Efficacy of Selection in Firm's Recruitment Behavior

Ashutosh Bishnu Murti

Selection practices are one of the important interfaces for firms to interact with the labor market. This paper attempts to unravel the impact of firms' selection practices and recruitment behavior. The results of this paper can be divided into firm-level heterogeneity in selection practices, what explains this heterogeneity and the effect of factors that determine selection of job seekers for an interview. Quite importantly, search and selection of job seekers by firms help both the parties to acquire information about each other. The paper locates its strong support for strings of firm preferences and methods of selections of jobseekers.

Ashutosh Bishnu Murti is Assistant Professor, Human Resource Area, Center for Management Studies, Administrative Staff College of India, Hyderabad. E-mail:murti.ashutosh@gmail.com

Introduction

Firms and job seekers are brought together for potential matches through their job search and recruitment activities. The recruitment and search activities help both parties to acquire information about each other and the more information they obtain prior to entering in to an employment agreement, the higher is the likelihood of a good employment match. The crucial role of information in the labor market has been recognized by Stigler (1962). However, despite a voluminous literature on job matching and organizational behavior in labor markets, we know less about the firms' recruitment strategies than about the job seekers' search strategies.

As Granovetter (1995:155) highlights:"While people are finding jobs, employers are finding people to fill them, and their behaviors, strategies, and purposes play a central but often neglected role in the process of matching people to jobs". The imbalance in research effort is explained more by a dearth of adequate data describing employer recruitment behavior than by the lack of scholarly interest. Indeed, labor economists,

sociologists, psychologists and human resource management specialists have spent the last half-century exploiting the meager existing data sets in efforts to learn about employer recruitment behavior.

Several studies have analyzed the relationship between labor market thickness, firm location and worker/firm matching. Wheeler (2001) develops a model where capital and worker skill complements. In this model, thicker labor markets lead to higher productivity, greater wage inequality and higher returns to skill. He cites and generates empirical evidence that is consistent with all these ideas. Freedman (2009) looks at similar issues, with a focus on the software industry in a single (unnamed) state. He first derives a model where firm/worker matches quality based on differences in the human resources packages offered by firms and variation in employee preferences. Empirically, he finds that agglomeration of software firms is associated with higher wages, bigger firms and less wage dispersion.

Although the enormous literature on employer recruitment has spanned more than six decades, dating back to some early empirical papers by Malm (1955), research in this area did not begin until the mid-1960s to early 1970s, with seminal work by Rees (1966), Rees & Shultz (1970) and Granovetter (1995). In economics literature, the stage was set by Stigler (1962), who emphasized the crucial role of information in the labor market. Rees (1966) explored the role of the recruitment choice as an information-generating device. More recently, Montgomery (1991) embedded social networks in an adverse selection model to analyze the effects of social networks on labor market outcomes.

Data Sources & Methodology

This paper focuses on the firms in India who search and select employees for job at global and local levels. The study started with identifying list of firms through Captiline database, the total number of firms present in the database is around 23,535 out of which 6,887 were present in multiple locations and 16,648 were at single location. The firms in India are distributed unevenly across location, concentrated in a few geographical units such as major urban agglomerations, in particular global cities (Saskia Sassen, 1991) such as Mumbai, Delhi, Bangalore and Hyderabad. The study moved with two global cities Mumbai and Hyderabad. The two cities were employed as separate groups to have proportional representation of firms across industries. After that random method was employed in selecting the firms within the group to avoid biases in the selection.

This research has six major phases: research design, pilot, data collection, validation, data entry and analysis. The research design is descriptive in nature. It involves sampling, designing survey instrument, identifying the samples, pilot test, final instruments, and interview of respondents. The research refrained from circumstances that obstruct the flow of engagements of employees in

the work site. The statistically acceptable sample size was determined by employing Daniel (1999)[1] method to compute the sample size. The sample size of 96 firms would suffice estimation with 10% margin of error. Following this, randomly chose firms from the list. Subsequently 101 interview schedules were completed.

Empirical Results

The search and selection of job seekers by firms help both parties to acquire information about each other and the more information increases the likelihood of a good employment match. Stigler (1962) recognized the crucial role of information in the labor market. Firms who witness vacancy and undertaken search process for prospective job seekers were asked what recruitment tool they use while recruiting for open positions (Table1). Interview is one of the most important recruitment tools for selection for managerial and non-managerial positions. Recruitment tools such as 'application forms', 'cvs and/or letters of application' 'references' and 'telephone interviews' are important in the process of recruitment for managerial open positions. In case of non-managerial selection 'telephone interviews', 'references', 'personality questionnaires' and 'general ability tests' are important tools for recruitment.

