



A Study of Recruitment and Selection Practices and Their Impact on Employee Performance

Behruz Xanthopoulos

Department of Computer Science and Engineering, Kelana Technical and Management College, Malaysia
behruz.xanthopoulos@ktmc-my.net

Peer Review Information	Abstract
<i>Submission: 09 Jan 2018</i> <i>Revision: 24 Feb 2018</i> <i>Acceptance: 11 March 2018</i> Keywords <i>Recruitment, Selection, Employee Performance, Person-Job Fit, Human Resource Management.</i>	Recruitment and selection determine the quality of human capital entering an organization and therefore influence later productivity, service quality, retention, and employee performance. This methodology paper develops a structured approach for examining the relationship between recruitment practices, selection practices, and employee performance. The proposed study adopts a quantitative, cross-sectional explanatory design using a structured questionnaire administered to employees in medium- and large-sized organizations. Recruitment practices are operationalized through vacancy communication, source effectiveness, realistic job information, transparency, and applicant attraction, while selection practices cover job-related criteria, structured interviews, employment tests, consistency, fairness, and person-job fit. Employee performance is assessed through task quality, target achievement, timeliness, dependability, and work effectiveness. Reliability analysis, descriptive statistics, Pearson correlation, and multiple regression are specified for data analysis. The framework is grounded in established staffing and human-resource-management research published no later than 2015. An illustrative worked analysis shows how transparent recruitment and valid, structured selection can jointly explain meaningful variation in employee performance. The paper concludes that organizations should treat recruitment and selection as an integrated strategic staffing system rather than as isolated administrative activities.

Introduction

Organizations compete not only through technology and capital but also through the capabilities and behavior of their employees. Recruitment creates the applicant pool from which talent can be chosen, whereas selection identifies applicants whose knowledge, skills, abilities, and other characteristics best match job requirements. Because both activities shape the quality of employees entering the firm, weak staffing decisions can create long-term costs through poor productivity, training burden, absenteeism, and turnover. Early organizational-level evidence showed that systematic staffing practices were positively associated with

profitability and growth, suggesting that staffing decisions have consequences beyond the immediate hiring event (Terpstra & Rozell, 1993).

The strategic importance of recruitment and selection is also supported by the broader human-resource-management literature. Huselid (1995) found that systems of high-performance work practices were associated with lower turnover and higher productivity and financial performance, while Delaney and Huselid (1996) reported positive associations between selective staffing and perceived organizational performance. These findings

imply a plausible pathway in which better recruitment increases the quality and fit of the applicant pool, and better selection increases the probability that the organization appoints candidates capable of performing the job effectively.

Selection quality is particularly important because procedures differ substantially in their predictive validity. Schmidt and Hunter (1998) demonstrated that structured interviews, work-sample tests, integrity tests, and cognitive ability measures can provide considerable predictive utility when used appropriately. Recruitment research likewise shows that recruitment methods, messages, recruiters, timing, and realistic information influence applicant attraction and post-hire outcomes (Breaugh, 2008, 2013). The present paper therefore proposes a step-by-step empirical methodology to test whether effective recruitment and selection practices positively influence employee performance.

Literature Review

Recruitment is the organizational process of identifying, informing, and attracting potential applicants for employment. A central objective is not simply to increase the number of applicants, but to attract applicants whose capabilities and expectations are compatible with the job and organization. Breaugh (2008) emphasized that recruitment source, message content, targeted recruitment, site visits, and realistic job information can influence applicant quality and later outcomes. His later review reinforced that recruitment decisions can affect who is hired, how employees perform, and whether they remain with the organization (Breaugh, 2013). Recruitment planning should therefore begin with explicit objectives and a strategy connecting target applicants, communication methods, message content, and timing (Breaugh, 2015).

Applicant attraction is also affected by perceptions of organizational characteristics, recruiter behavior, perceived fit, and expectations about the hiring process. Chapman

et al. (2005), in a meta-analysis of recruiting outcomes, found that job and organizational characteristics, recruiter behavior, perceived fit, and perceptions of the recruiting process were important predictors of attraction and job-choice outcomes. This evidence supports the view that recruitment quality should be evaluated in terms of both reach and the relevance of the applicants attracted.

Selection is the systematic process of choosing candidates from the applicant pool using job-related information. The quality of selection depends on the validity, reliability, structure, fairness, and consistency of the procedures used. Schmidt and Hunter (1998) showed that some combinations of selection methods achieve substantially higher predictive validity than unstructured or weakly job-related approaches. Applicant acceptance of the process also matters. Hausknecht, Day, and Thomas (2004) found that selection procedures perceived as job related and fair were associated with more favorable organizational attitudes and intentions. Thus, a technically valid procedure that is poorly communicated may still damage applicant reactions and employer reputation.

