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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Despite criticisms of the interview, it remains an extremely popular selection tool (Campbell, Dunnette, Lawler & Weick, 1970). While a number of research projects have investigated the interviewer's decision making (such as Carlson & Mayfield, 1967; Hakel & Dunnette, 1970; Webster, 1964), considerably less attention has been devoted to the applicant's decision making, including the importance of reactions to the interview (Alderfer & McCord, 1970; Schmitt & Coyle, 1976). An interview is a complex interaction between two people (Luthans, 1977); thus, research dealing with only the interviewer is one-sided.

Several writers (e.g., Schmitt, 1976; Wanous, 1973) have addressed this issue with the suggestion that we need to know more about the "joining up" process on both sides - the individual and the organization; and to incorporate several research areas in this endeavor. According to these and other authors, some topics potentially useful to understand the applicant include those of interpersonal attraction (such as Byrne, 1969; Frank & Hackman, 1975), and vocational psychology (for example, Holland, 1973).

Two recent studies (Alderfer & McCord, 1970; Schmitt & Coyle, 1976) are part of a systematic attempt to investigate the impact of the interview on the applicant. However, in both studies, the
applicants completed questionnaires about their experiences some
time after the interviews took place, thus allowing for such prob-
lems as errors in memory, confusion with other interviews, the in-
fluence of discussions with peers, job offers and rejections prior
to questionnaire completion, and so forth.

The present study was conducted to deal with some of these
issues. Applicant reactions to the interview were obtained directly
after the interview itself. The purpose of the study is to investi-
gate: (a) the relationship between perceived recruiter behaviors
and reactions to the interview, (b) the relationship of perceived
recruiter-applicant congruence and interview reactions, and (c) the
influence of the campus interview upon perception of company image.

Chapter II consists of a review of the background literature,
containing information on the selection and recruitment functions
of the interview, the job choice process, and the impact of the
interview on the applicant. Also included is a description of
Holland's (1973) schema of vocational choice, Byrne's (1969) frame-
work of interpersonal attraction, and the notion of company image.
At the conclusion of the chapter, specific hypotheses are presented.
In Chapter III, the method of the study is described. The results
are presented in Chapter IV. In the final chapter, V, the results
are discussed in light of future research.
CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

An interview is a complex interaction. Widespread use of the employment interview as a selection technique in organizations (Campbell, Dunnette, Lawler & Weick, 1970) emphasizes the need for research to fully understand the dynamics involved (Schwab, 1969). This is particularly so in view of recent EEOC guidelines (Federal Register, 1970) which provide that employers can be held responsible for showing that the interview (or any other selection device) is job-related.

Most of the existing research is one-sided in that it considers only the interview's frame of reference. From this approach, four reviews of the research (Mayfield, 1964; Ulrich & Trumbo, 1965; Wagner, 1949; Wright, 1969) concluded that both reliability and validity of the interview are low.

However, little is known about the perceptions held by the applicant, and interview research cannot be complete until this aspect is fully investigated. For example, how do recruiter characteristics and behaviors during the interview influence applicant reactions? Does the interview influence the applicant's perception of the company as a place to work?
The following section contains a review of the literature and issues in this area: the interview in selection and recruitment, perceived similarity and vocational orientation, and company image.

Selection Interview

The general term "employment interview" is often replaced by "selection interview" or "recruitment interview" depending upon the function of the interaction. This distinction tends to coincide with whether the focus of research interest is on the interviewer or the applicant. The majority of research efforts have been on the selection interview, and correspondingly, interview decision making.

Selection interview studies have often been partitioned into three major programs of research: the work of Webster and his students at McGill (for example, Rowe, 1963; Webster, 1964); Carlson and Mayfield (Carlson, 1967; Carlson & Mayfield, 1967; Mayfield & Carlson, 1966); and Hakel and colleagues (Hakel & Dunnette, 1970; Hakel & Schuh, 1971; Hakel, 1971).

While these studies have made important strides in our understanding of the interview, their focus has been only on the interviewer as Perceiver. A number of researchers have provided models of the interview process (e.g., Cannell & Kahn, 1968; Hakel & Dunnette, 1970; Schmitt, 1976), and, in each case, the model describes a dyad in which either the interviewer or interviewee could be a Perceiver. The need for research about applicant perceptions is emphasized by the description of the interview as an interactive
process (Porter, Lawler & Hackman, 1975) and the importance of what the applicant as Perceiver brings to the interview situation (Gage & Cronbach, 1955).

This omission is a noteworthy one, as an interviewer actually has two types of tasks. The selection task deals with the job of obtaining information, evaluating it, and making a prediction about the candidate in the organization. However, the interviewer must also give information to the candidate, as well as present the organization favorably so that the candidate will accept a job offer if extended. This second task is part of the recruitment function of the interview, and the importance of this function has largely been overlooked by researchers studying the interview (Alderfer & McCord, 1970; Behling, 1965; Schmitt, 1976; Schmitt & Coyle, 1976). Therefore, by neglecting the recruitment function and hence the applicant's evaluation of the interview, many questions remain unanswered.

Recruitment Interview

This paucity of research on the applicant's view of the interview has not gone unnoticed. Wanous (1973) stated there is a crucial need to study the "joining up" process from both sides - the individual and the organization. Both Wanous (1973) and Schmitt (1976) encouraged the incorporation of several research areas in this endeavor. More research is needed on how different people are attracted by different recruiting sources (Guion, 1976; Lawler, 1973). Attention has been drawn to the need for studying students in different disciplines
(Behling & Rodkin, 1969), and the influence of different factors upon the position selection process (Behling, Labovitz & Gainer, 1968).

Research on candidate job choice, then, is fairly limited. Studies which have been conducted are primarily of college students about to enter the job market, and cover such topics as: opinions of and preferences for working in various types of organizations (e.g., Braunstein & Haines, 1968; Sheard, 1970); organization choice and post-decision dissonance (Pieters, Hundert & Beer, 1968; Vroom, 1966; Vroom & Deci, 1971); and the decision-making process in job choice (Glueck, 1974; Soelberg, 1967; Swinth, 1976).

However, due to the lack of studies in this area, Behling, Labovitz and Gainer (1968) stated that research on the job choice process of college students offers little tangible information upon which to base recruiting efforts. In the most comprehensive attempt to identify factors considered by the job applicant, they trichotomized the existing literature and different emphases used by recruiting firms into three implicit theories of position selection: Objective Factor Theories, Subjective Factor Theories, and Critical Content Theories.

The Objective Factor Theories generally involve the development of a list of factors believed to be important in position selection. It is implicitly assumed that position selection is based on a weighting of the advantages and disadvantages in terms of these objectively measurable factors (salary, type of work, and so forth). For example,
Richardson (1966) constructed hypothetical job offers and, using college seniors in business administration as subjects, found that salary had more of an influence on job choice than did location, type of work, or company size.

The Subjective Factor Theories emphasize the emotional needs of the candidate, such as the congruence between the candidate's personality and the image of the company. This logic can be seen in the design of recruitment literature and advertisements to reflect presumably desirable attributes such as progressiveness. For example, Tom (1971) used Gough and Heilbrun's Adjective Check List and Allport, Vernon, and Lindzey's Study of Values to elicit college student descriptions of themselves and of organizations. He found support for the hypothesis that the similarity between an individual's description of himself and his description of the organization which he most prefers would be greater than the similarity between an individual's description of himself and his description of the organization which he least prefers. Behling and Tolliver (Note 1) found moderate support for the hypothesis that high self-esteem students would tend to implement their self-concept in their choice of employers, and low self-esteem students would tend to complement their self-concept.

The Critical Content Theories suggest that, because the typical college graduate is incapable of differentiating firms on either objective or subjective factors due to lack of experience, he or she grasps at such dimensions as the appearance and behavior of the recruiter, company efficiency in processing the application, and
physical facilities of the company. It is to one aspect of the Critical Content Theories, recruiter behavior, that the present study is addressed.

While there has been little systematic research dealing with applicants' perception of recruiter behavior, a number of writers, emphasizing the importance of the recruiter's function, have provided guidelines on how to be a good recruiter (e.g., Athos, 1966; Gerstner, 1966; Hilgert & Eason, 1968; Odiorne & Hann, 1961; Shaw, 1968; Soltys, 1967; Strother, 1960; Sutton & Carleton, 1962). According to these and other authors, the recruiter who is most effective (from the students' viewpoint) is warm, friendly, honest, interested in the person as a while (rather than only the grade point average), able to put the student at ease, well-dressed, polite, punctual, a good organizer, prepared, able to communicate well, has knowledge of his company and the specific job opportunities, does not waste time, does some talking during the interview but does not dominate it, does not use a "hard-sell" approach, is attentive to students' needs, offers advantages and disadvantages of working for his firm, asks questions that are direct and not superficial, does not embarrass students or put them on the spot, is perceptive, is concerned with students' feelings, treats students as equals, stimulates students to talk about themselves, and does not use a "canned" speech. It appears that the recruiter should exhibit many of the characteristics described as desirable for applicants.
Thus, it can be seen that the recruiter's job is not a simple one. In what is usually a 30-minute interview (or less), the recruiter must sell the industry and the company, describe the job and the training program, discuss opportunities, mention fringe benefits and company policies, answer questions, allow the applicant to sell himself - and, of course, make an appropriate decision about the applicant for the organization.

An important yet overlooked aspect of the recruiter's function is that of public relations - or the image of the company to outsiders. Prospective employees are seekers of information about organizations (Schneider, 1972). It has been suggested that if the student can see the recruiter as a good employee or coworker, he will transfer this favorable impression to his mental image of the company itself (Taylor, 1965). Implicit in the Critical Content approach is the notion that effective recruitment interviewing is particularly important because the more desirable candidates are likely to be the most critical (Gerstner, 1966) as well as the most difficult to influence (Behling, Friedman & Jankura, 1968). When there are many more acceptable candidates than available positions, the recruiter needs to favorably influence the top candidates - while insuring all candidates depart with a good image of the company. For these reasons, the student's reaction to the interview should be important to the company.

