceived credibility of the employment information received through the various recruitment sources, rated on a 5-point rating scale ranging from 1 = completely disagree to 5 = completely agree. A sample item is “I think the information was trustworthy” (α = .92).
Organizational attractiveness. The perceived attractiveness of the hospital as an employer was assessed using a five-item scale from Turban and Keon (1993), rated on a 5-point rating scale ranging from $1 = \text{completely disagree}$ to $5 = \text{completely agree}$. An example item is “I would like to work for the hospital” ($\alpha = .93$).

Control variables. Gender, age, degree, and employment status were controlled for in the analyses, given that previous research has found that demographic variables can affect perceptions of organizational attractiveness (Chapman et al., 2005).

Results

Means, standard deviations, and correlations are presented in Table 1. All recruitment sources as well as credibility were positively related to organizational attractiveness. Only recruitment events and word-of-mouth were positively related to credibility.

To examine the relationship of job seekers’ exposure to recruitment sources with credibility and organizational attractiveness, two hierarchical multiple regression analyses were conducted. In the first step, the control variables gender, age, degree, and employment status were entered. The four recruitment sources were added in the second step. For organizational attractiveness only, credibility was entered in the final step to test for mediation (Baron & Kenny, 1986). In addition, two relative weights analyses were conducted to determine the relative importance of the control variables and the four recruitment sources in predicting credibility and organizational attractiveness (Johnson, 2000). Relative weights are defined as the proportionate contribution that each predictor makes to the predictable variance ($R^2$), considering both its unique contribution and its contribution when combined with the other predictor variables in the analysis (Johnson, 2000). For ease of interpretation, raw relative weights can also be expressed as percentages of $R^2$.

As shown in Table 2, the control variables did not explain a significant amount of variance in credibility, $F(4, 179) = 1.61, p > .05$. The addition of recruitment sources in the
second step accounted for a substantial increase in explained variance (15.1%), \( F(4, 175) = 8.14, p < .001 \). Job seekers who had spent more time on recruitment events and word-of-mouth perceived the received employment information as more credible. Conversely, recruitment advertising was a negative predictor of credibility. Inspection of the relative weights shows that word-of-mouth made the most important contribution to the predictable variance in credibility, followed by recruitment events.

With respect to organizational attractiveness, the control variables did not explain significant variance in the first step, \( F(4, 179) = .48, p > .05 \). In the second step, the recruitment sources accounted for significant incremental variance (17.1%), \( F(4, 175) = 9.14, p < .001 \). Job seekers who had spent more time on receiving employment information through word-of-mouth were more attracted to the organization as an employer. In terms of relative weights, word-of-mouth made the single largest contribution to predicting organizational attractiveness, explaining more variance than all other recruitment sources together, in support of Hypothesis 1. In the final step, credibility explained a substantial amount of additional variance (14.4%), \( F(1, 174) = 37.20, p < .001 \). Job seekers who perceived the received employment information as more credible were more attracted to the organization. In addition, a Sobel test indicated that the regression weight of word-of-mouth was significantly reduced when controlling for credibility, \( z = 2.93, p < .01 \) (Preacher & Leonardelli, 2001). Nonetheless, word-of-mouth remained a significant predictor.

In line with the three-step procedure for examining mediation advocated by Baron and Kenny (1986), the above analyses show that: (a) word-of-mouth was positively related to credibility, (b) word-of-mouth was positively related to organizational attractiveness, and (c) credibility was positively related to attractiveness while controlling for word-of-mouth, whereas the relationship between word-of-mouth and attractiveness was less strong (but still significant) when controlling for credibility. Therefore, the perceived credibility of
employment information partially mediated the relationship between job seekers’ exposure to word-of-mouth and their attraction to the organization, supporting Hypothesis 2.

**Discussion**

This study yields several important conclusions that contribute to the recruitment literature. First, even though all recruitment sources were positively correlated with organizational attractiveness, only word-of-mouth was a significantly positive predictor in the regression. In fact, time spent on receiving word-of-mouth information explained more variance in job seekers’ attraction than all other sources (i.e., recruitment advertising, recruitment events, and publicity) together. This corroborates previous research indicating that word-of-mouth is an important determinant of organizational attractiveness (Van Hoye & Lievens, 2005, 2007b) and exerts a stronger influence than other recruitment sources (Collins & Stevens, 2002; Van Hoye & Lievens, 2007a, 2009), suggesting that these overall findings can be generalized across different types of job seekers, organizations, and labor markets. The present study extends previous research by including all types of recruitment sources from Cable and Turban’s (2001) taxonomy, by collecting actual recruitment data in the field, and by investigating a population of nurses in high demand on the labor market.