At the organizational level, staffing practices form part of a wider high-performance work system. Terpstra and Rozell (1993) found positive relationships between the use of validated staffing practices and organizational profit outcomes. Huselid (1995) linked high-performance HR practices to productivity and turnover, and Delaney and Huselid (1996) specifically identified staffing selectivity as part of the HR system associated with organizational performance. A later meta-analysis by Combs et al. (2006) showed that high-performance work practices have a positive overall relationship with organizational performance and that bundles of complementary practices tend to matter more than isolated practices. Ployhart (2006) consequently argued for staffing to be treated as a strategic, multilevel contributor to organizational capability.

Table 1. Key Literature Supporting the Proposed Framework

Study	Focus	Key finding used in this paper	Methodological implication
Terpstra & Rozell (1993)	Staffing practices	Systematic staffing was associated with organizational performance.	Measure recruitment/selection as formal practices.
Schmidt & Hunter (1998)	Selection validity	Structured and validated methods predict job performance better.	Assess structure, job relevance, and validity.
Chapman et al. (2005)	Applicant attraction	Fit, recruiter behavior, and process perceptions affect attraction.	Measure recruitment quality and applicant fit.

Hausknecht et al. (2004)	Applicant reactions	Perceived fairness and job relatedness influence reactions.	Include fairness and consistency indicators.
Breaugh (2013)	Recruitment review	Recruitment affects who is hired and post-hire outcomes.	Link recruitment quality to performance.
Combs et al. (2006)	HR systems	Bundles of high-performance practices improve performance.	Test recruitment and selection jointly.

Although prior studies establish the value of staffing, many studies examine organizational performance or applicant outcomes rather than employee-level performance after hiring. The proposed study addresses this gap by examining employees' perceptions of recruitment and selection quality and relating them directly to self-reported employee performance.

H1: Effective recruitment practices have a significant positive effect on employee performance.

H2: Effective selection practices have a significant positive effect on employee performance.

H3: Recruitment and selection practices jointly explain significant variance in employee performance.

Methodology

1. Research Design

The proposed study uses a quantitative, cross-sectional, explanatory survey design. A cross-sectional design is suitable because information on recruitment practices, selection practices, and current employee performance can be collected from a defined employee population at one point in time. The explanatory component permits statistical testing of the direction and strength of relationships among the study variables. The unit

of analysis is the individual employee, because the objective is to evaluate whether employees who report more systematic and job-related staffing experiences also report higher performance.

2. Population, Sampling and Sample Size

The target population consists of full-time employees who have completed at least six months of service in selected medium- and large-sized organizations. This tenure criterion ensures that respondents have experienced the recruitment and selection process and have had sufficient time to demonstrate job performance. A stratified sampling approach is recommended so that employees from major functional areas—such as operations, administration, finance, sales, technical services, and human resources—are represented. For a practical methodology study, a target sample of 150 valid responses is adequate for descriptive analysis and a regression model with two main predictors. Where a larger accessible population exists, oversampling by approximately 15–20% is recommended to compensate for non-response or unusable questionnaires.

3. Variables and Operational Definitions

Table 2. Operationalization of Study Variables

Variable	Indicators	Example measurement statement	Scale
Recruitment practices	Clear vacancy information; effective sources; realistic job information; transparency; applicant attraction	"The organization provided clear and realistic information about the job during recruitment."	5-point Likert
Selection practices	Job-related criteria; structured interviews; tests; consistency; fairness; person-job fit	"Selection decisions were based on consistent and job-related criteria."	5-point Likert
Employee performance	Work quality; target achievement; timeliness; dependability; effectiveness	"I consistently meet the performance standards required for my job."	5-point Likert

4. Instrument Development

A structured questionnaire is proposed with four sections. Section A records non-sensitive demographic and employment characteristics such as department, tenure, employment level, and recruitment source. Section B measures recruitment practices, Section C measures

selection practices, and Section D measures employee performance. Items are rated on a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree. Recruitment items are informed by Breaugh (2008, 2013) and Chapman et al. (2005), while selection items reflect evidence on structured and job-related

selection procedures from Schmidt and Hunter (1998) and applicant fairness principles summarized by Hausknecht et al. (2004).

5. Validity and Reliability

Content validity should be established through review by at least two specialists in human resource management and one research-methods expert. A pilot test with approximately 20 employees from a similar but non-sampled organization should be used to identify

ambiguous wording and estimate internal consistency. Cronbach's alpha values of 0.70 or above are treated as acceptable for multi-item constructs. Items with weak item-total correlations may be revised or removed before full data collection.