Table 1 Recruitment Tools Used by Firms While Recruiting for Open Positions (n*=101)[a]

Recruitment Tool	Managerial		Non-Managerial	
	N	Per cent	N	Per cent
Interviews	101	100.0	77	76.2
Application forms	70	69.3	21	20.8
CVs and/or letters of application	72	71.3	31	30.7
References	70	69.3	57	56.4
Tests of specific skills	40	39.6	28	27.7
Literacy and/or numeracy tests	10	9.9	1	1.0
Personality questionnaires	23	22.8	48	47.5
General ability tests	32	31.7	49	48.5
Assessment centers	15	14.9	23	22.8
Competency-based selection	35	34.7	11	10.9
Telephone interviews	61	60.4	65	64.4
Bio data	28	27.7	0	0.0
Tests carried out by telephone	5	5.0	63	62.4
Online testing	11	10.9	0	0.0

a Percentages add up to over 100 because some firms have more than one reason for occurrence of vacancies

*n represents the total number of sample enterprises

[1] To calculate an appropriate sample size, apply the following formulae: $n = \frac{NZ^2 P(1-P)}{d^2(N-1)+Z^2 P(N-1)}$, where n delineates sample size drawn from the finite population (N), Z represents Z statistic for 95% confidence level, P is the expected proportion that are going to calculate, d indicates precision (Daniel, 1999).. If P is between 0.1 and 0.9, then it is appropriate to choose 5% precision (0.5). In this study, P=0.5 and d=0.1., the sample size is 96.

The firm will choose a job seeker who is expected to perform best in the job in question. It needs to minimize uncertainties by making use of different types of information. Certainty can be enhanced by the fact that the firm tends to have different rounds of selection in the process of recruitment. Given this premise, it is of interest to understand characteristics that firms take in account when choosing a job seeker to call for interview or work out first elimination characteristics.

Therefore, it is of interest to analyze which characteristics firm takes into account when choosing the person to be employed. Previous experience and education are surely two indicators of how well a person can be expected to do the job. Table 2 (Panel A) depicts the characteristics that firms believe as positive/ negative signals about potential productivity. The data contains only the number of persons with different characteristics for managerial and non-managerial workforce. Regarding the selection process itself, it may be suitable to start by looking at the characteristics which according to firms will make job seeker directly unsuitable for the open position, i.e. the characteristics which firm uses to eliminate the job seeker in the first round of the selection process.

It is not very surprising that many firms regarded lack of skills the company demands (84 per cent) and experience (52 per cent), as reasons to eliminate job seekers as not appropriate for open position. It is quite visible that education and experience are important "signals".

Many firms regarded lack of skills the company demands (84 per cent) and experience (52 per cent), as reasons to eliminate job seekers as not appropriate for open position.

Low number of applicants with the required attitude, motivation or personality and too much competition from other employers are also common characteristics guiding elimination.

Another important aspect of the selection process is the decision to call a job seeker for an interview. Table 2 (Panel B) depicts characteristics that firms regard as most important, when deciding whether the applicant should be called for an interview or not. The characteristic such as 'experience' earned in 'job function at past work' and 'years of past work experience' account for 89 per cent and 65 per cent respectively. Only a few firms regard 'willingness to relocate', 'industry of past work experience', 'graduate degree area of study', 'language skills' and 'educational transcripts' as most important for the decision to call for an interview. The answers to this question seem to indicate that barriers for fresher to the labor market can be quite high.

To minimize the uncertainties associated with the decision to offer a job, the firms use such sources of information as given in Table 3, i.e. references from earlier employee, references from former employee, personal contacts, application papers and interviews with the

Table 2 Characteristics Guiding Elimination & Call for Interview

Panel A: Characteristic Guiding the First Elimination of Applicant (n*=101)[a]		
Reasons that leads to difficulty	Number	Per cent
Lack of/poor career progression	4	4.0
Unemployed	6	5.9
Job entails shift work /long/unsocial/irregular hours	8	7.9
Wages lower than other firms	15	14.9
Applicants lack basic ability to build upon	15	14.9
Lack of qualifications the company demands	17	16.8
Benefits trap/problem wage/benefits	18	17.8
Location of the firm/poor public transport	19	18.8
Too much competition from other employers	47	46.5
Low number of applicants with the required attitude, motivation or personality	50	49.5
Lack of work experience the company demands	53	52.5
Lack of skills the company demands	85	84.2
Panel B: Characteristic having greatest importance to call for an Interview (n*=101)[a]		
Characteristic	Number	Per cent
Professional memberships	5	5.0
Look and feel of resume	7	6.9
Internships	10	9.9
International work experience	11	10.9
School/institution	25	24.8
Extracurricular activities	25	24.8
Recommendation from somebody you know	30	29.7
Resume scan/employment application	32	31.7
Educational transcripts	32	31.7
Language skills	34	33.7
Graduate degree area of study	42	41.6
Industry of past work experience	53	52.5
Willingness to relocate	59	58.4
Years of past work experience	66	65.3
Job function at past work experience	90	89.1

a Percentages add up to over 100 because some firms have more than just one reason for occurrence of vacancies

*n represents the total number of sample enterprises

applicant. The interview schedule also aims to find most important source of the information, which influences the choice of whom to hire. About 80 per cent for managerial and 69 per cent for non-managerial job opening firms regard the

information collected from interview as very important for choosing the person they hired later on. Many firms also regard information gathered from application paper and referral from employees as the source of information having the greatest significance for managerial and non-managerial positions.