At this point, knowledge about the recruitment interview can be placed in much the same light as work on the selection interview was described by England and Patterson (1960) in Schwab (1969). That is,
before any more "do's and don't's" about the recruitment interview are presented, considerably more systematic research is needed. Two recent studies addressing this issue will be discussed, followed by a description of the contribution of the present study.

In the earlier study, Alderfer and McGrath (1970) utilized the field theory approach of Lewin. They hypothesized that those people high on relatedness needs would evaluate more positively those recruitment interviews which satisfied their interpersonal needs than persons low on relatedness needs.

Graduate business students seeking permanent and summer jobs participated in the study. They were asked to complete a questionnaire reacting to three interviews they had experienced: the best, worst, and average. Candidates were also asked to estimate the likelihood of receiving and accepting a job offer. Results of the study showed that candidates consistently estimated their likelihood of accepting a job offer as less than the likelihood of receiving an offer.

A number of perceived interviewer behaviors were also related to interviews being judged best or worst. Interviews were more likely to be evaluated favorably when the recruiter was willing and able to answer questions, told about the careers of other MBAs, asked a technical question, indicated the possibility of a high salary, and was familiar with the candidate's background.

Some perceived recruiter attitudes and traits were also associated with a high evaluation: appearing to be interested in and understand the candidate and his contribution, and the interviewer
being perceived as a successful younger man. In general, then, the results showed that certain interviewer behaviors and attitudes are related to a positive evaluation of the interview.

Unexpectedly, however, the authors also found that persons with higher interpersonal needs tended to experience less satisfaction of those needs in the best interviews than those with lower interpersonal needs; those with higher interpersonal needs also tended to experience more satisfaction of those needs in the worst interviews than those with lower interpersonal needs. According to Alderfer and McCord, the implications of this finding are that if the interpersonal climate of the worst interviews are improved, those with lower interpersonal needs will be positively affected. However, if the best interviewers improve their interpersonal style, candidates with higher interpersonal needs would more likely be attracted.

In conclusion, the authors noted a limitation of their study was the use of retrospective accounts of the interviews. While this allows for reflection and consolidation of reactions, it also allows for memory lapses and discussions with peers. They suggested that candidates be questioned right after the interview was completed.

More recently, Schmitt and Coyle (1976) conducted research in this topic area. Undergraduate students who had interviewed for either permanent or summer positions in a University Placement Office received mailed questionnaires. They were asked to consider the last interview in which they had participated, and described the interaction on 74 Likert-type items covering various interviewer behaviors
and characteristics. Factor analysis and varimax rotation of these items resulted in six factors: empathic dimension, manner in which the interviewer conducted the session, interviewer aggressiveness, interviewer's correctness, giving job information, and exchange of opinion.

Factor scores on these dimensions were computed and utilized as predictors. The criteria were a series of questions related to the interview outcome: the authors reported multiple regression of the dependent variables on the six factor scores. For example, the applicant's willingness to pursue actively a job with a given company was best predicted by Factors 1 (empathic dimension) and 5 (receipt of job information). This suggests that the way an interview is conducted can motivate good job applicants to consider the company. Perceived increase or decrease in favorability towards the company due to the interview was predicted by Factors 1 (empathic dimension) and 4 (interviewer's correctness); both factors are related to the interviewer's perceived personality characteristics.

The authors concluded that the interview most certainly is an interpersonal situation (Hakel & Dunnette, 1970), in which the interviewer does have an impact on the interviewee. They supported the notion that reactions to the recruiter and the interview context comprise an important factor in employment decisions made by applicants. While Schmitt and Coyle have provided an important contribution to the literature in this under-researched area, there are a number of limitations of their study. Students were instructed to react to the last interview they had had, and they may have confused
this with the total interview experience. It is likely that changes in perceptions occur as a result of acceptances or rejections, and these would be reflected in their responses. Thus, they suggested a need for research on the applicant's perceptions which questions the applicants immediately after the interview has occurred.

As a result of the nature of previous research on applicant reactions to the interview, a number of salient issues remain; these will be addressed in the present study. For example, the need to question applicants right after the interview has been well documented. The time interval between interview and questionnaire completion, while giving the student the opportunity to consolidate thoughts, also permits for errors in memory, confusion with other interviews, the influence of discussions with peers, job offers and rejections received prior to questionnaire completion, and so forth. Thus, methodologically, the tendency to be self-consistent (Bem, 1970) might influence responses on these questionnaires (Wancus, 1976).

Other issues need to be considered. According to Hall (1976), one problem with research on the psychology of work is the artificial dichotomy between the selection of a vocation (counseling psychology) and work experiences in a vocation (industrial/organizational psychology and sociology). As a result, the whole area of organizational choice (of which the interview is a facet, as shown by Behling, et al., 1968) has been neglected. Hall has suggested that theories of person-environment fit (such as Holland, 1966; 1973) that have guided occupational choice may be useful in organizational choice. An implication of this notion is that to the extent the recruiter determines the
environment of the interview (e.g., Walsh, 1973) applicant perceptions of the recruiter would influence evaluations of the interview and the company. The applicant might also be influenced by perceived similarity (e.g., Byrne, 1961); this variable has been considered in research on interviewer decision-making (such as Frank & Hackman, 1975). A final issue to be addressed in the present study is that of company image. While the importance of a company's image is vital to attracting prospective employees (Schneider, 1976), little is known about the influence of the interview itself upon this image.

Perceived Similarity

As was indicated earlier, a considerable body of literature exists on interviewer decision-making. Some of this research has dealt with interpersonal attraction in terms of attitudinal and background similarity (e.g., Baskett, 1973; Frank & Hackman, 1975; Peters and Terborg, 1975; Rand & Wexley, 1975).

Using the framework of interpersonal attraction described by Byrne (1961; 1969), results of these studies suggest that greater similarity between interviewer and applicant is related to a more favorable assessment of the interviewee. In addition, Byrne's framework proposes that evaluative responses to an individual are a function of the proportion of positive reinforcements associated with that individual. To the extent that these ideas apply to the applicant's viewpoint, the perception of desired recruiter behaviors and similarity with the recruiter on certain biographical items (age, sex, and race) should result in favorable ratings of the recruiter.
Vocational Orientation

Because theories of vocational orientation address the issue of occupational choice, they should relate to the job choice situation as well. In particular, it has been suggested that Holland's model would be useful in this area (Hall, 1976). While extensive descriptions of Holland's theory are available in a number of excellent sources (Holland, 1973, 1976; Osipow, 1973; Walsh, 1973), it will be briefly described below.

The basic assumptions of the theory are as follows:

1) In our culture, most persons can be categorized as one of six types: Realistic, Investigative, Artistic, Social, Enterprising, or Conventional. 2) There are, correspondingly, six kinds of environments, each dominated by a given type of personality. 3) People search for environments that are compatible - realistic types seek realistic environments, and so forth. 4) A person's behavior is determined by an interaction between his personality and the characteristics of his environment. This assumption includes the notion of congruence, i.e., that realistic types flourish in realistic environments.

Holland uses a notion popular to vocational psychology - that career choice is an expression of personality. He introduces the idea that people project their views of themselves and the world of work onto occupational titles. Thus, by expressing interests in
certain occupational titles, people may be assigned to modal types which have implications for personality and vocational choice (Osipow, 1973, p. 41).

This second notion is the basis for the Vocational Preference Inventory, or VPI (Holland, 1965), an operationalization of the six personality types. The VPI contains a list of 160 occupational titles. The respondent indicates whether (s)he is interested, uninterested, or has no opinion regarding that occupation.

According to Holland (1973), each of the six types is viewed as a global characteristic, which each person has to some extent. Rather than being a "pure" type, an individual can have all types, with one or two being the most dominant.

Numerous studies have been published dealing with various aspects of Holland's theory. (The research evidence is discussed in Holland, 1973; Osipow, 1973; Walsh, 1973.) In general, there is evidence for its validity and usefulness for counseling, and as an influence upon research on careers (Osipow, 1973).

Because Holland's theory addresses itself to the person-environment interaction, it can potentially be used to study the interview situation as well. According to Astin and Holland (1961), the major portion of environmental forces is transmitted through other people. The dominant features of a particular environment depend on the typical characteristics of its members. Specifically, then, the environment of an interview will be determined largely by the characteristics of the recruiter. Because students will be more satisfied the more closely they resemble the dominant pressures in
their environment (Walsh, 1973), similarity in perceived vocational orientation might be important in the student's evaluation of the interview situation.

**Company Image**

According to Katz and Kahn (1966), organization members are affected by the fact that the organizational space they occupy differs from those who are not members. This boundary creates a dilemma, in that the person within the system sees it differently than do outsiders.

In organizational psychology there is considerable research on the concept of organizational climate (for example, Lawler, Hall & Oldham, 1974; Payne & Mansfield, 1973) as it applies to current employees or organization members. However, little is known about the images held by outsiders - people seeking information about companies. In the case of college students, the Critical Content Theories described earlier emphasize the importance of the recruitment interview in determining company image. The need to study this topic is implied in Schneider's (1976) question, "How many [companies] have found that their poor corporation image as an employer kept employees away?" (p. 99)

In the present study, company image is defined as having two components. One is the individual's perceptions of the company as a place to work, rather than the corporation's objective characteristics. (This is similar to the notion of store image used in consumer behavior research - see Engel, Kollat & Blackwell, 1973). The second
component is the perceived similarity between the applicant's needs and the company's opportunities.

There is some evidence that for companies less well known, engineering seniors have few preconceived notions prior to the interview (Bradshaw, 1966; Frasher, Note 2). It seems reasonable that seniors in other majors may also lack this information about many companies they interview with. The public relations aspect of the interview is important with all applicants, but especially so when the applicant is unfamiliar with the company - a situation more likely for college students than more experienced members of the labor force. Luthans (1977) alluded to this issue in his statement, "It is important to the long-range objective of the organization that a good rapport exist when the interview is terminated." (p. 475).

