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Abstract
This paper investigates how technology in the interaction with humans is situated in practice and creates possibilities and new practices within organizations. In particular, this study explores how the technology of Social Network Sites (SNSs) is used within recruitment processes. The paper uses a qualitative method and is based on two case studies, where a private and a public organization are compared. Data has been collected by conducting 18 interviews with a field researcher and respondents within the two organizations. Additionally, SNSs posts and internal documents from the organizations have been collected. The paper uses a sociomateriality and affordance lens to analyse the collected data and identifies four functions of SNSs in relation to SNSs affordances. In addition, this paper reveals that practices within recruitment are being established in imbrication between humans and technology, in relation to the different SNSs functions, but depending on organizational context, individual context and the relation between SNSs affordances. This paper contributes to new insights in the research field since previous research has not focused on how practices have been situated, but rather on the implications of SNSs usage within recruitment.
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Introduction
Social network sites (SNSs) such as Facebook, Instagram, Twitter, LinkedIn and Youtube among others have during the last couple of years come to be increasingly used in recruitment activities (Girard, Fallery & Rodhain, 2014; Kluemper, Wang & Mitra, 2016). Surveys and reports reveal that many human resource (HR) professionals use SNSs extensively in their work (Society for Human Resource Management [SHRM], 2016; Statistics Sweden, 2015). In a survey of SNSs use in recruitment among HR professionals in the United States, 84 percent said they used SNSs in “some way” within the recruitment process whereas 43 percent even used it as a tool for screening applicants (SHRM, 2016). In a similar survey done in Sweden, 27 percent of the organizations involved answered that they use SNSs as tools for recruiting
employees (Statistics Sweden, 2015). Furthermore, the usage of SNSs for screening and background checks among Swedish organizations has increased substantially the last few years, where 72 percent of the respondents in a survey performed by Stockholm Chamber of Commerce (2015) answered that they had used SNSs for such purposes. Hence, what initially was found as websites facilitating social interaction for pure enjoyment (Boyd & Ellison, 2008; Lin & Lu, 2011) has evolved into tools applicable in job hunting, recruitment, and job applicant screening and selection (Kluemper & Rosen, 2009; Kluemper et al., 2016; Nikolaou, 2014). This indicates that the online information is used beyond its intended purpose (Kluemper & Rosen, 2009).

This development should be considered in relation to wider technological advancements in the last decades (Thompson, Braddy & Wuensch, 2008). With continuous changes in technology, facilitating information accessibility, speed and efficiency, among other things (Ryan & Ployhart, 2014; Chapman & Webster, 2003), the methods used in recruitment and selection processes have been affected (Ryan & Ployhart, 2014; Thompson et al., 2008) implying that human recruiters are nowadays given the opportunity to interact with technology as an actor when taking hiring decisions (Thompson et al., 2008). Many organizations and HR professionals have begun to understand the value of the new information and communication technology and the available data from SNSs, blogs and other Internet sites at minimal costs (Ramirez, Walther, Burgoon, & Sunnafrank, 2002; Berkelar, 2010), contrarily to traditional recruitment methods that usually are rather costly (Ostell, 1996; Ryan & Ployhart, 2014). Consequently, a trend has arisen in the last years within organizations: they actively engage in activities that are utilizing the possibilities SNSs are giving (Brown & Vaughn, 2011; Kluemper, Davidson, Cao & Wu, 2015).

Although a trend of integrating SNSs in organizational life is establishing, many researchers have, in previous theoretical studies related to recruitment activities, particularly accentuated three major issues with the usage of SNSs in these processes: legal issues (Roth, Bobko, Van Iddekinge & Thatcher 2016; Slovensky & Ross, 2012), feasibility (Kluemper & Rosen, 2009) and privacy right intrusions (Davison, Maraist & Bing, 2011). Yet, according to Kluemper et al. (2015) practitioners have not thoroughly considered these factors when using SNSs in practice. Within the framework of legal issues, researchers have in particular elucidated the issue of unintended discrimination (Brandenburg, 2008; Brown & Vaughn, 2011) due to the possibility to gather more information about the candidate e.g. age, gender, religion, sexual orientation, marital status, physical disabilities etc. which would normally not be available in a job application (Davison et al., 2012; Kluemper, 2013; Roth et al., 2016). Considering the Equal Employment Opportunity Law of United States and Sweden e.g., among other countries, recruiters must not value and consider such available information from SNSs when taking hiring decisions (Kluemper & Rosen, 2009; Roth et al., 2016).

In regard to the issue of feasibility (Kluemper & Rosen, 2009), many researchers (e.g. Brown & Vaughn, 2011; Davison et al., 2011; Roth et al., 2016) argue that the integration of SNSs in the recruitment process and the usage of accessible information from those networks can give rise to a potential discrepancy between the purpose of most SNSs and an organization’s use of
the SNSs, thus making SNSs inapplicable as recruitment tools. Slovensky and Ross (2012), among other researchers, discussed the validity of information on a job candidate given in SNSs, and argue that from an organization’s perspective, such data may be valuable in order to verify the information given in a resume (Brandenburg, 2008; Slovensky & Ross, 2012; Van Iddekinge et al., 2016). The argument lies in that job seekers can have different versions of their resumes for different types of job applications (Slovensky & Ross, 2012), but only have one version of their SNSs (Kluemper, 2013; Slovensky & Ross, 2012). However, Kluemper and Rosen (2009), who examined the feasibility of using applicants’ personal information to improve employee selection decisions argue that identification of personal traits, performance and intelligence through the usage of SNSs is possible if the context is evaluated (Brown & Vaughn, 2011; Kluemper, Rosen & Mossholder, 2012). Yet, research regarding the feasibility of SNSs usage in recruitment has in particular emphasized the technological aspects that can affect and determine recruitment and selection outcomes (Kluemper et al., 2012), which identification and tracing of work related qualities are examples of (Kluemper & Rosen, 2009).

Moreover, related to the issue of privacy right intrusions, many researchers have also accentuated that usage of SNSs within recruitment can intrude applicants’ private lives and rights to privacy (e.g. Davison et al., 2011; Van Iddekinge et al., 2016) since information from SNSs is accessible for everyone (Treem & Leonardi, 2012). Consequently, it is difficult for recruiters to not consider such information when recruiting (Kluemper et al., 2016), which results in what once was private information intended for private purposes and not related to job applications (Van Iddekinge et al., 2016) being no longer private. Davison et al. (2011) argue that many job candidates therefore may ‘fake good’, implying that content is deleted or created in what they believe could be favourable if used in recruitment. In doing so, the SNSs are not reflecting the truth of the job candidate’s personality and characteristics, which could be problematic for a possible employer but also for the job candidate who uses the private network to frame oneself (Davison et al., 2011).

Even though the research field of SNSs usage within recruitment and selection processes has grown extensively (e.g. Kluemper et al., 2016; Roth et al., 2016), previous studies have in particular elaborated on potential and actual issues with SNSs (e.g. Roth et al., 2016; Slovensky & Ross, 2012) rather than elucidating upon how the SNSs are used in practice and the potential possibilities that it brings (Davison et al., 2011; Van Iddekinge et al., 2016; Kluemper et al., 2016). Consequently, as Treem and Leonardi (2012) also suggest, many previous studies have disregarded the social aspects and behavioural consequences of organizational usage, which are especially essential in recruitment (Ostell, 1996), and instead focused on the technological properties and features (e.g. Brandenburg, 2008; Brown & Vaughn, 2011), which Treem and Leonardi (2012) argue is common when studying technological phenomenon as SNSs. Due to the ignorance of social actors’ involvement in technology use, there is a lack of studies that combine the material and social interactions in creating outcomes (Leonardi, 2011). Consequently, few studies include what the SNSs within recruitment afford people to do, and how HR professionals use SNSs in practice. In addition, despite increased usage of SNSs within recruitment, practices have still not become taken for granted (i.e. black-boxed [Latour, 1987]).
Thus, it is at the present time relevant to investigate how practices are being established in the interaction of humans and technology and the affordances it entails (Leonardi, 2011).

In line with the above mentioned arguments, the purpose of this paper is to investigate how technology, in the interaction with humans, is situated in practice, as well as how this create possibilities and new practices for usage in recruitment. The technology referred to in this study is SNSs, i.e. LinkedIn, Facebook and Twitter. By drawing on theory of sociomateriality and affordances (Orlikowski, 2007; Orlikowski & Scott, 2008), the interactions between social and material become visible and the establishment of new practices are possible to identify. As the lens of sociomateriality, and in particular the lens of affordances, seeks to explain why certain actions and outcomes within and between organizations can be differentiated due to different perceptions and contexts of the social beings (Leonardi, 2011), there is an interest to include a comparative approach in this study. The comparison is made between two contexts, containing a private organization that tend to have the goal of reaching as high profitability as possible, and a public organization that exists to serve the people and requires transparency. Since SNSs usage within recruitment at present has come to be a debated topic (Davison et al., 2011; Kluemper & Rosen, 2009; Slovensky & Ross, 2012), it is of particular interest to investigate whether the SNSs usage and perceptions of SNSs affordances within recruitment differ between the organizations or not.

The paper is structured as follows, first the theoretical framework of sociomateriality and affordances is presented, followed by an outline of the methodology used in this paper. Further, the analysis section presents the empirical findings and includes short analyses. The paper continues with a discussion section, and ends up with a conclusion and suggestions for future studies.

