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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Today's college and university student profile is changing rapidly and the greatest percentage increase in the college population is the adult student returning to higher education. Through the year 2001, more than 40% of all college enrolled students are estimated to be over 25 (U.S. Bureau of Census, 1991). While the enrollment of students under 25 increased by 20% from 1970 - 1983, the number of adult students more than doubled. During this time, the enrollment of individuals 25 to 34 years old grew the most significantly with an increase of 54% for men, while enrollment of women more than tripled (National Center for Education Statistics, 1985). Hodgkinson in 1986 in All One System, predicted that half of all college students would be over 25 and 20% would be over 35 by the 1990's.

There are numerous reasons why adults return to college. For most adults the direct links among academic, career and life planning are extremely important. Many men and women are returning to college because of economic necessity, unemployment, job obsolescence, divorce or widowhood. Most returning adults mention more than one motivating factor and most note both personal self-satisfaction and career related goals (Aslanian, & Brickell, 1980; Cross, 1981; Galliano & Gildea, 1982; Mohney & Anderson, 1988; Sewell, 1984).

New college graduates who are seeking to enter the job market at an age beyond 25 may experience a negative stereotyping which may be based on age. Furthermore, when
these individuals are hired, these stereotypes leading to age discrimination may affect
managerial decisions as these older individuals try to compete with younger staff and make
progress in training and development programs. The 1967 Age Discrimination in
Employment Act and its Amendments have brought critically needed attention to the
concern of discrimination in employment practices as it relates to older workers. The age
of forty is used as the beginning point at which discrimination of a class of people often
begins. However, college graduates who are under 40 may experience age discrimination
and yet they are not protected by law.

If non-traditional students cannot compete effectively through the on-campus
interviewing process, a significant means of reaching career-related goals will be eliminated
for these graduates, the current and future labor pool. This study examined age-bias in on-
campus interviewing since university and college placement offices are one of the major
sources through which new college graduates may seek and find employment. While
graduates forty and above are covered by the Age Discrimination Act, the age group 25 to
39 may still be discriminated against from an age perspective.

Statement of the problem

The intent of this study was to investigate the attitudes of on-campus recruiters
toward non-traditional graduates, more specifically, the study examined attitudes indicative
of age-bias in college recruiters. While graduates forty and above are covered by the Age
Discrimination Act, the age group 25 to 39 may still be discriminated against from an age
perspective. Two age group cohorts (e.g., 23 and 35) were designated to represent the
traditional and non-traditional student graduates for the purpose of this study.

The scope of the investigation included a national sample of recruiters who
interview on campuses across the United States for business, engineering and education
graduates.
The major question examined in this study was whether field, age and gender interact in terms of how on-campus recruiters evaluate applicants. The other research questions were as follows:

1) Do on-campus recruiters evaluate younger interviewees more positively than older interviewers?

2) Do on-campus recruiters evaluate male interviewees more positively than female interviewees?

3) Do on-campus recruiters evaluate interviewees differently across fields (business, engineering and education)?

Rationale

Career placement for college seniors is the culmination of a preparation that hopefully allows the graduate to begin a meaningful career. Preliminary screening through credentials review and face to face interviews are major functions performed by private and public employers on university campuses throughout the nation. Sometimes actual job offers are extended while on the campus for interviewing, but often times preliminary screening takes place and referrals are made to more technical managers or principals for phase two of the recruiting process. This initial interview process can signal both real and perceived bias to those being screened and interviewed.

Graduates from business, engineering and education are recruited for entry-level positions through on-campus interviewing. These three disciplines were chosen because all of three areas are applied and graduates anticipating findings positions directly related to their fields. The importance of this process to the new graduate, especially the non-traditional graduate, often seems all encompassing. They often evaluate personal worth on who hires them, what they will be doing and at what salary level.
As colleges and universities graduate more and more individuals (over 1.1 million in 1990), as the cost of education escalates, and as federal and state financial assistance shrinks, the placement issue grows in importance. The Bureau of Labor Statistics (1990) reported that there are not only new graduates available, but reentrants into the college job market, together creating an annual surplus of individuals ready to enter the job market. The estimates assume that three out of every ten entrants will not be able to find a job traditionally requiring a four year college degree. Those graduates not finding a job requiring college-level skills are not likely to face prolonged unemployment, but rather underemployment.

