

**This is a self-archived version of an original article. This version may differ from the original in pagination and typographic details.**

**Author(s):** Yacine, Leyla; Karjaluoto, Heikki

**Title:** Video Recruitment : Online Perspectives and Implications for Employer Branding

**Year:** 2022

**Version:** Accepted version (Final draft)

**Copyright:** © 2022 the Authors

**Rights:** In Copyright

**Rights url:** <http://rightsstatements.org/page/InC/1.0/?language=en>

**Please cite the original version:**

Yacine, L., & Karjaluoto, H. (2022). Video Recruitment : Online Perspectives and Implications for Employer Branding. In C. Machado, & J. P. Davim (Eds.), *Organizational Innovation in the Digital Age* (pp. 87-123). Springer International Publishing. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-98183-9\\_4](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-98183-9_4)

# Video Recruitment: Online Perspectives and Implications for Employer Branding

*Video recruitment*—the use of videos at any point in the recruitment process—has surged among organizations as a strategy for hiring talent and operating in their respective fields amid the pandemic. While some organizations were already using video recruitment practices, others had to redesign their recruitment strategies to adapt to the online realm. Within this process, the use of video for offering job previews, presenting CVs/resumes, screening candidates, conducting interviews, finalizing job offers/rejections, and video-powered on-boarding has spread. *Video interviews* have particularly become mainstream. In recruitment, video interviews are conducted remotely between employers and job applicants. They are either synchronous or asynchronous, and they present cost advantages because they overcome time and geographical boundaries to benefit both employers and candidates. However, the adoption and use of video interviews, notably the asynchronous type, may not be welcome by job seekers in the labor market. This has indeed generated online criticism from job seekers and practitioners alike on online platforms, such as LinkedIn. Various reasons have been cited, such as a lack of humanity, fairness, video training, and effective talent assessment by recruiters, as well as privacy and increased anxiety concerns, among others. Nevertheless, video interviews are becoming common in hiring, and *remote and hybrid working models* are predicted to last (McKinsey's 2020; OECD 2021).

The video interview phenomenon has already inspired several studies in the fields of business, human resource management (HRM), technology and information sciences, marketing, and psychology. The extant work has focused on pre-test (e.g., Proost et al. 2021) and post-test reactions toward video interviews (e.g., Brenner et al. 2016), revamping recruitment and selection (e.g., Nikolaou 2021), providing guidance on how to run video interviews (e.g., Driscoll 2020; Kuoppala 2019), the pros and cons of video in recruitment (Hendrick 2011; Kuoppala 2019), verbal and non-verbal cues and candidate assessment (e.g., Suen et al. 2020; McColl and Michelotti 2019; Gorman et al. 2018), algorithmic bias and video analysis (e.g., Köchling et al. 2020; Bongard 2019; Hemamou et al. 2019), the effects of artificial intelligence (AI) and automation on recruitment (Bongard et al. 2019; Kuoppala 2019; Rodney et al. 2019; Wilkinson et al. 2019; Meija and Torres 2017;) and retention (Wilkinson et al. 2019), the normalization

process of asynchronous video interviews (Meija and Torres 2018), and the “applicability and explanatory value” of conceptual frameworks on technology usage in employment interviews (Brenner 2019, p. III).

However, video interviews need to be studied in relation to employer branding, social media, electronic word of mouth (eWOM), and cross-channel marketing with the intent to build the competitive advantage of a “*great place to work*” (Dabirian et al. 2019) in the digital age recruitment market. This encompasses research in and understanding of what job seekers value and prefer (e.g., Dabirian et al. 2019; Eger et al. 2019; Mishra and Kumar 2019) to then implement the most suitable online marketing strategy (e.g., Dwidedi et al. 2021; Li et al. 2021; Rodrigues and Martinez 2020; Mishra and Kumar 2019; Kannan and Li 2017) by means of AI-embedded solutions (e.g., Huang and Rust 2021), such as mobile and social media (e.g., Li et al. 2021; Carah 2017) and websites (e.g., Allen et al. 2007), to attract potential employees and ensure appropriate positioning of the employer brand (e.g., Wilden et al. 2010; Frasca and Edwards 2017; Rodrigues and Martinez 2020).

Hence, the key research question that guides this chapter is as follows: **How can employer branding be improved by organizations that use video interviews to hire remotely?** This problem is investigated across three research questions, with each driving a particular phase of the study:

- 1. RQ1 What are the perceptions of potential hires about video interviews?**
- 2. RQ2 How are video interviews branded by service providers for remote recruitment?**
- 3. RQ3 How can employer branding be adapted for video interviews in remote recruitment?**

This chapter investigates and compares (1) online perspectives of video recruitment to determine what value is associated with video interviews, from both employer and worker perspectives, and (2) how employer branding can be upgraded accordingly in the context of remote recruitment. The comparison of job seekers’ views on LinkedIn with those of video interview service providers regarding video recruitment and employer branding can result in more concrete and practical ways to address job seekers’ concerns and improve video recruitment. This is especially beneficial at a crucial time in history when the pandemic precipitated video recruitment adoption and use to hire

new talent. Daily behaviors and practices are now developing the new paradigm of recruitment. This can benefit hiring organizations not only in their selection process but also in their decision-making regarding employer branding in the digital era, thereby positively affecting talent attraction. This can also benefit potential hires' experience with video recruitment and enhance their opinion of video interviews, which could lead to a better employer-worker match. In addition, this study underscores the key role and responsibility of video interview service providers in video recruitment. Service providers act as intermediaries between organizations and job applicants in the video recruitment process; thus, they influence both recruiters' and job applicants' experience with video recruitment.

This chapter offers a novel and essential approach to the study of video interviews through the theoretical exploration of the crossover between HRM, marketing, and information technology, with the goal of uncovering several ways that employer branding can be ameliorated in a world wherein video recruitment prevails. This chapter follows an internal marketing approach—the *employees-as-customers* philosophy—which is a paradigm that conceives employees as individuals whose needs, preferences, and demands should be considered and addressed similar to those of customers. This chapter first explores and conflates extant literature on video interviews, recruitment, employer branding, and digital marketing to lay the groundwork for empirical research. The methodological section then elaborates on the data collected from comments generated by individual users in a dedicated LinkedIn news thread about asynchronous video interviews and a service provider's website content. Next, the empirical research findings are presented to stress the viewpoints of recruiters and the online pool of potential hires. Finally, the focus is shifted to the implications of these viewpoints as follows: (1) implications for organizations in their adoption, deployment, and use of video interviews in remote recruitment, (2) implications for employer branding, and (3) implications for the pool of potential and current workers. The chapter closes by discussing future research avenues on video recruitment and employer branding in the digital age.

## 1.1 Literature review and theoretical framework

The present section covers two points in the extant literature to build the theoretical foundation of this chapter. The first sheds light on video interviews in online recruitment, their description,

and their antecedents. The distinction is established between synchronous and asynchronous video interviews, including their respective pros and cons and relative implications, which are compared using diverse media theories. Importantly, the first point underscores video interviews' impact on recruitment today and their relation to employer branding. The second point pertains to employer branding in digital recruitment. It furthers a recruitment funnel and emphasizes the sourcing and attraction phase through the strategic and purposeful use of digital marketing and social media. Lastly, the theoretical framework adopted for the present research is presented and discussed.

### 1.1.1 Video interviews in digital recruitment

Organizations that have adopted video interviewing during the pandemic in an effort to successfully steer and pursue their activities, despite their possible lack of experience, will have the ability to prosper through adaptability in the long run. *Video interviews* are those conducted remotely between recruiters and applicants in the context of recruitment, which comprises the initial and foundational stage of the employment relationship (Mishra and Kumar 2019). Recruiters should show genuine enthusiasm and excitement about the position they need to fill, with the goal of making interviewees feel comfortable and eager to seize the job opportunity. With time and practice, recruiters can build the skills necessary to successfully run video interviews (Driscoll 2020). Although interviewees aim to display their fit for the position (Proost et al. 2021), they are ultimately sourced and selected to match both the position they apply for and the organization's social and physical environment (Kuoppala 2019). Roberts (1997) noted that the person–organization match is the priority in HRM because in its absence, HR cannot be effective. Hence, the use of video interviews in the remote recruitment process is the major applicant assessment means by which *person–organization fit* can be evaluated.

Communication skills and future job performance can be envisaged during video interviews in accordance with social signaling theory<sup>1</sup> (Suen et al. 2020); however, the *distortion created by*

---

<sup>1</sup> Social signaling theory explicates that people's interpersonal communication skills are reflected in both the verbal and non-verbal messages they emit during an interaction, with the latter weighing more significantly (up to 70–80%) than the former in terms of providing clues, information, and conveyance of meaning (Suen et al. 2020).

*technology* impacts recruitment interviews (McColl and Michelotti 2019), applicants' evaluation by recruiters, and applicants' interview experience (Proost et al. 2021). According to Suen et al. (2020), recruiters typically resort to behavioral interviews to let interviewees describe their decisions and actions in a specific context. This allows the recruiter to see how the interviewee would perform in the position and interact with others. Additionally, interviewees' facial expressions may be exploited to evaluate personality traits to ascertain person–job fit and person–organization fit (Suen et al. 2020). However, the evaluation may be impaired due to video interviews' lack of media richness, velocity, and transparency, as well as poor social bandwidth in comparison to in-person interviews (Brenner 2019). The candidate's character and personality traits may also be more difficult to assess in comparison to face-to-face interviews, which could dramatically affect interview outcomes (McColl and Michelotti 2019). Even the use of high-quality equipment, good lighting, and an appropriate background, with the camera capturing the “triangle of love” (i.e., top of the head to the shoulders) (Driscoll 2020, p. 2), may not offset the drawbacks that limit the potential of video interviews in recruitment. Gorman et al. (2018) posited that the shortcomings of video-based interviews could be offset through face-to-face interviews upon screening candidates and providing them with video technology access to allow them to rehearse and feel more comfortable using it. Furthermore, video-mediated interviews impact candidates' experience with the organization's recruitment practices and processes, which explains applicants' seeming preference for face-to-face interviews. This is corroborated by applicants' perception of video interviews as “less procedurally fair” than in-person interviews (Proost et al. 2021). Proost et al. (2021) purported that performance opportunities, access to information about the selection and the position, and opinion about the interviewer (agreeableness, “trustworthiness, competence, and overall appearance”) may be undermined.

The substantiality of such distortion depends on the type of video interview utilized: synchronous or asynchronous. *Synchronous video (two-way) interviews (SVIs)* are attended by all participants in real time, whereas *asynchronous video (or one-way) interviews (AVIs)* allow for more flexibility in terms of place and time for recording (Torres and Meija 2017). Both can be approached through the lens of Potosky's conceptual framework, from which four media attributes can be assessed: transparency, social bandwidth, interactivity, and surveillance (as cited in Brenner 2019). Transparency is “the extent to which a medium allows the clear and smooth exchange of information” (Brenner 2019, p. 38). Social bandwidth consists of “the degree to which a

communication medium can transmit social information”; it refers to the “number of social cues that can be transmitted” (Brenner 2019, p. 38). Interactivity envelopes “the opportunities a medium gives to provide immediate feedback” (Brenner 2019, p. 38). Surveillance alludes to “the degree to which outside parties can monitor or intervene in the communication process” (Brenner 2019, p. 39). If both synchronous and asynchronous video interviews observe, on average, the same level of social bandwidth, the former usually presents the medium with low transparency because of possible disturbances due to internet connection issues, whereas the latter offers a medium-to-high level of transparency due to the pre-recorded nature, leaving little-to-no room for disturbances or interference that could hijack the message transferred from the emitter to the receiver. However, the interactivity level conferred by SVIs far outweighs that of AVIs because the former occur in real time and allow for a direct exchange, while the latter do not permit any direct exchange between the emitter and the receiver of the message, thereby producing latency between them and possibly a lack of involvement. Both synchronous and asynchronous video interviews have the potential to be surveyed due to mediation of the exchange via technology (i.e., surveillance by big ICT service providers, such as Google, WhatsApp, Zoom, etc.). Moreover, SVIs may be recorded, stored, and shared with other parties, a feature that equates to the recording of videos for AVIs, with one major difference. AVIs aim to inform decision-making in hiring and typically comprise applicants’ self-recorded videos, which are uploaded to the interview platform in use by recruiters to reply to predefined questions. By contrast, the recording of SVIs can be initiated by either the interviewer or the interviewee to capture the exchange. They can be stored and used as desired and are neither bound by nor limited to the hiring process.