Theoretical framework

Introducing Sociomateriality and Affordance Theory
Sociomateriality is a unified term that seeks to explain how the material and the social interact in practice (Orlikowski & Scott, 2008). The term was developed by Orlikowski (2007) as a further expansion of the theoretical field of technology in practice, which includes previous concepts as for instance actor-networks (Callon, 1986; Latour, 1992; 2005), relational materiality (Law, 2004) and sociotechnical ensembles (Bijker, 1995) which all seek to describe how the social and material interact (Orlikowski, 2007). In contrast to the previous concepts, Orlikowski and Scott (2008) suggest that social actions are made possible due to materiality, which in return is created by social processes (Leonardi, 2012). Hence, Orlikowski (2007) suggests that material artefacts and social actors should be seen as constitutive entangled entities rather than be considered as independent, and that materiality is present in each phenomena or process that is to be considered as social. Further, Orlikowski (2007) and Orlikowski and Scott (2008) suggest that technology in itself is not sociomaterial, but rather the practice or process in which technology is embedded. Thus, it is within practices that the social and material becomes entangled (Orlikowski, 2010).
Leonardi (2011) presents a theory about how the entanglement of the social and material occurs, which he conceptualizes as imbrication, and suggests that it is the social and material agencies (i.e., the things that the materiality allows people to do) combined that produce empirical phenomena as technology, practices, and routines. Leonardi (2011) exemplifies how technology, practices, and routines can be produced by imbrication in a process of creating a newsletter, which does not allow for visually appealing and well-formatted texts. In order to meet the requirements, the social and material will be entangled and interact in creating either a new technology (e.g., change features of existing technology to allow for the desired properties) or a new routine (e.g., reorganize the way newsletters are produced). Moreover, Leonardi (2011) argues that the material agencies are similar to the concept of affordances, which are possibilities of an object’s or artefact’s material properties that actors can perceive and use (Hutchby, 2001), similar to material agency (Leonardi, 2011). Further, affordances are to some extent created by social actors as, for instance, an object designer (Norman, 1999), who has social agency to create the materiality (Leonardi, 2011). Hence, materiality becomes incorporated in the social and, conversely, supporting the sociomateriality arguments by Orlikowski (2007), Orlikowski and Scott (2008), and Suchman (2007).

The theory of affordance originates from the ecological psychologist Gibson (1979), who argued for the possibilities that an object or environment offers to a “perceiving” subject. For human beings, particular objects, such as doors, tables, and chairs can be said to have affordances that go beyond their material properties (Gibson, 1986) implying that for instance a door affords entry and exit and handles afford grabbing (Fayard & Weeks, 2007). Gibson (1979) further argued that what humans perceive when observing an object is not its physical or material characteristics but its affordances. Hence, it is suggested that humans do not interact with objects without the perception of what the objects can do (Gibson, 1986). For example, a door can have the affordance of open and close, but if the information specifying its affordance (e.g., a visible handle) is not available to the actor, it cannot be an interaction (Gibson, 1986). However, if both affordance and information that specifies the affordance are present, the actor can perceive the affordance and interact with the material object (Gibson, 1986).

As a perspective elaborating on Gibson’s, Norman (1988) argues that affordance is the perceived and actual properties of an object that suggests and determines how the object possibly can be used (Norman, 1988). He suggests that the objects’ properties and design are created by designers, implying that they also are creating affordances, based on their assumptions of how possible users would perceive the objects (Norman, 1999). However, as users not necessarily share the same assumptions as the designers, the intended possibilities for action can be interpreted in multiple ways, including seeing possible actions as constraints (Norman 1988; 1999).

Moreover, Hutchby (2001) conceptualizes that affordances should be seen as dual, thus arguing for a combination of Gibson’s (1979) and Norman’s (1988) approaches. On one hand, affordances are functional in the sense that they are enabling and constraining actions and activities even though they are not necessarily perceived as possibilities, thereby suggesting that affordances can exist but be non-perceived. On the other hand, affordances are also
relational because multiple and different affordances can arise for different people in different contexts (Hutchby, 2001). Hutchby (2001) emphasizes affordance as relational in which the argument takes its stance in that an object’s material properties exist independently of the people of use but affordances and constraints do not (Hutchby, 2001; Zamutto, Griffith, Majchrzak, Dougherty & Faraj, 2007). This implies that objects have materiality but afford different possibilities for action depending on context (Hutchby, 2001; Zamutto et al., 2007; Leonardi & Vaast, 2017). Hence, Hutchby (2001) argues that affordances of objects can change across different contexts even though the materiality of the object is the same. Because materiality can provide multiple affordances, due to the individual actors’ perceptions of materiality (Norman, 1988), an artefact can produce many different outcomes (Leonardi, 2011), thus effecting organizational work in practice in different ways (Fayard & Weeks, 2007; Zamutto et al., 2007). Thus, depending on how individuals perceive materiality and its affordances, the social and material will be entangled differently, resulting in different practices and routines (Leonardi, 2012). However, although perceptions of affordances can differ, Leonardi (2011) and Leonardi and Barley (2008) argue that because the features of technology are often similar for organizations, the interpretations of the possibilities the technology can afford tend to, consequently, be similar as well.

As somewhat of a contradiction to the term “affordance”, Norman (1988; 1999) and Hutchby (2001) suggests that like an object can be perceived as having or not having affordances people may also perceive that an object constraints possible actions and activities (Faraj & Azad, 2012). Constraints are related to an individual’s agenda or purpose for using the object according to Faraj and Azad (2012). If the agenda cannot be fulfilled by the usage of the specific object, there is a constraint. Hence, it is of importance to include both perceptions of affordances and constraints when using the affordance theory for understanding organization practices and behaviour (Leonardi, 2011; Leonardi & Vaast, 2017).

**Affordances of Social Media**

Previous studies of affordances in relation to SNSs have in particular relied upon a literature review of SNSs usage in organizations by Treem and Leonardi (2012), who identified four affordances enabled by the new technology of SNSs; visibility, persistence, editability and association (between people and between people and information). The first identified affordance of visibility refers to “the ability [of social media] to make [users’] behaviours, knowledge, preferences, and communication network connections that were once invisible (or very hard to see) visible to other.” (Treem & Leonardi, 2012, p. 150). Activities and actions that contribute to the SNSs content as status updates, comments, likes, adding friends and picture-sharing becomes visible to all those with access to the SNSs, to either part or the whole of a member’s network (DiMicco, Geyer, Millen, Dugan, & Brownholtz, 2009). The second identified affordance is persistence, which refers to the ability to remain previously created content accessible and available (Wagner & Majchrzak, 2006). Hence, when information as pictures and posts have once been published on SNSs, it does not expire or disappear (Leonardi & Treem, 2012), but can be stored, transmitted and accessed for an indeterminate period of time (Vaast & Kaganer, 2013).
The third affordance of SNSs is editability, which Leonardi and Treem (2012) suggest gives individuals the ability to revise, add and change content that has been created. Thus, if an individual has published a post containing spelling errors or wrong information, it is possible to adjust the mistake on SNSs, implying that the communicator retains some degree of control over the created content. The fourth is the affordance of association between people, and between people and information (Leonardi & Treem, 2012), which refers to established connections between entities (Vaast & Kaganer, 2013). Associations between people relates to what Leonardi and Treem (2012) call ‘social tie’, meaning that people become tied together into relationships (Steinfield, DiMicco, Ellison, & Lampe, 2009), as for instance being friends on different SNSs. The other association, between people and information, can be exemplified by comments, likes and contribution to a post, hence tying individuals and information together (Leonardi & Treem, 2012).

Moreover, Treem and Leonardi’s (2012) SNSs affordances have been used as ground for research within the field of SNSs and organizational usage. Many researchers have examined how the affordances of SNSs relate to communication (e.g. Leonardi, 2014) and knowledge sharing (e.g. Ellison, Gibbs & Weber, 2014; Majchrzak, Faraj, Kane and Azad, 2013; Wagner, Vollmar & Wagner, 2014). Researchers have also examined organizational governance of SNSs by looking at employee policies (Vaast & Kaganer, 2013), in which identification of relationships between SNSs affordances and governance, as well as between the four different affordances was made (Vaast & Kaganer, 2013).

Methodology

Research Design
In order to fulfil the purpose of this study, a qualitative research method was deemed the most appropriate. The method is in line with the arguments by Silverman (2013), who claims that everyday actions and behaviours are studied best with a qualitative approach. Bryman and Bell (2011) describe the qualitative research method as a good technique in collecting data for describing social processes and practices, which is in line with the aim of this paper. Moreover, this study is based on a case study approach on two chosen organizations. Flyvbjerg (2006) highlights that the advantage of a case study is the providing of depth and practical examples from real life, which will contribute in fulfilling the purpose of this paper. Hence, this paper takes on a comparative approach by contrasting the two cases of a public and private organization, which gives a deeper understanding of the usage of SNSs in recruitment. A comparative approach is, in its own simplicity, the act of comparing two or more things with an aspiration to discovering something about one or all of the things being compared, and is a technique that utilizes multiple directions in one study (Heidenheimer, Heclo & Adams, 1996).