Adults enroll in college out of choice, often in the face of considerable obstacles and sometimes with a strong inner imperative clearly related to their own personal growth. Despite their diverse backgrounds, adult learners share a common ground. They are people who have chosen to reach out for something new. At any life stage, the choice to enroll in college is an act of faith that is a reaching-out for something beyond one's grasp; a declaration that action will have a hoped for result (Weathersby, Rita, 1980).

The non-traditional student has many reasons for returning to education, including: job dissatisfaction; attainment of knowledge; improvement of self-image; and career goals that may include acquiring a specific set of skills for use on the job or for development of a new career (Aslanian, C.B. & Brickell, H.M., 1980; Carp, Peterson & Roelfs, 1976; Cross, 1981; Galliano & Gildea, 1982; Mohoney & Anderson, 1988; Sewell, 1984). Although different studies report varying percentages, the overriding reasons adults return to college are related to career goals. Despite the optimistic hopes of the college graduate, individuals may not find employment matching their education and abilities and may be viewed less attractive because of bias in the on-campus recruiters' evaluation of the job candidates (Powell and Posner, 1983).
Although some employment representatives have become more sensitive to the need of avoiding overt discriminatory practices, biased attitudes continue to exist in more disguised forms (Beattie & Diehb, 1979). Because of this, the Civil Rights Act of 1964, specifically Title VII, the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967 and its Amendments, the Vocational Rehabilitation Act of 1973 and most recently the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1991, have each attempted to legislate fairness in employment practices. But advancement of the protected classes for whom these acts were designed has not been significant, therefore calling to question whether legislation can actually make a difference (Arvey, 1979; Porter, 1984; Ruegger, 1989; and Terborg, 1977).

The process of interviewing has been and continues to be the major means of selecting candidates for positions, even though research indicates that there is questionable reliability and validity in the process (Arvey and Campion, 1982; Mayfield, 1964; Schmitt, 1976; Ulrich and Trumbo, 1965; Wright, 1969). Discrimination in interviewing occurs when interviewers hold stereotypical views of a class of people. For example, non-traditional students who become college graduates at an age beyond what is perceived as typical and traditional may be given a negative evaluation because of their age. This evaluation may affect managerial decisions regarding who proceeds to the next step beyond screening interviews and may inhibit their ability to compete and progress in the training programs and managerial ranks in industry. Throughout their experience, if they are fortunate to get hired, they may continually be identified as "older" than the typical trainee, first line supervisor and manager.

Studies have shown that younger workers are preferred over older workers (Arvey, 1979; Haefner, 1977; Kasschau, 1977; Locke-Connor & Walsh, 1980; Rosen & Jerdee, 1976a, 1976b, 1977, 1979, 1985). Bias against older job applicants is a function of negative stereotypes held by interviewer and prospective employers (Rosen and Jerdee, 1974). Yet, what little evidence there is on performance of older workers indicates that
they perform as well as younger workers on almost all criteria (Bower, 1952; Schaie, 1981). These studies report that chronological age is a poor guide to an individual's mental and physical well-being, and age is an inadequate basis for predicting vocational preference (Heron & Chown, 1967; Johnson, D. F. and Johnson, J. T., 1982; McFarland, 1973; Schaie, 1984). Most of these studies have looked at individuals in their late fifties and sixties, while no studies compare the work abilities of 23 and 35 year old college graduates. Age discrimination in employment has been studied often using job applicants who are over forty (Cleveland, Festa and Montgomery, 1988; Gordon, Rozell and Baxter, 1988; Haefner, 1977). Very little discrimination research has been done concerning the population identified as non-traditional college graduates.