Various existing theories have been proposed and applied to video interviews, including the **technology acceptance model (TAM)**, **media richness theory**, **role theory**, **media naturalness theory**, and the **theory of socio-material practice** (Brenner 2019).

1. **The TAM** deserves attention because it considers perceived usefulness and perceived ease of use of new technology to be prominent predictors of behavioral intentions toward a technology, thereby foretelling its usage (Venkatesh and Bala 2008; Venkatesh et al. 2003; Venkatesh and Davis 2000; Davis 1989; Davis et al. 1989). The TAM can be instrumentalized to gain a better understanding of users’ acceptance of video interviews, including AVIs (Brenner et al. 2016; Maier et al. 2013), which are more disruptive than

SVIs. Specifically, in the context of the pandemic, video interviews are more easily accepted by recruiters and applicants alike because they constitute the only alternative to in-person interviews and thus the only way to bridge their respective stances and match individual profiles with organizations to fill employment positions. Additionally, AVIs' acceptance appears motivated by time, space, and cost advantages, which increase the perceived usefulness and ease of use of systems developed by video interview service providers<sup>2</sup>.

2. From a sheer **media richness** perspective, video interviews cannot replicate the effectiveness of face-to-face interviews because of the need to convey more abstract and ambiguity-reducing messages with potentially emotionally loaded meanings during recruitment (Proost et al. 2021, p. 266). Media richness is defined as “the ability of information to change understanding within a time interval” (Daft and Lengel 1986, p. 560). Media richness is contingent on “the availability of immediate feedback (i.e., the ability to ask questions and to make corrections), multiple cues (i.e., the number of social cues available), language variety (i.e., the range of meaning that can be conveyed), and personal focus (i.e., personal feelings and emotions can be expressed” (Proost et al. 2021, p. 266; Daft et al. 1987). SVIs present both verbal and non-verbal communication hindrances (e.g., time lags, connection failures, absence of or limited eye contact, limited appearance in the frame), whereby the quality and impact of the exchange are impaired, along with the SVI experience, depending on the nature and severity of the hindrances encountered. However, all these downsides, except perhaps limited body framing, do not seem to be true in the case of AVIs because they are pre-recorded and ensure smooth message delivery.
3. **Role theory** posits that technology triggers changes to what tasks are performed and how, as well as the nature of the interactions (Brenner 2019). In the context of the pandemic, while SVIs essentially resemble in-person interviews in the way they proceed and are used in recruitment (i.e., setting an interview, running it, and evaluating the candidate), this is not the case for AVIs, which demand mediation by a video interview service provider to

---

<sup>2</sup> Video-interview service providers are organizations that develop, build, and supply AVI platforms to organizations to help streamline recruitment (e.g., VidCruiter, RecRight, Recruiter.com, Modern Hire, Interviewstream, Spark Hire, Jobvite, etc.).



set the interview modalities and questions, make them accessible to applicants, and allow applicants to record and share their responses according to a specific timeframe set by recruiters (e.g., Suen et al. 2020; Nikolaou 2021). Recruiters can freely and collaboratively retrieve, comment, and evaluate candidates' videos for a certain position and manage the selection and rejections using the video interview platform (e.g., Suen et al. 2020; Nikolaou 2021). The introduction of video interview service providers in the hiring process changes individual tasks, adds new ones, and fundamentally alters the nature of the recruiter–applicant exchange, with subsequent implications for the candidate selection and experience in the hiring process. However, AVIs tend to be considered more as an initial screening tool that is not yet perceived suitable in later recruitment stages (Nikolaou 2021; Brenner 2019; Torres and Meija 2017).

4. According to **media naturalness theory**, all these changes may nevertheless be accepted over time, and verbal computer-mediated communication may lead to effective recruitment through learning and experience (McColl and Michelotti 2019). Media naturalness can be determined with reference to five key attributes: collocation, synchronicity of communication flow, and the capacity to express and perceive facial expressions, body language, and speech” (McColl and Michelotti 2019, p. 640; Kock 2005, 2009). All these properties can become familiar, and their repeated use over time can engender a feeling of knowledge, comfort, and even mastery on the part of both the interviewers and the interviewees.
5. **Socio-material theory** uses an approach that is necessary for the acceptance and effective use of video interviews in recruitment because it focuses on the effects of technology on human behavior and human thinking, which conversely affect technology (Brenner 2019). This entails harnessing the power of human–technology interaction to study “how evaluation practices can be changed to better respond to their users” (Brenner 2019, p. 43). More precisely, the investigation of the use of SVIs and AVIs by recruiters in remote hiring and that of applicants' participation in video interviews can yield an understanding of how to address both parties' needs and preferences.

However, if the pros and cons of each video interview type are contingent on the theory and related lens employed to assess them, a more objective evaluation of their worth in recruitment lies in the distinction between structured and unstructured formats. *Structured interviews* follow a

predetermined script for all applicants for a certain job offer; thus, they are assumed to increase reliability and accuracy by restraining subjectivity and limiting inconsistency (Pursell et al. 1980). Conversely, *unstructured interviews* are not uniform and do not share a consistent pattern; interviewers follow their intuition and ask more open questions (Kuoppala 2019). While SVIs tend to conform to the unstructured interview style because of the interactivity enabled between the interviewer and interviewee, AVIs comprise structured interview characteristics because they are staged and guided by the same questions for all interviewees, and their rating is made according to an identical scale across interviews (Suen et al. 2020). In this regard, AVIs may be perceived as more reliable and fairer than SVIs. The latter allow more flexibility and personalization, thus paving the way for more inconsistencies across interviews and less objectivity in the evaluation of candidates' profiles and potential fit in the organization.

Notably, more recent studies on AVIs specifically consider their possible lack of objectivity and fairness in consideration of the applicants' evaluation. Thus, a distinction needs to be made between two categories of AVIs: those assessed using human analysis and decision-making and those that are assessed using algorithmic analysis and decision-making, which can be supervised by humans. Most of the literature on AVIs has engaged in the study of the latter category. These AVIs are assessed by means of *AI*, which leverages machine learning to reach human-like types of intelligence. Machine learning can be implemented through deep learning, which exists in three forms: supervised learning, semi-supervised learning, and unsupervised learning. Semi-supervised learning can be achieved "with relatively small quantities of unlabeled data plus some labeled data for pattern recognition" (Suen et al. 2020, p. 2). Advanced data analytics are used to identify and decipher every move, word, and facial expression via sensor devices (Nikolaou 2021). In particular, convolutional neural networks, whose use has gone mainstream, "can be trained to accurately detect and recognize facial impressions without manual feature extraction" (Suen et al. 2020, p. 2). For instance, AVI-AI can learn and predict interpersonal communication skills, openness, agreeableness, and neuroticism and apply the model learned to assess interviewees, although conscientiousness and extraversion cannot be learned from facial expressions and movement only (Suen et al. 2020)<sup>3</sup>. Nevertheless, the three different types of AI present limitations

---

<sup>3</sup> The study was conducted with reference to Goldberg's (1992) big five dimensions of personality traits, including "openness to new experiences (be creative and imaginative),

(Huang and Rust 2021). *Mechanical AI* often loses contextual data and has difficulty capturing emotional data; “[t]hinking AI is not neutral. If data input is erroneous or biased, output is likely to be biased too” (Huang and Rust 2021, p. 46). Additionally, Lambrecht and Tucker (2019) proved that biases can even occur when an unbiased algorithm is used. Finally, there may be a lack of readiness for interactions with *feeling AI* (Huang and Rust 2021). Hence, the possibility of replacing human ratings, either partially or completely, with automated functions may be questioned by researchers and practitioners (Suen et al. 2020).

However, the pandemic and subsequent increased use of AI in screening has not precluded job seekers from applying (Wilkinson et al. 2019), even though they may feel nervous about AI-powered AVIs (Meija and Torres 2018). In this respect, the TAM theory can be applied to understand “classical reliability and validity issues related to new selection technologies” while offering “insights into technology adoption by candidates and recruiters” (Brenner 2019, p. 45). Thus, the adoption of AVIs by recruiters should not impair the attraction of top candidates at the expense of the entire recruitment process (Murphy 1986).

Organizations therefore rely on employer branding to position themselves as compelling firms with a pool of potential hires online. Video interviews occur at the assessment phase of the hiring process (as defined by the International Organization for Standardization 2016), which is third after sourcing and attraction (Eger et al. 2019), which implies that talent must first be identified and attracted. Consequently, employers aim organizational communication at bridging the gap between the organization and their target audience in the labor market (i.e., talent) (Roxo 2020).

### 1.1.2 Employer branding in digital recruitment

By using the same digital and interactive tools and platforms for both sourcing and attraction, employers have entered an increasingly unpredictable phase in the digital age, which emphasizes

---

conscientiousness (be organized and self-disciplined), extraversion (be assertive and sociable), agreeableness (be tolerant, honest, and altruistic), and neuroticism (be vulnerable to frequent strong negative emotions)” (as cited in Suen et al. 2020, p. 6).

the need to use an “*integrated marketing communication (IMC) strategy*”, as advanced by Rodrigues and Martinez (2020). Talent attraction can be difficult due to the diversity of stakeholders involved online, their respective interests, communication speed, and the potential virality of content across channels, which can also generate strong effects in the physical realm, such as talent attraction or repulsion. The specificities of the digital environment and its connection to the physical world thereby induce the need for a digital media marketing strategy (including mixed media and cross-media information) in recruitment, which aligns and is synchronized with the overall employer marketing strategy. This necessitates the adoption and deployment of an IMC, defined as “a communication strategy which integrates different tools to communicate the recruitment message effectively to the targeted audience, combining marketing traditional and new media, while depending heavily on data” (Rodrigues and Martinez 2020, p. 39; Batra and Keller 2016; Luxton, Reid, and Mavondo 2015; Madia 2011). Such IMC can help organizations offset the desired control of information with the involvement and engagement of other stakeholders (Rodrigues and Martinez 2020).

*Talent attraction and engagement* therefore demand organizational branding and, more specifically, external employer branding to build a strong reputation with a positive and compelling image of a great employer with prospective workers via content marketing and storytelling (Rodrigues and Martinez 2020; Allen et al. 2013; Elving et al. 2013; Blackman 2006; Fisher et al. 1979). External employer branding aims to achieve *recruitment effectiveness* (i.e., “the ability to hire the most-suited candidates”) by swaying “the target candidates’ decision to apply” (Rodrigues and Martinez 2020, p. 28) through building a dialogue with job seekers (Yasmin et al. 2015). In fact, *employer branding* follows an internal marketing approach, which conceives job positions as an internal portfolio of products designed by using marketing techniques to cater to both workforce and organizational needs while communicating employment benefits to both internal and external markets (Wilden et al. 2010). Employer branding can become a competitive advantage because it contributes to securing and retaining the best talent (Dabirian et al. 2019).