6. Conceptual Framework and Step-by-Step Procedure



Figure 1. Conceptual framework linking recruitment and selection practices with employee performance.

Step 1 – Define the study scope. Specify the organizations, employee groups, inclusion criteria, and period of data collection. Define recruitment practices and selection practices as the independent variables and employee performance as the dependent variable.

Step 2 – Review existing staffing procedures. Examine job advertisements, application channels, interview formats, testing practices, selection criteria, and appointment procedures to ensure questionnaire items reflect the actual staffing context.

Step 3 – Develop and pilot the questionnaire. Adapt constructs from the literature, obtain expert review, pilot the instrument, calculate preliminary reliability, and revise unclear or redundant items.

Step 4 – Select the sample. Prepare the employee sampling frame, divide it into functional or organizational strata, and select respondents using proportional random sampling wherever feasible.

Step 5 – Collect data ethically. Provide a participant information statement, obtain voluntary consent, avoid collecting unnecessary identifiers, and allow respondents to complete the survey privately.

Step 6 – Screen and code the data. Check missing responses, identify invalid response patterns, reverse-code items if required, calculate scale scores, and document all exclusions.

Step 7 – Analyze relationships. Compute descriptive statistics and Cronbach's alpha, test Pearson correlations, then estimate multiple regression with recruitment and selection practice scores predicting employee performance.

Step 8 – Interpret and report. Evaluate effect direction, standardized beta values, p-values, confidence intervals, and explained variance. Interpret statistical results alongside staffing theory and prior empirical evidence.

7. Statistical Analysis Plan

Data analysis can be performed in SPSS, R, Jamovi, or equivalent statistical software. First, frequencies, means, and standard deviations describe respondent characteristics and construct levels. Second, Cronbach's alpha assesses internal consistency. Third, Pearson's correlation coefficient tests bivariate associations among recruitment, selection, and performance. Finally, multiple linear regression estimates the unique effect of recruitment and selection practices on performance. The proposed equation is: $\text{Employee Performance} = \beta_0 + \beta_1(\text{Recruitment Practices}) + \beta_2(\text{Selection Practices}) + \epsilon$. Statistical significance is evaluated at $p < .05$, while R^2 is used to indicate the proportion of variance in performance explained by the staffing variables.

Results

Because this is a methodology paper rather than a report of completed fieldwork, the numerical

results in this section are an illustrative worked example showing how findings from a sample of 150 employees would be analyzed and reported.

They should be replaced by actual field results when the proposed survey is conducted.

Descriptive Statistics and Reliability

Table 3. Illustrative Descriptive, Reliability and Relationship Results (N = 150)

Construct	Mean	SD	Cronbach α	r with Performance	Interpretation
Recruitment practices	3.78	0.62	0.84	0.54***	Positive, moderate association
Selection practices	3.91	0.58	0.87	0.63***	Positive, strong association
Employee performance	3.86	0.61	0.86	1.00	High perceived performance

The illustrative means indicate generally favorable perceptions of recruitment ($M = 3.78$) and selection ($M = 3.91$), while employee performance is also relatively high ($M = 3.86$). All three scales exceed the recommended 0.70 internal-consistency threshold. Recruitment practices show a positive correlation with employee performance ($r = .54$, $p < .001$), and

selection practices show a stronger positive correlation ($r = .63$, $p < .001$). These patterns are consistent with the expectation that effective staffing practices contribute to higher-quality placement and better subsequent performance.

Illustrative Regression Results

Table 4. Illustrative Multiple Regression Predicting Employee Performance

Predictor	B	SE	Standardized β	t	p
Constant	0.82	0.24	—	3.42	.001
Recruitment practices	0.30	0.06	0.31	4.68	< .001
Selection practices	0.49	0.07	0.48	7.19	< .001

The illustrative regression model explains 48% of the variance in employee performance. Recruitment practices have a positive standardized effect ($\beta = .31$, $p < .001$), supporting H1, while selection practices show a stronger positive effect ($\beta = .48$, $p < .001$), supporting H2. The overall model is statistically significant, supporting H3. In practical terms, the example suggests that improvements in recruitment transparency and applicant quality, together with more structured and job-related selection, can contribute to stronger employee performance after appointment.

Interpretation of the Proposed Findings

The stronger illustrative effect for selection is theoretically plausible because selection is the immediate decision mechanism that converts an applicant pool into actual hires. Valid selection methods increase the probability of appointing candidates who possess job-relevant capabilities (Schmidt & Hunter, 1998), while fair and credible procedures can improve applicant attitudes toward the organization (Hausknecht et al., 2004). Recruitment remains important because the quality of the final selection decision is constrained by the quality and fit of the applicant pool generated earlier in the staffing process (Breaugh, 2013; Chapman et al., 2005).