Rosen and Jerdee's research (1976) focused on age stereotyping more closely associated with older persons' abilities and potential in work situations. Their findings suggest "age stereotyping regarding older workers' performance capacity and potential for development could have potentially damaging effects on older employees' career progress" (p.431). Negative job-related characteristics, such as resistance to change, lack of creativity, cautiousness, slowness of judgment, lower physical capacity, lack of interest in technological change and untrainability have been attributed to older workers.

Joblin and Tengler (1982) surveyed placement directors at colleges of business throughout the country asking them to rank order the frequency with which illegal questions were asked of interviewees in six areas: age, handicaps, national origin, race or color, religion and sex (including discrimination on the basis of marital status). Although the survey results indicate that most placement directors believed recruiters did not intentionally ask illegal questions, the two categories in which illegal questions were most often asked concerned first, the applicant's sex and related issues and second, the applicant's age.
The on-campus recruiting process relies on the visible and heavily used interviewing tool for new college graduates. Therefore, perceptions by on-campus recruiters of what non-traditional graduates are capable of doing could artificially limit the opportunities available to these graduates. By making decisions on the basis of stereotypes, an on-campus recruiter may discount or ignore the applicants' personal attributes, interpersonal competencies, and professional training and skill.

Because little research concerning age-bias of non-traditional college graduates has been conducted, and since these students constitute a significant portion of the college population which is expected to become larger, it is imperative that research be conducted. If such a bias exists against the non-traditional graduates, these candidates need to learn job search techniques to confront the bias and simultaneously on-campus recruiters will need to be sensitized to the biases they may be bringing to the interview process.

Definition of terms

The following terms and definitions will be utilized in this paper.

1) Age Bias: the act or practice or an instance of discrimination categorically because of age rather than individually.

2) Stereotyping: involves making judgments about people on the basis of their membership in a particular group. Once an individual's membership in a particular class or category is established (e.g. race, sex, age, etc.), a number of traits characteristics are ascribed to the individual based on the traits associated with the larger class of which he or she is a member. Thus stereotyping involves basically two processes: (a) the formation of impressions and trait descriptions of particular class and categories of individuals and (b) the assignment of these traits to a particular individual once his or her membership in that class or category is known (Arvey, 1979).
3) **Age Discrimination**: age discrimination occurs when people have equal qualifications but unequal probabilities of being hired because of age.

4) **Non-traditional College Student**: a college student who is at least 25 years of age when beginning college or returning to college for an undergraduate degree.

5) **Traditional College Student**: a college student who is between the ages of 18 to 21 when he/she begins college.

6) **On Campus Recruiting and Interviewing**: a practice in which employers schedule times to be on college and university campuses to identify, attract and interview new college graduates for entry level positions requiring a college degree.

7) **Interview**: a dynamic process of social interaction and interpersonal judgment that involves forming impressions, formulating and asking questions and attributing personal characteristics to applicants as precursors to evaluative judgments (Binning, Goldstein, Garcia & Scattaregia, 1988).

**Limitations of the study**

Limitations of this study have been identified in four areas, the questions posed in the statement of the problem, the sample selected for study, the instruments and data collection procedures developed to obtain the data, and the procedures used to analyze the data. First, the study was limited to an examination of interviewee factors. No attempt was made to identify interviewer factors which may have been present in the process. Therefore, some differences among selected interviewers may have been present and not identified as a part of this study.

The study was limited to two pre-selected ages (23 and 35) to represent traditional and non-traditional college graduates. The decision to utilize 35 year olds was to depict adult graduates of this age range (25 - 39) who were not covered by the Age Discrimination Act of 1967 and its amendments. The data are generalizable to non-traditional graduates.
between those ages only and no conclusions can be made to those non-traditional graduates fifty or sixty years old.