Table 3 Sources of Information Regarded as Having Greatest Importance (n*=101)[a]

Sources of Information	Managerial		Non-Managerial	
	N	Per cent	N	Per cent
Reference from employee	31	30.7	45	44.6
Reference from former employee	24	23.8	15	14.9
Personal contacts	20	19.8	5	5.0
Application papers	38	37.6	28	27.7
Information from the employment interview	83	82.2	70	69.3

a The percentages add up to over 100 because some firms have more than just one reason for occurrence of vacancies

*n represents the total number of sample enterprises

Interview schedule also aim to understand 'firm inform about job descriptions when selecting prospective job seeker'. Table 4 (Panel A) depicts firms providing information about job description or not. 81 per cent of the firms tend to provide information about job description. As job description covers the information related to job specification such as sequences of tasks necessary to perform the job. 19 per cent of the firms did not provide job description to the job seekers. Table 4(Panel B) depicts the information shared about job description at different stages of selection process. 65 per cent of the firms tend to provide information about job description before the interview and 23 per cent of the firms

Table 4 Firms Providing Information about the Job Description (n*=101)

Panel A Information about job description	Frequency	Per cent
No	19	18.8
Yes	82	81.2
Total	101	100.0
Panel B Information about Job Description at different stage of Selection (n*=82)		
Stage of Selection process	Frequency	Per cent
Before the Interview	53	64.6
At the Interview	19	23.2
At selection/appointment	10	12.2
Total	82	100
Panel C Firms having Policy for Recruitment (n*=101)	Frequency	Per cent
No	16	15.8
Yes	85	84.2
Total	101	100.0

*n represents the total number of sample enterprises

tend to provide information at the interview. Moreover, 12 per cent of the firms tend to provide information about the job description after selection of the job seekers. Table 4 (Panel C) depicts the firm's response about having policy for recruitment. 84 per cent of the firms said that they have a policy for recruitment and about 16 per cent of them did not have policy for recruitment.

After getting information from employment interviews, it is important to understand different characteristics, which play significant role in making decision to hire. Naturally, professional competence is very important characteristics of the person to be hired for managerial and non-managerial positions. Many firms believed that the language ability and personal engagement for managerial and non-managerial positions are the most important. About half of the firms regarded the social competence of the job seekers as an important factor in the decision about offering an open managerial position. That firms value social competence may depend on the fact that teamwork is an important part of the organization.

Professional competence is very important characteristics of the person to be hired for managerial and non-managerial positions.

Table 5 Characteristics of Person Hired Over all Those Who Were Called (n*=101)[a]

Characteristics	Managerial		Non-Managerial	
	N	Per cent	N	Per cent
Personal engagement	62	61.4	25	24.8
Family status	3	3.0	3	3.0
Social competence	48	47.5	11	10.9
Professional competence	96	95.0	95	94.1
Language ability	88	87.1	50	49.5
Other Characteristic	54	53.4	30	29.7

a The percentages add up to over 100 because some firms have more than one reason for occurrence of vacancies

*n represents the total number of sample enterprises

Firm Selection: Dimension & Determinant

There are several selection factors available to firms for selecting particular job seekers for an interview; firms often use more than one selection factor (either sequentially or non-sequentially). Limited studies have considered issues related to firm selection, such as Malm (1955); Stigler (1962); Rees (1966); Rees & Shultz (1970); Montgomery (1991); Granovetter (1995); DeVaro (2003). Firms and job seekers are brought together for prospective matches through search and selection process by firm and job seekers. In fact, selection factor for an interview helps both parties to acquire more information about each other. Firms tend to choose selection factor purposefully, however, they are likely to be determined by many endogenous factors

and policies that operate through the factors.

In the model, firm's choice to adopt particular selection factor recognizes a trade-off by organization between selection method and the quality of potential matches. Firms will differ in the relative weights they place on different objectives. Moreover, the same firm may make different selection factor according to the needs of the open position. Therefore, it is important to observe selection choices varying with firm characteristics. For each firm in this paper fifteen factors were observed that are being used in selecting most recent recruit. To understand which selection factors are bundled together and which are used apart, the correlation matrix for the fifteen selection factors were considered. No pair of methods appears to be substitutes in the sense that the use of one is associated with less frequent use of the other.