Therefore, organizations employ varied communication forms and means “to reach candidates, connect with them, and build a positive employer image” (Rodrigues and Martinez 2020, p. 25; Puncheva-Michelotti et al. 2018). This underscores the decisive role of both communication channel selection for the right target audience and *cross-media recruitment marketing*

*orchestration*, given the number and diversity of platforms in the digital age (Kuoppala 2019). Among communication channels, websites, social media platforms, AI-based recruitment software, and global professional employer organizations (PEOs) are the main hiring tools available to recruiters (Payne 2021). They are generally used simultaneously or in a complementary manner to recruit new hires because they consider the attraction effect to be tied to the message source (Allen et al. 2007). For this purpose, text, image, video, and audio content formats (Mishra and Kumar 2019) are carefully selected and leveraged to create a compelling, credible, and consistent story while understanding that “the format of the presentation of the information can be as important as the information itself” (Rodrigues and Martinez 2020, p. 29; Allen et al. 2013).

Parallel to their employer value proposition, organizations continuously *experiment* by relying on *storytelling and content marketing* to attract talent across “markets, media and culture” (Carah 2017, p. 384) by building their reputation and image. *Organizational reputation* refers to the socially constructed bundle of organizational features in accordance with its past actions (Eger et al. 2019). The *organizational image* then emerges from the individual “set of beliefs, ideas, and impressions a person holds” (Eger et al. 2019, p. 522) regarding the organization, based on its reputation, offering, and marketing communications. Finally, *organizational attractiveness* stems from the benefits potential workers anticipate from working at a certain organization, which they consider a “good [if not great] place to work” (Eger et al. 2019, p. 523; Wilden et al. 2010; Berthon et al. 2005) with reference to its reputation and the image they have of it. This implies that organizational attractiveness is affected by the individual attributes of potential workers, such as culture, personality, gender, or life situation (Eger et al. 2019); therefore, storytelling and content marketing should cater to their individual profiles. This emphasizes the importance of *content creation and personalization* in opening the dialogue in a way that delivers value that meets the needs and demands of the target (Järvinen & Taiminen 2016), in this case potential hires. Targeted marketing, which communicates the most appropriate message at the optimal time to the right audience through the most apt channel(s), can today be automated via AI-powered technologies that are integrated into websites and applications, social media platforms, and recruitment software, among others.

Specifically, organizations send *signals* (ref. **signaling theory**) to prospective workers during the recruitment process to build trust through a well-informed, consistent, smooth, and enjoyable experience across the media (Wilden et al. 2010) from the inception of the hiring process, thereby setting job seekers' expectations (Allen et al. 2007). These *expectations*, even though they may not be well-informed, usually influence job seekers' identification of their favorite prospective employers early on, and the remainder of their decision-making mostly entails the confirmation and rationalization of their early judgments (Allen et al. 2007; Soelberg 1967). Thus, the adoption and implementation of a recruitment funnel (Headworth 2015) is deemed worthwhile.



**Fig. 1.1 The recruitment funnel in the digital age (adapted from Headworth 2015).** From sourcing, attraction, interest, application, and assessment all the way to selection and hiring, different marketing tactics are used to engage talent across the recruitment process.

The *recruitment funnel* aims to turn the most adequate profiles into hires—similar to what the sales and marketing funnel does with prospective customers (Kuoppala 2019; Headworth 2015). Figure 1.1 (adapted from Headworth 2015), which presents the recruitment funnel in the digital age, implements different marketing tactics across channels to engage talent throughout the recruitment process. It comprises four stages: (1) sourcing and attraction (to build awareness and channel talent to suitable job opportunities), (2) interest and application (to create interest about a specific opportunity and receive applications), (3) assessment (of applicants' profiles and fit via interviews and other possible tests), and (4) selection and hiring (job offering or rejection and onboarding). Such a funnel appears relevant in recruitment in the digital age because job seekers have decision-making power in the labor market (i.e., they can decide on their workplace). This tendency has been reinforced during the pandemic, with employers reporting a higher level of

difficulty filling positions in European countries and the UK, Turkey, North America, South America, Japan, and Australia in 2021 ([ManpowerGroup](#) 2021).

In this regard, it appears essential for recruiting organizations to uncover *talent preferences* when planning communications and to ensure that personal connections can be built (Kuoppala 2019) throughout the recruitment funnel. *Cybervetting*—the extraction and instrumentalization of applicant or employee information from non-governmental and non-institutional digital tools and websites by employers (Nikolaou, 2021)—can help unveil talent preferences and can be incorporated with an *applicant tracking system (ATS)*, which facilitates both the administration and execution of activities considered time-consuming during the screening phase. The data of not only officially submitted candidates or employees but also that of other candidates or employees can be found online, stored, parsed, and made easily retrievable from an ATS. Although applicants may expect or encourage prospective employers to access their LinkedIn profiles, cybervetting may become controversial due to the variety of personal information available, especially on social media websites and apps (Nikolaou 2021). Frasca (2017), who researched “job seekers’ perceptions of commonly utilized web-based recruitment media and how these impact a core pre-hire recruitment outcome, organizational attraction” (p. 133), posited that web-based media should be enriched with personalized focus, cues, and sufficient information to meet job seekers’ preferences. Thus, the combination of video and social media was advanced as beneficial to organizations, while instant messaging was purportedly useful for customization of responses to job seekers’ questions (Frasca 2017). Additionally, the power of *word of mouth* and *user-generated content (UGC)* should be tapped, especially on social media platforms. The most recent development and spread of *social media* and social networking sites has had a significant effect on digital attraction, making it a topic of interest for both practitioners and researchers, particularly amid the pandemic, which has increased the use of social media (Nikolaou 2021). More precisely, widespread access to and use of the Internet, social media, and social networking sites allow applicants to easily and rapidly “make or break” the reputation of an organization as an employer, thereby affecting its employer brand and financials (Nikolaou 2021, p. 4). Moreover, it has been observed that *negative eWOM* has a greater influence than *positive eWOM* (Kannan and Li 2017). In this sense, understanding potential and current hires’ engagement motivations and social media interactive features is essential to “designing valuable content and facilitating [talent] interactions

that would help stimulate [and enhance] content sharing among [the pool of talents on social media]” (Li et al. 2020, p. 9).

Thus, recruiting organizations need to adapt their employer branding to talent preferences by harnessing transmedia storytelling and, more specifically, social customer relationship management (CRM) strategy, which is a cornerstone of recruitment. *Transmedia storytelling* refers to a means of exploring applicants’ “attitudes, skills, interests, values, and competences” to establish their suitability for a vacant position (Roxo 2020, p. 74). Each medium can be expressly determined for a purpose based on the intentional exploration and involvement of the audience, which thereby participates in the cocreation of recruitment processes designed to support employee professional development and career decisions (Roxo 2020). Transmedia storytelling can benefit from social CRM strategies because they are “designed to engage the customer in a collaborative conversation in order to provide mutually beneficial value in a trusted and transparent business environment” (Greenberg 2009, p. 34). While social CRM strategies have been advanced for the development of relationships with customers, they seem applicable to relationships with potential hires in the labor market in a rich and dynamic media environment. In particular, a few good CRM practices that have been postulated by Li et al. (2020) can be translated into a “*social recruitment strategy*” as follows:

1. Continuous and consistent systematic engagement of potential and current hires on social media
2. Initiation of dialogue with potential hires on social media through integration of resources, knowledge exchange, and deep exploration, as well as understanding their attributes, attitudes, and behaviors
3. Closely monitoring the encouragement of social media postings by potential and current hires
4. Building “specific capabilities (e.g., those anchored on operational excellence, information technology, and specific employee skills/knowledge) to systematically collect, analyze, and act on data derived from interactions” with potential and current hires in social media (Li et al. 2020, p. 12).



### 1.1.3 Theoretical framework

In the discussed context, it seems important to study potential employees' opinions about video interviews, which have become the new paradigm of candidates' assessment. Talent preferences can affect the device used for recruitment because all experiences, regardless of their positive or negative nature, have the potential to affect employer brand attractiveness (Proost et al. 2021). Given that applicants seem to prefer in-person interviews (Proost et al. 2021), organizations can also benefit from attending to applicants' viewpoints about video interviews to improve employer branding.


An employer's brand can be promoted and reinforced through e-recruitment techniques such as social media platforms and organizational websites (Mishra and Kumar 2019); thus, the present study undertakes the qualitative e-research of both a social media platform (LinkedIn) and content retrieved from the organizational website of a video interview service provider (RecRight). *Qualitative e-research* corresponds to the study of "perceptions, experiences or behaviors through participants' verbal or visual expressions, actions or writings" (Salmons 2016, p. 6). Potential recruits' viewpoints can easily be retrieved from social media platforms and analyzed to gain "a deeper understanding of what factors influence the preferences of job applicants, a fundamental and necessary prerequisite for a recruitment strategy and for the development of an employer brand" (Eger et al. 2019, p. 537). The perspectives they share on *LinkedIn* deserve attention because LinkedIn is the world's largest online professional platform, with more than 722 million users (WEF 2021), and it offers the possibility for employers and workers to search, network, share, and engage in conversations and discussions about work and employment-related matters. This underpins the suitability and relevance of data collected from LinkedIn about video interviews. Furthermore, only LinkedIn data were considered for the purpose of this research because of the platform's specific "mix of communication features and constraints" (Salmons 2016, p. 179).

The organizational (or employer) stance can be captured from content marketing by *video interview service providers*, which release abundant information about video interviews and employer branding to attract and support recruiting organizations via their digital recruitment funnel. Valid, credible, and rich information can be collected from their websites, which is

important because it is not possible to access detailed information about video recruitment directly from recruiting organizations' websites.

The *comparison of employer and talent stances on video interviews* can then be leveraged for employer branding purposes, as per the recommendation of Mishra and Kumar (2019), who have urged future research to focus on narrowing the gap between employees' preferred dimensions and the actual dimensions offered by the employer to advance employer branding strategy. The present study aims to bridge the gap between employer and talent standpoints regarding video interviews by comparing the content generated by a video interview service provider and the LinkedIn pool of potential hires. While the content of a video interview service provider offers a comprehensive understanding of recruiters' recruitment funnel, comments from the LinkedIn pool of potential hires illustrate their opinions and preferences. To improve employer branding in the context of video recruitment, this study addresses the need for more research on the semantic nature of UGC, as stressed by Kannan and Li (2017).

Figure 1.2 crystallizes the theoretical framework adopted in this chapter. It starts from the selected video interview service provider's content on video recruitment and employer branding to answer RQ2. This content informs employers' decisions regarding video recruitment and related practices. Upon adoption of video interview services, employers can source and attract talent through the digital content they target to potential hires, which helps throughout the entire recruitment funnel, especially for creating interest and encouraging applications. RQ1 then investigates the comments made by LinkedIn users in the news thread dedicated to AVIs. This UGC helps capture platform users' (who are all potential hires for organizations) opinions about video interviews and, more generally, about video recruitment, including subsequent effects on the employer brand perceived by current and potential workers. Both types of content are then compared and put into perspective with extant literature to respond to RQ3 and formulate suggestions for improvement of employer branding in remote recruitment that harnesses the power of video interviews.



**Fig. 1.2 Theoretical framework—Improving employer branding of video interviews in remote recruitment**

## 1.2 Methodology

### 1.2.1 Data collection

To collect unstructured data without any interference by the researcher (Salmons 2016), this research gathered (1) written UGC (or text in the form of comments) from LinkedIn individual users in the dedicated news thread “[Meet the one-way job interview.](#)”, created by Gold in 2021, and (2) expert content released by RecRight, a major video interview service provider in the Nordics.