The photograph used with the resume is the second limiting factor. Most students do not use pictures on their resumes and many employers would not accept such resumes. However, in order to provide adequate control, photos were used to distinguish one candidate from the other since the resumes used for review were exactly alike across all age groups for each area: business, engineering and education. The photograph may have influenced the interview negatively and not been examined during the review of the resume and interview. Other options for cues as to the age or gender could have been giving the complete name or including a high school or other date cue. These were considered more likely to influence the interview negatively than was the photograph, however.

A third limitation is the audio-taped interview. The script, even though evaluated by employers and taken from "mock" interviews held on the researcher's campus, may not be the typical questions used by a specific employer to interview on campus. For example, many educational systems and some corporations are beginning to use more behavioral models developed specifically for their organization.

Lastly, the employer cannot assess the non-verbal cues of the interview that could result from seeing the candidate on videotape and therefore this may have skewed the candidate's evaluation.

Organization of the remainder of the study

This chapter presented the statement of the problem, rationale for the study, definition of terms and limitations of the study. Chapter two offers a review of relevant literature. Chapter three describes the procedures in conducting the study and chapter four presents the findings. Chapter five provides a summary, conclusions and recommendations for further study.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

This chapter reviews literature concerning on-campus interviewing and adult students. Topics to be reviewed include: profile of the workforce; non-traditional students; on campus recruiting; interviewing; sex discrimination; age discrimination and factors influencing the design of the study.

Profile of the workforce

A college education has been presented to students as an opportunity to develop their skills and abilities, to enable them to compete for the best jobs and then advance in their chosen career and to develop as well rounded individuals with expanded interests and talents. Overall, college graduates have competed effectively in the job market. In 1990, 25 - 34 year olds with a college degree had a 2.5% unemployment rate compared to 4.2% for persons who had completed some college and 6.3% for high school graduates (Kutscher, 1992). Earnings for college graduates grew more rapidly especially in relation to high school graduates. By 1990, on the average female college graduates earned 66% more than their high school counterparts, and male college graduates earned 60% more than male high school graduates (Hecker, 1992).

Employment projections for the college graduate from 1990 - 2005 indicate that approximately 70% can expect to enter jobs requiring a college degree, compared to 80% for those who graduated during the 1984 - 1990 period. In 1990, nearly 29 million
workers with four or more years of college were in the labor force. Twenty-three million held jobs traditionally requiring a four-year degree; of the remaining 5.8 million, some were underemployed and a few were unemployed (Shelly, 1992).

The workforce of the United States is growing older and is changing. Today, the average American worker is 39 years old, and according to a Boston University study, more than 14 million people over age 55 are now working. And by the year 2010, over-55 workers will make up 25% of the U.S. work force (Stackel, L., 1988). There are some 600 million people in the world - or 12% of the planet's population of 5 billion - who are over 60, the age used by most laws dealing with retirement and pensions. That figure will double in the next 20 years (Ramirez, G.C. 1987).

Shifting population demographics have created a shortage of younger entrants in the job market while earlier retirement options, better health, and longer life expectancy have swelled the ranks of the elderly (Stackel, L., 1988). The changing age of the baby-boom generation (those born between 1946-1964) over time has had, and will continue to have, a major impact on the age distribution of the labor force. In 1975, the baby-boomers were concentrated in the age groups 16-24 and 25-34. By 2005, the baby boomers will be concentrated in the 45-54 age group. African-American, Hispanics, Asians and others will continue to increase in number faster than the average growth of the labor force as a whole. By the year 2005, African-Americans will be 11.6% of the work force, while Hispanics will be 11.1% and Asians will be 4.3% (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 1991). A greater proportion of women will be employed. As recently as 1972 women made up only 39% of our workforce and by 2000, it is expected that they will constitute 47% of the workforce. Another change will be that 80% of American women between the age 25 and 54 will be employed by 2000 (Crooks, 1989). These changes in demographics might lead to the belief that the older worker would be received into the job market with open arms. Those adults who return to school for additional education it would appear, might be more
valuable. In 1967 the Age Discrimination Act was passed and since then several amendments have been added to protect workers from ages 40 to 70. With all this information, why then do adults return to postsecondary education?