It is important to understand that this correlation matrix answers the simple question of which factors tend to be bundled together. Correlation matrix is not able to elucidate what factors tend to be bundled together or used apart by similar firms. To answer this, a multivariate multiple regression analysis, simultaneously estimating equations for each of the fifteen-selection factors used to select job seekers for an interview. The rationale for using multivariate multiple regressions is to yield unrestricted estimates of the full set of cross-equation correlations in the unobserved determinants of selecting job seekers for interview. A close examination of these correlations provides insights into which selection factors tend to be used together across firms with similar observable characteristics to select job seekers for an interview.

Specifically, the multivariate multiple regression model estimated is:

$$\text{Prob}\,(R_j=1) = \Phi\,(\beta_j' x) \quad j = 1, 2, \ldots 15$$

Where Φ is the standard normal cumulative distribution function (cdf); R_j is a dummy variable that equals 1 if the j^{th} selection factor was used to select and 0 if this method was not used; β_j is a parameter vector in the j^{th} equation; and x is a vector of covariates that includes the general categories of firm characteristics such as location, industry, revenue, number of employees, percentage of management graduates, attrition rates, attitude of the firms towards recruitment, organizational design, per cent of management graduates and attrition rates.

The application of the multivariate multiple regression envisions a continuous (normally distributed) latent index for each of the selection methods. Presumably the firm's propensity to use that particular selection factor is a function of both observed and unobserved characteristics of the firm. The observed selection choice is a discrete indicator that the latent index exceeds some threshold. The disturbance in this context represents the part of the latent index that is unrelated to observed firm characteristics, so it can be interpreted as the propensity to use the given factors for observably similar firms and jobs. The most noteworthy

differences pertain to factors determining selection for an interview are: job function at past work, industry of past work experience, years of past work experience and graduate area of study (Annexure I).

Factors determining selection of jobseekers for an interview (Annexure II) depict marginal effects from multivariate multiple regression equations estimated for each selection factor for an interview. The model estimates reveal a large number of statistically significant associations between each factors and firm characteristics, location, industry, revenue, number of employees, percentage of management graduate, attrition rates, attitude of the firms towards recruitment, organizational design, percent of management graduate and attrition rates. We restrict our comments to ten of the more interesting patterns that emerge.

The model estimates reveal a large number of statistically significant associations between each factors and firm characteristics.

First, Hyderabad firms are more likely than Mumbai ones to select jobseekers for an interview based on years of past work experience, resume scan/employment application and language skill. Quite importantly, Hyderabad firms are less likely (statistically not significant) than Mumbai ones to select jobseekers for an interview based on job function at past work experience, industry of past work experience, graduate degree area of study, school/institution and educational transcription. This is an interesting finding in the presence of the other controls in the model and is consistent with a growing body of evidence that the work culture is systematically different in Hyderabad from Mumbai.

Second, the industry controls tend not to be statistically significant, except job function at past work experience, that is, after controlling for firm characteristics the probability of using any particular selection factor does not vary much with the industry in which the firm operates. Service industry is less likely than manufacturing industry to select a jobseeker for an interview based on, years of past work experience, graduate degree area of study, school/institution, recommendation, internships, resume scan/employment application, language skills, international work experience, willingness to relocate and professional membership. Relative to manufacturing industry, the service industry has only one statistically significant association with the probability of selection of job seekers for an interview based on the above mentioned factors.

Third, firms with Rs. 501-1000 crores revenue are less likely (statically not significant)than firms with revenue less than Rs. 500 crores to select jobseekers based on job function at past work experience, years of past work experience, graduate degree area of study, school/institution, recommendation, resume scan/employment application, language skills, international work experience and educational transcription.

Firms with revenue of Rs. 501-1000 crore controls tend not to be statistically significant and the probability of using any particular selection factor of jobseeker for an interview does not vary much with the revenue size less than Rs. 500 crores. Firms with Rs.1001-5000 crores revenue are less likely than firms with revenue less than Rs. 500 crores to select a jobseeker for an interview based on job function at past work experience and industry of past work experience and more likely to select jobseeker based on internships, resume scan/employment application, international work experience, extracurricular activities willingness to relocate and professional membership. Firms with more than Rs. 5001 crores revenue are more likely to use years of past work experience to select a jobseeker for an interview based on years of past work experience, look and feel of resume and extracurricular activities than firms with less than Rs. 500 crores revenue.

Fourth, there is a clear pattern in the factors determining selection of jobseeker for an interview by firms with higher years of existence compared to lower years of existence. Relative to the less than 5 years of existence, firms seeking to select jobseekers for an interview with 6-10 years of existence are more likely to rely on industry of past work experience, years of past work experience, look and feel of resume and less likely to rely on internship and extracurricular activities. Firms with higher year of existence (11 and more years) are more likely to use internship, extracurricular activities and willingness to relocate, than firms with less than 5 years of existence.

The factors determining selection of jobseekers for an interview are clearly associated with the size of the firm.