**Proposed Model**

On the basis of the above, there are a number of unanswered questions about applicants' assessments of the campus recruitment interview. When applicants respond immediately after the interview, what recruiter behaviors are related to satisfaction? Can the notion of vocational orientation and environment be useful in a relatively short-term interaction? Is the perception of biographical similarity related to satisfaction? Does the amount of company information prior to the interview influence the relationship between reactions to the interview and post-interview company image? In Figure 1 a model is proposed which incorporates those factors suggested to be important in applicant reactions to the campus interview.
FIGURE 1

Applicants' Characteristics and Assessments of the Campus Recruitment Interview
Hypotheses

As described earlier, a number of writers have suggested certain behaviors that are considered by student applicants to be desirable. To the extent that the applicant perceives the recruiter as doing certain key behaviors during the interview, the applicant's reaction to the interview should be favorable. A favorable reaction should also related to liking of and perceived similarity with the recruiter (Berscheid & Walster, 1969), as well as a positive evaluation of self-presentation.

**Hypothesis 1:** There will be a positive relationship between the perception of desirable recruiter behaviors and applicants'

(a) satisfaction with the manner in which the interview was conducted.
(b) satisfaction with the self-impression made during the interview.
(c) liking for the recruiter.
(d) perceived similarity with the recruiter.

Interpersonal attraction in terms of background similarity has been shown to be a factor in some interviewer evaluations (Frank & Hackman, 1975). Thus, perceived background similarity may influence applicant evaluations as well.

**Hypothesis 2:** Overall satisfaction with the interview will be related to applicant perception of similarity between him/herself and the recruiter in

(a) age
(b) sex
(c) ethnic background (race)
(d) vocational orientation

Little is known about the variables that influence company image. It is, however, important for an organization that the applicant leaves an interview with a favorable company image (Luthans,
Post-interview image may be determined by information the applicant brings to the interview as well as the interview itself. If little is known about a company, image is formed in the interview; if the applicant has considerable prior information, however, image is less likely to be influenced by the interview.

**Hypothesis 3:** The greater the amount of information an applicant has prior to the interview, the smaller the relationship between satisfaction with the interview and post-interview image.
CHAPTER III

METHOD

Overview

College students currently seeking full-time, permanent positions voluntarily participated in a field study designed to assess their reactions to the 30-minute meeting with a campus recruiter. At the time participation was solicited, subjects provided background data and completed the six vocational interest scales of Holland's Vocational Preference Inventory. Data on company image was obtained at the time of sign-up for each interview; generally, this was about two weeks prior to the actual interview. Immediately after the interview, each participant completed a questionnaire reacting to the interview itself.

Subjects

The subjects in this study were 84 Ohio State University seniors and graduate students who were interviewing on campus during Winter Quarter 1977 for permanent, full-time jobs. Tables 1 and 2 contain background data on the students participating in the study.

The 67 students enrolled in the College of Administrative Science (see Table 1) constituted approximately 60% of those attending the session during which participation was solicited, and about
TABLE 1

Biographical Data of Study Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MAJOR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>41.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Science</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Computer and Information Sciences, Chemistry, Consumer Economics)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEGREE STATUS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelors candidates</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>77.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters candidates</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral candidates</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>78.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETHNIC BACKGROUND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>95.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afro-American</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oriental-American</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLEGE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Science</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>79.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Sciences</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Sample size = 84.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>19 - 30</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>Not reported for 7 students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade Point Average in Major</td>
<td>2.00 - 4.00</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>Out of a possible 4.00. Not reported for 12 students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Grade Point Average</td>
<td>1.93 - 3.92</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>Out of a possible 4.00. Not reported for 4 students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of previous jobs (part time and full time)</td>
<td>0 - 20</td>
<td>5.06</td>
<td>Only 3 of the 84 reported no previous job experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous interviews and plant visits</td>
<td>0 - 20</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>69% had no interviews or visits during their current job search, prior to participation in the study. Only 4% had received a job offer prior to agreement to participate.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Sample size = 84.
30% of those enrolled in the placement office during Winter Quarter. The 11 engineering students constituted approximately 5% of students enrolled in that placement office. Data was not available on the total number of students enrolled in the Arts and Sciences Placement Office. Due to provisions in the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974 (i.e., the Buckley Amendment), it was not possible to determine the representativeness of these students in the total population of those registered with the placement offices.

Questionnaires

Several questionnaires were used at different points in the study.

Upon agreement to participate, each student was given an envelope with questionnaire materials. The Background Information Questionnaire (Appendix A) contained various questions about demographics, work and interviewing experience, current employment interests, and a self-description section based on adjectives corresponding to Holland's (1973) six categories. (There is some evidence for the correspondence of measurement between the adjectives suggested by Holland and the VPI; see Bobele, Alston, Wakefield, and Doughtie, 1976.) Holland's VPI and answer sheet for the six vocational scales (Realistic, Investigative, Artistic, Social, Enterprising, and Conventional) was included. For each occupation, the students were instructed to indicate if they found the occupation interesting, uninteresting, or had no opinion. Students were
asked to read and sign the Consent to Participate in Research (Appendix B), in compliance with the requirements of the Human Subjects Review Committee at The Ohio State University. An instruction sheet for completing participation (Appendix C) was included for students to take as a reminder of their participation in the study.

Further participation required the completion of the Company Image Questionnaire (Appendix D) after signing up to interview with a specific company. This contained items about the amount of information on the company, the perception of the company as a place to work, and the perception of similarity between the student's needs and the company's opportunities. The latter two questions used a 7-point scale, anchored at both ends.

The final set of data consisted of the Interview Reaction Questionnaire (Appendix E), which was completed by the students immediately upon leaving the interview. This form requested information on the student's perception of the recruiter's characteristics (sex, estimate of age, ethnic background). A list of 12 recruiter behaviors was presented; subjects were instructed to check those behaviors their interviewer had performed. Included were such items as, "told me about the advantages of the job" and "summarized what I said." The items were developed from previous research on the interview (e.g., Alderfer & McCord, 1970; Hakel & Dunnette, 1970; Schmitt & Coyle, 1976) and extensive talks about interviewing with students during pilot testing. Students were also questioned about the following on a 7-point scale: satisfaction with the way
the recruiter conducted the interview, satisfaction with self-presentation during the interview, liking for the recruiter, and similarity between oneself and the recruiter in personality. The three items contained in the Company Image Questionnaire were repeated. Finally, the student was asked to describe the recruiter according to the six categories taken from Holland (1973).

Procedure

Procedure for data collection was modified to accord with the varied organization of placement offices in different Colleges of the University.

The participation of students enrolled in the College of Administrative Science, the majority of students in the present study, was solicited at the conclusion of a presentation of resume-writing conducted by the Assistant Placement Director of the College. The presentation was conducted twice during the first week of Winter Quarter. Upon completion of that session, the researcher was introduced to the students, and proceeded to explain the general nature of the project and the requirements of participation. In exchange for their participation, students were promised individual feedback on Holland's VPI and a summary of group results. Students agreeing to participate were given envelopes containing the preliminary questionnaires (Appendices A, B, and Holland's VPI), which were completed and returned at that session. Instructions for further participation were explained, and students were told to retain the sheet with this information as a reminder (Appendix C).
In the College of Administrative Science Placement Office, students were permitted to sign up to meet with a recruiter from a specific company beginning on a certain day - or any time thereafter. The first day sign-up was permitted was two weeks prior to the date of the recruiter's visit to the campus. Each day, sign-ups for several new companies were allowed. During the hours specifically allotted for this procedure, the researcher was in the sign-up area. After a student participating in the study signed up for the companies (s)he was interested in, the individual was given a Company Image Questionnaire to complete right away and return to the researcher. During the interviewing period, the Interview Reaction Questionnaires were distributed by the receptionist in the College Placement Office. As students passed her desk after leaving an interview, they would pick up a questionnaire, complete it in the reception area, and return it to the receptionist before leaving.

Participation of students in engineering and other areas was solicited via a seminar in techniques of effective interviewing. The seminar was conducted by the researcher and was offered in exchange for participation in the study; these students were promised individual and group results, as well. Publicity for the seminar included an advertisement in the campus newspaper, and notices in several sources (the Engineering Placement Office, engineering fraternities, to professors of senior-level engineering courses, bulletin boards outside engineering area offices and student lounges).
The notices are contained in Appendices F and G. Three seminars were conducted during the first two weeks of the quarter. Students in a variety of fields attended, and those who were interviewing on campus were asked to participate in the study.

Engineering students were also solicited for participation by means of an announcement at the beginning of two senior-level engineering classes. Individuals agreeing to participate mailed the preliminary questionnaire packet to the researcher.

The procedure for sign-ups in the Engineering Placement Office differed from that in Administrative Science. All recruitment schedules for Winter Quarter were made available at the beginning of the quarter, and students were able to sign them at any time during the day for any company. For this study, the receptionists at that office displayed copies of both the Company Image Questionnaire and the Interview Reaction Questionnaire. Study participants using that office were instructed to complete the Image form when they signed up for a company, and the Reaction form immediately after the interview. The student would complete the form in the reception area and leave it with the receptionist.

Four students used other placement offices on campus. These students were given questionnaires and envelopes addressed to the researcher as they reported scheduling interviews, and mailed the completed forms after their interviews.
CHAPTER IV
RESULTS

Overview

Results of the study will be presented in three sections, corresponding with the hypotheses. Section one contains the tests of the hypotheses dealing with the presence of desirable recruiter behaviors and the criterion measures of satisfaction. The results of the Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients will be presented. This data was also analyzed with a multiple regression of each satisfaction variable on the set of recruiter behaviors, as well as a canonical correlation of the perceived behaviors and attitudes. The frequencies of the recruiter behaviors will also be presented.

Results of Hypotheses 2a-b were tested using a Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient for both vocational orientation and age with the satisfaction measures, and a t-test between two means for the sex and race variables.

For Hypothesis 3, amount of prior information served as the moderator for the Pearson correlation between satisfaction and post-interview company image.