The comparison between the public and the private organizations is especially of interest since the organizations are similar in many ways, such as size and structure, where they are located, and what SNSs they use. However, the organizations are also dissimilar in organizational agendas and principles, leading to different motives for recruitment, thus affecting practices. Due to the many similarities it is possible to compare and isolate one single variable, which in
this paper is how the two organizations are recruiting people by using SNSs and the effects of it. The public organization was chosen by cause of an ongoing project for integrating SNSs in recruitment, which makes the organization particularly relevant. As a result of the public organization’s characteristics, there was a desire to find a private organization that had similar size and job categories. Hereafter the public organization will be referred as Welfare and the private organization as Power AB.

Data Collection
The primary data for this paper has been collected through interviews, which is to be preferred since they provide information about individual attitudes and motives. Through interviews, researches can get examples of daily activities (Silverman, 2013), which in this case study is necessary for understanding the usage of SNSs in recruitment in the chosen organizations. Moreover, other data used in this study consists of internal documents, reports and postings activities on SNSs from the two organizations. A recruitment order containing formal principles, rules and guidelines regarding SNSs and recruitment in general, and two meeting protocols containing notes from the pilot project were given by Welfare. These were, in combination with the interviews, used in order to understand how recruitment in general, and in relation with SNSs, proceeds. Additionally, posts between September 2016 and April 2017 from different SNSs as e.g. Facebook, Instagram and LinkedIn from both organizations have been observed and analysed in order to outline the usage of SNSs and to fully understand the answers and examples given in the interviews. When observing the organizations’ SNSs three common agendas were identified; branding of the company by illustrating activities during a working day, providing information regarding open vacancies, and creating and sharing company related news.

As the persons involved in recruitment are HR professionals, which includes recruiters, HR specialists and HR business partners, they were suitable to be interviewed for this study. However, since all HR professionals repeated the hiring manager’s importance in the final selection process, it was relevant to also conduct interviews with them. A hiring manager is the manager responsible for the area where there is an open vacancy and is normally working together with an HR professional to fill the vacancy. The hiring managers are hereafter referred to as managers. A comparison of HR professionals and managers is out of this paper’s scope and purpose, hence not included.

An initial interview was held with a researcher within the field of sociology and work science to get a thorough presentation and background of the topic. The empirical material is in total built upon 18 interviews, including the interview with the researcher and an interview with a private organization that was not taken into consideration due to lack of information on the topic studied. The 16 remaining interviews represented eight interviewees at Power AB and eight at Welfare (see table in appendix 1 for a brief presentation of the respondents). An initial contact with Welfare was established through email, which led to an interview with the responsible manager for employer branding and the recruitment process leader. The purpose of this interview was to shed light and give a first insight about the organization and its work with SNSs as well as to get information about an ongoing pilot project regarding SNSs usage.
in recruitment. The snowball effect (Emerson, 2015) of this interview led to contact information and interviews with HR professionals and managers throughout the organization that are participating in the project, which in total comprises 10 subunits and HR professionals. Six of the participants were interviewed and two interviews were held with hiring managers. At Power AB, three initial interviews were held with HR professionals, given by the head of student relations, which through the snowball effect resulted in five additional interviews of which one was with an HR professional and four with hiring managers.

The majority of the interviews were held face-to-face at the respondents’ offices but due to some of the interviewees’ tight schedule three interviews were held over the telephone. All interviews were recorded, as agreed with the interviewee, and were afterwards transcribed. Bryman and Bell (2011) state that it is more efficient to record an interview than taking notes while having a conversation since the interviewer can completely focus on the respondent. In addition, recorded material can be transcribed and used to avoid inaccurate interpretations and misunderstandings due to the interviewer’s limited memory, thus facilitates a more thorough analysis of the answers. This method also increases the reliability of the paper since it gives the opportunity to go back and control the document again, although it is time-consuming (Bryman & Bell, 2011).

The length of the interviews conducted was between 20 and 90 minutes and they were performed in a semi-structured manner. The semi-structured method allows some latitude of developing new questions in response to what the interviewee responds, and thus gives a greater understanding of the subject (Bryman & Bell, 2011). The method is subjective by nature demanding active intercommunications, hence coherent with the idea of interactionism in interviews (Silverman, 2013). The interviews were constructed to have open-ended questions to let the interviewees speak freely about the subject. Themes covered in the interviews were related to the recruitment process in general, the usage of SNSs within recruitment and additionally advantages and disadvantages that comes with the usage of SNSs. The combination of a semi-structured approach and the open-ended questions allows and encourage the interviewees to go outside the framework and interact with the interviewer (Silverman, 2013).

The data used in this paper was collected until saturation was reached, which means that data was collected until new data no longer gave any new or relevant information (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). In sum this paper’s empirical part is based on 16 interviews, a demonstration of the LinkedIn recruiter tool (included in interview no. 9), internal documents and posts on different SNSs from September 2016 until April 2017.

In order to fulfil the purpose of this paper some sensitive and private questions regarding the HR professional and manager’s practices in using SNSs for recruitment were needed. Even if the interviewee had the possibility to be anonymized there is a chance that some of the questions were answered in a favourable manner and/or not reflecting the truth. To overcome this potential problem, the interviewees were encouraged to skip any question given if they felt uncomfortable. Moreover, recruitment is a very sensitive process and is normally not shared
with people outside the organization. Consequently, even though observations would have been of value to get an understanding of how SNSs are used, the normal daily work of HR professionals and managers would be impacted and thus not reflect the truth. Further, the researchers of this paper were during the creation of this paper, students and applying for jobs and hence highly involved with SNSs and recruitment. This involvement could unconsciously have impacted the behaviour during the interviews and affected the interpretations of the data in a favourable way for the researchers.

Data Analysis
The data analysis is inspired by a grounded theory approach, thus a continuous comparative analysis was made when analysing the collected data material (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). In line with the grounded theory approach, the empirical material was analysed in two steps; 1) the data was analysed without any theoretical considerations, 2) the data was analysed from the chosen theoretical framework. With the grounded theory approach, the most relevant data for the research questions was selected (Martin & Turner, 1986), implying that the common issue with the large amount of data semi-structured interviews can result in, was avoided.

An essential part of the analysis process was the coding of the collected material, where the transcribed material and the secondary data were summarized and placed in different categories based on keywords and citations of interest (Bryman & Bell, 2011). Examples of codes are LinkedIn, subjectivity and worries. In order to structure the coded material, keywords and concepts were placed into different categories, which SNSs as search agents, SNSs as attractors, SNSs as background checkers and SNSs as reference finders are examples of. An analysis and categorization of the gathered data was initiated in three different rounds during the data collection phase. These rounds entailed combining the transcriptions of the recorded interviews with the author’s handwritten notes to create as complete understanding as possible.

In the first round which consisted of interviews number 1-8, the primary intention was to get an understanding of how recruitment processes operate in practice, and to get an introduction of the organizations work with SNSs within recruitment in general. Additionally, posts from Power AB and Welfare’s LinkedIn, Facebook, Instagram and Twitter accounts were analysed to get a deeper understanding of how SNSs are used within the organizations. The data from the first eight interviews and the SNSs posts were analysed, coded, and placed in different categories, which served as background to adjustment and development of more specific interview questions in order to get relevant and in-depth information from remaining interviews. The second round of data analysis process, contained describing, defining and specifying relationships from all the data collected from interview 1-14, taking the study forward and enabling a closer investigation of different concepts.

After coding the first 14 interviews there was a need for more material, since new interesting ideas came up during the coding process, especially concerning the managers’ perspective. This resulted in additional three interviews at Power AB and one at Welfare. These interviews were included in the third round of analysis and placed within the already existing categories. During the third round of analysis the codes were first analysed without any theoretical
considerations. This was followed by bridging data and theoretical concepts from sociomateriality and affordance. By incorporating the theoretical framework of sociomateriality and affordances with the gathered data, with the result of the continual shifting between gathered data, notes and theory, the study will be able to fulfil the purpose of this paper, and thereby ensuring that the data analysis is theoretically based and that the theory is grounded in data (Silverman, 2013).

Analysis

Introducing the Settings

Welfare is a large public organization employing 55,000 employees within different sectors and job categories in the Gothenburg region. The organization has annual net sales of SEK 34 billion and is financed by public funds and taxes and has a purpose of generating welfare for all citizens in the region Welfare supply. Welfare has, due to their public organization structure to comply with requirements of being transparent against all people (i.e. citizens) they supply. As Welfare is facing a rather intense pressure on its upcoming infrastructure project in the region, the organization has a large demand of engineers, project managers and other kinds of employees within the building and construction sector. As a consequence of an increased competition of professionals in the job market (and hence difficulty to recruit to their open vacancies), Welfare has initiated a project for integrating SNSs in recruitment. The primary SNS they are focusing on is LinkedIn, where they hope to find and attract possible job candidates with right competences for their positions.

Power AB is a large, global and publicly held organization with headquarters in Gothenburg. The organization employs 95,000 people in the Gothenburg region and has annual net sales of SEK 302 billion. Power AB is one of the world’s leading manufacturers within the transportation sector and provides products and services. Due to their publicly held organization, Power AB has a requirement of being transparent and provide information about ongoing activities to the shareholders. Power AB has, similar to Welfare, an increased demand of professionals with engineering background at the same time as they are facing an increased competition on the employee market. One unit within Power AB estimates that they must recruit 450 engineers in the upcoming year, and hence must engage more in activities that attract job candidates.