Fifth, the factors determining selection of jobseekers for an interview are clearly associated with the size of the firm. All of the size of firm variables are statistically significant with search channels equation and most of them are significant in more than one equation. Firms that have sizeable number (101-501 employees) are associated with less frequent use of years of past work experience and willingness to relocate, compared to those with less than 100 employees. Firms with 501-1000 employees are more likely to use industry of past work experience, years of past work experience and less likely to use internship as factors determining selection of jobseeker for an interview compared to firm with less than 100 employees. Moreover, relatively firms with more than 1000 employees are more likely to be associated with industry of past work experience, years of past work experience and recommendation and less likely to use Internship and educational transcription for determining selection of jobseeker for an interview.

Sixth, the type of firm controls tends to be statistically significant. Relative to the private companies, the publically listed companies have a statistically significant association with the probability of selecting a jobseeker for an interview

based on job function at past work experience and industry of past work and are less likely to use recommendation as a factor determining selection of job seeker for an interview.

Seventh, the attitudes toward recruitment for a given position are clearly associated with the choice of selecting a jobseeker for an interview. All out of four attitudes are statistically significant in at least one selection factor determining selection of jobseekers for an interview equation and most of them are significant in more than one equation. Relative to the firm who believes recruitment should not be expensive; the firm who believes recruitment should be expensive are less likely to use internships, resume scan/employment application, language skills, look and feel of resume, willingness to relocate and more likely to use job function at past work experience as a selection factor for an interview. Relative to the firm who believes recruitment should cause much work, the firm who believes recruitment should not cause much work tend to use years of past work experience, recommendation and willingness to relocate as selection factors for job seekers for an interview.

Eighth, there is a clear pattern in the factors determining selection of jobseeker for an interview by the organization structure. Relative to the entrepreneurial organization (vertical and horizontal centralization), the machine organization (limited horizontal decentralization) are less likely to use years of past work experience, internships, resume scan/employment application, look and feel of resume, international work experience, extracurricular activities and more likely to use job function at past work experience for selecting jobseekers for an interview. Relative to the entrepreneurial organization (vertical and horizontal centralization), the professional organization (vertical and horizontal decentralization) are less likely to use internships, extracurricular activities, professional memberships and more likely to use job function at past work experience and industry of past work experience for selecting jobseekers for an interview. Relative to the entrepreneurial organization (vertical and horizontal centralization), the divisional organization (limited vertical decentralization) is more likely to use recommendation and willingness to relocate as a selection factor for an interview. Relative to the entrepreneurial organization (vertical and horizontal centralization), the innovative organization (selective decentralization) are less likely to use internships, resume scan/employment application and more likely to use job function at past work experiences selection factor for an interview.

Ninth, there is a clear pattern in the type of factors determining selection of jobseekers for an interview by the firm and percentage of managerial workforce in deciding selection factor. Relative to the firm with less than 5 per cent of managerial workforce, the firms with 6-10 per cent of managerial workforce are less likely to use school/institution, internships and extracurricular activities. Relative to the firm with less than 5 per cent of managerial workforce, the firms with more than 10 per cent of managerial workforce

The factors for determining selection of jobseekers for an interview are clearly associated with the attrition rate of the firm.

are less likely to use extracurricular activities, educational transcription, professional membership and more likely to use language skills, look and feel of resumes and resume scan/employment application for selection of jobseekers for an interview.

Finally, the factors for determining selection of jobseekers for an interview are clearly associated with the attrition rate of the firm. Relative to the firms with less than 10 per cent of attrition, the firms with more than 10 per cent of attrition are more likely to use job function at past work experience, years of past work experience, recommendation, willingness to relocate and professional membership for selection of jobseekers for an interview (Annexure II).

Conclusion

The results of this paper can be divided into firm-level heterogeneity in hiring practices, what explains this heterogeneity, the effect of factors determining selection of job seekers for an Interview and the effects of sources of information. The search and selection of job seekers by firms help both parties to acquire information about each other and the more information increases the likelihood of a good employment match. An 'interview' is one of the most important recruitment tools for selection for managerial and non-managerial positions. The firm will choose a job seeker who is expected to perform best in the job in question. This can be achieved by having different rounds of selection in the process of recruitment. Given this premise, it is of interest to understand characteristics that firms take into account when choosing a job seeker to call for interview or work out first elimination characteristics. It is quite a fact that experience and education are two important indicators of how well a person can be expected to do the job.

Therefore, it is of interest to analyze which characteristics firm takes into account when choosing the person to be employed. Former experience and education are surely two indicators of how well a person can be expected to do the job. It is not very surprising that most of the sample firms regard lack of skills the company demands and experience as a reason to eliminate job seekers for open positions. It is quite visible that education and experience are important "signals". Therefore, it may be more 'politically correct' for the firms to use skill and experience in the choice of job seekers than other personal characteristics. It is quite evident that the Indian labor market does not consider unemployed as a negative signal. However, it should be remembered that this investigation only covers limited firms who have reported above mentioned observation.