Conclusion and Discussion

The proposed methodology provides a systematic way to examine whether recruitment and selection practices influence employee performance. The conceptual argument is that recruitment determines the breadth, quality, and fit of the applicant pool, while selection determines how accurately the organization identifies candidates most capable of meeting job requirements. When both processes are transparent, job related, consistent, and strategically aligned, they improve the probability of achieving person-job fit and high-quality hiring decisions. The framework is consistent with several streams of pre-2016 research. Terpstra and Rozell (1993) demonstrated that staffing practices can be related to organizational-level outcomes. Huselid (1995) and Delaney and Huselid (1996) connected selective staffing and broader high-performance HR systems with productivity and organizational performance. Schmidt and Hunter (1998) provided strong evidence that the predictive quality of selection methods differs, emphasizing the value of validated and structured procedures. Chapman et al. (2005) showed that recruitment outcomes depend on

organizational attractiveness, perceived fit, recruiter behavior, and process perceptions, while Hausknecht et al. (2004) highlighted the importance of fairness and job relatedness in applicant reactions. Reviews by Breaugh (2008, 2013) further demonstrate that recruitment strategy can influence both pre-hire and post-hire outcomes. From a managerial perspective, organizations should avoid treating recruitment as advertising and selection as intuition. Job analysis should precede both activities so that job requirements are translated into clear vacancy information and consistent selection criteria. Recruitment sources should be evaluated by quality of applicants and later performance, not only by cost or number of applications. Interviews should be structured around job competencies, and employment tests should be used only when they are relevant, reliable, and appropriate for the role. The same standards should be applied consistently across applicants, with records retained to support transparency and fairness. The proposed methodology also recognizes that recruitment and selection are complementary. A sophisticated selection system cannot fully compensate for a weak applicant pool, while excellent recruitment cannot guarantee performance if final selection is inconsistent or unrelated to job requirements. This systems perspective is supported by evidence that bundles of high-performance work practices tend to have stronger performance effects than isolated HR techniques (Combs et al., 2006). Ployhart (2006) similarly emphasized that staffing should be understood as a strategic capability connecting individual hiring decisions with organizational performance.

References

- Breaugh, J. A. (2008). Employee recruitment: Current knowledge and important areas for future research. *Human Resource Management Review*, 18(3), 103–118. DOI: 10.1016/j.hrmr.2008.07.003.
- Breaugh, J. A. (2013). Employee recruitment. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 64, 389–416. DOI: 10.1146/annurev-psych-113011-143757.
- Breaugh, J. A. (2015). Recruiting. In C. L. Cooper, D. E. Guest, & D. J. Needle (Eds.), *Wiley Encyclopedia of Management*. DOI: 10.1002/9781118785317.weom050101.
- Chapman, D. S., Uggerslev, K. L., Carroll, S. A., Piasentin, K. A., & Jones, D. A. (2005). Applicant attraction to organizations and job choice: A meta-analytic review of the correlates of recruiting outcomes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90(5), 928–944. DOI: 10.1037/0021-9010.90.5.928.
- Combs, J., Liu, Y., Hall, A., & Ketchen, D. (2006). How much do high-performance work practices matter? A meta-analysis of their effects on organizational performance. *Personnel Psychology*, 59(3), 501–528. DOI: 10.1111/j.1744-6570.2006.00045.x.
- Delaney, J. T., & Huselid, M. A. (1996). The impact of human resource management practices on perceptions of organizational performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 39(4), 949–969. DOI: 10.5465/256718.
- Hausknecht, J. P., Day, D. V., & Thomas, S. C. (2004). Applicant reactions to selection procedures: An updated model and meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology*, 57(3), 639–683. DOI: 10.1111/j.1744-6570.2004.00003.x.
- Huselid, M. A. (1995). The impact of human resource management practices on turnover, productivity, and corporate financial performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38(3), 635–672. DOI: 10.5465/256741.
- Ployhart, R. E. (2006). Staffing in the 21st century: New challenges and strategic opportunities. *Journal of Management*, 32(6), 868–897. DOI: 10.1177/0149206306293625.
- Schmidt, F. L., & Hunter, J. E. (1998). The validity and utility of selection methods in personnel psychology: Practical and theoretical implications of 85 years of research findings. *Psychological Bulletin*, 124(2), 262–274. DOI: 10.1037/0033-2909.124.2.262.
- Terpstra, D. E., & Rozell, E. J. (1993). The relationship of staffing practices to organizational level measures of performance. *Personnel Psychology*, 46(1), 27–48. DOI: 10.1111/j.1744-6570.1993.tb00866.x.