The analysis is based on four different functions representing HR professionals and managers’ use of SNSs within recruitment: SNSs as search agents, SNSs as attractors, SNSs as background checkers and SNSs as reference finders. Within each function, practices have been identified in relation to the SNSs affordances, in which ambiguities emerge. An ambiguity refers to doubtfulness or uncertainty, implying that there is a “possibility of two or more meanings” (The World Book Dictionary, 1992). After outlining the empirical findings for each function, an analysis is made which relates to the affordance perspective. Each analysis section discusses one main theoretical aspect in relation to the function. However, these aspects are not exclusive for one specific function but appear in several of them. A concluding table
summarizing functions, affordances, practices and ambiguities follows in the beginning of the discussion section.

**Social Network Sites as Search Agents**

In recent years, both organizations in the study have experienced a shift in the labour market within some professions, particularly engineers. This market is described as a market that has gone from being an employer market to a job seeker’s market, where the job seekers now have the opportunity to choose employer, due to an increased demand for engineers. This shift has put pressure on the organizations to find new ways to attract and recruit qualified employees. As a result, Welfare initiated the pilot project regarding an active use of LinkedIn within recruitment and consequently creating new practices. The situation is similar within Power AB, as they also are experiencing a much tougher job market, implying that they no longer can just rely on their good reputation and established brand to attract employees. However, in contrast with Welfare, the HR professionals and managers at Power AB are acting on their own initiatives, trying to find new ways to find candidates rather than having processes and practices on an organizational level. Moreover, both organizations have started to realize that they are competing with a greater number of organizations when it comes to certain professional groups and that they therefore need to take control of the situation and find a solution to the problem.

In using SNSs as search agents, two practices have been identified: establishing of job candidate network, and the procedure of approaching job candidates. Within the practices, the ambiguity of having versus losing influence of candidates and employees’ presence on SNSs emerges.

As the SNSs, particularly LinkedIn, enable the organizations to actively search for, and establish contact with qualified candidates, the practice of establishing job candidate network is identified. An HR professional at Power AB describes that LinkedIn is very useful when there is a need to find job candidates to their vacancies, especially since they can type in desired education, working experiences, competences, home district and get matching candidates presented. For instance, if they are looking for candidates with technical background from a university located in the larger regions in Sweden, LinkedIn enables the HR professional or manager to find that specific requirement, something that was rather difficult before the SNSs establishment. Welfare also identifies this opportunity of finding candidates to build a contact network and has started to more often use the tool, especially when difficulties finding the right candidates occur, which a manager describes:

> We have experienced a couple of times with difficult recruited positions, positions that we have had open for more than a year, perhaps even longer, without finding any good candidates. One example was a position as a lighting engineer, which was an open vacancy for a long period of time without succeeding finding the right candidate. But, by doing some search for candidates on LinkedIn, several top candidates came up. We succeeded to recruit one of them and this would not be possible without LinkedIn.
The manager elaborates on how technology and its usage has enabled the organization to extend their network of possible candidates, which has led to situations where vacancies open for long times could be filled with qualified candidates. Thus, professions that previously were difficult to find are now searchable and therefore possible to fill.

In relation to the practice of establishing a job candidate network, candidates need to be present on SNSs and have updated profiles where educational background and past experiences are specified for the SNSs’ search function to find and add them to the network. However, this is out of the organizations’ control, leading to the ambiguity of having versus losing influence of candidates and employees’ presence on SNSs. The usage of e.g. LinkedIn among required senior professionals at Power AB is rather generational, meaning that specific generations’ competences are not visible and thus difficult to search after. Similar, LinkedIn is also professional-based and therefore only suitable for search within some specific professional groups. Yet, there is an ongoing trend that more professions are becoming active on LinkedIn, which is described by a manager at Welfare:

We have a very hard time to find nurses, they are hard to find. I think one can say that it’s a change going on concerning what professions are present on LinkedIn. In an early stage, there were a lot of technicians, engineers, economists and social scientists. It was a clear bias towards that direction, so for many professions it was no point in using LinkedIn, but as I said different professions are appearing on LinkedIn nowadays, so I believe that medical personnel in various levels start to be present and available to search for. However, there are other professions that are more difficult to find, such as teachers and preschool teachers. For them you need to organize it in another way than using LinkedIn.

The manager here explains that there are vacancies that cannot be solved by using LinkedIn, mainly because there are some professions that are not familiar with the usage of it. Thus, for SNSs such as LinkedIn to serve it purposes for recruitment (i.e. find and approach candidates), both job providers and candidates need to be present, something that neither of the organizations can influence.

In relation to the influence aspect, both Power AB and Welfare emphasize another side of the usage of SNSs as a searching tool. Since SNSs are not organizational-specific, implying that other organizations can contact Power AB and Welfare’s employees with job offerings by using SNSs for similar purposes, difficulties and ambiguities regarding internal control appear. As an example, one HR professional at Power AB explains that they are losing many engineers to one of their competitors who actively contacts employees on LinkedIn, among other things, but emphasizes that it is not in line with Power AB’s values to go for a similar strategy. A similar concern is also raised by Welfare, who is worrisome regarding what signals it would send, and what reputation it would result in if they became known for stealing candidates from other public organizations. At the same time, both organizations argue that if you are part of
the game you must accept the rules that come with it, suggesting that it is impossible to influence and control who is contacting whom.

The second practice identified is the procedure of approaching job candidates and establish contact. Both organizations are not fully taking advantage of LinkedIn and other SNSs as search agents as they are concerned that they encounter too many candidates and then must let them down by not offering them the position first presented. They believe that this could create a “bad-will” or bad employer branding for the company. To overcome the risk of bad employer branding, both organizations tries to be very selective in which candidates they contact. In addition, Welfare does not contact people on LinkedIn until very late in the recruitment process. From the job candidates’ perspectives, HR professionals at Welfare express that it is important to give approached job candidates time to process the job advertisement before a possible application can be prepared. However, by the time the organization has contacted the candidate, the deadline for application could already have passed, and the organization may miss a possible candidate. Another consideration when approaching and establishing contact with candidates is how the candidate will perceive the communication, which an HR professional at Welfare discusses:

If I encourage you to apply for a position, I’ve headhunted you. Do you then expect to get the job? But now I’m contacting you but it’s not sure that I want to hire you in the end. How should I formulate myself so that the job applicant understands that? I believe that we are in a change: LinkedIn was previous a place where you headhunted people but today there are so many that have profiles and it works a little bit different. There are so many working with LinkedIn as a recruitment tool today, so it’s not sure that you will get the job anymore after being contacted. It’s important that the candidates also take part in this change and that they understand that LinkedIn is a channel that works more like an ad and that we encourage you to apply, without any promises.

The HR professional is in the quote discussing the dilemma of what promises are perceived by the candidate, in relation to the intentions of the organization, and suggests that the interpretations may differ, although there is an ongoing change in the use of SNSs. This is something that HR professionals, managers and the candidates need to adapt to in order for the SNSs to function properly. Thus, HR professionals and managers need to carefully approach open positions to candidates in order make sure that the candidates understand the situation and the purpose of the contact, hence making sure that a possible goodwill will not turn into a bad will.

Analysis: Interdependence and Counteracting of SNSs Affordances
Due to the SNSs affordances of visibility and associations between people (Treem & Leonardi, 2012), the HR professionals and managers establish networks of possible candidates that are active on SNSs. As a result, some candidates that previously were difficult to reach are now possible to find and approach, while some still remain not present on SNSs and continue to be invisible for employers.
When using SNSs as search agents it is apparent that the two affordances of visibility and associations are interdependent in the construction of the function, similar to Vaast and Kaganer’s (2013) argument. Power AB and Welfare must first find the candidates on the SNSs, which are afforded by the visibility, but then also become tied together into relationships (i.e. create social ties) with the candidates by becoming friends or contacting them on SNSs, which are afforded by the possibility to associate (Treem & Leonardi, 2012). Thus, the SNSs affordances are, in combination, enabling the search agent to function.

Through the interaction between the affordances of visibility and associations, the search agent function is creating practices for usage (Leonardi, 2011) within the organizations. The pilot project at Welfare is an example of a process where the HR professionals and managers are given the opportunity to develop procedures when integrating SNSs in recruitment. At Power AB, no similar organizational efforts regarding practices have been initiated, but procedures are still developing as a consequence of the usage of the SNSs affordances. Ergo, both organizations are within a process of imbrication (Leonardi, 2011), where no practices are yet established, but are instead in progress. Within this imbrication process, in which the two affordances interact, ambiguities arise (e.g. the influence over the job candidate and employees’ presence on SNSs), due to tensions between the affordances of visibility and association. An example of this is that Power AB and Welfare’s HR professionals and managers must be present and visible on SNSs to be able to establish a job candidate network. However, this implies that the HR professionals, managers and other employees also become visible for organizations on SNSs that use the affordances similar as Power AB and Welfare do. Other organizations can then use the opportunity to take contact with HR professionals, managers and other employees, and extend associations by getting access to their contact networks, in which possible job candidates can be found, leading into a rather difficult act of balance between being present on SNSs and being too visible. Hence, the affordances are interdependent at first, creating possibilities to develop practices (Leonardi, 2011), but are also counteracting the same practices within the organizations by the interaction of visibility and associations.