On LinkedIn, the main selection criterion was participation in the online conversation on this news thread to avoid data selection bias. While all conversation participants can be recognized from their respective user names on LinkedIn, all their personal data remained somewhat anonymous because their comments were made in the private domain of LinkedIn, which is only accessible to the platform’s users. Nonetheless, this access restriction appears rather weak because the comments are made public to all LinkedIn users. As LinkedIn users ourselves, we could access

and utilize these data without having to request consent from the participants. Data collection was executed via Phantombuster to extract all “*LinkedIn Post Commenters*” on the four first posts whose URL links were visible and retrievable to have sufficient data for analysis. This resulted in the collection of user names, number of degrees, occupation, comments with their respective URL links and number of likes, as well as their extraction timestamps (dated 9/12/2021). All these data were then uploaded to Atlas.fi for thorough discourse analysis.

Even though a variety of content could be retrieved across the blog and *resources of [RecRight's website](#)*, only two documents were utilized to comprehend the use of video interviews and employer branding in recruitment, considering the exhaustive nature of the concepts and phenomenon that are central to this study. More specifically, “Video Recruitment—The Ultimate Guide” and the “Employer Branding and Recruitment Handbook” were downloaded from the company’s website and saved as data sources.

### 1.2.2 Data analysis

Qualitative content analysis was performed by means of Atlas.ti for data collected from the LinkedIn news thread post and RecRight’s documents.

From multiple LinkedIn posts in the news thread about AVIs, only comments that belonged to the reference post of the first post were examined and systematically analyzed because similar comments were found under all other posts, and patterns could already be identified solely from the post referred to by the first post of the LinkedIn news thread. Figure 1.3 displays this reference post, which counted 190 reactions and 282 comments at the time of data collection (mid-September 2021). It notably contained a poll to gauge people’s opinions about the usefulness they attach to one-way video job interviews. This poll found that the majority of respondents (68%) believed that AVIs were not useful, and the remainder was equally split: 16% (AVIs are useful) and 16% (AVI’s usefulness “depends”). Even if only those who voted “It depends” were asked to elaborate in the comments, it is possible that other voters and non-voters who came across the post also commented.

Very cool article in the CBC this week on the rise of asynchronous video interview (AVI) platforms, also known as one-way job interviews. Good development/bad development? Adds to bias or allows better-informed screening?

### Are one-way video job interviews a useful tool?

The author can see how you vote. [Learn more](#)

Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	16%
No <input type="checkbox"/>	68%
It depends (comment below) <input type="checkbox"/>	16%

8,434 votes • Poll closed • [Remove vote](#)

   190 • 282 comments

**Fig. 1.3 Reference post of the first post in the LinkedIn news thread for “Meet the one-way interview”**

All these comments were analyzed with the intention to respond to **RQ1: What are the perceptions of potential hires about video interviews?** In this regard, they were coded to isolate “patterns and relationships between variables and themes” (Given 2008, p. 121). What LinkedIn potential hires think and why they think that way emerged in the comments. All comments were uploaded to Atlas.ti and coded inductively while considering what had previously been read about video interviews, recruitment, and employer branding.

RecRight’s data were subjected to a similar content analysis process to respond to **RQ2: How are video-interviews branded by service providers for remote recruitment?** The two brochures published by the video interview service provider were uploaded to Atlas.ti and jointly coded (both documents were aligned and complementary) to capture information about video recruitment, video interviews, and employer branding. An abductive process was used to code the data. In particular, codes were formed by combining the inductive understanding of the meaning of RecRight’s content with the codes previously found inductively from LinkedIn UGC while also considering the literature reviewed earlier in this chapter.

The clarification and comparison of what collective meanings were emerging from the use of video recruitment services, according to what was shared online on the subject, were harnessed to

propose ways to best adopt and use video recruitment in remote work in part 1.4 (ref. **RQ3: How can employer branding be adapted for video-interviews in remote recruitment?**). This is vital at a turning point in history, with the pandemic precipitating video recruitment adoption and use to hire new talent. The new paradigm of recruitment is indeed currently being developed by daily behaviors and practices.

## 1.3 Research results

This section presents the research findings. RQ1 guides the analysis of LinkedIn users' comments to understand what are their perceptions about video interviews, and RQ2 steers the analysis of RecRight's online brochures on video recruitment and employer branding and recruitment.

### 1.3.1 LinkedIn users' comments

Figure 1.4 shows the aggregation of codes discovered from LinkedIn users' comments. In total, 45 codes were allotted and then reorganized under 5 overarching dimensions: HRM matters (10 codes), interviews are a two-way street (14 codes), AVIs/AVI usefulness and benefits (9 codes), limits of AVIs (9 codes), and implications of AVI use (10 codes). For the purpose of the analysis, comments have been split into quotations that convey a specific meaning associated with one or multiple codes. Throughout this section, these quotations are referred to as "Q" followed by the number of the quotation, and they follow the chronological order of posting by LinkedIn commenters (e.g., Q34, Q158, Q291, etc.). Thus, there are more quotations than comments.

<b>HRM matters</b>	Change in Recruitment Practices; Context-Related AVI Use; Curiosity of LinkedIn Users; Future Orientation; Ignorance Influences Opinions about AVIs; Job Offer Negotiations; Overdemanding Job Ads; Personal Interest in Hiring; Person-Organization Fit Assessment.
<b>Interviews are a two-way street</b>	Application Withdrawal & Distancing; AVIs Lack Non-Verbal Cues; Creepy AVIs; Dehumanizing AVIs; Disrespectful AVIs; Impaired User Experience AVIs; Impersonal AVIs; Interviews are a two-way street; Lack of Interest & enthusiasm due to AVIs; Ridiculous AVIs; Stressful AVIs; Superiority of SVIs; Unfair AVIs; Unuseful AVIs.
<b>AVIs' Usefulness &amp; Benefits</b>	AVI Benefits; AVI Brings Structure that Helps Candidates; Context-Related AVI Use; Cost-cutting; Easy AVIs; Personalized AVI Communication; Positive Opinion about AVIs; Useful to Candidate; Useful to the Recruitment Process.
<b>Limits of AVIs</b>	AVI Difficulties; AVIs Lack Non-Verbal Cues; Bias & Trust Issues; Disrespectful AVIs; Impaired User Experience AVIs; Impersonal AVIs; Limits of AVIs; Need to Supplement AVIs; Stressful AVIs.
<b>Implications of AVI Use</b>	AI Risks; AVI Risks; AVI User Need for Specific Training; Bias & Trust Issues; Change in Recruitment Practices; Context-Related AVI Use; Employer Impression & Branding with Candidates; Need for Training Recruiters; Need Testing & Regulation; Need to Supplement AVIs.

**Fig. 1.4 Aggregate dimensions in LinkedIn users' comments to the post referred by the first post in the news thread on "Meet the one-way interview"**

### 1.3.1.1 HRM matters

*HRM matters* refer to various topics recognized as associated with HRM in a broad manner by LinkedIn commenters. These topics (Figure 1.4) highlight the continuous change in recruitment practices that have shaped the recruitment landscape over time and are driven by a future orientation, which will improve the recruitment process. To be more precise, video interviews were introduced decades ago (Q9, Q13, Q130, Q143, Q207, Q227, Q239, Q284, etc.), with some potential hires having participated in AVIs in the early 1990s (Q309). Some specialized video interview service providers, such as HireVue or VidCruiter (Q315, Q342, Q349, etc.), have emerged, and the adoption of their services by organizations has accelerated as a result of the pandemic (Q3, Q53), allowing organizations to hire globally (Q319). Although AVI use is recognized as mostly useful as an alternative for screening candidates prior to having them meet the hiring team (Q82, Q121, Q287, Q309, Q315, Q359, Q397), some believe that top talent may not make it there because AVIs feel "unnatural" (Q287). Remarkably, one commenter expressed the following: "While the poll suggests that most believe one-way job interviews are NOT useful tools, it does not mean that companies are not going to use them" (Q377). This, combined with the

comment “I’m all for it as long as it helps to reinforce the human touch” (Q346) and the fact that screening is an “iterative task” that can be automated (Q359), seems to enlighten the overall recruitment situation. Ultimately, we must ask, “Will this help [organizations] attract, hire, onboard, and develop diverse talents” (Q297)?

The acceptance of the adoption of AVIs and their relative value are contingent on the context of use of the tool. Some industries may be more appropriate than others (Q91), such as marketing and digital media (Q421), entertainment (Q203, Q361), companies that have a technological focus (Q137), or jobs that require giving presentations (Q195) or interpretations (Q229). AVIs’ usefulness is clear when there is a large pool of applicants for a job (Q52, Q123, Q219, Q315, Q393), especially for entry-level roles (Q393). Interestingly, a commenter stated that resume screening should be done and that large pools of applicants could be reduced by raising the qualification requirements (Q242). Another commenter stated, “The AVI platform could be part of the process to see how the candidate handles technology, new situations, and adaptability, but only if those are competencies [that] they would also need to do [in] their prospective job” (Q137). Another commenter emphasized the different priorities of recruiters, who may “believe, rightly in many cases, that there are more pertinent issues to be working on, rather than screening job candidates” (Q328). This could explain why some candidates do not receive any feedback on their AVIs (Q46).

Additionally, LinkedIn users showed interest and curiosity in the topic by raising concerns about the willingness of candidates to participate in AVIs (Q213), AVIs’ benefits (Q55), the lack of human touch (Q135), the way organizations “try to combat bias” (Q56), and the point in the recruitment process when AVIs would be used (Q295). Notably, a certain ignorance of AVIs could be sensed from certain comments: “I really don’t know about this” (Q141); “I’ve never heard of such a thing before. It sounds abhorrent. Why would any employer or job seeker want to interview this way? It removes most of any potential discovery from the interview process. Why bother at all, just hire off the resume then” (Q425). One commenter even said, “All the people who responded ‘No’ [to the poll on AVIs’ usefulness] don’t know how to use tools...” (Q103).

Nonetheless, because video interviews (as much as face-to-face interviews) are meant to help both candidates and recruiters gauge the person–organization fit, it is crucial to consider these comments to understand both perspectives. Commenters emphasized that person–organization fit



is assessed by candidates as much as it is by recruiters (Q3, Q42, Q80, Q159, Q167, Q168, Q213, Q215, Q255, Q344, Q397). They also underscored the absence of real character assessment by recruiters who use AVIs (Q50) and the difficulty of reaching a ratable score due to having insufficient information shared by candidates in this format (Q73). It was also stated that hiring results from the recruiters' projection of candidates in their teams and the way they connect and relate to each other during the interview (Q109). Hence, interviews are a two-way street.