All analyses were conducted using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (Nie, Hull, Jenkins, Steinbrenner & Bent, 1975).
Recruiter Behaviors and Applicant Satisfaction

Data for the study consists of a total of 596 Interview Reaction Questionnaires collected from 84 participants. The number of interviews for each subject ranged from 1 to 26, with a median of 6.17. For the purposes of the present study, the interview was treated as the unit of analysis. According to Porter, Lawler and Hackman (1975), no two interviews are alike even though one member is the same, because of the interactive process which occurs.

Students were asked to report, in checklist form, on the presence of certain recruiter behaviors. Table 3 shows these behaviors, and the percentage of interviews for which these behaviors were perceived. For the 596 interviews, the total number of behaviors perceived ranged from 0 to 12, with a mean of 6.37 and a standard deviation of 2.21. It can be seen that, for this total set of interviews, the most frequently perceived behaviors were providing specific information about a follow-up contact (81.4%) and smiling during the interview (79.9%). The recruiter behaviors least often seen were telling the disadvantages of the job (21.0%) and summarizing what the applicant said (19.5%).

Because of the possibility that reading the questionnaire after the first interview might lead participants to alter their own interviewing behavior and thus later perceptions of recruiter behavior, this total set was compared with the first wave of interviews (that is, first interviews for each participant) and the sixth wave. An
### TABLE 3

**Frequencies of Perceived Recruiter Behaviors**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavior</th>
<th>Total Set</th>
<th>First Set</th>
<th>Sixth Set</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gave me specific information about a follow-up contact from the company.</td>
<td>81.4%</td>
<td>72.6%</td>
<td>81.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smiled during the interview.</td>
<td>79.9</td>
<td>83.3</td>
<td>79.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recalled information from my resume.</td>
<td>77.5</td>
<td>78.6</td>
<td>81.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used my name when addressing me.</td>
<td>70.8</td>
<td>70.2</td>
<td>68.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asked about my interests in career advancement.</td>
<td>62.4</td>
<td>54.8</td>
<td>64.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Told me specifically about the job I would have.</td>
<td>57.4</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>62.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Told me about the long-term prospects with the company.</td>
<td>48.8</td>
<td>48.8</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Told me about the advantages of the job.</td>
<td>45.6</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>47.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asked about my hobbies and outside interests.</td>
<td>44.1</td>
<td>52.4</td>
<td>45.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Told me about the success of others who joined the organization with backgrounds similar to mine.</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>35.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Told me about the disadvantages of the job.</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summarized what I said.</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** Sample size = 596 interviews for total set, 84 for the first interviews reported by the participants, and 48 for the sixth interviews.
examination of the frequencies (Table 3) indicates similar percentages for each group, suggesting the Interview Reaction Questionnaire did not have this effect.

Hypothesis 1a-d predicted that presence of these behaviors would be positively related to attitudinal measures taken directly after the interview. As can be seen from Table 4, all satisfaction measures were positively related to the presence of these recruiter behaviors. Missing data on the satisfaction measures was dealt with by listwise deletion of those cases. This method is preferable so that all correlations will be based on the same sample size, and is feasible with large samples and small amounts of missing data. The listwise deletion resulted in 591 cases utilized in the correlational analyses.

Further analyses were conducted to determine those recruiter behaviors which contributed most to the satisfaction variables. First, four stepwise multiple regression procedures will be presented, comparing each of the satisfaction variables with the recruiter behaviors. The results of a canonical correlation will also be discussed. Canonical correlation is a generalization of multiple regression (and the multivariate analog of simple correlation) in that it is appropriate when there are two or more predictor variables and two or more criterion variables (Dunham & Kravetz, 1975; Cooley & Lohnes, 1971). Canonical analysis provides a linear combination of each of two sets of variables such that the two sets are maximally related to one another. Thus, this technique can provide more information than is available from a series of multiple regression analyses.
### TABLE 4

Pearson Correlations Between Total Number of Perceived Behaviors and Reactions to the Interview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Total number of behaviors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am satisfied with the way the recruiter conducted the interview.</td>
<td>.50*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am satisfied with the impression I made on the recruiter during the interview.</td>
<td>.42*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judging from the interview, I like the recruiter as a person.</td>
<td>.42*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judging from the interview, the recruiter is similar to me in personality.</td>
<td>.44*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** Sample size = 591.

*p < .001
Results of the stepwise multiple regression procedures for each of four criterion measures (satisfaction with the conduct of the interview, satisfaction with self-presentation, liking for the recruiter, perceived similarity with recruiter in personality) are presented in Tables 5, 6, 7, and 8, respectively. Variables were selected for inclusion in the regression equation based on an examination of the multiple R at each step in the procedure. Clearly, it can be seen that the recruiter behaviors contributing most heavily to these attitudinal measures were "smiled during the interview" and "told me about the advantages of the job." This suggests that satisfaction with the interview is the result of both appropriate interpersonal behaviors as well as providing desired information.

Table 9 reports the results of the canonical analysis of the recruiter behaviors and satisfaction measures. The top section of Table 9 presents the summary of the canonical analysis, and the bottom section contains the loadings of the variables on the variates. The first canonical correlation (R = .58) relates all measures of satisfaction with the following recruiter behaviors: "used my name" (loading = .38), "told about advantages of the job" (loading = .53), "recalled information from my resume" (loading = .37), "smiled during the interview" (loading = .66), "summarized" (loading = .38), and "told about long-term prospects" (loading = .46). For most variables these results are similar to those obtained from the multiple regression. The second canonical correlation (R = .25), which is orthogonal to the first, relates "like the recruiter" (loading = .52) with "smiled during the interview" (loading = .55), "asked about
TABLE 5

Results of Stepwise Multiple Regression Using Twelve Recruiter Behaviors as Predictors of Satisfaction with Conduct of the Interview

Multiple R (five variables) = .53
Standard Error = 1.33
F = 46.60

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>R² change</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>Beta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Smiled during interview</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Told advantages</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-term prospects</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Told about follow-up contact</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recalled resume</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Variables listed in order they were entered by stepwise algorithm. These beta weights are for the regression equation with 12 independent variables.
TABLE 6

Results of Stepwise Multiple Regression Using Twelve Recruiter Behaviors as Predictors of Satisfaction with Self-Presentation During the Interview

Multiple R (four variables) = .42
Standard Error = 1.25
F = 32.22

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>R² change</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>Beta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Smiled during interview</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Told advantages</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Told about follow-up contact</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recalled resume</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Variables listed in order they were entered by stepwise algorithm. These beta weights are for the regression equation with 12 independent variables.
TABLE 7

Results of Stepwise Multiple Regression Using Twelve Recruiter Behaviors as Predictors of Liking the Recruiter

Multiple R (four variables) = .47
Standard Error = 1.29
F = 55.87

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>R² change</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>Beta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Smiled during interview</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Told advantages</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-term prospects</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recalled resume</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Variables listed in order they were entered by stepwise algorithm. These beta weights are for the regression equation with 12 independent variables.
TABLE 8

Results of Stepwise Multiple Regression Using Twelve Recruiter Behaviors as Predictors of Perceived Similarity with Recruiter in Personality

Multiple R (five variables) = .45  
Standard Error = 1.38  
F = 30.01

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>R² change</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>Beta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Smiled during interview</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Told advantages</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Told about success of others</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summarized</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asked about hobbies</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Variables listed in order they were entered by stepwise algorithm. These beta weights are for the regression equation with 12 independent variables.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Eigenvalue</th>
<th>Canonical Correlation</th>
<th>Wilk's Lambda</th>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>310.95</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>68.62</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Variables**

**Loadings**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Used my name</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific about job</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Told advantages</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>-.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Told disadvantages</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>-.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recalled resume</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asked about advancement</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>-.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asked about hobbies</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smiled during interview</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Told about success of others</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>-.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summarized</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-term prospects</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>-.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Told about follow-up contact</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 9 -- Continued

Canonical Correlation of Twelve Recruiter Behaviors and Four Satisfaction Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Loadings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied with conduct of interview</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied with self-impression</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Like recruiter</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruiter similar to me in personality</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Variables with loadings of .35 or greater were reported in the interpretation.
interests in career advancement" (loading = -0.55) and "told about a follow-up contact from the company" (loading = -0.41). This second set can be interpreted as liking for the recruiter being related to the recruiter smiling during the interview, not asking about interests in career advancement, and not telling about a follow-up contact from the company. However, while significant at the .001 level, it accounts for only 6% of the variance in the analysis.

Because canonical correlation represents the relationship of linear composites of two sets of variables, a relatively strong relationship may be obtained even though these linear functions may not extract significant portions of variance from their respective batteries. Stewart and Love (1968) developed an index based on canonical correlation which represents the amount of predicted variance in a set of variables. Using the index, the total proportion of variance in C (criterion variables) predictable from P (predictor variables) was found to be .25. This is the total shared variance of the two sets of variables. However, over 24% was accounted for by the first canonical correlation, emphasizing the lack of practical significance in the second canonical correlation.

Due to the high intercorrelations among the criterion variables (see Appendix H) and the results of the multivariate analyses, it was decided to combine these four scores into an index of overall satisfaction. This index was used to test hypotheses 2a-d and 3.
**Perceived Similarity and Interview Satisfaction**

Hypotheses 2a-d predicted that satisfaction with the interview and the recruiter would be greater when the applicant perceived similarity between him/herself and the recruiter on certain background characteristics.

Hypothesis 2a predicted that post-interview satisfaction would be related to perceived similarity in age, corresponding to Alderfer and McCord's (1970) finding that higher evaluations were given when the interviewer was a younger man. As can be seen from Table 2, there was a restriction of range for age of the subjects participating in this study: the modal age was 21. However, perceived age of the recruiter varied from the 20's to 60. Thus, it was decided to examine the relationship between age of the recruiter and satisfaction; results of this analysis are presented in Table 10. The low negative correlations suggest the trend predicted by the hypothesis: from the viewpoint of the college student, the older the recruiter, the lower the satisfaction with the interview and the interviewer.