Moreover, for SNSs to work as search agents, the candidates must be present on the sites to create associations, consequently leading to establishment of the job candidate network and job approaching. As the SNSs affordances are interdependent, professionals not present on SNSs are becoming invisible and difficult to contact and associate with for recruitment purposes, opposing the SNSs affordances of visibility and associations. As an effect, it is a possible risk that HR professionals and managers only rely on the job candidates visible on SNSs and hence overlook competent job candidates without SNSs accounts, which could be a constraint in their work (Hutchby, 2001). Consequently, candidates present on SNSs must be aware of how job approaching and headhunting proceed if usage of SNSs as search agents not should result in bad will and more constraints. In sum, although the SNSs affordances interact in the practice establishments, i.e. imbrication (Leonardi, 2011), the affordances are also sources for ambiguities, which interfere in the establishment of practices within organizations.
**Social Network Sites as Attractors**

Besides the possibilities to use SNSs as a tool for searching and contacting potential future job candidates (i.e. LinkedIn), Welfare and Power AB suggest that Facebook, Instagram and LinkedIn work as tools for earning goodwill and positive employer branding, an activity highly related to recruitment. In using SNSs as attractors two practices are identified: branding of the organization by posting on SNSs, and the principle of sharing. Within the practices, the ambiguity of privacy and professionalism (i.e. standing up for the organizational values) emerge.

Regarding the practice of branding on SNSs by posting on SNSs, the responsible person for Welfare’s employer branding department explains that by reaching out to a wide group of professionals at a platform as LinkedIn, Welfare can profile themselves as an attractive employer that offers interesting and challenging positions. They believe that they must brand their organization in a better way to move beyond the general image of Welfare as a boring, traditional and grey employer. In order to do so, Welfare uses a strategy for employer branding on LinkedIn, Facebook and Instagram by not solely sharing job advertisements but also news and information from the region. As an example, Welfare posts news on their Facebook and LinkedIn pages about competitions and exhibitions, among other things, in relation to an upcoming anniversary (e.g. Facebook post, 4/4-17). Welfare hopes to raise an interest for the organization and its purpose and additionally create engagement on their platforms by posting news like the one exemplified, consequently leading to more pageviews on their job vacancies as well.

Power AB uses a similar strategy as Welfare. However, their background for using SNSs for employer branding purposes is rather that the organization has been too comfortable in the past relying on their well-known brand and position on the market, thus expecting to attract possible job candidates without much effort. As they have seen an increase of competition in the job market for their kind of professional categories at the same time as they are demanding employees, they have come to realise that they must engage more in activities that can strengthen their employer brand, and consequently attracting more and better job candidates. The strategy to reach out to their target groups (i.e. possible job candidates as students, newly examined and senior professionals) is to make the organization visible from the inside by sharing pictures, videos and text from the ongoing activities in the organization, in combination with job advertisements on SNSs. One HR professional at Power AB illustrates an example of what such content can look like:

There is one unit within Power AB that has a very good mind-set concerning this at the moment. They have tried to make it more fun by sharing pictures from group meetings, coffee breaks etc. to show that this is a great work. For instance, ‘here we are during our coffee break, eating cream buns together - come and join our wonderful team’.

The combination of showing up a positive picture of the organization from the inside, by making something as simple as a coffee break visible for the public, and adding something job
related to the text or picture is what the HR professional believes attract possible job candidates to apply for positions.

However, neither Welfare nor Power AB have as many followers on their social network platforms as they would like (see appendix 2), and do not reach out to as many people as they desire. To overcome this problem, the HR professionals and managers use the principle of sharing, which is the second practice identified in relation to SNSs as attractors. The principle of sharing implies that the organizations try to involve managers and employees to like, comment and share organizational content (i.e. posts on LinkedIn) with their own private SNSs accounts (i.e. Facebook and LinkedIn), hence spreading the content in their personal networks. Employees at Power AB, in particular, have started to acknowledge the opportunity of getting a wider spread of organizational content by actively participates themselves. One manager mentions that the sharing is mainly performed on the employees’ own initiatives, without HR professionals pushing for employee participation, although such encouragements are still needed in some cases. Such movement is also starting to take place at Welfare that more or less considers it a manager's obligation to share job advertisement. However, many HR professionals and managers still are not active on these platforms, meaning that Welfare must encourage and push for employee engagement. Moreover, an HR professional at Welfare raises the importance of having updated profiles and established networks, and not only having accounts, to get a spread and legitimacy of the content created. In relation to this, there is a concern regarding what can be required from the employees, and where the line should be drawn between private and professional, which an HR professional expresses in these terms:

I like to keep the private and professional separated so that they are not the same, but at LinkedIn one must use a private profile, meaning it’s my name that becomes visible and sends out messages. I really need to write very clear that I work here at Welfare and that it’s in that purpose I use it. Right now, I work for an organization where I’m satisfied and can stand for the values, but if I was working at another place where I didn’t share the values I would have got involved in activities I don’t believe in. That would be a problem.

The HR professional means that the professional and private lives become very close, especially when the employee has been encouraged to share content on private SNSs for attracting job candidates. This is highlighted as a concern as the employee must use a private name for professional agendas; hence the private person becomes related to the organization’s content and values.

Regarding the ambiguity of privacy and professionalism (e.g. standing up for organizational values), many of the HR professionals at Welfare emphasize the importance to act carefully on SNSs in their privacy and not engage in content that is not in line with Welfare’s values, especially since the media coverage of the organization is extensive. A manager at Welfare expresses that employees at Welfare have a responsibility to think twice before engaging in agendas on SNSs that may damage the organization. As an example, if an employee expresses political agendas or values that may be directly contradictory to the organization’s values, the
damaging effect would be enormous and could also affect how possible job candidates perceive the organization, which in the long run can result in problems when recruiting. HR professionals and managers at Welfare are rather sure of what is not acceptable behaviour and suggest that if their employees do not express and engage in activities and agendas in private that diverge from the organisation’s purposes and values, active participation on SNSs cannot be problematic from an employer branding perspective.

Similarly, Power AB also emphasizes that it is of importance to act in line with the organization’s values when participating on SNSs. A manager involved in employer branding activities at Power AB argues that it is not possible to separate private values from the ones of the organization’s. As an example, although Facebook is very private and may not be used in work, an employee can have a description in the profile where it is mentioned that this person is employed by Power AB, implying that it is rather easy to relate the values an employee expresses in private life to the organization. If setting the organization in an unfavourable position, such behaviour can result in dismissals, which has happened in the past. Related to values and inappropriate behaviour, an HR professional explains that it would not be good either if an employee at Power AB would share content created by their largest competitor. Because of the inseparability of organizational values and privacy, concerns are raised which an HR professional at Power AB elaborates on:

You need to think of what you like and not like because it’s not great if you like a post about X who is our largest competitors if you are using the profile from a Power AB perspective. But, it’s difficult because in the end it’s I as a person, my name, but I share things from a business perspective so when do I cross the line? I’ve been in situations where a contact from Y showed up and I was like ‘oh my God, I can’t push that bottom because then they will have access to all my contacts here’. In the situation we are in now I shouldn’t help the competitors to get access to our engineers.

The HR professional at Power AB expresses a concern over the thin line between private and professional life and tries to think of what behaviour is acceptable on SNSs if used for professional agendas and purposes. The HR professional also expresses a fear of how employee participation on SNSs and the principle of sharing content can lead to advantages for their competitors if not being managed in a good way. However, due to the size of the organization it is not possible to control all employees’ activities on SNSs. Also, as employees do not have common perceptions of what content is acceptable to create, like, comment or share according to a manager at Power AB, it is difficult to come up with common guidelines for appropriate behaviour on SNSs from a business perspective. Therefore, Power AB encourages their employees to act based on common sense. One of Power AB’s managers believes that the subjectivity and insecurity of what is acceptable or not from a professional perspective may be a reason that not all employees at Power AB feel comfortable with active participation on SNSs. An HR professional illustrates the dilemma of subjectivity and what is professional and not:
Some people use LinkedIn in an equivalent way as they use Facebook, which I believe becomes wrong. I have heard from people in the organization that they have got contacted on LinkedIn as it would have been Facebook and that isn’t so professional, so there may be a negative effect of it as well.

What is expressed in the example is that employees within the organization can have different mind-sets of how SNSs should be used in a professional manner and how that could damage the organization’s employer brand in the long run. Moreover, the HR professional at Power AB elaborates on how much the organization should push for employee participation on SNSs due to the fear of losing control of what is happening on SNSs and the difficulty to value what is appropriate behaviour and what is not acceptable. Another manager at Power AB expresses a fear of how employee participation on SNSs and the principle of sharing content can lead to advantages for their competitors if not being managed in a good way. In sum, both organizations emphasize that activities and agendas that diverge from the organizational values should be avoided as much as possible, hence it is significant that newly recruited employees are in line with the values from the start.

**Analysis: Practice Establishment in Imbrication Processes**

To reach out to a greater public of possible job candidates and overcome a problem that both organizations have, the SNSs affordances of visibility, persistence, association and editability (Treem & Leonardi, 2012) are used to establish practices (Leonardi, 2011) within recruitment.

By posting content on different SNSs, the organizations can strengthen their employer brand and attract more job candidates to their vacancies. This possibility is created by the perception of the affordances of visibility, in which the organizations can expose themselves from the inside, and editability in which information are created in a favourable way (Treem & Leonardi, 2012). However, although postings on SNSs are created, afforded by visibility and editability, neither of the organizations has as many followers as they wish for, hence do not reach out to the desired amount of possible job candidates. In order to overcome this obstacle in the practice of branding, the organizations perceive that the SNSs affordances can be used to a greater extent, e.g. using employees’ private associations on SNSs (Treem & Leonardi, 2012) to become even more visible and get a greater spread. Thus, they use the initial practice of branding and the SNSs affordances to create a new practice (Leonardi, 2011); the principle of sharing content among employees. Though, new practices can only be created if employees as HR professionals and managers use their social agency and capacity to develop practices with the materiality of technology, in line with social and material entanglement (Leonardi, 2011).