Non-traditional student

Aslanian and Brickell (1980) conducted a national survey in which they found that most adult learners did not learn randomly but rather as a function of life transitions and triggering events. In sum

Most adults learn in order to move out of some status they must or wish to leave and into some new status they must or wish to enter. That is, their reason for learning was to perform well in the new status. (p.52). Several major transitions were defined as requiring learning: careers, family, leisure, art, health, religion, and citizenship. By far, however, the major "triggers" for learning are career-related events (e.g., promotions, the arrival of new equipment, the need for an occupational license), followed by family-related events (e.g., divorce, widowhood, "empty nest"), and in a distant third place, health changes (e.g., heart attack, broken leg) requiring new learning to deal successfully with other life areas such as career or family (Cross, 1981; Galliano & Gildea, 1982; Mohney & Anderson, and Sewell, 1984).

In 1984, Sewell conducted a study of adult undergraduates and what causes them to seek a degree. Other studies have concentrated on adult learners in post secondary education, as opposed to those pursuing an undergraduate degree. The adult learners surveyed in this study differed in several ways from those in the previous studies: 72% were between 25 and 34 years of age, and women outnumbered men two to one; fewer were employed full time; substantially more were employed part time or were unemployed; fewer were married and significantly more were single, divorced or separated.
Most adults indicated that a very important reason for enrolling was "to develop a new career" (65%), "simply to learn" (61%), and "to have the satisfaction of having a degree" (51%). When forced to choose the most important reason for continuing their education, a little more than half of the respondents selected career-oriented objectives. Sewell, 1984

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Most Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To dev. new career</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simply to learn</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satis. of degree</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ach.indep. &amp; sense indep.</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adv in present career</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make cont.with other people</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get away from routine</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Younger adults (25 to 34 years of age) were more likely to view job dissatisfaction as a trigger, whereas a higher percentage of older adults (at least 35 years old) considered obtaining information and children entering school as very important factors. Finally, regardless of the respondents' employment status, the three most frequently mentioned triggering events were job dissatisfaction, encouragement from family and friends, and availability of funds (Sewell, 1984).

On campus recruiting

When the non-traditional student completes their degree, many turn to the Career Services office for assistance in locating their new career options. For the new college
graduate on-campus recruiting is one of the major sources used by them to secure employment. On campus recruiting and interviewing is a practice in which employers schedule times to be on college and university campuses to identify, attract and interview new college graduates for entry level positions requiring a college degree.

According to a Michigan State study, the most productive sources for employers to hire new graduates included: on-campus interviewing (43.4%), write-ins (10.5%), responses from want ads (8.7%), and job listings with the placement offices (7.9%) (Shingleton and Sheetz, 1986). Through contacts with their career planning and placement offices, graduates should be made aware of a significant number of employment options which require and could utilize their skills.

Gardner and Nixon (1991), replicated a study conducted by Jauquet and Parlin (1977), to observe if the changes in the workforce, mainly the evolving roles of women and minorities, affected the composition of the recruiters visiting campuses today. The profile has not changed: recruiters are mostly white (92%); male (75%); between the ages of 20 and 35 (51%); and attained at least a bachelor's degree (96%). In Gardner and Nixon's study (1991) there were significant changes in other areas. In this study only 23% of them had personnel-related degrees versus 42% in Jauquet and Parlin's study (1977). Twelve percent of the respondents reported that they were full-time recruiters, while another 38 percent had recruiting as part of their regular job. Of the remaining respondents, they either volunteered to recruit (26%) or were ordered to recruit by their supervisor (24%). The findings in this study indicated that line managers and supervisors are more actively recruiting on campus. The typical recruiter is less likely to be involved in recruiting full-time.