### 1.3.1.2 Interviews are a two-way street

This telltale dimension stresses the essential dialogue needed between candidates and recruiters for job interviews. It consists of the third-most quoted dimension across all comments gathered. The missing conversation in AVIs indeed proved to be the most pressing issue (ref. 66 quotations), especially when considering that the interview is supposed to be the first touchpoint of a more tangible relationship between candidates and the recruiter (Q48). Hence, there is the expectation of a synchronous exchange, either physical or virtual (Q79, Q80), where both parties can spontaneously and fluidly have a discussion to learn more about each other (Q20, Q95, Q145, Q166, Q231, Q232, Q267). More importantly, spontaneity can change the course of hiring decisions made by recruiters (Q145, Q166, Q387). Both parties are more involved in the exchange and engaged in the building of a relationship when there is a possibility to have a live exchange (Q199, Q207, Q209, Q251). Candidates need to get a feel for the leadership and the organizational culture (Q167), while recruiters should be able to evaluate candidates' communication skills, critical thinking, and interaction abilities (Q178, Q211, Q273). In the end, "Hiring is as much about human interpretation and interaction as it is about raw knowledge" (Q286). In this regard, careful introduction of automated processes is necessary "where social interaction has long been the standard" (Q338). The idea of recruiters and upper management producing a video was introduced (Q225, Q326). This could help counter AVI candidates' feelings of unfairness (Q48, Q59, Q61, Q177, Q192, Q209, Q213, Q270, Q299, Q301, Q311, Q319, Q340). AVIs could indeed be considered disrespectful of candidates (Q5, Q7, Q172, Q177, Q301, Q351, Q370, Q401), as well as stressful (Q46, Q62, Q189, Q195, Q268, Q307), impersonal (Q11, Q46, Q71, Q373), creepy (Q7, Q48, Q276, Q299), discriminatory (Q77) toward introverts (Q418), and inferior to SVIs and face-to-face interviews (Q3, Q28, Q73, Q79, Q80, Q188, Q209, Q232, Q312, Q385) because they

lack non-verbal cues (Q105, Q173). Most importantly, AVIs can convey an inhumane message to candidates (Q15, Q34, Q40, Q50, Q59, Q93, Q105, Q114, Q150, Q170, Q287, Q373, Q379, Q381, Q399), who feel like they are not valued and are simply a number or commodity. “I will retract my name from consideration. If I come on camera, the employer must also have a representative on camera as well. #Respect #ReclaimingMyTime” (Q301). Thus, some deemed AVIs ridiculous (Q9, Q32, Q139, Q178, Q289, Q336) because they believe such interviews do not have anything to do with the assessment of the person’s profile and fit in the recruiting organization (Q59, Q32, Q261, Q340, Q355, Q375, Q420, Q425). Rather, the feeling was that they display recruiters’ laziness (Q313) and waste applicants’ time (Q275). In this sense, the pool of online talents and professionals may perceive AVIs as not useful (Q32, Q38, Q351) and even as a reason for withdrawing their application or distancing themselves from organizations (Q9, Q46, Q93, Q95, Q128, Q145, Q159, Q193, Q203, Q220, Q222, Q255, Q301, Q322, Q340, Q357, Q381, Q399, Q401). “I noped out of one of these last week. To me, it spoke to how I’d be treated if I were hired—like a robot or a number. No thank you” (Q322).

However, it seems that certain factors, such as stage presence, skin tone, and computer presence, which can be evaluated through AVIs, can prove useful for workers required to work on screen (Q329), especially in the context of remote or hybrid work. Further, AVIs can still be “a good way to understand who you are talking to, [including] his attitude and skills” (Q175), which is discussed in the next subsection.

### 1.3.1.3 AVIs’ usefulness and benefits

The dimension *AVIs’ usefulness and benefits* envelopes all the upsides mentioned by LinkedIn commenters. AVIs’ usefulness to the recruitment process was the most cited across all comments (68 quotes), whereas their usefulness to candidates was commented on only 19 times. From the recruiter perspective, AVIs are a step in the hiring process and an alternative to other forms of screening, such as phone calls or CVs (Q36, Q75, Q83, Q91, Q97, Q103, Q121, Q150, Q186, Q188, Q251, Q267, Q273, Q284, Q305, Q324, Q333, Q359, Q392, Q397). They can add convenience and ease to scheduling (Q52, Q62, Q64, Q120, Q201, Q207, Q231, Q246, Q253, Q389) and cut financial costs (Q28, Q124, Q201, Q338, Q390) by streamlining recruitment.

Moreover, more decision-makers can access and participate in the rating of candidates' videos (Q219), which, in tandem with the structure articulated by the same questions across interviews (Q91), can reduce bias in assessment and selection. From the candidates' perspective, benefits include the convenience of doing the interview whenever it is suitable for them (Q71, Q120, Q131, Q231) without having to commute (Q118, Q9), the possibility to re record themselves multiple times (Q71, Q75, Q234) to stand out from other candidates (Q125, Q280), and (for some) a reduction in anxiety (Q234, Q412)/help in building confidence (Q234). Importantly, these benefits were not found to be universally true; other LinkedIn commenters countered them, as noted in the next subsection.

#### 1.3.1.4 Limits of AVIs

Numerous *limits of AVIs* were listed in the comments, including use difficulties, impaired user experience, disrespect of candidates, candidate stress, impersonal AVIs, the need for AVI supplementation in recruitment, and bias and trust issues. Difficulties that led to impaired AVI experience were mostly cited from the outlook of potential hires. Among these difficulties were the limited time to respond to interview questions (Q11, Q13, Q46, Q207, Q284) and no ability to re record themselves (Q13, Q46, Q284). These issues diverted applicants' attention from having a chance to "shine" (Q62, Q217, Q166). Commenters also mentioned that the absence of direct interaction between the interviewee and interviewer prevented the parties from getting to know each other well due to a lack of spontaneous back-and-forth conversation (Q109, Q118, Q145, Q220, Q231, Q286, Q368, Q420). The correlated lack of feedback thereby undermines the assessment quality (Q109, Q287, Q420). The focus may be on "simulation and personality testing with technical skills" (Q151), whereas "your character shines when the conversations are fluid; the interview is more on alignment versus validating your credentials and discussing real-life challenges [in] the workplace that you would help solve" (Q166). Additionally, clarification may be needed on questions (for applicants) and on answers (for recruiters) (Q271, Q284, Q311, Q416), not only in terms of content but also in terms of format, and an accent could, for instance, impede understanding (Q156, Q319).

"Hiring is as much about human interpretation and interaction as it is about raw knowledge" (Q286); therefore, the assessment of applicants' skills, personality, experience, and, most

importantly, the assessment of their fit in the organization in terms of culture, both for themselves and recruiters, is questionable (Q213, Q215, Q261). Consequently, it is assumed that recruiting organizations will be denied the opportunity to interview and integrate quality applicants (Q160, Q383) if they rely on AVIs for hiring. However, multiple commenters who highlighted the usefulness of AVIs stated that its supplementation is necessary to be able to achieve effective decision-making on a hire (Q3, Q26, Q36, Q97, Q101, Q137, Q188, Q245, Q251, Q259, Q273, Q280, Q284, Q293, Q306, Q315, Q324, Q390, Q394, Q397, Q403). A few alluded to the need to provide some type of video feedback on AVIs to make this “strange” experience (Q13) more human for applicants (Q172, Q186).

Generally, the use of AVIs in recruitment could increase bias (Q44, Q46, Q50, Q55, Q87, Q139, Q143, Q205, Q217, Q220, Q263, Q319, Q398, Q414) and erode trust between candidates and employers (Q62, Q69, Q197, Q299, Q330, Q414). One commenter noted that biases are inherent in decision-making because they ultimately consist of “preferences” (Q253), which a need to train recruiters to limit and reduce bias in hiring (Q319). One commenter stated, “We may just be trading one set of biases for another. Instead of ‘Can you answer my questions and interact well with me?’, it comes down to ‘Can you answer my questions, and do you look/sound good in a video?’” (Q398).

All these limits lead to the ramifications associated with the use of AVIs in recruitment, which are discussed in the next subsection.

#### 1.3.1.5 Implications of AVI use

Four *implications of AVI* use could be drawn from LinkedIn users’ comments:

- 1. There is a need for increased awareness of AVIs** among LinkedIn users, even though they are probably more informed on the topic than those who are not present on the social media platform. Many comments reflected the diversity of practices and the ignorance of many on AVIs: “An organization that won’t invest its hiring officials/leaders’ time to meet with candidates is making a statement. That statement is that we don’t want to invest in our human resources. Hiring is one of the single most important decisions a leader makes” (Q353). Regardless of the lack of awareness and understanding of AVIs’ value, their use has spread during the pandemic and will

likely remain essential to recruitment. AVI use is contingent on context; thus, its acceptance, unfolding, and outcomes will differ for individuals and organizations. Different AVI specificities, benefits, downsides, and risks should be communicated to all actors in the labor market.

**2. Education and training** play central roles in the successful adoption and implementation of AVIs in recruitment. Recruiters should learn and know “how to review a resume and how to properly interview and evaluate candidates” (Q87) when using AVIs. If interviewing is both an art and a skill, the skill component can and should be built (Q87, Q319), especially in the context of digital recruitment. In practice, it may be that recruiters simply follow the instructions given by video interview service providers (Q377). Organizations therefore bear the responsibility for the evaluation of the character and emotional quotient of their “people leaders” (Q340) as well as effective collaboration between decision-makers who rely on AVI when hiring. Potential hires need to receive training on how to successfully navigate AVIs to secure a desired job. Potential hires can and should be trained on the practicalities of AVIs (notably technology-related) (Q101, Q315), how to deliver a speech for an AVI (Q89), and how to adjust ambient factors, such as lighting, background, and sound (Q130), to enhance their impact on recruiters who view their recordings, assess them, and decide who to hire. Finally, it was said that “you’re only as good as the questions asked” (Q162).

**3. The need to test and regulate recruiters that implement AVIs** (Q147) has become paramount considering the absence of accountability from those who invest in biased AI tools (Q143) and the inevitable presence of recruiters’ conscious and unconscious biases. Although LinkedIn users’ opinions differ depending on whether decision-making is human or AI-assisted, a sense of distrust and unfairness arises from the use of AVIs for recruiting. While testing appears easier with human decision-making, such as when different individuals rate and select a candidate, this can be difficult for AI-assisted decision-making because sometimes recruiters who use AVI service providers’ tools “don’t even know what their algorithm is learning. This is, at best, random chance, [and] at worst, systematic discrimination hidden in code” (Q263). Video interview service providers indeed bear an enormous responsibility in the design, coding, assessment, and selection of hires in AVI-assisted recruitment. Hence, the key questions are related to the identification and distribution of responsibilities between all agents involved in the production, adoption, and utilization of AVIs (e.g., “Who is auditing compliance or biases on AVI tools? Who is auditing

auditors who audit AVI?” (Q153, Q154). Yet, current loopholes in the law allow for a lack or absence of accountability. “One specific offender has repeatedly refused to have their algorithm audited for bias or to define what metrics they are using to define success” (Q263).

**4. The recruitment process should be kept as interactive and humane as possible** when using AVIs to preserve and nurture the organization’s employer branding and the quality of their hires. People are longing for connection. When asked to do an AVI, they may consider it a hindrance to success or worse, a barrier to building a sound, mutually respectful, and empathetic relationship with recruiters and ultimately organizations. Preventing both the loss of quality applicants and feelings of being undervalued requires interactivity and constructing a sense of mutuality, which could benefit the employer brand and organizational returns. “[I]f the company does not have time to interview employees, they likely won’t have the time to understand employees once they are hired. This will result in higher employee turnover. Employee turnover is probably one of the highest costs for a company” (Q179). The need for humane communications and connections in recruitment can be seen in the fact that many people are struggling to accept AI technologies (e.g., Q357, Q379).

In sum, the analysis of LinkedIn individual users’ comments under the reference post of the first post in the LinkedIn news thread about AVIs proved useful for understanding the outlook that potential hires have regarding AVIs. Their comments expanded comprehension of their viewpoints and approach to applications and expectations of employer–employee relationships, video recruitment practices, and organizations. Investigating a video interview service provider’s content is needed to obtain a more complete understanding of video recruitment and its connection to employer branding. Therefore, the next section explores this aspect.

### 1.3.2 RecRight’s content on video recruitment and employer branding

Figure 1.5 displays the aggregate dimensions that emerged from coding the selected content published by RecRight on their website. All the codes that materialized from the data analysis of the two brochures released by RecRight could be classified under four all-encompassing categories: (1) HRM context and matters, (2) employer branding, (3) AVI recruitment, and (4) from candidate to employee. These dimensions were inspired from dimensions revealed by the

data of LinkedIn users with the goal of subsequently comparing them (see 1.4). In the following subsections, reference to RecRight’s quotations is made by page number, followed by the publication number. Publication 1 represents “Video Recruitment–The Ultimate Guide,” and publication 2 represents the “Employer Branding and Recruitment Handbook.” For instance, quotations could take the following form: “...” (p. 5, 1) or “...” (p. 12, 2). Because RecRight refers to AVIs by the term “video interviews” in the two documents analyzed, each quotation replaces the term “video interview(s)” with “AVI(s)” to be more accurate. Although RecRight’s content may seem redundant regarding definitions and concepts in the literature review, we have presented them to expose what is conveyed and targeted to recruiting organizations to foster those organizations’ adoption and deployment of AVIs for hiring.