Second, whereas the findings with respect to word-of-mouth are in line with previous research, the role of recruitment advertising as a recruitment source is less clear. Specifically, controlling for word-of-mouth, recruitment advertising was not a significant predictor of organizational attractiveness in the present study. On the contrary, previous field studies conducted in other samples found that both word-of-mouth and recruitment advertising positively affected organizational attraction (Collins & Stevens, 2002; Van Hoye & Lievens, 2009). This suggests that, given the high demand for nurses on the labor market (Massey et al., 2009), they might be more critical of recruitment advertising from organizations desperately trying to attract them and prefer to rely on more independent word-of-mouth
information to evaluate potential employers. Therefore, even though word-of-mouth appears to play a key role in recruiting job seekers across different settings, it seems to be even more important for attracting job seekers in high demand on the labor market.

Third, the relationship between word-of-mouth and organizational attractiveness was partially mediated by the credibility of the received employment information. This is in line with Cable and Turban’s (2001) taxonomy of recruitment sources and a source credibility perspective (Hovland et al., 1953; Pornpitakpan, 2004), suggesting that job seekers perceived word-of-mouth as providing more credible information because it is not under the direct control of the organization and allows to obtain information in a personal, vivid manner. Given that the information received through word-of-mouth was seen as more trustworthy and believable, it was more strongly related to attractiveness. This finding extends previous laboratory research demonstrating that word-of-mouth is a more credible source of employment information than recruitment advertising (Van Hoye & Lievens, 2005, 2007a).

Fourth, the results suggest that credibility is strongly related to job seekers’ attraction, consistent with a source credibility perspective (Hovland et al., 1953; Pornpitakpan, 2004). Moreover, the experiential sources recruitment events and word-of-mouth were positively related to credibility whereas the informational sources publicity and recruitment advertising were not or negatively related. This implies that the experiential-informational dimension of Cable and Turban’s (2001) framework might be the most important determinant of the credibility of recruitment sources. Being able to acquire employment information through direct personal experience seems to increase its credibility for job seekers.

Limitations and Directions for Future Research

This study has some limitations. First, common method variance may have affected the results as self-reports gathered by a single survey were used. However, the observed differential relationships show that more is happening here than just common method
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variance. In addition, in line with recommendations to reduce common method variance (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Lee, & Podsakoff, 2003), the present study used a procedure aimed at protecting participant anonymity and reducing evaluation apprehension, valid and sound scales from previous research, and different response scales. Second, the cross-sectional design of this study prevents drawing causal conclusions. Finally, Belgian nurses at two hospital job fairs participated in the study. Future researchers should examine the generalizability of this study’s findings in other settings, populations, and countries.

In addition, the following avenues for future research are suggested. First, the aim of the present study was to investigate all types of recruitment sources from Cable and Turban’s (2001) theory-driven taxonomy. To this end, four broad categories of sources were included, namely recruitment advertising, recruitment events, publicity, and word-of-mouth. However, Zottoli and Wanous (2000) suggested that not only differences between categories of recruitment sources should be investigated but also differences between and even within specific sources. For instance, future research on recruitment advertising could differentiate between print and internet advertising. In turn, print advertising could be subdivided into job advertisements in national magazines, regional papers, and local freesheets whereas internet advertising might be split up into corporate websites, job boards, and social network sites.

Second, the results of this study suggest that word-of-mouth is the most important source of employment information for recruiting job seekers. However, word-of-mouth is a company-independent source that can only be influenced indirectly through other recruitment activities (Cable & Turban, 2001). Therefore, future research should examine the efficacy of various strategies that organizations might apply to stimulate word-of-mouth such as campus recruitment, internships, sponsorship, building relationships with key influentials (e.g., career counselor, teacher), and providing employees with bonuses for making referrals. In addition to their effects on the occurrence of word-of-mouth, the impact of these strategies on the
outcomes of word-of-mouth should also be taken into account. For instance, rewarding employees for referring applicants is likely to increase their extrinsic motivation for spreading word-of-mouth (Van Hoye, 2011). However, this might also undermine the credibility and thus the impact of word-of-mouth if job seekers would perceive employees as having a self-interest in promoting the organization (Godes et al., 2005).

A final direction for future research is to investigate additional mediators of the relationship between word-of-mouth and organizational attractiveness. Given that credibility only partially mediated this relationship, other variables can help to explain the strong impact of word-of-mouth. Possible explanations include the amount and realism of the provided information, person-organization fit, and individual differences (Zottoli & Wanous, 2000).