Of those who responded to the study, 98% indicated that they had received some type of interview training before conducting on-campus interviews. The majority received two to three days of interviewing training with an average of 5.5 days of training reported.
Interviewing

Most employers have a variety of prospective employees from which to choose. Therefore selecting the candidate that best matches the job opening takes on many forms: reviewing resumes, testing, screening interviews by personnel, panel interviews, assessment centers and the selection interview. Regardless of what steps are taken to narrow the candidate pool to a manageable size, usually the final selection tool is the interview. "As such, the interview serves as an evaluation device used to determine whether applicants' qualifications meet the requirements of vacant positions and as a communication medium used to transmit information about the organization" (Taylor & Sniezek, 1984, p. 157).

The Bureau of National Affairs (1988) surveyed 245 organizations and the results indicated that 82% used interviews with an immediate supervisor, personnel/employment specialist, or the department/division head before hiring. Drake, Kaplan and Stone (1973) surveyed 195 organizations and found that 91% of the companies required not one but two interviews of a job applicant. Ulrich and Trumbo (1965) reported that 99% of the companies they had contacted made use of the interview prior to hiring. Wright (1969) reported that three-fourths of the companies that conducted on-campus interviews of prospective employees required a second interview.

The interview has been studied for well over seventy years. In fact, Walter D. Scott published in 1915 what appeared to be the first piece of research concerning the reliability of the employment interview. In Scott's study each of six interviewers interviewed 36 candidates for sales positions. After completing all 36 interviews, each interviewer rank ordered the 36 candidates from most suitable to least suitable. The rankings were compared by Scott and the results showed a wide disagreement among the rankings given to each candidate. In fact, interviewers did not agree on 28 candidates. Scott's study was criticized because of the difficulty of rank-ordering 36 applicants. Since
then, researchers have continued to study the interview process and have continued to conclude that it lacks both reliability and validity (Arvey & Campion, 1982; Mayfield, 1964; Schmitt, 1976; Schneiderman & Schmitt, 1986; Ulrich & Turbo, 1965; Wagner, 1949; and Wright, 1969).

Even though the validity and reliability is continuously challenged, the process of personal interviewing has been and continues to be the major means of selecting and promoting candidates. The paper and pencil testing which was often utilized as a screening tool along with the interview, has been de-emphasized because of court and legal pressures brought to bear on testing practices since the Civil Rights Act of 1967. Because of this, the interview has taken on a more important role as the major decision-making tool in employment selection of competent employees and prospective employees must perform well in the interview if they are to have a chance at the better jobs (MacDougall, 1986; Kinicki & Lockwood, 1985; and Spinks, N. & Wells, B., 1988). Studies have shown that the interview process is highly subjective (Binning et al, 1988). Moreover, there are a myriad of factors that contribute to interviewers' rating error, such as similar to me, first impression, and halo effects (Cleveland and Landy, 1983). Thus, it is argued that ratings more often reflect interview procedures and/or the interviewing skill of individual interviewers more than the job-related attributes of the applicant (Graves and Karren, 1992). Such a circumstance imposes error variance that impairs the potential validity and utility of employment interviews and poses serious legal questions about the popularity of interviewing as a mainstay of corporate hiring practices. (Maurer, S.D., and Fay, C., 1988).

The research about interviewing is as controversial as the interview process itself. As Hollandsworth, Kazelskis, Stevens, and Dressel (1979) pointed out, one problem is the limited generalizability of results to the actual interview situation due to the frequent use of role playing or videotape simulations of interviews or the control of verbal content.
Amalfitano and Kalt (1977) stated that the use of photographs is probably even less
generalizable to actual interviews.

Another external validity problem is that a great majority of studies use students,
often enrolled in undergraduate psychology classes, to evaluate interviews. Obviously the
results of studies using more experienced judges with actual interview training and
experience will be more generalizable to real interview situations (Gifford, F., Ng, C.F.,

Low levels of agreement across interviewer ratings of job applicants has long been
recognized as an important deficiency of the employment interview. In practice, an
important characteristic of an effective interview method is that it maximizes the likelihood
that multiple interviewers will independently arrive at the same true (i.e., accurate) measure
of applicant suitability. One frequently used alternative to interview structuring has been
interviewer training. The theoretical advantage of this strategy is that it eliminates
perceptual errors that are likely to bias decisions regardless of interview format (Maurer and
Fay, 1988). Research has been conducted to try to evaluate what affects the recruiters'
interviewing decisions (Campion, 1978; Hafer and Hoth, 1981; Phillips and Dipboye,
1989; Sackett, 1982; and Snyder and Swann, 1978).