In hypothesis 2b, it was predicted that satisfaction would be greater when both interviewer and interviewee were of the same sex than when the dyad was a mixed sex one. Data for this hypothesis are presented in Table 11. The criterion measure of overall satisfaction is the combined measure of the four satisfaction variables. A t-test between two means showed no significant difference (.05 level, one-tailed). Thus, hypothesis 2b was not supported.
TABLE 10

Pearson Correlation Coefficients Comparing Age of Recruiter with Satisfaction Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Age of Recruiter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with the conduct of the interview</td>
<td>-.12 (p &lt; .004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with the impression I made</td>
<td>-.08 (p &lt; .04)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Like the recruiter</td>
<td>-.11 (p &lt; .006)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruiter is similar to me in personality</td>
<td>-.11 (p &lt; .005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall satisfaction</td>
<td>-.12 (p &lt; .003)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Sample size = 511. The overall satisfaction variable was created by combining the four satisfaction measures.

TABLE 11

Means and Standard Deviations on Overall Satisfaction For Same Sex and Mixed Sex Dyads

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Same Sex</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>20.74</td>
<td>5.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different Sex</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>20.54</td>
<td>5.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Sample size = 566.
Hypothesis 2c predicted higher satisfaction for applicants with a recruiter of the same race than with a recruiter of a different ethnic background. Means and standard deviations on overall satisfaction for both groups are presented in Table 12. Due to the small number of applicants and recruiters who were non-white, the number of mixed race dyads is quite small. When samples are greatly different in size, the t ratio is calculated with different degrees of freedom (Hays, 1973; Nie, et al., 1975) and a pooled variance estimate is not made. Results of this analysis show a significant difference between two means (.05 level, one-tailed). While this provides some evidence for the prediction made in hypothesis 2c, the generalizability is questionable due to the sample size.

Hypothesis 2d predicted that higher perceived vocational congruence will be associated with greater overall satisfaction with the recruiter and the interview situation. In this study, vocational orientation of the applicant was measured by the perceived rankings on adjectives describing Holland's types.

The correlations between the applicant's perceived vocational orientation of him/herself and recruiter, based on these adjectives, are presented in Appendix I. The correlations of the applicants' perceived vocational orientation (using the adjectives) and scores on the VPI are shown in Appendix J.

Adjectives used to describe each of the six types were taken from Holland (1973), and students were asked to indicate their perception of the type most descriptive of them, as well as the second
TABLE 12

Means and Standard Deviations on Overall Satisfaction for Same Race and Mixed Race Dyads

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Same Race</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>20.74</td>
<td>5.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different Race</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>19.52</td>
<td>3.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Sample size = 401.

most descriptive type (see Background Information Questionnaire, Appendix A). Each student was also asked to complete this information as it described the recruiter (see Interview Reaction Questionnaire, Appendix E). These rankings were matched and categorized according to level of vocational congruence, from no agreement to perfect agreement. This data is shown in Table 13; Appendix K contains the decision rules used to construct the vocational congruence scale. The Pearson correlation of overall satisfaction with vocational congruence was .11 (p < .008 for N=522). Thus, there is a low positive relationship between overall satisfaction and perceived vocational congruence.

Satisfaction with Interview and Company Image

The third hypothesis predicted that amount of information an applicant had about the company prior to the interview would moderate the relationship between overall satisfaction with the interview and post-interview evaluation of the company. Evaluation of the
TABLE 13

Means and Standard Deviations on Overall Satisfaction and Sample Sizes for Six Levels of Vocational Congruence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Congruence</th>
<th>Satisfaction Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 (no agreement)</td>
<td>20.16</td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>20.38</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>20.62</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>21.25</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>20.89</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 (perfect agreement)</td>
<td>22.21</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Sample size = 522.

company was operationalized with two items: "image of the company as a place to work" and "perceived similarity between my needs and the company's opportunities." Overall satisfaction was measured by a combination of the four satisfaction variables.

Results of these analyses are presented in Table 14. For the item, "image of the company as a place to work," the relationship with interview satisfaction was significantly greater with almost no prior information than with a lot of prior information. (These calculations were based on a test for the difference between correlations after the Fisher r to z transformation; Hays, 1973.) "Perceived similarity between my needs and the company's opportunities" was significantly greater with almost no information than
TABLE 14
Pearson Correlations Between Overall Interview Satisfaction and Company Evaluation Moderated by Pre-Interview Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount of Information</th>
<th>Almost None</th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>A Lot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Image of the company as a place to work</td>
<td>.663\text{a}</td>
<td>.573</td>
<td>.402\text{a}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived similarity between my needs and company opportunities</td>
<td>.499\text{c}</td>
<td>.575\text{b}</td>
<td>.177\text{bc}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Correlations with common subscripts are significantly different. Sample size = 149 for almost no information, 239 for some information, and 60 for a lot of information.
with a lot of information. These results do lend some support to the hypothesis that amount of prior information moderates the relationship between satisfaction with the interview and post-interview evaluation of the company.
CHAPTER V
DISCUSSION

The purpose of the present study was to investigate the relationship of recruiter behaviors, perceived applicant-interviewer similarity, and prior information about a company to applicants' reactions to the campus recruitment interview. College students (N=84) currently seeking full-time, permanent positions voluntarily participated in the study. Each student provided background data and completed Holland's VPI. For each interview participants provided information on knowledge of the company prior to the interview and their reaction to the interview immediately after it took place.

Summary of the Results

The major findings of this study were as follows:

1) Frequency of perceived desirable behaviors ranged from "gave specific information about a follow-up contact" (81.4% of interviews) and "smiled during the interview" (79.9%) to "summarized what I said" (only 19.5% of the interviews) and "told about the disadvantages of the job" (21.0%).

2) The presence of desirable recruiter behaviors was positively related to each of the following attitudinal measures: satisfaction with the way the recruiter conducted the interview, satisfaction
with self-impression, liking for the recruiter as a person, and perceived similarity between applicant and interviewer personalities.

3) Multiple regression analyses of several attitudinal measures on recruiter behaviors showed that the behaviors most contributing to positive reactions were "smiled during the interview" and "told me about the advantages of the job."

4) Results of a canonical correlation of behaviors and attitudes showed that all measures of satisfaction were related to the following behaviors: "used my name," "told about the advantages of the job," "recalled information from my resume," "smiled during the interview," "summarized what I said," and "told about long-term prospects." The second canonical correlation related "liking for the interviewer" with "smiled during the interview," not asking about interests in career advancement, and not telling about a follow-up contact from the company. However, this second set accounted for a very small percentage of the variance and, while statistically significant, is not practically significant.

5) A low negative correlation showed that to some extent the older the recruiter, the lower the applicant's overall satisfaction with the interview and interviewer.

6) Applicant-recruiter congruence on the sex variable did not result in higher satisfaction than when applicants and interviewers were of different sexes, based on a t-test between means.

7) The analysis of applicant-recruiter congruence on ethnic background showed that overall satisfaction was significantly lower for the mixed race dyads than same race dyads. However, it should be
noted that the sample size of mixed race dyads was quite small, limiting the generalizability of these findings.

8) A low positive correlation was found between applicant-recruiter vocational congruence (as perceived by the applicant) and overall satisfaction.

9) Amount of information the applicant had about a company prior to the interview was found to moderate the relationship between company image and overall satisfaction. A significantly higher relationship was found between "image of a company as a place to work" and overall satisfaction when almost no prior information was available than when a lot of prior information was available. "Perceived similarity between my needs and the company's opportunities" had a significantly higher relationship with satisfaction when the applicant had almost none or some information about a company than when (s)he had a lot of prior information about a company.

In summary, the results supported Hypotheses 1a-d which predicted that the perceived behaviors would be related to attitudinal measures. Hypotheses 2a-d, suggesting a relationship between applicants' perceived background similarity with the recruiter and satisfaction measures, received some support for three variables - congruence on age, race, and vocational orientation - but not for the dimension of sex congruence. Hypothesis 3, proposing that prior information functions as a moderator between satisfaction with the interview and company image, was supported.
Related Findings and Implications

A unique feature of the recruitment of college students is that the campus interview is only a preliminary step, to be followed by a plant visit prior to the hiring decision. As a result of this procedure, and due in part to the current labor market situation, the applicant is not likely to make a final decision about the company based on the 30-minute campus interview. However, the present study supports previous research showing that this type of interview is important for establishing rapport and for the organization's public relations.

This study was designed partly in response to issues raised in the Alderfer and McCord (1970) and Schmitt and Coyle (1976) articles. As was noted in Chapter II, these authors proposed that research on the applicant's assessment of the recruitment interview should be conducted such that questions would be asked immediately after the interview took place - a strategy neither set of authors utilized. Thus, in both studies, the interview outcome might have influenced reported evaluations. Implicit in this criticism seems to be the notion that, based on the totality of interviews, the student has formed a generalized concept of a good or bad interview - and certain recruiter behaviors are associated with each type. Thus, a student questioned some time after the interview might reason as follows: "The interview must have been good because they offered me a job and I accepted it. Therefore, the interviewer
must have been friendly and interested in me," and so forth. In both studies, certain recruiter behaviors were shown to be related to interview outcomes (i.e., accepting an offer).

The present study required applicants to evaluate the interview right after it occurred, and the criterion variables were selected to assess applicant reactions to the interviewer and the interview situation rather than outcomes. It was found that these attitudinal measures, when taken directly after the interview, were found to be related to demonstrating interpersonal behaviors and providing information about the job. As cited, prior research has shown variables in these clusters to be important in several perceived outcomes of the interview. Thus, this study confirms the importance of two aspects of interview behavior: the interpersonal conduct of the interview (such as smiling, recalling information from the applicants' resume, and summarizing) and providing information (about the advantages of the job, and long-term prospects with the company) upon applicant reactions to the interview when knowledge of outcomes cannot alter the assessment. It is interesting to note that a good interviewer, much as a good applicant, scores high on personal relations or sociability.

Applicants were questioned about only 12 recruiter behaviors, and, of course, the domain of possible behaviors is considerably larger. The amount of variance accounted for between this set and the attitudinal measures suggests that other features of the interview are important as well. For example, an interviewer who would
talk during the entire 30 minutes would not be favorably evaluated - even if that interviewer provided much valuable information.