Similar to the obstacles arising in the practice of branding, ambiguities related to privacy and professionalism emerge when the practice of sharing content has been established. HR professionals and managers can be constrained (Faraj & Azad, 2012) following the principle of sharing, since private content must not oppose the organization’s values. This put pressure on what content the employees can produce and share, but they still have ability to use their social agency (Orlikowski, 2007) to not participate in creating visible and persistent content (Treem & Leonardi, 2012). From an organizational point of view, the ambiguity of privacy and
professionalism can result in brand damaging effects and dismissals if employees’ private opinions, through content on SNSs, oppose the organizational values and becomes visible and associated (Treem & Leonardi, 2012) with the organizations, even though the organizations believe that their advice to act based on common sense on SNSs can prevent it.

Hence, as ambiguities emerge within practices due to different perceptions of affordances, former practices evolve and advance, resulting in new practices through material and social entanglement, in line with Leonardi’s (2011) argument of imbrication process. Thus, the practice of principle of sharing will, through the SNSs affordances, ambiguities and entanglement, at a time result in the establishment of a legit practice within Power AB and Welfare, leading to a cohesive usage of SNSs as attractors.

**Social Network Sites as Background Checkers**

SNSs and search engines as Google also enable recruiters to gather information about candidates, which was previously rather difficult to obtain. Although it is a rather efficient method to get a more thorough picture of job candidates, the usage of SNSs for information gathering purposes are widely spread in the two organizations. Representatives from both organizations say that a typical background check usually starts by typing in the job applicant's name in the search engine Google, which further shows results related to the name. Most of the time, the HR professionals find job applicants’ Facebook, Instagram or LinkedIn accounts, but also information about the job applicants’ involvements in sports, associations or similar. In using SNSs as background checkers one main practice is identified: performing background checks. Within this practice, an ambiguity of objectivity versus subjectivity in valuation of information emerges.

In both organizations, the reasons behind the practice of using SNSs and Google as background checkers are related to uncertainty and curiosity. Regarding uncertainties, SNSs are often used when the HR professionals and managers have strange “gut-feelings” of the job-candidate’s background. Thus, the decision to use SNSs and Google for background checks is based on a rather personal and subjective intuition of the HR professionals and managers. Another type of uncertainty regards concerns with a job candidate’s previous experiences and resume accuracy, and thus there is a need to ensure that the person has had the credentials stated in the resume. One HR professional at Welfare describes an experienced uncertainty where a weird feeling regarding something about a job applicant was not accurate when the person expressed himself:

> There were different things that didn’t make sense. I got a feeling that it seems to be something weird because of the kind of jobs the persons had. How can they have all that money, have her parents died? You start to think of where all that money comes from. Then you start Googling and begin to realise: you see addresses, Porsche association and so on and you think that something is odd and it often is.

With the example, the HR professional illustrates how they operate when perceived uncertainties arise, and describes a situation in which there was a desire to look for more
information about a candidate, based on how the person expressed oneself. The result that showed up from Google and SNSs was explaining more about the context the person was in and gave the HR professional a more thorough picture of the job candidate. Similar situations where there is a desire to get a better understanding of what kind of person the job applicant is and get more information than what can be extracted from a resume and/or a personal letter also occur at Power AB.

Another reason for gathering information about job candidates, similar to a background check, is the curiosity of the HR professionals and managers, which both Welfare and Power AB express. One of the HR professionals from Welfare discusses the topic and states:

> We don’t do it systematically with the final candidates every time, but sometimes we need to gather a little bit more information and I’m one of the more curious persons so I look for some more about the candidate, and I think that’s good if you work with recruitment, if you can handle the information in the right way.

The HR professional suggests that it is acceptable to check due to curiosity, but emphasizes the importance of objectivity and professionalism, which leads into the ambiguity of being objective or subjective in valuing information. Both Welfare and Power AB stress the importance of being objective when using SNSs as background checkers and valuing the information stemming from it. Although such information can possibly be of value, much content on SNSs may not be of relevance for the position, which an HR professional at Power AB elaborates on:

> Of course you’re curious about people. At the same time, how would you feel if someone brought up something that isn’t related to your potential performance at the workplace? If I saw that you had an Alaskan malamute that has been dead for 1.5 years now, what does that have to do with work?

According to the HR professional in the quote, background checks on job applicants occurs, but illustrates that some information given by a SNSs is not of value in the evaluation process of job applicants. Related to this, there is a dispute concerning whether it is acceptable or not to do background checks on SNSs. Within both organizations, there are disparate opinions where some HR professionals and managers do not understand what is positive and valuable with doing so and additionally refer to the bound of private life and mention the method as unethical. Representatives from both Power AB and Welfare also refer to the validity of the recruitment processes and argue that SNSs usage goes against their practices. Other HR professionals and managers describe that performing background checks are of importance and thus frequently use it as a part of the recruitment process. The argument is that they rely on their own ability in their professions to separate relevant from irrelevant information, and thus justify the practice of SNSs usage by themselves and within the professions.
Moreover, representatives from both Welfare and Power AB describe that aspects and information that often are screened at job applicants’ SNSs are expressions and actions that diverge from the values of the organizations. One of the HR Professional at Power AB states the following concerning this issue:

There are some negative things about a person you can find doing a background check, e.g. if the candidate would express obvious racist opinions or hateful opinions against any gender. If a candidate was to be associated with these opinions then that person would not have any advantage in the recruitment process, since we don’t want to have that kind of people within the organization.

The HR Professional in regard states that Power AB does not want to get employees with opinions related to racism or distorted views of gender. By using SNSs for background check purposes HR professionals and managers can identify certain opinions, such as racism, before going further with job applicants. These opinions can be hard to figure out by just looking at job applicants’ resumes and/or personal letters and therefore other sources such as information given on SNSs can serve as complements. HR professionals at Welfare also describe similar thoughts and emphasize that it is important that the job candidates do not oppose the organization’s values. As an illustration, an HR professional describes what values or opinions that is not in line with Welfare:

If it would be transparent that a person votes for SD (i.e. Swedish Democrats) then that person isn’t a good person for us because we work so much with new refugees and arrange residents to them in our organization as well. It’s not aligned with our values. But how are we going to evaluate this information and how do we know that it’s accurate?

Here, the HR professional highlights the antagonism for job applicants who support a certain political party (i.e. a party that relates to conservative agendas) because of Welfare’s activities. However, the HR professional expresses an uncertainty for how valuable such information may be, as well as for how they should handle such information in the process of recruitment. Related to this, one manager at Welfare expresses a concern with valuing such information about opinions due to freedom of opinion, which is a part in the Swedish constitution:

At the same time, we also have another dimension we need to stand up for. We must stand up for freedom of opinion. Are you disqualified to work here with us, because you have a certain opinion? At the same time, a person with racist opinion does not sound like a person suitable to work with refugees.

The concerned manager at Welfare discusses that it is not just one dimension of the debate, and even though the organization does not want to have employees with certain opinions, the organization also needs to consider all the individuals basic rights. One side of the debate is to stand up for the organization’s values and principles, which comprises non-racism among other
things. On the other side, the organization should act in line with the freedom of opinions, causing ambiguities for HR professionals and managers regarding what guideline to follow. HR professionals and managers within Power AB also express that it is of importance to make sure that opinions as described are avoided among job candidates. However, due to the size and purpose of the organization an employee’s private opinions would not harm the organization as such.

**Analysis: The Perceptions of Individuals Influence of Affordances Usage**

Without significant effort, HR professionals and managers are given the possibility to gather more information than given in applicants’ resumes and/or personal letter, since information on SNSs is visible and persistent (Treem & Leonardi, 2012). Instead of solely taking job candidates’ presentations of themselves in formal documents and in interviews into account, usage of SNSs for background check purposes rather implies that whom the job candidate is online becomes of relevance. Consequently, a job candidate is not only a person with qualifications for the vacancy, but also become a candidate associated with being part of e.g. the Porsche association or an Alaskan malamute dog. Hence, HR professionals and managers construct the job candidates, by using their own interpretation and subjectivity evaluating the information regarding the job candidate found on SNSs. Due to the different individual perceptions of what the affordances can be used for (Hutchby, 2011; Norman, 1988), the usage of SNSs for background checks varies within and between the organizations.

Regarding the ambiguity of how to value information stemming from SNSs, a discrepancy is particularly apparent at Welfare, who believes that information about e.g. racism and gender discrimination is valuable to obtain due to their societal purposes and values. However, if they use the affordances of visibility and persistence (Treem & Leonardi, 2012) to gather information, they also become constrained (Faraj & Azad, 2012) since they must act in agreement with the freedom of opinion. Thus, if they find out that a candidate expresses racist opinions when doing background checks, a dilemma emerges regarding what values to stand up for: the organization or the Swedish constitution, leading to different actions depending on what HR professionals and manager perceive as most affording or least constraining. Thus, it is up to the HR professionals and managers to make an individual interpretation and valuation of information that is visible and persistent, resulting in different usage and practices, in line with Leonardi (2012).