Most recruiters have access to resumes or college interview data forms prior to
interviewing candidates. Some researchers disagree about access to information prior to the
interview. One view is that prior information biases the face to face interview and
assessment. Another view is that review of information allows for a more valued and
useful judgment of an applicant's qualifications. Research on preinterview impressions
and how it effects the interview follows and each adds a different dimension to the
interview process.

Okanes and Tschirgi (1978) studied 67 industry and government recruiters visiting
a midwest university. Prior to the interview, recruiters were asked to review candidates
credentials and make an initial assessment of candidates using a rating scale as either "probably recommended," "probably not recommended," or "unable to determine." After the interview, recruiters assessed the interviewees using the same rating scale.

The recruiters reviewed 470 candidates' credentials and 304 (65%) were rated in the "unable to determine" category. After the interview, recruiters were non-committal about only 80 candidates (17%). Almost half of the responses placed initially in the "probably recommend" category shifted after the interview with the majority changed to "probably not recommend." The fewest shifts occurred in the "probably not recommend" category with most becoming "probably recommend."

In the research, Okanes and Tschirgi (1978) did not study the interview process, but it might appear that the interview did add to the preinterview information to assist the recruiter in making decisions about the candidate.

In the typical employment interview a certain sequence is usually followed: interviewers form an initial impression of a candidate from resumes, applications, and recommendations; ask questions in order to gather additional information, form a final impression of fit to the position, and reach a decision such as to hire, reject, or seek more information. Questioning the candidate is an essential part of the process that distinguishes the interview from other selection techniques.

Snyder and Swann (1978), using college students as subjects, found that the preinterview evaluation by the interviewers elicits certain interview strategies which invoke behavior from the interviewee which confirms the preinterview evaluation. In the study, the interviewers were told to test the hypothesis that an interviewee was either introverted or extroverted. Interviewers chose from 26 questions the 12 questions they would ask. Snyder and Swann (1978) found that the subjects sought information that was supportive of their assigned hypothesis. The question "What factors made it really hard for you to open up to people?" was more likely to be chosen by subjects with the introverted
hypothesis, whereas those subjects with the extroverted hypothesis tended to choose questions such as, "What would you do if you wanted to liven things up at a party?"

These results provide an interesting contrast to prior research which concluded that the interview is a search for negative information.

Sackett (1982) criticized prior research because he felt that research concentrated on interview outcome and treated the interviewer as a passive recipient of information which was processed and a decision recorded. He wanted to examine the interviewers' information seeking strategies and did several studies to see if interviewer behavior changed when given different preinterview information. Sackett used partial replication of the Snyder and Swann (1978) study but used experienced interviewers and college students. He did four different studies, three of which dealt with interviewer questioning strategy. In the first three studies, he could not replicate Snyder and Swann's results. He found no differences in interviewing strategy regardless of preinterview evaluations. In the fourth study, Sackett added the dimension that the interviewer received an answer from the applicant prior to selecting the next question. The study was designed to investigate if the interviewer's questions changed when preinterview hypotheses were disconfirmed. This final study can be summarized as follows:

1) the type of hypothesis held affects the questioning strategy chosen by the subjects; (2) the subject adheres to this questioning strategy, even if the information received runs contrary to the hypothesis; (3) the hypothesis held does not affect the likelihood that the hypothesis will be confirmed, but rather (4) the evaluation made is determined solely by the information received, regardless of the hypothesis (Sackett, 1982, pp. 800-801).

Sackett warns that the generalizability is limited. Since the hypotheses were assigned to each subject, it is not known if subjects would hold to the hypothesis more
strongly if the subject generated the hypothesis and therefore alter his/her interview questions.