The characteristics such as 'experience' earned in 'job function at past work' and 'years of past work experience' accounts for most of the firms

while selecting a jobseeker for an interview. Thus barriers for freshers to the labor market can be quite high. To minimize the uncertainties associated with the decision to offer a job, the information gathered during the interview process should be regarded as the best source of information. The quality of job seekers firms hire always depends on the effectiveness of search, selection and recruitment strategy the firm believes in. The cost of wrong selection has never been greater than it is in today's economic climate.

References

Daniel, W.W. (1999), Biostatistics: A Foundation for Analysis in the Health Sciences. 7th edn, New York, John Wiley & Sons

DeVaro, J. (2005), "Employer Recruitment Strategies and the Labor Market Outcomes of New Hires", *Economic Inquiry*, 43(2): 263-82.

DeVaro, A. (2003),"Corporate Values: Stimulus for the Bottom Line", *Financial Executive*, 19(3): 20-23.

Freedman, D. (2009), Statistical Models: Theory and Practice, Cambridge University Press.

Garicano, L.& Hubbard, T. N. (2007),"Managerial Leverage Is Limited by the Extent of the Market: Hierarchies, Specialization, and the Utilization of Lawyers' Human Capital", *Journal of Law and Economics*, 50(1): 1-43.

Garicano, L. & Hubbard, T. N. (2009), "Specialization, Firms, and Markets: The Division of Labor within and between Law Firms", *Journal of Law, Economics, and Organization*, 25(2): 339-71.

Granovetter, M. (1995), Getting a Job: A Study of Contacts and Careers, University of Chicago Press.

Malm, F. (1955), "Hiring Procedures and Selection Standards in the San Francisco Bay Area", *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, 8(2):231-52

Montgomery, J. D. (1991), Social Networks and Persistent Inequality in the Labor Market, Center for Urban Affairs and Policy Research

Rees, A. (1966), "Information Networks in Labor Markets", *The American Economic Review*, 56 (1/2): 559-66.

Rees, A. & Shultz, G. P. (1970), Workers and Wages in an Urban Labor Market, Chicago, University of Chicago Press.

Saskia, Sassen (1991), The Global City: New York, London, Tokyo, Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Stigler, G. J. (1962), "Information in the Labor Market", *The Journal of Political Economy*, 70 (5):94-105.

Wheeler, C. H. (2001),"Search, Sorting, and Urban Agglomeration", *Journal of Labor Economics*, 19(4): 879-99.

Annexure I: Selection Factor Tends to Be Bundled Together or Used Apart (n*=101)
Phi Correlation Matrix for Search Channels Used to Hire Most Recent Managerial Position

Factor Determining Selection for an Interview	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
1. Job Function at past work Experience	1														
2.Industry of past work experience	.36**	1													
3.Years of past work experience	.14	.18	1												
4.Graduate degree area of study	-.02	-.00	.40**	1											
5.School/institution	.20*	.31**	.41**	.21*	1										
6.Recommendation	-.12	-.11	.01	.37**	-.07	1									
7.Internships	-.41**	-.34**	-.10	.05	-.19	.14	1								
8.Resume scan/ employment application	-.10	-.20*	.27**	.07	.34**	-.07	.48**	1							
9.Language skills	.04	-.03	.38**	.07	.32**	-.23*	.25*	.73**	1						
10."Look and feel" of resume	-.15	.10	.03	-.23*	.29**	-.17	.17	.40**	.21*	1					
11.International work experience	-.38**	-.04	.25*	.41**	.16	.26**	-.00	.17	.15–	-.09	1				
12.Extracurricular activities	.20*	-.14	.41**	.21*	.46**	-.07	.19	.34**	.27**	-.15	.24*	1			
13.Willingness to relocate	.09	-.28**	.23*	.30**	-.21*	.24*	-.05	.14	.04	-.32**	.29**	.25*	1		
14.Educational transcripts	.23*	-.20*	-.17	-.35**	.10	-.11	-.22*	.08	-.03	.23*	-.23*	.10	.14	1	
15.Professional memberships	.08	-.24*	.16	.27**	-.13	.35**	.68**	.33**	.22*	-.06	.06	.39**	.19	-.15	1

1. Job Function at past work Experience, 2.Industry of past work experience, 3.Years of past work experience, 4.Graduate degree area of study, 5.School/institution6.Recommendation, 7.Internships, 8.Resume scan/employment application, 9.Language skills, 10."Look and feel" of resume, 11.International work experience12. Extracurricular activities, 13.Willingness to relocate, 14.Educational transcripts, and 15.Professional memberships

Note: * and ** denote statistical significance at 5% and 1% level

i *n represents the total number of sample enterprises

Annexure II: Effects from Multivariate Multiple Regression for Factors Determining Selection of Jobseekers for Interview (n*=101)