**Practical Implications**

Important practical implications follow from this study. Organizations should take into account that job seekers receive employment information from a broad variety of sources, some of which can only be influenced indirectly through other recruitment activities. To increase organizational attraction, especially for job seekers in high demand on the labor market, it seems particularly promising to stimulate word-of-mouth about the organization and its jobs. First, job seekers are more likely to receive word-of-mouth from strong ties such as family and friends than from weak ties such as acquaintances (Van Hoye & Lievens, 2009). This implies that to stimulate word-of-mouth, organizations should broaden the target group of their recruitment activities to include job seekers’ friends and family. For instance, they can encourage job seekers to communicate relevant vacancies to their friends or organize family fairs and open house events.

Second, the organizations’ current employees represent one of the most important sources of positive word-of-mouth (Van Hoye & Lievens, 2009). Therefore, all employees should have easy access to accurate and complete information about the organization and
vacant positions. In a study exploring employees’ motives for spreading positive and negative word-of-mouth, intrinsic job dissatisfaction was found to be the primary determinant of negative word-of-mouth whereas both intrinsic job satisfaction and the prosocial desire to help other people find a suitable job, and to a lesser extent monetary incentives, motivated positive word-of-mouth (Van Hoye, 2011). Moreover, Van Hoye (2008) found that enhancing employees’ perceptions of employer image is an effective means to increase their willingness to recommend their employer to others. Together with the potential negative effect of monetary incentives on the credibility and impact of word-of-mouth (Godes et al., 2005), these findings suggest that intrinsically motivating employees might be the best strategy for stimulating positive word-of-mouth and avoiding negative word-of-mouth. This illustrates the importance of internal employer branding in addition to external branding, as organizations need to be an attractive employer not only for potential applicants, but also for their own employees (Edwards, 2010). Furthermore, appealing to prosocial motives seems to be another effective way to stimulate positive referrals (Van Hoye, 2011). For example, organizations might encourage employees “to help friends and relatives find the job of their life”.

Third, in addition to motivating others to spread positive word-of-mouth, recruiters can choose to actively participate in social interactions and engage in word-of-mouth themselves. For instance, this might involve talking to potential applicants at events, writing a blog, or connecting with potential applicants on social network sites (Kluemper & Rosen, 2009). One important consideration, especially in an online environment, is whether recruiters reveal their identity while doing so. In addition to ethical considerations, evidence from the marketing literature suggests that recruiters might better identify themselves straightforwardly, given the devastating effects on credibility and attractiveness when an undisclosed affiliation is discovered later on (Godes et al., 2005).
Finally, the results of this study suggest that credibility is an important determinant of organizational attraction and that experiential sources are perceived as more credible than informational sources. Therefore, organizations should enable job seekers to obtain employment information through direct personal experience. Moreover, the credibility of informational sources such as job advertisements and websites might be enhanced by making them more personal and vivid, for instance by using employee testimonials. Along these lines, previous research suggests that employee testimonials should be presented using a rich medium (e.g., video and audio; Walker, Feild, Giles, Armenakis, & Bernerth, 2009) and that employees should talk about themselves and their own work experiences instead of promoting the organization as a whole (Van Hoye & Lievens, 2007a), given that this increases their credibility and attractiveness for job seekers.
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Table 1

Means, Standard Deviations, and Correlations of Study Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>$M$</th>
<th>$SD$</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Gender$^a$</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Age</td>
<td>25.20</td>
<td>6.70</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Degree$^b$</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>-.15*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Employment status$^c$</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.48***</td>
<td>-.18*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Recruitment advertising</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>-.17*</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Recruitment events</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.16*</td>
<td>.26***</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Publicity</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.43***</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Word-of-mouth</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.32***</td>
<td>.52***</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Credibility</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.28***</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.34***</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Organizational attractiveness</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>.39***</td>
<td>.48***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $^a$ 0 = female, 1 = male. $^b$ 0 = certificate, 1 = bachelor. $^c$ 0 = not employed, 1 = employed.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$. 
### Table 2

**Regression of Credibility and Organizational Attractiveness on Recruitment Sources**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Credibility</th>
<th></th>
<th>Organizational attractiveness</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>β</td>
<td>Relative weights</td>
<td>β</td>
<td>Relative weights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td>Raw</td>
<td>% R²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender(^a)</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree(^b)</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.15(^*)</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment status(^c)</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment sources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment advertising</td>
<td>-.19(^*)</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment events</td>
<td>.19(^*)</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publicity</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word-of-mouth</td>
<td>.28(^**)</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>44.6</td>
<td>.32(^***)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Credibility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th>Step 2</th>
<th>% R²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>.186(^***)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted R²</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.149(^***)</td>
<td>-.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΔR²</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>.151(^***)</td>
<td>.011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.**
- \(^a\) 0 = female, 1 = male.
- \(^b\) 0 = certificate, 1 = bachelor.
- \(^c\) 0 = not employed, 1 = employed.

\(^*\) p < .05, \(^**\) p < .01, \(^***\) p < .001.