Similar, although Power AB also consider hiring employees with e.g. racist opinions as unfavourable for the organization, but without direct impact on the operation, they are not expressing possible constraints in relation to their organizational purposes as Welfare does when using SNSs for background checks. Rather, some HR professionals and managers at Power AB perceive the SNSs affordances of visibility and persistence (Treem & Leonardi, 2012) as problematic in relation to information validity, thus perceiving constraints in their endeavour, for an objective recruitment process. Since Power AB does not have as strict organizational purposes to rely on, the individuality is even more essential in determining how or if the affordances should be used, influencing the usage of SNSs as background checkers.
Hence, even though the materiality (i.e. technology) of the SNSs is the same (Hutchby, 2001; Zamutto et al., 2007; Leonardi & Vaast, 2017) within both organizations, HR professionals and managers create different perceptions and practices, which diverges from Leonardi and Barley’s (2008) argument that interpretations of the affordances tend to be similar. Rather, HR professionals and managers that are within the same organizational contexts have similar tasks and technological conditions perceive affordances of SNSs differently and use their social agency (Orlikowski, 2007) when deciding how and if SNSs could be used as search agents. Thus, the different practices for SNSs as background checkers are dependent on the material and social interactions (i.e. entanglements) (Orlikowski, 2010), in which the individual perceptions and actions of HR professionals and managers are essential.

**Social Network Sites as Reference Finders**

As a complement to using SNSs for background checks, these sites can also make job applicants’ personal networks visible for the employer, creating possibilities to take advantage of the given information. A practice of finding and using formal and informal references is identified when using SNSs as reference finders. This practice is also discussed as an ambiguity.

According to the recruitment order (2017) at Welfare it is an ethical principle to always ask the job applicant to name and anchor references, which the responsible recruiter can contact. Although Welfare are very rigorous with always taking formal references in the recruitment process, an HR professional at Welfare explains that there are opportunities to get contact information from SNSs, if they have common contacts with the job applicant. The HR professional refers this method to ‘evil references’, meaning that the job candidate must not submit a reference for the HR professionals and managers to take contact with the common connections. Other HR professionals and managers at Welfare describe such contacts as informal references. As an example, on LinkedIn it is rather easy to see common connections and contacts, especially if they are using the LinkedIn recruiter tool in which common contacts come up as suggestions. Consequently, there have been cases where HR professionals have used SNSs to find informal references.

Additionally, such informal references are problematic, according to one HR professional at Welfare due to their recruitment order. The HR professional emphasizes that it is especially important for Welfare to follow the guidelines regarding formal references since they are a public organization and hence should be able to motivate in official documents why candidates are given or not given the job. If the guidelines were not to be followed, the HR professional expresses a concern on whether it would be possible to motivate that an informal reference has been used as ground for the job decision or not. Another HR professional describes that informal references can be used, but suggests that candidates should be aware of the contact taken:

For me, it’s the same to ask Sarah in this specific context as it is to take a reference. I mean, it’s great that I can find out that Sarah is a common contact but I want to
ask the candidate before if he or she is okay with me asking this person and of course I can. And then he or she says that it’s a superficial contact.

Although the HR professional argues that it is possible to use common contacts as informal references, it is suggested that formal references are preferable. However, the HR professional also expresses that informal references can turn into formal ones by asking for the candidate’s permission even though the candidate does not mention the contact in advance, thus taking the opportunity for contacting while avoiding violation of the recruitment guidelines.

Contrary to Welfare, Power AB does not express contacts visible on SNSs as informal, problematic or as against their recruitment guidelines. Rather, a manager expresses that SNSs can work as a tool for mapping out the job applicant’s network and its previous colleagues, and therefore SNSs are often used in the recruitment process. The manager explains that the personal connections are of value since much recruitment are done within the organization and describes how such connections can be used in recruitment:

The world is not very large when it comes to engineers so it’s often that you find and see someone who knows someone and get references in that way without really requesting it. Of course it’s valuable. Then you can ask persons you trust in, so that’s something we have used a few times.

What is said by the manager is that when a job applicant’s social networks are visible and common contacts are shown, the manager has used these connections to take contact, as a reference, without the job applicant’s permission, hence likened with an informal reference. In addition, other managers at Power AB describe that connections on LinkedIn are giving them an information advantage by having the opportunity to use connections on SNSs if there are for instance doubts regarding information given by the formal references. In addition, it can be of value to look at job candidates’ contact networks if they are applying for a position that requires close connections to a specific unit. If the job applicant has contacts within that specific unit, it can be an advantage. However, an HR professional emphasizes that common contacts would not be used as references but rather as a complement to the information given in the resume and as ground for upcoming interviews, hence only be used as positive information. Contrary to the HR professional, one manager suggests that job applicants can have ‘wrong connections’ as well when elaborating on how to use the connections in the recruitment process. The manager describes that although common connections often are positive and can create advantages for the candidate, there are also cases when job applicants have had relations with persons that the manager have had unpleasant experience of, and hence do not have trust in, leading to a more critical picture of the job candidate. As a consequence, the manager would not take contact with the common connection and use it as a reference. Hence the subjectivity of the manager will be what decides if a contact stemming from SNSs will be asked being a reference for the job applicant or not, or whether the manager should rely on given formal references.
Analysis: The Organizational Contexts’ Influence on Perceptions of SNSs Affordances

The establishment of practices to find references in networks on SNSs is made possible due to the SNSs affordances of visibility and associations between people (Treem & Leonardi, 2012). However, because of different organizational contexts, Power AB and Welfare have disparate interpretations of how to use the affordances in practice, resulting in different outcomes (Leonardi, 2012).

In regard to Power AB, HR professionals and managers perceive that SNSs affordance of visibility enables them to identify job applicants’ networks, in which common associations can be used for approaching in the recruitment process. Hence, the visible associations on SNSs are used for finding, and taking, references in an informal manner. In contrast, although HR professionals and managers at Welfare perceive that the affordances of SNSs can be used for finding references, they rather perceive constraints in their work since their recruitment order requires usage of formal references. Thus, if using the affordances, they cannot fulfil their guidelines and agendas (Faraj & Azad, 2012) of an objective recruitment process, resulting in a practice of not finding and taking informal references or not resulting in a practice at all. However, as the HR professionals and managers perceive the affordances of visibility and association, although they cannot use them, they use their social agency in combination with usage of the SNSs affordances to turn informal references into formal. By asking for the job candidate’s approval, they create new practices that allow them to overcome the constraint and fulfilling their agendas.

Hence, even though the materiality of the SNSs is the same within both organizations, and both use the affordances of visibility and association, the formal organizational principles influence how the practices for usage of SNSs as reference finders will come about, in line with Leonardi (2012). This supports the claim that different contexts create different perceptions and practices (Hutchby, 2001; Norman, 1988), but also the argument by Leonardi and Barley (2008) claiming that interpretations of the affordances tend to be similar. However, due to the contextual influence at Welfare, the possibilities are limited and constrained, even though the HR professionals and managers perceive the SNSs affordances similarly to their counterparts at Power AB, implying that the social agency must be used on behalf of the organization if the affordances should result in practices. In contrast, as Power AB do not have as strict guidelines regarding informal references, and therefore can use the SNSs affordances without constraints, their practices will be more directly created on the affordances. Thus, although they have the same technological conditions but different organizational contexts, the practices between Power AB and Welfare vary, in line with Hutchby (2001) and Zamutto et al. (2007).

Discussion

In this paper, the sociomateriality perspective and the concept of affordance have been used to investigate how contemporary technology, namely SNSs, is creating new practices within recruitment in the interaction with humans. The SNSs affordances of visibility, persistence, editability and associations (Treem & Leonardi, 2012) are giving organizations possibilities to use SNSs as functions within recruitment processes: SNSs as search agents, attractors, background checkers and reference finders (see table 1).
Table 1. Summary of analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functions</th>
<th>SNSs Affordances</th>
<th>Practices</th>
<th>Ambiguities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SNSs as search agents</td>
<td>Visibility</td>
<td>Establishing of job candidate networks</td>
<td>Having versus losing influence of employees’ presence on SNSs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Association</td>
<td>The procedure of approaching job candidates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNSs as attractors</td>
<td>Visibility</td>
<td>Branding of the organization by posting on SNSs</td>
<td>Privacy versus professionalism (i.e. standing up for the organizational values)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Persistence</td>
<td>The principle of sharing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Editability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Association</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNS as background checkers</td>
<td>Visibility</td>
<td>Performing background checks</td>
<td>Objectivity versus subjectivity in valuation of information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Persistence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNSs as reference finders</td>
<td>Visibility</td>
<td>Finding and using references</td>
<td>Formal versus informal references</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Association</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What is shown in the study is that the usage within, as well as between the organizations, varies despite that the organizations use the same SNSs, and therefore having common affordances. While previous studies brought up technological properties to be determining in whether SNSs are feasible as recruitment tools (Kluemper & Rosen, 2009; Kluemper et al., 2012) and thus predicting common usage due to what the SNSs can afford, this study shows a diverging result. As the SNSs usage and recruitment practices identified are different, even though the technological affordances are similar (Zamutto et al., 2007; Leonardi & Vaast, 2017), the social aspects consisting of individual perceptions, social agencies (i.e. capacity to act) and contexts are influencing the way SNSs are used. Ergo, it is in the social and material entanglement (Orlikowski, 2007; Orlikowski & Scott, 2008) that the SNSs usages develop, and create practices (Leonardi, 2011) in an ongoing process of imbrication, before becoming taken for granted and black-boxed.