**Fig.1.5 Aggregate dimensions of RecRight’s digital content**

### 1.3.2.1 HRM context and matters

The *HRM context and matters* comprises key definitions and HRM matters posited by RecRight; thus helping to frame the environment wherein video interviews are adopted and deployed. Video recruitment, defined as HR that utilizes videos “at any point throughout [the] hiring process” (p. 3, 1), can substantially benefit organizations in their recruitment of new hires in more digital workplaces that have become connected on a global scale (p. 3, 1), a tendency that was reinforced during the pandemic. This, along with the shift toward personality-driven hiring, has contributed

to the rise of video recruitment (p. 3, 1). According to RecRight, the best performing companies are 61% more likely to video interview their candidates (p. 4, 1). Video interviews consist of video-mediated interviews, which can be live or asynchronous (p. 10, 1). AVIs can be sorted across three main groups: (1) traditional AVIs (i.e., pre-recorded videos of recruiters' questions and pre-recorded videos of applicants' answers); (2) public AVIs, whose link can be published and shared as deemed fruitful by recruiters; and (3) embedded AVIs, which are embedded on another webpage (p.7, 1). Video interviews work well for screening "candidates when mass hiring for entry-level roles, summer, and graduate programs, where the age group is generally younger" (p. 11, 1). However, their use is not limited to entry-level positions and young talent pools. Given that nearly everyone in developed countries possesses a smartphone, most people based in those countries can apply for a job using an AVI (p. 10, 1). While some may hold the assumption that only people who belong to a certain industry will find AVIs useful and use them to apply for a position, some applicants may have a background (personality, education, career, personal background) that would make them more inclined to use AVIs, regardless of their current role (p. 11, 1). Additionally, AVIs can prove useful in hiring more experienced people, such as middle and senior management (p. 11, 1). Yet, many recruiters believe that AVIs do not suit them or their potential hires due to their introversion or discomfort "being in front of the camera" (p. 11, 1). Nonetheless, people have been confronted with this approach since the beginning of the pandemic, and video interviews have grown more common, no matter how uncomfortable some people may feel about being on camera.

Another area of the talent acquisition process, employer branding, has been intensified amid the pandemic, with previously existing trends reviewed and strengthened to attract new hires in a highly competitive labor market (p. 2, 2). Employer branding "[i]s the most valuable asset in [an] HR toolbox when it comes to recruiting [the] best talents" (p. 2, 2). The employer brand is crystallized from the "multiple considered and unconscious signals that [a] company and its current employees convey each day" (p. 2, 2). In this respect, employer branding consists of a strategic process that seeks to shed light on the employer's value proposition: "a promise, a value or [the] combination of these two that [a] company conveys to its employees" (p. 9, 2), which should ideally fulfill employee needs (p. 9, 2) in a manner that is superior to that of other employers. In a world where candidates can decide where they want to work (p. 2, 2), video interviews can



facilitate the remote recruitment of the best applicants by offering “the possibility of sending a video CV” (p. 15, 2).

### 1.3.2.2 Employer branding

*Employer branding* demands preliminary “culture mapping” to set the direction an organization should adopt and the action plan to be deployed for this purpose (p. 2, 2). Therefore, *culture mapping* relies on two types of inquiries: one conducted with organizational leaders to unveil the direction to be set and one performed with employees to evaluate what operations should be executed for the action plan to succeed (p. 3, 2). Because different teams may greatly differ from one another, emphasis should be placed on evaluating the right angle of inquiry prior to the release of a job ad (p. 17, 2). An Employer Brand Canvas was advanced by RecRight for culture mapping (p. 7, 2). The process addresses several questions that should guide employer branding (pp. 8–12, 2):

1. “Who are you?”
2. What [do] you do?
3. What makes the [organization] credible?
4. What employee benefits [do] you offer?
5. Why are you the best employer?
6. Who do you want to work for you?
7. How [will] your future employees find out about you?
8. What do you need to [succeed]?
9. What are the results/How [do you] measure employer brand?”

The measurement of employer branding performance can unfold from a variety of indicators, among which are “employees’ opinions and wellbeing,” the “ENPS<sup>4</sup>,” “the cost of one recruitment,” “the [number] of applications,” “employees’ success in their job,” “conscientiousness,” and “social media activity” (p. 12, 2).

---

<sup>4</sup> Employer Net Performer Score. The most satisfied employees will more likely promote their workplace, and the least satisfied may impede its reputation.

Employer branding is infused in all organizational communications to potential hires. More specifically, transparent and genuine communication plays a paramount role in finding the right match by helping talent find the workplace they deem most suitable (p. 8, 2). HRM professionals should collaborate with marketing experts in their organization to ensure achievement of the desired branding by means of the most appropriate communication content, tools, and channels (p. 13, 2). A key tool that can be harnessed for employer branding is video content that presents information about the organization, what it feels like to work there, what is entailed in different jobs, etc. (p. 13, 2). Employees can become brand ambassadors to attract newcomers (p. 13, 2); thus, the best marketing mix conveys the intended message(s) to potential hires (p. 10, 2). Messages should be extensively delivered through social media accounts and the organization's website, which should contain a variety of media that can build the brand (p. 10, 2). Websites and career pages particularly matter for broadcasting positions that are open to external hires, and they should communicate the most important job and organization-related information to prospective workers to help them envision their employment (p. 14, 2). Likewise, social media pages can be leveraged to share public video interviews with followers, who compose a large talent pool (p. 7, 1), and their respective networks through shares. While employees might genuinely share their experience with the organization, management should engage in employer branding by leading by example and communicating key messages via the right channel(s) (p. 13, 2). Therefore, employee education is vital to internal branding: "If social media is the best tool for employees, educate them on how to use it. Tell them what kind of a message you wish to deliver together [with] your company" (p. 13, 2). If online communications should be informative and targeted to the right segment by and large, they should be personalized to match different applicant profiles and situations once an applicant contacts the organization (p. 2, 2). Another best practice is for recruiters to communicate with candidates who are not selected to guarantee that positive signals are sent about the employer brand (p. 2, 2). Recruitment practices will influence candidates' views about the organization and, thereby, will impact their willingness to apply again or recommend the organization to their friends (p. 2, 2). In other words, recruitment is crucial to employer branding. "To recruit the right people for relevant roles in today's evolving world of work, [an organization's] hiring processes need to be lean, flexible, and efficient" (p. 15, 1).

### 1.3.2.3 AVI recruitment

*AVI recruitment* offers various opportunities to organizations, provided they select the most suitable and quality video interviewing platform. It is recommended that organizations select a video interview service provider with the aim of benefitting from platform convenience and ease of use, both for themselves and their applicants (p. 14, 1). Recruiters “should be able to record video interview questions and watch candidate responses from the palm of their hand. And candidates [should] appreciate the ease with which they can submit their video responses over mobile” (p. 14, 1). Both recruiters and potential hires should be able to re record their videos as many times as they would like (p. 6, 1). Overall, the video interviewing platform should be intuitive and include timely support for both employers and the pool of potential hires. All recruitment-related communications, including the rating of candidates, should occur within the platform (p. 14, 1).

Recruiters mostly use AVIs in the screening phase, where “most hiring teams see the greatest benefits” (p. 5, 1). The following guidelines are recommended:

- Interview questions should be creative (p. 12, 1) and thoughtful to reveal the most relevant and insightful information about applicants and result in smart recruitment (p. 6, 1).
- The lighting, background, camera level, and dress code should be adequate (p. 12, 1) to ideally reflect the organizational culture (p. 16, 1).
- Instructions should be provided to applicants regarding the expected response length (i.e., more formal or informal) and style (p. 12, 1).
- About one-third of candidates should be invited to do an AVI for large talent pools, while all should be invited for smaller talent pools (p. 7, 1).
- Elimination decisions should be made as a team to ensure that in-person interviews are done with only the most suitable profiles (p. 16, 1), as well as to limit bias.

According to a RecRight survey, “92% of recruiters said they’d continue using [AVIs] as part of their recruitment” (p. 11, 1) because of the many benefits AVIs offer, including the following:

- Cost improvements (p. 4, 1)
- Dramatically increased engagement in postings that have video embedded (800%) (p. 4, 1)
- Reduced time spent in an AVI as compared to in-person interviews (p. 9, 1)

- The ability to re record videos as many times as needed and time convenience for all parties (p. 6, 1)
- A 50% reduction in time invested in screening and interviewing candidates (i.e., efficiency) thanks to management through a unique platform (p. 8, 1)
- The ability to gain a clearer “picture of the people behind the resume” (p. 8, 1) to see if they would fit (p. 16, 2), as well as offering a glimpse of the organization’s culture to candidates (p. 15, 2)
- The involvement of all the people whose opinion matters to the hire, increased trust between recruiters and managers (p. 8, 1), and decreased bias in decision-making
- “Compared to other screening methods, video interviews bring humanity back to the hiring process by allowing you to see candidates as real people—not just names on a CV.” (p. 10, 1)

Across their digital content, RecRight highlighted that AVIs work best as a screening tool, but they require supplements (e.g., p. 10, 1). The following subsection sheds light on candidates’ adoption and use of AVIs in consonance with the topic of conversation in the LinkedIn news thread on AVI adoption and acceptance.

#### 1.3.2.4 From candidate to employee

The dimension *from candidate to employee* includes elements that relate to the employment lifecycle. In general recruitment, job searches primarily occur on mobile devices (90%, per RecRight), yet not even half of applicants apply via mobile devices (44%, per RecRight) (p. 15, 2). This may be due to the complicated systems potential hires have to go through to submit their applications, and such systems could be replaced with AVIs to simplify the application process. “No company can afford to lose their best applicants right in the beginning, which is why many companies have made it possible to apply for a job with [an AVI]” (p. 15, 2). The adoption of AVIs allows applicants to watch their prospective employers’ videos and capture a broad picture of the organizational culture to better gauge whether it is worth applying via video (p. 16, 2). They can browse the web, the organization’s website, and the social media pages of the organization of interest, as well as those of competing employers in the same or other industries, to complement

the information given in the recruiters' video recordings. While some people may assume that AVIs would only work with younger generations, "...over 50% of candidates that reply to video interviews are over 30 years old, 28% are over 40 years old, and 10% are over 50 years old according to our recruiter survey" (p. 11, 1). Regardless of demographics, applicants with genuine interest in a job at a certain organization will not hesitate to do an AVI (p. 10, 1). Furthermore, AVIs result in a high candidate satisfaction rate (83%) (p. 4, 1), which is enabled by "a great candidate experience" (RecRight; p. 8, 1). It seems that the considerate use of AVIs, which is facilitated and encouraged by the video interview service provider, renders potential hires' experiences with AVIs more humane, with subsequent enhancement of their perceptions of the employer brand. This considerate and humane approach to recruitment can be epitomized by RecRight's discernment and incentive to identify and meet employees' fundamental needs (i.e., functional, emotional, self-expression, and social needs) (p. 9, 2).

To conclude, RecRight's virtual content shows a clear link between recruitment, employer branding, and AVIs. RecRight's content helped clarify the three concepts and emphasized AVIs' benefits for both employers and prospective employees. This could reduce barriers to adoption and implementation of AVIs in the digital age. While the LinkedIn comments and RecRight's virtual content focused on AVIs in the context of recruitment by and large, the next part of this chapter will draw from their comparison to recognize what is needed in a world where remote recruitment could be the new norm.