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Location (Reference Category: Mumbai)															
Hyderabad	-.17	-.02	.40	-.14	-.02	.09	.13	.27	.40	.06	.19	.10	.02	-.26	.07
	(.11)	(.14)	(.14$)	(.20)	(.17)	(.16)	(.11)	(.15*)	(.17$)	(.10)	(.12)	(.12)	(.18)	(.18)	(.08)
Industry (Reference Category: Manufacturing)															
Service Industry	-.17	-.17	-.02	-.25	-.06	-.15	-.01	-.06	-.19	.10	-.02	.00	-.04	.13	-.10
	(.10*)	(.13)	(.13)	(.18)	(.15)	(.15)	(.10)	(.13)	(.16)	(.09)	(.10)	(.11)	(.16)	(.17)	(.07)
Revenue (Reference Category: Up to 500 Crore)															
Between Rs.501-1000 Crore	-.20	.00	-.27	-.15	-.08	-.21	.17	-.03	-.29	.02	-.00	.10	.15	-.16	.05
	(.19)	(.24)	(.24)	(.35)	(.29)	(.28)	(.19)	(.26)	(.30)	(.17)	(.20)	(.21)	(.31)	(.32)	(.14)
Between Rs.1001-5000 Crore	-.54	-.63	.10	.40	.51	-.11	.73	1.23	.47	.34	.53	1.13	1.23	.50	.32
	(.27$)	(.34*)	(.34)	(.48)	(.40)	(.39)	(.26$)	(.36$)	(.42)	(.24)	(.28*)	(.29$)	(.42$)	(.44)	(.19*)
More than Rs.5001 Crore	-.22	-.56	.38	-.17	.31	-.64	-.05	.13	.24	.24	.19	.75	.06	.13	-.15
	(.15)	(.20$)	(.19*)	(.28)	(.23)	(.23$)	(.15)	(.21)	(.24)	(.14*)	(.16)	(.17$)	(.25)	(.25)	(.11)
Years of Existence (Reference Category: Up to 5 Years)															
6-10 Years	.29	.72	.88	.15	-.00	.04	-.53	.01	.21	.35	.16	-.50	.40	-.24	-.10
	(.18)	(.23$)	(.23$)	(.33)	(.27)	(.26)	(.18$)	(.24)	(.28)	(.16$)	(.19)	(.19$)	(.29)	(.30)	(.13)
11 and more Years	-.27	-.65	-.47	.19	-.32	-.30	.31	.19	.11	-.04	.03	.25	.39	.27	.12
	(.12$)	(.15$)	(.15$)	(.21)	(.17*)	(.17*)	(.11$)	(.15)	(.18)	(.10)	(.12)	(.13*)	(.19$)	(.19)	(.08)
Size (Reference Category: Up to 100 employees)															
101-500 employees	-.50	-.21	-.93	-.43	.13	-.10	.14	-.52	-.34	-.16	-.27	.22	-1.16	.45	-.35
	(.35)	(.44)	(.44$)	(.63)	(.52)	(.51)	(.34)	(.47)	(.55)	(.31)	(.37)	(.38)	(.55$)	(.58)	(.25)