This study shows that the SNSs recruitment practices are still created within this imbrication process. Therefore, SNSs usage within recruitment is rather a question of how technology could be used in light of existing recruitment purposes, based on HR professionals and managers’ perceptions of SNSs affordances, than whether SNSs are feasible to integrate in recruitment or not (Kluemper & Rosen, 2009; Kluemper et al., 2012). Consequently, it is problematic to identify and outline issues with SNSs within recruitment (e.g. Davison et al., 2011; Kluemper & Rosen, 2009; Roth et al., 2016; Slovensky & Ross, 2012) as if they are verities and determined, and result in similar practices that are not possible to influence. Since social processes and perceptions of SNSs affordances depend on individuality and context, the emerging practices are rather disparate (Hutchby, 2001), but also possible to influence in the establishment of common practices within specific contexts. Thus, even though laws in force, e.g. Equal Employment Law, (Kluemper & Rosen, 2009; Roth et al., 2016) and organizational guidelines exist and to some extent regulate what SNSs can be used for (Brandenburg, 2008; Brown & Vaughn, 2011; Kluemper et al., 2016), HR professionals and managers can still use their social agency to decide on how to use the SNSs affordances that exist regardless of regulations. This means that it is the individual perceptions of how to use the affordances...
(Hutchby, 2001; Treem & Leonardi, 2012), in relation to the regulations, that influence how practices are created, which also implies that regulations are in shade of the social agencies. Moreover, the study shows that the organizational guidelines and contexts influence to some extent the SNSs usage, but are not fully determining how it should be applied in recruitment, which is evident in the many similarities between the organizations but substantial differences within. This means that HR professionals and managers’ own values, subjectivity and perceptions of SNSs affordances influence practices within the recruitment processes. Hence, it is the HR professionals and managers’ assessment of job candidates’ activities on SNSs, in combination with formal documents, which creates an overall picture of the candidate and lay the foundation for the hiring decision. However, this study reveals that SNSs information in some situations (i.e. racist opinions) are more influential than the formal qualifications related to the vacancy when deciding on who to recruit. Ergo, if there are not obvious criteria on what information is of relevance to include and evaluate in recruitment, and the affordances of SNSs are perceived and used differently within the organizations, it results in unequal treatment of candidates. Because of the inconsistent SNSs usage, the legitimacy of the recruitment processes is jeopardized.

However, although different perceptions of affordances, constraints and ambiguities emerge (e.g. not being able to recruit objectively), because of the relationality of the SNSs affordances (Treem & Leonardi, 2012) it is possible to overcome these. When constraints appear in the usage of SNSs, but HR professionals and managers want to fulfil their recruitment purposes, the process of imbrication will continue. Hence, if HR professionals and managers see beyond the constraints, and perceive that usage of the SNSs affordance would result in possibilities for the recruitment process, the imbrication will either lead to development of a new technology or a new practice (Leonardi, 2011). Thus, the illegitimacy of SNSs recruitment usage and unequal treatment of job candidates are mitigated by not accepting the ambiguities and constraints as actualities, but use these as sources for development of practices in the imbrication process. However, previous researchers have overlooked this process, due to their primary intention to examine issues regarding legal aspects, feasibility and privacy intrusion (e.g. Davidson et al., 2012; Kluemper et al., 2016; Slovensky & Ross, 2012) and technological aspects (e.g. Brandenburg, 2008; Kluemper et al., 2012). Rather, from an affordance perspective, potential problems, ambiguities and constraints are sources for how affordances can be used for continuous development and establishment of recruitment practices (Leonardi, 2011). Hence, as long as ambiguities emerge in the practices, the imbrication process will continue until all HR professionals and managers’ requirements of technology within recruitment are fulfilled, which is a highly complicated process due to the wide spread of individual perceptions of what the SNSs affordances can be used for.

Moreover, the imbrication process is a priori dependent on technology, in line with previous research (e.g. Kluemper & Rosen, 2009; Kluemper et al., 2012). However, as the social and the material entangles, practices are continuously developed until, from a technological point of view, is not possible to meet the social actors’ recruitment purposes with the technology. Thus, it is first when social actors no longer can create new recruitment practices with the
existing technology of SNSs and its affordances that technology development (Thompson et al., 2008; Ryan & Ployhart, 2014; Chapman & Webster, 2003) becomes significant and reliant for the imbrication process. However, neither of the organizations in this study is yet in the stage of requiring new technology, since practices related to SNSs within recruitment are still being developed and established with existing technology, and not yet taken for granted.

In sum, it is in the social (e.g. HR professionals, managers and contexts) and material (i.e. SNSs) entanglements (Orlikowski, 2007) that the SNSs recruitment practices are created. As long as organizations are within the process of imbrication, and HR professionals and managers perceive SNSs affordances differently, the SNSs usage is individual and inconsistent, leading to ambiguities. However, ambiguities and constraints are sources behind practice development in the imbrication process and should therefore not be considered as the termination for SNSs usage within recruitment.

Conclusion
This study has investigated how technology within recruitment is situated in practice by examining how HR professionals and managers within two organizations use SNSs to create possibilities and new practices. The study shows how SNSs are used as four different functions within recruitment: SNSs as search agents, attractors, background checkers and reference finders. The different functions are used as tools for solving problems, facilitating practices within recruitment and create new practices as outcomes of the possibilities SNSs afford. However, SNSs practices also give rise to ambiguities, in which some HR professionals and managers perceive that SNSs are rather constraining and/or preventing their recruitment processes.

Even though the two organizations have equal technological conditions, the usage that is made of technology is different. This study reveals that the varying SNSs usage is a result of the HR professionals and managers’ different perceptions of how the SNSs can, and should, be used, due to lack of distinct organizational directions. This means that it is the individual perceptions of what the SNSs afford, with some impact from organizational contexts, that influences what and how practices will be constituted. Consequently, neither of the organizations in the study has hitherto established common practices in relation to SNSs within recruitment, but are in a process of imbrication where HR professionals and managers interact with technology to invent solutions that serve their purposes and agendas. This implies that SNSs recruitment processes within the two organizations are inconsistent and job candidates are treated differently. However, this study’s application of the theory of sociomateriality and affordances shows that affordances of SNSs are not only possibilities, but are also used within the imbrication process to invent solutions to the ambiguities, and thus create common recruitment practices in the future.

As the results of this study reveal, HR professionals and managers within two different contexts share many perceptions and thoughts of how SNSs should be used. Even though the organizations have different agendas and purposes, the spread of SNSs usage is rather within the organizations than between, indicating that the individuality is essential in determining
practices. A limitation to the study is why individuals in some cases share perceptions, but in other situations perceive SNSs differently. Hence, for future research, it would be of interest to investigate further what factors affect the disparate perceptions of SNSs usage, e.g. backgrounds, professions, generation and interests in SNSs etc. Moreover, it would be of interest to investigate if other aspects of context, e.g. organizational size and industry, influence how SNSs are situated within recruitment.
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Appendix

Appendix 1. Brief presentation of the respondents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Position of the interviewee(s)</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Form of interview</th>
<th>Length of interview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Gothenburg University</td>
<td>Researcher1</td>
<td>1/2 2017</td>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
<td>37:32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Welfare</td>
<td>Manager Manager</td>
<td>8/2 2017</td>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
<td>50:01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Welfare</td>
<td>HR Professional</td>
<td>10/2 2017</td>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
<td>59:36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Welfare</td>
<td>HR Professional</td>
<td>17/2 2017</td>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
<td>48:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Private Organization1</td>
<td>HR Professional</td>
<td>21/2 2017</td>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
<td>44:23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Welfare</td>
<td>HR Professional</td>
<td>22/2 2017</td>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
<td>01:02:21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Wheel AB</td>
<td>HR Professional</td>
<td>23/2 2017</td>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
<td>43:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Welfare</td>
<td>HR Professional</td>
<td>28/2 2017</td>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
<td>50:35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Welfare2</td>
<td>HR Professional</td>
<td>1/3 2017</td>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
<td>01:28:39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Wheel AB</td>
<td>HR Professional</td>
<td>6/3 2017</td>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
<td>48:53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Wheel AB</td>
<td>HR Professional</td>
<td>8/3 2017</td>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
<td>59:50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Welfare</td>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>10/3 2017</td>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
<td>51:44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Wheel AB</td>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>15/3 2017</td>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
<td>01:27:34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Wheel AB</td>
<td>HR Professional</td>
<td>20/3 2017</td>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
<td>48:17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Wheel AB</td>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>22/3 2017</td>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>23:32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Welfare</td>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>20/4 2017</td>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
<td>27:14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Wheel AB</td>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>21/4 2017</td>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>24:03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Wheel AB</td>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>24/4 2017</td>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>24:20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Interview with researcher within the field of SNSs and recruitment at Gothenburg University.
2 This private organization was deselected after the first interview due to lack of information within the chosen study topic.
3 The interview included a demonstration of LinkedIn recruiter.

Appendix 2. Followers on SNSs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>LinkedIn</th>
<th>Facebook</th>
<th>Instagram</th>
<th>Youtube</th>
<th>Twitter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Power AB</td>
<td>128598</td>
<td>8915</td>
<td>886</td>
<td>2220</td>
<td>2928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welfare</td>
<td>17042</td>
<td>10839</td>
<td>No account1</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>514</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Instagram accounts in different units, no common for Welfare.
Source: Power AB and Welfare SNSs accounts, (170508)