## 1.4 Research implications

With consideration of the extant literature reviewed earlier, RQ3 articulates the implications of the comparison of LinkedIn users' opinions (ref. RQ1) and RecRight's digital content (ref. RQ2) for employer branding when using video interviews in remote recruitment.

The data analysis underscored the significance of recruitment changes in the digital age and the need to ensure the preservation of a *humane approach* to the process of recruitment to build and maintain trust between potential hires and recruiters and thus between potential hires and organizations. More precisely, a substantial need has emerged regarding the increased use of technology, such as AVIs, in hiring, but the humane aspect should be reconciled with the

technological aspect so that both parties (i.e., potential hires and recruiting organizations) have their respective interests met in video recruitment. Potential hires may show reluctance to use AVIs because it deprives them of human synchronous interaction with recruiters, which can be detrimental for them and recruiters in terms of general outcomes. These can include less timely exchange of information, less information received and given, less engagement in the interviewing process, reduced interest in the other party, a deteriorated interview experience for both sides, candidates' feelings of unfairness, ethical concerns regarding AI use in candidate assessment, and impaired assessment of the other party. Such negatives could potentially induce a different outcome than that of an SVI or a face-to-face interview. By contrast, recruiters may prefer adopting AVIs over SVIs in the context of remote recruitment for the many benefits provided. For example, AVIs streamline and thus ease the interview process, reduce the time and financial costs involved while boosting convenience for both parties, enable both parties to rehearse and share information, and limit the impact of human bias on candidates' assessment. The nature and extent of the pros and cons depend on the features of the video interview service provider that powers the system adopted and implemented by the organization. For instance, some video interview services may not offer the ability to re-record sessions, which could accentuate candidates' feelings of unfairness. This feeling could worsen if rerecording was an option for recruiters. Such examples emphasize the importance of the following:

1. *Video interview platform design and transparency by suppliers*, both on their websites, which are accessible to all internet users, and even more so with their clients (i.e., organizations)
2. *Organizations' video interview platform selection, transparency, and guidance* in implementation with candidates
3. *Practice and rehearsal when using AVIs*

Organizations can leverage employer branding to safeguard the humane character of recruitment that deploys AVIs in remote circumstances when video interview service providers recommend using AVIs for screening before conducting in-person interviews for selection of the most suitable applicant. Organizations can articulate employer branding throughout the recruitment funnel (see Figure 1.1) to build dialogue and a humane relationship in a remote arrangement. This can counter

the “dehumanizing” aspect of AVIs, which was also invoked by Suen et al. (2019). Across the recruitment funnel, different actions can be taken, namely:

- In **sourcing and attraction**, video-based branding can provide potential hires with information about the organization, its leadership, its culture, and its people, as well as the type of work which can be done there and how, to raise interest online and draw people to the application tool. Employers can embed these videos on any webpage that is utilized to build awareness and channel people to suitable employment opportunities. Moreover, the social recruitment strategy advanced in 1.1.2 (see p. 14) can assist in all recruitment stages. Social media monitoring has indeed become essential to communicating about the organization, its activities, and its people and for building a dialogue with potential employees, among other stakeholders. Targeted messages should promote the employer brand and incentivize potential employees to want to work there and thus click on call-to-actions, which redirect them to the career page website or the application page. More importantly, social media monitoring should be harnessed to inform and should be as transparent as possible about the remote recruitment process to reassure people and build trust in the employer brand. Recruiters and marketers should join forces to counter negative eWOM by responding to negative, skeptical, angry, or worried comments and messages about video recruitment with positive messages and testimonies from applicants who have used it. For instance, posting videos about the hiring process that feature recruiters or people who have gone through it could establish trust, lead to increased acceptance of video recruitment, and advise applicants on how to ensure a successful video interview.
- In terms of **interest and application**, employers should show support for potential hires at every step and escort them to the application tool. Active and timely listening is needed to clarify points or eliminate doubts that may prevent talent from applying. The more engaged recruiters are in the video recruitment process, the more likely talent will be engaged and compelled to apply. Whereas some may use automation in the form of chatbots, for instance, there is a real need to personalize the exchange and have real people involved to entice people to apply for a specific job. If recruitment is fully remote, it is especially important to have a humane presence and interaction from the beginning to cultivate interest and offer a positive recruitment experience. This can be done via messaging, phone calls, or even live video calls. Ideally, recruiters should utilize video to communicate about

the open position and smile, demonstrate a sense of humor, and provide clear instructions to help candidates feel comfortable when applying through AVI. Candidates should be given the chance to rehearse their AVI as much as they would like to help them gain confidence in their submission and feel like their chances to be hired are fair. At this stage, it is also beneficial to again broadcast videos about the organization, its culture, and its people to help candidates see themselves as part of the organization and ignite or reinforce their willingness to join the organization by recording an AVI. Having direct managers or future colleagues featured in videos could be highly effective.

- In the **assessment** of candidates, multiple individuals should participate in the screening of video profiles rather than solely relying on AI. More precisely, recruiters, managers, and possibly future teammates should participate in the evaluation of candidates' videos to minimize bias and find the best fit, not only for the position itself and the organization but most importantly to match the team's culture. There has been significant discussion about person–organization fit, yet it seems that person–team fit matters most because of the subcultures that exist within an organization, and the bigger the organization, the more subcultures there may be. The inclusivity of future team members in the assessment could produce a better fit and thus strengthen both workforce and organizational performance. If the strategic involvement of more people in the evaluation of applicants' AVIs could reduce bias in assessment, it should be executed with caution, and a minimum diversity between raters should be utilized. If multiple applicants were to be shortlisted, it seems important to inform both those screened out and those retained via a video of their strengths and weaknesses and the reason(s) behind the assessment decision. This would positively affect employer branding. Genuine feedback on their AVIs could fortify their engagement if they are chosen for the next selection round and turn those rejected into advocates of the employer while keeping them engaged for possible future applications.
- In the final stage of **remote selection and hiring**, video decisions should be sent to all applicants specifying their strengths, weaknesses, and the reasons behind the decision made, leading to the same benefits for employer branding as those in the assessment phase. Ultimately, it would be a plus to have recruiters create a video featuring the new hire and explaining why they were chosen over others, which could be shared via email with all the applicants. This would once again enhance the reputation, image, and attractiveness of the



organization and consequently strengthen its employer brand in the labor market. With regards to their positive video recruitment experience, applicants who were not selected could share information on social media and even be asked to share this experience in future informative and/or explanatory videos about AVIs. Additionally, subsequent calls for applicants could feature new hires, show them in their work environment, and let them share their experience, thus transforming them into brand ambassadors.

These recommendations could be implemented and harnessed by employers in their video recruitment amid remote work to enhance their employer brand with potential hires online. The preservation of humane touches across the online recruitment funnel could help develop the acceptance of AVI as a remote recruitment tool among the pool of potential hires. Once the idea is accepted, job seekers would be given the chance to personally experience AVIs and, depending on the positive or negative connotation they would associate with such an experience, they could either become pro or against AVIs and the organization utilizing them. It is assumed that a positive experience with an AVI would convince an applicant to do another one. The more people apply through AVIs, the more natural AVIs will feel, thus normalizing their use in recruitment.

## 1.5 Research limitations and future research

This chapter explored online perspectives of video recruitment and sought to capture their implications for employer branding in the context of remote recruitment.

Future research could focus on one of the three parties involved in recruitment: recruiters, potential hires, or video interview service providers. Here, the emphasis was on AVIs, the way they are deployed and experienced, and providing a blueprint for successful implementation that would satisfy both employers and potential hires. Future research could further the examination of employer branding regarding not only remote recruitment that leverages videos, including both AVIs and SVIs, but also hybrid recruitment that utilizes them. For instance, a systematic study could be centered on the adoption and deployment of video recruitment by a specific employer with reference to the implications pinpointed in the present study.

Although the data analysis could prove insightful by relying on comments from one LinkedIn post in a dedicated news thread, considering posts from various formats on the topic of video

recruitment could be beneficial. Likewise, having other variables besides the content posted in comments, including, for example, the job and industry of the commenter, could provide more substance and help draw comparisons of opinions across industries and experience levels. Moreover, a cross-media study of content tied to video recruitment could reveal the variety of narratives adopted by social media users. Provided that such data could be shared with practitioners, it could help employers review and adapt their approach to video recruitment accordingly to ensure the building of a more humane and trustworthy candidate–recruiter relationship from the ground up, thereby benefiting the candidate–organization relationship, which could lay a sound foundation for the employee–employer relationship. If this study was limited to the derivation of implications for employer branding, attention could also be given to video recruitment implications for candidates’ personal branding.

The major role played by video interview service providers in the development and commercialization of platforms will one day justify the need to study them from various angles, especially their platform and services’ design and their relation to employer branding and ethics. Could they favor applications or become a deterrent to hiring in the context of hybrid work?

## References

- Allen, D. (2013). Reactions to recruitment web sites: Visual and verbal attention, attraction, and intentions to pursue employment. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 28(3), 263–285.
- Allen, D. G., Mahto, R. V., & Otondo, R. F. (2007). Web-Based Recruitment: Effects of Information, Organizational Brand, and Attitudes Toward a Web Site on Applicant Attraction. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(6), 1696–1708. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.92.6.1696>
- Allen, D. G., Biggane, J. E., Pitts, M., Otondo, R. & Van Scotter, J. (2013). Reactions to Recruitment Web Sites: Visual and Verbal Attention, Attraction, and Intentions to Pursue Employment. *Journal of business and psychology*, 28(3), 263–285. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-012-9281-6>
- Alexander, A., De Smet, A., and Mysore, M. (July 7, 2020). Reimagining the postpandemic workforce. *McKinsey Quarterly*. Retrieved from <https://www.mckinsey.com/business-functions/organization/our-insights/reimagining-the-postpandemic-workforce>. Accessed 28 August 2021.