It should be remembered that one important limitation of this research is the correlational nature of the design, and the resulting limitations on causal interpretation. The interview is a reciprocal influence process. It may be that the interview was highly rated because the applicant perceived many desirable behaviors, or as a reaction to the number of behaviors, rather than their desirability. It is also possible that the interviewer was particularly effective in an attempt to impress a sought-after candidate. In addition, because it was not possible to have an independent judge observe the interview, there was no check on the presence of the interviewer behaviors.

An issue in research of this type is the possibility that the questionnaire itself might influence applicant perceptions and conduct in the interview situation. In the present study, however, the frequency of perceived behaviors remained fairly stable for this sample of students throughout many interviews (see Table 3). These results suggest that completion of the questionnaire after the first interview did not result in reporting that later interviews contained behaviors in vastly different proportions. Possibly, this sample of students—primarily business majors—were better prepared for their interviews than most students in other majors, and hence were not influenced by questionnaire items.
Given the findings of previous research that perceived similarity on various biographical characteristics can lead to a more favorable assessment of an applicant by an interviewer, it is not surprising that some support would be found for this notion in applicant assessments.

Alderfer and Mc Cord demonstrated that "the interviewer seemed like a successful younger man" was one feature that differentiated a good interview from a poor interview. From this item, it is difficult to determine whether the students were referring to the trait of a successful appearance, youth, gender, or a combination of these. If age is one of the traits, the slight negative correlation between satisfaction and age of the recruiter in the present study offers some support. However, the trend is weak, and other results showed essentially no relationship between the total number of behaviors perceived and recruiter age ($r = -.05$). Perhaps satisfaction led to the judgment that these recruiters were older. Again, recruiter ages were based on applicant estimates because recruiters could not be questioned, and no independent judgment was available.

The finding that satisfaction is related to perceived congruence on ethnic background agrees with previous research which has shown that black job-seekers respond differently to black interviewers than to white interviewers (Ledvinka, 1971; 1973). Almost all of the mixed-race dyads in the present study involved a non-white applicant. If the non-white subjects in the present study did not interact as effectively with the white interviewers, the recruiters would respond to them differently, thus resulting in a
less effective interview. In addition, due to the unequal sample sizes involved in this finding, it should be replicated in other studies to be accepted with confidence.

As described earlier, Holland's theory of vocational choice suggests that congruence between personal and environmental orientations should result in satisfaction. The environmental orientation is determined by characteristics of important people in the setting (in the present case, the recruiter). Student perceptions of their own type and that of the recruiter were found to be very slightly related to the satisfaction measures. It should be considered, however, that most research on Holland's person-environment congruency has studied a school environment experienced for several months or years; the recruitment interview may be of insufficient length to make this determination.

In the present study, the similarity notion was not supported for the sex congruence variable. In an earlier study, Frank and Hackman (1975) included sex in one of the 10 variables they utilized. Admissions officers at a highly selective university were asked to evaluate dossiers for admission. They found marked differences among three interviewers in the similarity-favorableness relationships: strong positive for one, low positive for another, and no relationship for a third. The authors pointed out that previous research finding a similarity-favorableness relationship generally involved simulations of the selection process in which background characteristics have been experimentally varied. These results, then, might not be appropriate for actual interviews in organizations.
In addition, the need for social validation demonstrated by the similarity-favorability relationship might vary across individuals, perhaps moderated by self-concept. Therefore, in view of the weak relationships found for the background similarity-favorable assessment relationship in the present study, considerable research is needed to determine the extent of this phenomenon from the applicant's point of view.

Company image as viewed by people seeking jobs has been a neglected area of research. Knowledge of the firm that the applicant brings to the interview situation is likely to be important in evaluation of a representative of that organization. Results of this study suggest that the amount of information that an applicant has when making a commitment to interview may influence the importance given to that interaction in determining post-interview image of the company. If an organization is not well-known, the interview can be an extremely useful tool to attract new employees when they have few other sources of information about the company. Of course, it is possible that the desire to be employed by a company influences both reactions to the interview and perceptions of the company.

It is interesting to note that further examination of the data (see Appendix L) revealed that amount of prior information as a predictor was slightly related to liking for the recruiter \( (r = .16, \ p < .001) \), post-interview image of the company as a place to work \( (r = .19, \ p < .001) \), and post-interview perception that one's needs are similar to the organization's opportunities \( (r = .18, \ p < .001) \).
Of all company image premeasures, however, perceived similarity with the organization was the best predictor of liking for the recruiter ($r = .28, p < .001$) and satisfaction with the interview ($r = .25, p < .001$). In addition, prior company image as a place to work was related to the ratings on this same measure after the interview ($r = .44, p < .001$); prior similarity between one's needs and company opportunities was related to this item completed after the interview ($r = .43, p < .001$). Those companies the applicants selected to interview were, for the most part, positively rated on the pre-interview company image items. Thus, it may be that these students possessed reasonably certain ideas about the firms, and the recruitment interview served as a means of confirming or validating this information for them. Because little is known about the nature and determinants of company image, further research is needed in this area.

Limitations, Conclusions, and Future Research

In conducting this study, an attempt was made to investigate reactions to the interview immediately after it took place. One of the important questions not dealt with is the relationship of the recruitment interview to outcomes such as acceptance of a job offer. Well-conducted interviews are important for an organization's public relations; they are also desirable if they increase the likelihood of acceptance by the sought-after candidate. Thus, interview outcomes should be a focus of future research, in addition to measuring attitudes directly after the interview.
Another feature that would be desirable in research on the recruitment interview would be independent judgments of what actually occurred in the interview; only the applicant's perceptions were available in the present study. If, for example, an applicant hopes to join Company X, this need might influence both perceptions of and reactions to that firm's interviewer. In order to gain a better understanding of the influence process which occurs, it would be desirable if both applicant and recruiter could provide assessments of the interview.

In this study, the pre-interview measures of company image were taken at the time of sign-up for an interview. It is likely that at least some students seek information during the time period between sign-up and interview. Thus, a more useful study of the interview's unique effects might involve collecting this data just before the interview.

As discussed in Chapter II, there is a need to conduct research using students from a variety of disciplines. This project, while attempting to question students from two colleges, used primarily students in the business area (especially accounting majors). The numerous attempts to recruit engineering students through advertisements and notices (see Chapter III) was largely unsuccessful; and, due to the provisions of the Buckley amendment, the researcher was not able to obtain student telephone numbers to contact them and request participation. In this case, the procedures used in different placement offices altered the type of students available to participate.
Concomitantly, it cannot be determined how the participants of this study differ from those who declined to participate. It seems reasonable, on the basis of the way these students were contacted, that they are more concerned about maximizing job-seeking efforts than students who did not participate. However, the effect this difference might have upon reactions to the recruiter and interview situation is not clear with the present state of knowledge in this area.

Some additional analyses were conducted in an attempt to better understand these issues (see Appendix I). No covariation was found between the students' overall grade point average and the number of interviews they had \((r = .03)\). An examination of a scatter diagram showed no evidence of a curvilinear relationship between these two variables. A low positive correlation \((r = .19, p < .001)\) was found between grade point average in the major field and amount of information reported prior to the interview. The extent to which abler students are more aware of different firms or conduct more extensive pre-interview research should be studied further.

There are many possible behaviors a recruiter may perform during the course of an interview. Due to potential ambiguity of the items and time constraints during data collection, the questionnaire used in the present study contained only positive behaviors. Future research on applicant reactions should include negative behaviors as well.
Much additional research is needed to fully understand the recruitment process. One approach that should be productive would involve extensive interviews with students throughout their job-seeking and interviewing, similar to Glueck's (1974) study of decision-making. The most important issues that could be investigated would systematically study the whole recruitment process, including the different sources of information about companies and how they are utilized (as suggested by Lawler, 1973), how the plant visit is evaluated, and the way in which reactions to first interviews differ from later ones. A comprehensive program such as this should provide new insights into the area of person-organization matching.
APPENDICES
APPENDIX A

BACKGROUND INFORMATION QUESTIONNAIRE

Name: __________________________ Date: __________

Expected date of graduation __________ Degree: __________________________

Age: __________ Sex: M F Ethnic background: (check one)
____Caucasian _____ Spanish-American
____Afro-American _____ American Indian
____Oriental-American _____ other (specify)

Major: __________________________ GPA in major: __________ Overall GPA: __________

Number of part time jobs you have had _____ Full time jobs _____

Have you had any interviews during the recruiting season? _____
If so, how many? _______

Have you received any plant visit or job offers to date? _______
If so, how many? Plant visits _____ Job offers _____

Often, individuals seeking jobs have certain preferences that they will try to satisfy. For example, you may prefer a certain geographical area, and this preference influences your actual job choice. Please specify any such requirements that are important to you in your search. (For example, under geographical preference a response might read, "Midwest only - prefer urban area in Ohio").

geographical location:
salary requirements:
company size:
other (specify):
Place a 1 before the group of adjectives which best describes you, and a 2 before the next best description of you.

___ realistic; frank, persistent, practical, stable

___ investigative; critical, methodical, rational, precise

___ artistic; intuitive, idealistic, imaginative, impractical

___ social; generous, kind, understanding, responsible

___ enterprising; domineering, energetic, acquisitive, optimistic

___ conventional; calm, conscientious, efficient, orderly
APPENDIX B

CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH

I consent to participate in the research investigation, "Employment interviewing."

The general purpose of the research procedure has been explained to me. This research is being performed by Barbara L. Karol under the direction of Dr. Milton D. Hakel.

I understand that participation in this research is voluntary. I understand my identity will NOT be revealed in any publication, document, computer data storage, or in any other way which relates to this research.

Signed _______________________

Date _______________________

*    *    *    *    *

Please print your name, local address, and local phone number below. This information will remain strictly confidential and will be used ONLY in the event that I need to contact you for clarification or completion of your responses.