501-1000 employees	-.00	.76	1.39	-.46	.02	.07	-.41	-.30	.33	.10	.22	-.17	-.25	-.59	-.16
	(.24)	(.30$)	(.30$)	(.42)	(.35)	(.34)	(.23*)	(.31)	(.37)	(.21)	(.25)	(.25)	(.37)	(.39)	(.17)
More than 1001 employees	.22	.81	.75	-.30	-.10	.54	-.30	-.14	-.06	-.06	.17	-.21	.02	-.47	.02
	(.15)	(.19$)	(.19$)	(.28)	(.23)	(.22$)	(.15*)	(.20)	(.24)	(.13)	(.16)	(.16)	(.24)	(.25*)	(.11)
Type of Firm (Reference Category: Private Listed)															
Publicly Listed Company	.20	.20	-.10	-.18	-.11	-.31	-.03	-.02	-.14	-.13	-.13	.12	.09	.12	.00
	(.09$)	(.12*)	(.12)	(.17)	(.14)	(.13$)	(.09)	(.12)	(.14)	(.08)	(.10)	(.10)	(.15)	(.15)	(.06)
Recruitment Attitude (Reference Category: Recruitment should be expensive)															
Recruitment should not be expensive	.67	.06	.15	.19	-.04	.32	-.56	-.92	-.65	-.42	-.00	.05	-.44	-.13	.05
	(.16$)	(.21)	(.21)	(.30)	(.24)	(.24)	(.16$)	(.22$)	(.26$)	(.14$)	(.17)	(.18)	(.26*)	(.27)	(.11)
Recruitment Attitude (Reference Category: Recruitment should cause much work)															
Recruitment should not cause much work	.18	-.06	.73	-.20	.19	.49	-.35	.05	.20	-.00	.083	-.06	.40	.01	-.05
	(.12)	(.16)	(.16$)	(.23)	(.19)	(.18$)	(.12$)	(.17)	(.20)	(.11)	(.13)	(.13)	(.20$)	(.21)	(.09)
Recruitment Attitude (Reference Category: Recruitment does not deliver motivated applicants															
Recruitment deliver motivated applicants	.77	.29	-1.19	-.41	-1.1	.69	-.67	-1.97	-1.22	-.94	-.76	-.87	-.63	-.99	-.18
	(.28$)	(.35)	(.35$)	(.50)	(.41$)	(.40*)	(.27$)	(.37$)	(.43$)	(.24$)	(.29$)	(.30$)	(.44)	(.45$)	(.19)
Recruitment Attitude (Reference Category: Recruitment does not deliver applicants quickly)															
Recruitment deliver applicants quickly	-.51	.07	-1.32	-.05	.04	-.95	.65	.69	.07	.38	-.09	.04	-.33	.84	.02
	(.24$)	(.30)	(.30$)	(.43)	(.36)	(.35$)	(.23$)	(.32$)	(.38)	(.21*)	(.25)	(.26)	(.38)	(.39$)	(.17)
Structure (Reference Category: Entrepreneurial Organization)															
Limited horizontal decentralization	.51	.18	-.54	-.22	-.35	.11	-.46	-.85	-.46	-.28	-.45	-.93	-.41	-.00	-.17
	(.18$)	(.22)	(.22$)	(.32)	(.26)	(.26)	(.17$)	(.23$)	(.28)	(.16*)	(.18$)	(.19$)	(.28)	(.29)	(.12)
Vertical and horizontal decentralization	.37	.69	.20	-.15	-.07	-.08	-.39	-.16	.38	.01	.00	-.52	-.26	-.35	-.24
	(.19*)	(.24$)	(.24)	(.34)	(.28)	(.28)	(.18$)	(.25)	(.30)	(.17)	(.20)	(.20$)	(.30)	(.31)	(.13*)
Limited vertical decentralization	-.16	-.05	.20	.36	.30	.65	-.14	.26	-.00	.04	.30	.07	.68	.67	-.04
	(.19)	(.24)	(.24)	(.34)	(.28)	(.28$)	(.18)	(.25)	(.30)	(.17)	(.20)	(.20)	(.30$)	(.31$)	(.13)

Selective decentralization	.69 (.25$)	.52 (.32)	.45 (.32)	.54 (.46)	.05 (.38)	-.39 (.37)	-.74 (.25$)	-1.10 (.34$)	.10 (.40)	-.16 (.22)	-.28 (.27)	-.15 (.27)	.53 (.40)	.30 (.42)	-.16 (.18)
Per cent of Managerial work force (Reference Category: up to 5% of Managerial work force)															
Between 6-10 % of Managerial work force	.26 (.15)	-.10 (.19)	-.23 (.19)	-.21 (.27)	-.55 (.22$)	.13 (.22)	-.30 (.14$)	-.18 (.20)	-.08 (.23)	-.17 (.13)	.05 (.15)	-.40 (.16$)	.29 (.23)	-.20 (.24)	-.04 (.10)
More than 10 % of Managerial work force	-.28 (.11)	.10 (.14)	.03 (.14)	-.26 (.21)	-.19 (.17)	-.24 (.17)	.15 (.11)	.59 (.15$)	.35 (.18*)	.19 (.10*)	.09 (.12)	-.25 (.12$)	-.09 (.18)	-.51 (.19$)	-.16 (.08*)
Attrition (Reference Category: Attrition up to 9%)															
Attrition more than 10%	.20 (.11*)	-.17 (.14)	.42 (.14$)	.25 (.20)	-.07 (.17)	.29 (.16*)	-.06 (.11)	.16 (.15)	.01 (.17)	-.07 (.10)	.13 (.12)	.10 (.12)	.35 (.18*)	-.08 (.18)	.24 (.08$)
Constant	.81 (.19)	.23 (.24)	-.16 (.24)	.97 (.34)	.59 (.28)	.29 (.27)	.44 (.18)	.19 (.25)	.07 (.29)	.02 (.17)	-.21 (.20)	.27 (.20)	.10 (.30)	.68 (.31)	.10 (.13)
N	101	101	101	101	101	101	101	101	101	101	101	101	101	101	101
R-sq	0.509	0.697	0.67	0.373	0.44	0.517	0.493	0.615	0.485	0.418	0.463	0.704	0.515	0.415	0.493

Note: Standard errors are below coefficients$ and * indicate significance at the 5% and 10% levels respectively.
1. Job Function at past work Experience, 2.Industry of past work experience, 3.Years of past work experience, 4.Graduate degree area of study, 5.School/institution, 6.Recommendation, 7.Internships, 8.Resume scan/employment application, 9.Language skills, 10. “Look and feel” of resume, 11.International work experience, 12.Extracurricular activities, 13.Willingness to relocate, 14.Educational transcripts, 15. Professional memberships