- Batra, R., & Keller, K. (2016). Integrated marketing communications: New findings, new lessons, and new ideas. *Journal of Marketing*, 80(6), 122–145.
- Berthon, P., Ewing, M. and Hah, L.L. (2005). Captivating company: dimensions of attractiveness in employer branding. *International Journal of Advertising*, 24(2), 151–172. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02650487.2005.11072912>
- Blackman, A. (2006). Graduating students' responses to recruitment advertisements. *Journal of Business Communication*, 43(4), 367–388.
- Bongard, A. (2019). Automating Talent Acquisition: Smart Recruitment, Predictive Hiring Algorithms, and the Data-driven Nature of Artificial Intelligence. *Psychosociological Issues in Human Resource Management*, 7(1), 36–41. <https://doi.org/10.22381/PIHRM7120193>
- Brenner, F. (2019). *Asynchronous Video Interviews in Selection: A Systematic Review and Five Empirical Investigations*.
- Brenner, F. S., Ortner, T. M. & Fay, D. (2016). Asynchronous Video Interviewing as a New Technology in Personnel Selection: The Applicant's Point of View. *Frontiers in psychology*, 7, 863. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2016.00863>
- Carah, N. (2017). Algorithmic brands: A decade of brand experiments with mobile and social media. *New Media & Society*, 19(3), 384–400. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444815605463>
- Dabirian, A., Berthon, P., & Kietzmann, J. (1C.E.). (2019). Enticing the IT crowd: employer branding in the information economy. *The Journal of Business & Industrial Marketing*, 34(7), 1403–1409. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JBIM-11-2018-0333>
- Daft, R. L., & Lengel, R. H. (1986). Organizational information requirements, media richness and structural design. *Management Science*, 32(5), 554–571. <https://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.32.5.554>
- Davis, F. D. (1989). Perceived usefulness, perceived ease of use, and user acceptance of information technology. *Mis Quarterly*, 13(3), 319–340. <https://doi.org/10.2307/249008>
- Davis, F. D., Bagozzi, R. P., & Warshaw, P. R. (1989). User acceptance of computer-technology: A comparison of 2 theoretical models. *Management Science*, 35(8), 982–1003.
- Driscoll, K. (2020). Tips for remaining professional while remotely interviewing candidates. *Rochester Business Journal (Rochester, N.Y.: 1987)*, 36(4), 22–24.
- Dwivedi, Y. K., Ismagilova, E., Hughes, D. L., Carlson, J., Filieri, R., Jacobson, J., Jain, V., Karjaluoto, H., Kefi, H., Krishen, A. S., Kumar, V., Rahman, M. M., Raman, R., Rauschnabel, P. A., Rowley, J., Salo, J., Tran, G. A., & Wang, Y. (2021). Setting the future of digital and social media marketing research: Perspectives and research propositions. *International Journal of Information Management*, 59, 1–37. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2020.102168>

- Elving, W., Westhoff, J., Meeusen, K., & Schoonderbeek, J. (2013). The war for talent? The relevance of employer branding in job advertisements for becoming an employer of choice. *Journal of Brand Management*, 20(5), 355–373.
- Eger, L., Mičík, M., Gangur, M., & Řehoř, P. (2019). EMPLOYER BRANDING: EXPLORING ATTRACTIVENESS DIMENSIONS IN A MULTICULTURAL CONTEXT. *Technological and Economic Development of Economy*, 25(3), 519–541. <https://doi.org/10.3846/tede.2019.9387>
- Fisher, C., Ilgen, D., & Hoyer, W. (1979). Source credibility, information favorability, and job offer acceptance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 22(1), 94–103.
- Frasca, K. J., and Edwards, M.R. (2017). Web-based corporate, social and video recruitment media effects of media richness and source credibility on organizational attraction. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ijsa.12165>
- Given, L. M. (2008). *The SAGE encyclopedia of qualitative research methods*. 121–122. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781412963909>
- Gorman, C. A., Robinson, J., & Gamble, J. S. (2018). An Investigation into the Validity of Asynchronous Web-Based Video Employment-Interview Ratings. *Consulting Psychology Journal*, 70(2), 129–146. <https://doi.org/10.1037/cpb0000102>
- Greenberg, P. (2009). *CRM at the speed of light: Social CRM strategies, tools, and techniques for engaging consumers*. New York: McGraw-Hill Osborne Media.
- Headworth, A. (2015). *Social media recruitment: how to successfully integrate social media into recruitment strategy*. London: Kogan Page, 38–45, 202.
- Hemamou, L., Felhi, G., Vandebussche, V., Martin, J.-C., & Clavel, C. (2019). HireNet: A Hierarchical Attention Model for the Automatic Analysis of Asynchronous Video Job Interviews. *Proceedings of the Thirty-Third AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 33, 573–581. <https://doi.org/10.1609/aaai.v33i01.3301573>
- Hendrick, E. (2011). What are the pros and cons of using video for recruitment? *Strategic HR Review*, 10(6). <https://doi.org/10.1108/shr.2011.37210faa.006>
- Huang, M. & Rust, R. T. (2021). A strategic framework for artificial intelligence in marketing. (Conceptual/Theoretical Paper) (Report). *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 49(1), 30–50. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-020-00749-9>
- Järvinen, J., Taiminen, H., Kaupparokkeakoulu, Economics, S. o. B. a., scholarship, B. o. d., Markkinointi & Marketing. (2016). *Harnessing marketing automation for B2B content marketing*. Elsevier Inc.

- Kannan, P.K., and Li, H. “A” (2017). Digital marketing: A framework, review and research agenda. *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, 34(1), 22–45. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijresmar.2016.11.006>
- Köchling, A., Riazzy, S., Wehner, M. C. & Simbeck, K. (2020). Highly Accurate, But Still Discriminatory: A Fairness Evaluation of Algorithmic Video Analysis in the Recruitment Context. *Business & information systems engineering*, 63(1), 39–54. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12599-020-00673-w>
- Kock, N. (2005). Media richness or media naturalness? The evolution of our biological communication apparatus and its influence on our behaviour toward e-communication tools. *IEEE Transactions on Professional Communication*, 48, 117–130.
- Kock, N. (2009). Information systems theorizing based on evolutionary psychology: An interdisciplinary review and theory integration framework. *MIS Quarterly*, 33, 395–418. <https://doi.org/10.2307/20650297>
- Kuoppala, J. (2019). *Video Tools in Recruitment: The utilisation and benefits of video throughout the recruitment process*.
- Lambrecht, A., & Tucker, C. (2019). Algorithmic bias? An empirical study of apparent gender-based discrimination in the display of STEM career ads. *Management Science*, 65(7), 2966–2981.
- Li, F., Larimo, J. & Leonidou, L. C. (2021). Social media marketing strategy: Definition, conceptualization, taxonomy, validation, and future agenda. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 49(1), 51–70. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-020-00733-3>
- Lund, S., Madgavkar, A., Manyika, J., and Smit, S. (November 23, 2020). What’s next for remote work: An analysis of 2,000 tasks, 800 jobs, and nine countries. *McKinsey Global Institute*. <https://www.mckinsey.com/featured-insights/future-of-work/whats-next-for-remote-work-an-analysis-of-2000-tasks-800-jobs-and-nine-countries>. Accessed 28 August 2021.
- Luxton, S., Reid, M., & Mavondo, F. (2015). Integrated marketing communication capability and brand performance. *Journal of Advertising*, 44(1), 37–46.
- Madia, S. A. (2011). Best practices for using social media as a recruitment strategy. *Strategic HR Review*, 10(6), 19–24.
- Maier, C., Laumer, S., Eckhardt, A., & Weitzel, T. (2013). Analyzing the impact of HRIS implementations on HR personnel’s job satisfaction and turnover intention. *Journal of Strategic Information Systems*, 22(3), 193–207. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsis.2012.09.001>
- ManpowerGroup (2021). Driving factors – Shortages around the world. The Talent Shortage. <https://go.manpowergroup.com/talent-shortage>. Accessed 28 August 2021.

- McColl, R., & Michelotti, M. (2019). Sorry, could you repeat the question? Exploring video-interview recruitment practice in HRM. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 29(4), 637–656. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1748-8583.12249>
- Mejia, C., & Torres, E. N. (2018). Implementation and normalization process of asynchronous video interviewing practices in the hospitality industry. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 30(2), 685–701. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJCHM-07-2016-0402>
- Mishra, S., & Kumar, S. P. (I.C.E.). (2019). E-recruitment and training comprehensiveness: untapped antecedents of employer branding. *Industrial and Commercial Training*, 51(2), 125–136. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ICT-12-2017-0106>
- Murphy, K. R. (1986). When your top choice turns you down: Effect of rejected offers on the utility of selection tests. *Psychological Bulletin*, 99(1), 133–138. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.99.1.133>
- Nikolaou, I. (2021). What is the Role of Technology in Recruitment and Selection? *The Spanish Journal of Psychology*, 24(2), 1–6. <https://doi.org/10.1017/SJP.2021.6>
- OECD (2021), *Implications of Remote Working Adoption on Place Based Policies: A Focus on G7 Countries*. OECD Publishing, Paris, <https://doi.org/10.1787/b12f6b85-en>.
- Payne, H. (2021). New-age recruitment tools: How to hire in the post-pandemic era. *BenefitsPRO*.
- Proost, K., Germeys, F., & Vanderstukken, A. (2021). Applicants' pre-test reactions towards video interviews: the role of expected chances to demonstrate potential and to use nonverbal cues. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 30(2), 265–273. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1359432X.2020.1817975>
- Puncheva-Michelotti, P., Hudson, S., & Jin, G. (2018). Employer branding and CSR communication in online recruitment advertising. *Business Horizons*, 61(4), 643–651.
- Pursell, E., Champion, M. and Gaylord, S. (1980). Structured Interviewing: Avoiding Selection Problems. *Personnel Journal*, 59(11), 907–912.
- RecRight website. Retrieved from <https://www.recright.com/en/>
- Rodney, H., Valaskova, K., & DURANA, P. (2019). The Artificial Intelligence Recruitment Process: How Technological Advancements Have Reshaped Job Application and Selection Practices. *Psychosociological Issues in Human Resource Management*, 7(1), 42–47. <https://doi.org/10.22381/PIHRM7120194>
- Rodrigues, D. and Martinez, L.F. (2020). The influence of digital marketing on recruitment effectiveness: a qualitative study. *European Journal of Management Studies*, 25(1), 23–44. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EJMS-09-2020-002>

Roxo, F. (2020). Transmedia Storytelling as a Potential Employer Branding Strategy. *U.Porto Journal of Engineering*, 6(1), 66–77. [https://doi.org/10.24840/2183-6493\\_006.001\\_0007](https://doi.org/10.24840/2183-6493_006.001_0007)

Salmons, J. (2016). Using social media in data collection. In *The SAGE Handbook of social media research methods* (177–196). SAGE Publications Ltd, <https://www-doi-org.ezproxy.jyu.fi/10.4135/9781473983847>

Soelberg, P. O. (1967). Unprogrammed Decision Making. *Industrial Management Review*, 8(2), 19–29.

Suen, H.-Y., Hung, K.-E., & Lin, C.-L. (2020). Intelligent video interview agent used to predict communication skill and perceived personality traits. *Human-Centric Computing and Information Sciences*, 10(1), 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13673-020-0208-3>

Torres, E. N., & Mejia, C. (2017). Asynchronous video interviews in the hospitality industry: Considerations for virtual employee selection. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 61, 4–13. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2016.10.012>

Vaara, E., Tienari, J. & Laurila, J. (2006). Pulp and Paper Fiction: On the Discursive Legitimation of Global Industrial Restructuring. *Organization studies*, 27(6), 789–813. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0170840606061071>

Venkatesh, V., & Bala, H. (2008). Technology acceptance model 3 and a research agenda on interventions. *Decision Sciences*, 39(2), 273–315. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-5915.2008.00192.x>

Venkatesh, V., & Davis, F. D. (2000). A theoretical extension of the Technology Acceptance Model: Four longitudinal field studies. *Management Science*, 46(2), 186–204. <https://doi.org/10.1287/Mnsc.46.2.186.11926>

Venkatesh, V., Morris, M. G., Davis, G. B., & Davis, F. D. (2003). User acceptance of information technology: Toward a unified view. *Mis Quarterly*, 27(3), 425–478. <https://doi.org/10.2307/30036540>

Wilden, R., Gudergan, S., & Lings, I. (2010). Employer branding: strategic implications for staff recruitment. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 26(1-2), 56–73. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02672570903577091>

Wilkinson, W., Podhorska, I., & Siekelova, A. (2019). Does the Growth of Artificial Intelligence and Automation Shape Talent Attraction and Retention? *Psychosociological Issues in Human Resource Management*, 7(1), 30–35. <https://doi.org/10.22381/PIHRM7120192>

World Economic Forum. (12 April 2021). *Delivering the Reskilling Revolution*. [Video]. YouTube. Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=MK3TsnVaSEk&list=PLSzEnVW4LW9JcZ15X3kVda519vCDKyHdr&index=160&t=139s>. Accessed 28 August 2021.

Yacine, L. (2021). *Employees-as-customers: Coupling the employee value proposition and millennials' experience in the construction of the internal brand.*

Yasmin, A., Tasneem, S., & Fatema, K. (2015). Effectiveness of digital marketing in the challenging age: An empirical study. *The International Journal of Management Science and Business Administration*, 1(5), 69–80.