Print name _______________________

Local address _______________________

__________________________________

Local phone number _______________________
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To complete your participation in the study, you will be requested to respond to two very brief questionnaires for each interview:

1) A Company Image Questionnaire - complete one for each company you sign up to interview with. The questionnaire will be available where you sign up for interviews - return it there, or to Barbara Karol (address below).

2) An Interview Reaction Questionnaire - complete one after each interview, as soon as possible after your interview - available from the receptionist in the placement office. Return it to the receptionist, or to Barbara Karol (address below).

If you have any questions about this project at any time, please contact Barbara Karol at:

(office) 404C West 17th Avenue - Department of Psychology
Columbus, 43210
Phone: 422-8145

(home) 101 Curl Drive, #1148
Columbus, 43210
Phone: 421-1158

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION!!!
APPENDIX D
COMPANY IMAGE QUESTIONNAIRE

Your name: Date:

Company:

For the company named above, please circle the number which best represents your opinion:

The amount of information I have about this company is:

1. almost no information
2. some information
3. a lot of information

My opinion of this company as a place to work is:

good 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 bad

My opinion of the similarity between my needs and this company's opportunities is that they are:

very similar 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 very different

Thank you for your time.
APPENDIX E

INTERVIEW REACTION QUESTIONNAIRE

Name: ___________________________ Date: ___________________________

Company: ___________________________

Recruiter: ___________________________

Description of recruiter - Sex: M F (circle one)
Estimate age: ___________________________
Ethnic Background: ___________________________

Each statement below refers to a possible behavior of a recruiter during the interview. Check those behaviors which the recruiter did when interviewing you.

____ 1. used my name when addressing me
____ 2. told me specifically about the job I would have
____ 3. told me about the advantages of the job
____ 4. told me about the disadvantages of the job
____ 5. recalled information from my resume
____ 6. asked about my interests in career advancement
____ 7. asked about my hobbies and outside interests
____ 8. smiled during the interview
____ 9. told me about the successes of others who joined the organization with backgrounds similar to mine
____ 10. summarized what I said
____ 11. told me about the long-term prospects with the company
____ 12. gave me specific information about a follow-up contact from the company
Circle the number which best expresses your opinion.

1. I am satisfied with the way the recruiter conducted the interview.
   very satisfied 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 very dissatisfied

2. I am satisfied with the impression I made on the recruiter during the interview.
   very satisfied 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 very dissatisfied

3. Judging from the interview, I like the recruiter as a person.
   strongly agree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 strongly disagree

4. Judging from the interview, the recruiter is similar to me in personality.
   very similar 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 very dissimilar

5. The amount of information I have about this company is:
   1. almost no information
   2. some information
   3. a lot of information

6. My opinion of this company as a place to work is:
   good 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 bad

7. My opinion of the similarity between my needs and this company's opportunities is that they are:
   very similar 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 very different

Place a 1 before the group of adjectives which best describes the recruiter, and a 2 before the next best description of the recruiter.

___ realistic; frank, persistent, practical, stable
___ investigative; critical, methodical, rational, precise
___ artistic; intuitive, idealistic, imaginative, impractical
___ social; generous, kind, understanding, responsible
___ enterprising; domineering, energetic, acquisitive, optimistic
___ conventional; calm, conscientious, efficient, orderly
Comments:

Thank you for your cooperation.
APPENDIX F

ATTENTION: GRADUATING STUDENTS PREPARING TO INTERVIEW WITH
RECRUITERS DURING WINTER QUARTER, 1977

Are you wondering how to tackle the job-hunting game? Doctoral candidate in Industrial/Organizational Psychology (I have considerable experience training interviews and applicants) will offer a FREE class on,

"HOW TO BE AN EFFECTIVE JOB APPLICANT"

The session will consist of a presentation on how to interview followed by a question and answer period.

In exchange, I will ask you to fill out a short questionnaire as part of my dissertation research (that's fair, isn't it?).

Sessions will be held at 3:00 PM and again at 7:00 PM on Thursday, January 6, 1977. If you can't attend either of these times, an alternate date and/or time will be arranged.

Any questions? Contact Barbara Karol at 422-8145 (office) or 421-1158 (home).

If you are interested in attending, please list your name, address, phone number, and preferred time - I'll contact you with the location (the session will be held ON CAMPUS).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>PHONE</th>
<th>PREFERRED TIME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3:00, 7:00, other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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ATTENTION: GRADUATING STUDENTS PREPARING TO INTERVIEW WITH RECRUITERS DURING WINTER QUARTER, 1977

Are you wondering how to tackle the job-hunting game?

"It's not what you say, but how you say it" - if you will be interviewing with recruiters during Winter Quarter, this saying has meaning for you NOW.

As you begin your career, every interview is potentially vital for your future progress. Help yourself to a more rewarding career by improving your interviewing style and self-presentation skills.

Doctoral candidate in Industrial/Organizational Psychology (I have considerable experience training interviewers and applicants) will offer a FREE seminar on:

"HOW TO BE AN EFFECTIVE JOB APPLICANT"

PROGRAM:

I. How to prepare for interviews to maximize your effectiveness.

II. Improving your self-presentation in the interview situation.

III. Exchange of information about your interviewing experiences.

IV. (Tuesday session only) Mr. Steve Warren, Employment Manager, Ross Laboratories, will be present to discuss interviewing and answer your questions about how to conduct a successful job-hunting campaign.

Seminar will be offered twice:

     Monday, January 10, 1977 - 4:00 PM - Hitchcock 031
     Tuesday, January 11, 1977 - 7:00 PM - Smith 1005 (home)

Questions? Contact Barbara Karol at 422-8145 (office) or 421-1158
# APPENDIX H

## TABLE 15

Intercorrelation Matrix of Criterion Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Satisfaction with conduct of interview</th>
<th>Self-impression</th>
<th>Like recruiter</th>
<th>Similar in personality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with conduct of interview</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-impression</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Like recruiter</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Similar in personality</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Sample size = 591*
APPENDIX I

TABLE 16

Correlations Between Applicant's Rating of Vocational Orientation for Self and Recruiter

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RATINGS OF APPLICANT</th>
<th>Real</th>
<th>Inves</th>
<th>Artis</th>
<th>Soc</th>
<th>Ent</th>
<th>Conv</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Real</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.37*</td>
<td>-.43*</td>
<td>-.33*</td>
<td>-.29*</td>
<td>-.35*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inves</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>.15*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artis</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>-.16*</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.18*</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soc</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.22*</td>
<td>-.41*</td>
<td>-.22*</td>
<td>-.26*</td>
<td>-.34*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ent</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.31*</td>
<td>-.09*</td>
<td>-.23*</td>
<td>-.26*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conv</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td>.19*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Sample size = 511. Holland's types as follows: Real = Realistic, Inves = Investigative, Artis = Artistic, Soc = Social, Ent = Enterprising, Conv = Conventional.

*p < .001
APPENDIX J

TABLE 17

Correlations Between Applicant Reported Vocational Orientation Based on Adjectives and Score on Holland's VFI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adjectives</th>
<th>Real</th>
<th>Inves</th>
<th>Artis</th>
<th>Soc</th>
<th>Ent</th>
<th>Conv</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Real</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.22*</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inves</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.24*</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artis</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.23*</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.21*</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soc</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.21*</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ent</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.27*</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.27*</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conv</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Sample size = 84. Holland's types as follows: Real = Realistic, Inves = Investigative, Artis = Artistic, Soc = Social, Ent = Enterprising, Conv = Conventional.

*p < .05
APPENDIX K

Decision Rules for Vocational Congruence Scale

In order to test Hypothesis 2d, a scale of vocational congruence was constructed to correspond to the research question.

Level of congruence was determined by a matching of each applicant's self-rating with the rating the applicant gave to the recruiter. The questionnaire listed six possible vocational types; the rater ranked the most descriptive (score = 1) and second most descriptive (score = 2) types for himself, and then after the interview, for the recruiter.

For each person, a six-digit score was obtained incorporating the rankings (1 or 2) given for the vocational types in the following order: Realistic, Investigative, Artistic, Social, Enterprising, Conventional, respectively. The response pattern was devised by adding each applicant's self-rating to the rating the applicant gave to the recruiter. For example, the combination of 120000 for self and 201000 for the recruiter results in a response pattern of 321000. The six numbers comprising the response pattern are presented such that 240000 represents the same level of congruence as 020040, only on different vocational types. The coding system ignores which specific vocational types are matched, and regards "0" as an unimportant match.
Congruence was coded in ascending order, according to increasing similarity between descriptions of the recruiter and applicant on the six types:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Response Pattern</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>212100</td>
<td>No matching on any variable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>114000</td>
<td>Match on second most descriptive rating only (in this example, Artistic).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>321000</td>
<td>First and second most descriptive ratings match for one variable (in this example, Realistic); remaining variables do not match.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>222000</td>
<td>First most descriptive ratings match for one variable; second most descriptive ratings do not match.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>330000</td>
<td>First and second most descriptive ratings match for one variable; second and first most descriptive ratings match for another variable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>240000</td>
<td>Complete matching of first and second most descriptive ratings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is recognized that this scale is only one of several possibilities. In this study, only two of Holland's types, rather than six, were considered; and just a subset of adjectives for each vocational type were utilized.
APPENDIX L

TABLE 18

Intercorrelations Among Applicant Background Variables, Company Image, Recruiter Behaviors, and Satisfaction Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Variable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AGEAPP</td>
<td>Age of applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAJORGPA</td>
<td>Grade Point Average in major field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALLGPA</td>
<td>Overall Grade Point Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUMJOBS</td>
<td>Number of part-time and full-time jobs held, prior to participation in this study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUMINT</td>
<td>Number of interviews and plant visits during current recruiting season, prior to participation in this study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUMOFFRS</td>
<td>Number of job offers received prior to participation in this study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUMINTER</td>
<td>Number of interviews during course of the present study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PREINFO</td>
<td>Amount of company information at time of sign-up for the interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PREIMAGE</td>
<td>Image of the company as a place to work - at the time of sign-up for the interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRESIM</td>
<td>Similarities between my needs and the company’s opportunities - at time of sign-up for the interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGEREC</td>
<td>Estimated age of recruiter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USEDNAME</td>
<td>Used my name when addressing me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPECIFIC</td>
<td>Told me specifically about the job I would have</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADVANTAG</td>
<td>Told me about the advantages of the job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISADVAN</td>
<td>Told me about the disadvantages of the job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESUME</td>
<td>Recalled information from my resume</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADVANCE</td>
<td>Asked about my interests in career advancement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOBBIES</td>
<td>Asked about my hobbies and outside interests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMILED</td>
<td>Smiled during the interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHERSUC</td>
<td>Told me about the successes of others who joined the organization with backgrounds similar to mine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Variable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUMMARIZ</td>
<td>Summarized what I said</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LONGTERM</td>
<td>Told me about the long-term prospects with the company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOLLOWUP</td>
<td>Gave me specific information about a follow-up contact from the company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTBEH</td>
<td>Total number of recruiter behaviors perceived by applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SATISFAC</td>
<td>I am satisfied with the way the recruiter conducted the interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SELFIMPR</td>
<td>I am satisfied with the impression I made on the recruiter during the interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIKERECR</td>
<td>Judging from the interview, I like the recruiter as a person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIMPERS</td>
<td>Judging from the interview, the recruiter is similar to me in personality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSTINFO</td>
<td>Amount of company information after the interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSTIMAG</td>
<td>Image of the company as a place to work - after the interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSTSIM</td>
<td>Similarities between my needs and the company's opportunities - after the interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALLSAT</td>
<td>Overall satisfaction (combination of four satisfaction measures)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFRESC</td>
<td>USLDHME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* - SIONIF. LE .001  ** - SIONIF. LE .001

(999.000 IS PRINTED IF A COEFFICIENT CANNOT BE COMPUTED)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SUMMARY</th>
<th>LONGLAM</th>
<th>FOLLOWUP</th>
<th>TOTREM</th>
<th>SATISFACT</th>
<th>SELFIMP</th>
<th>LIKEREAS</th>
<th>SIMPERS</th>
<th>POSTINFO</th>
<th>POSTINGAG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADDAX</td>
<td>0.6271</td>
<td>-0.0129</td>
<td>-0.0796</td>
<td>-0.0945</td>
<td>0.0122</td>
<td>-0.0352</td>
<td>-0.0081</td>
<td>-0.0697</td>
<td>-0.0787</td>
<td>-0.1325**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADL</td>
<td>-0.0541</td>
<td>-0.0548</td>
<td>-0.0458</td>
<td>-0.0952</td>
<td>0.0196</td>
<td>-0.0613</td>
<td>0.0138</td>
<td>0.0215</td>
<td>0.0246**</td>
<td>0.0512**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AKYR</td>
<td>0.1315</td>
<td>0.0755</td>
<td>0.0616</td>
<td>-0.0372</td>
<td>0.2332</td>
<td>0.0628</td>
<td>0.1013</td>
<td>0.0934</td>
<td>0.1378</td>
<td>0.0734**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KULT</td>
<td>0.3478**</td>
<td>0.0319</td>
<td>0.0710</td>
<td>0.0844</td>
<td>0.3073</td>
<td>-0.0465</td>
<td>0.3448</td>
<td>0.3403</td>
<td>0.4109**</td>
<td>0.0169**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KURRER</td>
<td>-0.1315</td>
<td>-0.0548</td>
<td>-0.0458</td>
<td>-0.0952</td>
<td>0.0196</td>
<td>-0.0613</td>
<td>0.0138</td>
<td>0.0215</td>
<td>0.0246**</td>
<td>0.0512**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KURRER</td>
<td>0.1315</td>
<td>0.0755</td>
<td>0.0616</td>
<td>-0.0372</td>
<td>0.2332</td>
<td>0.0628</td>
<td>0.1013</td>
<td>0.0934</td>
<td>0.1378</td>
<td>0.0734**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRAK</td>
<td>0.1315</td>
<td>0.0755</td>
<td>0.0616</td>
<td>-0.0372</td>
<td>0.2332</td>
<td>0.0628</td>
<td>0.1013</td>
<td>0.0934</td>
<td>0.1378</td>
<td>0.0734**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEFTE</td>
<td>-0.1315</td>
<td>-0.0548</td>
<td>-0.0458</td>
<td>-0.0952</td>
<td>0.0196</td>
<td>-0.0613</td>
<td>0.0138</td>
<td>0.0215</td>
<td>0.0246**</td>
<td>0.0512**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEFTE</td>
<td>0.1315</td>
<td>0.0755</td>
<td>0.0616</td>
<td>-0.0372</td>
<td>0.2332</td>
<td>0.0628</td>
<td>0.1013</td>
<td>0.0934</td>
<td>0.1378</td>
<td>0.0734**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KILE</td>
<td>0.1315</td>
<td>0.0755</td>
<td>0.0616</td>
<td>-0.0372</td>
<td>0.2332</td>
<td>0.0628</td>
<td>0.1013</td>
<td>0.0934</td>
<td>0.1378</td>
<td>0.0734**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KILE</td>
<td>0.1315</td>
<td>0.0755</td>
<td>0.0616</td>
<td>-0.0372</td>
<td>0.2332</td>
<td>0.0628</td>
<td>0.1013</td>
<td>0.0934</td>
<td>0.1378</td>
<td>0.0734**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KILE</td>
<td>0.1315</td>
<td>0.0755</td>
<td>0.0616</td>
<td>-0.0372</td>
<td>0.2332</td>
<td>0.0628</td>
<td>0.1013</td>
<td>0.0934</td>
<td>0.1378</td>
<td>0.0734**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KILE</td>
<td>0.1315</td>
<td>0.0755</td>
<td>0.0616</td>
<td>-0.0372</td>
<td>0.2332</td>
<td>0.0628</td>
<td>0.1013</td>
<td>0.0934</td>
<td>0.1378</td>
<td>0.0734**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KILE</td>
<td>0.1315</td>
<td>0.0755</td>
<td>0.0616</td>
<td>-0.0372</td>
<td>0.2332</td>
<td>0.0628</td>
<td>0.1013</td>
<td>0.0934</td>
<td>0.1378</td>
<td>0.0734**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KILE</td>
<td>0.1315</td>
<td>0.0755</td>
<td>0.0616</td>
<td>-0.0372</td>
<td>0.2332</td>
<td>0.0628</td>
<td>0.1013</td>
<td>0.0934</td>
<td>0.1378</td>
<td>0.0734**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KILE</td>
<td>0.1315</td>
<td>0.0755</td>
<td>0.0616</td>
<td>-0.0372</td>
<td>0.2332</td>
<td>0.0628</td>
<td>0.1013</td>
<td>0.0934</td>
<td>0.1378</td>
<td>0.0734**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KILE</td>
<td>0.1315</td>
<td>0.0755</td>
<td>0.0616</td>
<td>-0.0372</td>
<td>0.2332</td>
<td>0.0628</td>
<td>0.1013</td>
<td>0.0934</td>
<td>0.1378</td>
<td>0.0734**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KILE</td>
<td>0.1315</td>
<td>0.0755</td>
<td>0.0616</td>
<td>-0.0372</td>
<td>0.2332</td>
<td>0.0628</td>
<td>0.1013</td>
<td>0.0934</td>
<td>0.1378</td>
<td>0.0734**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KILE</td>
<td>0.1315</td>
<td>0.0755</td>
<td>0.0616</td>
<td>-0.0372</td>
<td>0.2332</td>
<td>0.0628</td>
<td>0.1013</td>
<td>0.0934</td>
<td>0.1378</td>
<td>0.0734**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* - SIGNIF. LE .01     ** - SIGNIF. LE .001

(99,000 IS PRINTED IF A COEFFICIENT CANNOT BE COMPUTED)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>POSTSIM</th>
<th>ALLSAT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acroft</td>
<td>-0.1452**</td>
<td>-0.0228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majuropa</td>
<td>0.0294</td>
<td>0.0034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allga</td>
<td>0.0094</td>
<td>0.0097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rimbis</td>
<td>-0.1115</td>
<td>0.0112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wintuk</td>
<td>-0.0443</td>
<td>-0.0181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wintuk</td>
<td>-0.1115</td>
<td>0.0137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wintuk</td>
<td>0.0047</td>
<td>0.0045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purtor</td>
<td>0.1772**</td>
<td>0.1234*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purtor</td>
<td>0.2240**</td>
<td>0.2240**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purtor</td>
<td>0.6642**</td>
<td>0.6519**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arest</td>
<td>-0.0777</td>
<td>-0.1274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lachlan</td>
<td>0.2632</td>
<td>0.2600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specif</td>
<td>0.1355**</td>
<td>0.1457**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanica</td>
<td>0.2240**</td>
<td>0.2166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disavan</td>
<td>0.0115</td>
<td>0.1156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resimi</td>
<td>0.3162**</td>
<td>0.1268**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antyle</td>
<td>0.0575</td>
<td>0.1510**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitimus</td>
<td>0.0534</td>
<td>0.1409**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitimus</td>
<td>0.1711**</td>
<td>0.0697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitimus</td>
<td>0.1419**</td>
<td>0.1954**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitimus</td>
<td>0.1217**</td>
<td>0.2227**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitimus</td>
<td>0.1514**</td>
<td>0.1537**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitimus</td>
<td>0.3105**</td>
<td>0.1767**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitimus</td>
<td>0.4739**</td>
<td>0.1958**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitimus</td>
<td>0.4015**</td>
<td>0.3246**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitimus</td>
<td>0.5915**</td>
<td>0.4663**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitimus</td>
<td>0.6044**</td>
<td>0.5794**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitimus</td>
<td>0.6149**</td>
<td>0.2959**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitimus</td>
<td>0.7175**</td>
<td>0.5106**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitimus</td>
<td>0.7750**</td>
<td>0.5479**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitimus</td>
<td>0.9471**</td>
<td>1.0000**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = SIGNIF. LE .01  ** = SIGNIF. LE .001 (99.0000 IS PRINTED IF A COEFFICIENT CANNOT BE COMPUTED)
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