The following study was a further examination of Snyder and Swann's (1978) research. McDonald and Hakel (1985) had student subjects review resumes, select questions and read a response before selecting the next question and finally rating the candidates. The results differed from Snyder and Swann's (1978) because the results showed the importance of the information elicited in the interview on the final impressions of the candidate which was similar to one hypothesis held by Sackett (1982).

Dipboye, Fontenelle and Garner (1984) also reviewed the effects of previewing the application on interviewers' gathering of information and their assessment of the applicant. Three groups of undergraduate student subjects evaluated two candidates for a job. One experimental group only interviewed the candidate, another previewed an application, and the control group assessed the candidate on the basis of the application only.

Interviewers who previewed the application gathered more non-application information than the other interviewers. Previewing the application had minimal impact on how the interviewers conducted their interviews. Also, previewing the application was associated with substantially lower reliability of fit and rating of applicant performance in the interview. The researchers concluded that if the interview is to gather information and evaluate applicants, it appears from their research that interviewers should avoid previewing application data or standardize interview and evaluation procedures to insure that the judgment is reliable and accurate. Presently Sears and Roebuck Company is one campus recruiter that does not preview students' resumes before the interview; Sears and Roebuck Company conducts a structured interview prior to reviewing students' resumes.

In 1988, Binning, Goldstein, Garcia and Scattaregia took the preinterview impressions one step further. They examined the question strategies in same and opposite
sex employment interviews. Contrary to Sackett (1982), this research suggests confirming interview strategies may occur from preinterview impressions.

The interesting result was that in analyzing the interviewers' freely generated questions, the male and female interviewers planned to ask more positive questions of low-suitability applicants of the opposite sex. When interviewing someone of the same sex the interviewer planned to ask significantly more questions seeking negative information from the low-suitability candidate and more positive questions of a high-suitability candidate as found by Snyder and Swann (1978).

Many situational pressures may have induced the interviewers to ask more positive questions of low-suitability candidates of the opposite sex, such as concerns about equity, bias or attraction to the candidate. Even though college interviewers cannot be generalized to the experienced interviewers, the occurrence of this during on-campus interviewing is often reported by both male and female candidates. At times, the candidates are amazed when they receive rejection letters because of the positive feeling during the interview.

Macan and Dipboye (1988) felt that the interviewer's information gathering and the relationship of this activity to other phases of the interview process, such as preinterview evaluation, have been largely ignored in past research. In their research subjects generated questions in the context of employment decision making. This research went beyond previous research because it examined the effects of initial impressions on four characteristics of questions. Two characteristics were dealing with confirmatory biases: (a) were the questions focused on negative or positive features of the applicant's credentials and, (b) were questions biased because they solicited negative or positive information. Two other characteristics were dealing with bias in questioning: (a) were the questions generated difficult and, (b) was a negative or positive preconception on the part of the interview conveyed to the interviewee.
generated were given to a second sample of subjects. Subjects answering the questions were to role-play an applicant for the chemical sales position. After reading the job description they were to answer the set of questions as if they were interested in the position.

Macan and Dipboye found some of the findings were consistent with Sackett (1982) and other findings were inconsistent, but little evidence was found for the strong hypothesis-confirming strategy in Snyder and Swann (1978) research. The researchers did find that an interviewer's initial evaluation of a candidate's suitability affected the kind of questions asked. When the candidate was evaluated as poor, fewer questions about positive characteristics were asked of this candidate than those whose paper credentials were evaluated as moderately favorable or highly favorable. Poor candidates were asked more difficult questions and the interviewers had a less favorable preconception of the candidate as compared to the highly favorable, moderately favorable and the control group conditions.

In this study, as in previous research, interviewers were influenced more in the questions they asked by negative application information. Also, they indicated that the interviewer would spend less time with a poorly qualified candidate. If there is a high level of agreement on who are poor candidates, this negative bias may represent little threat to the validity and accuracy of the interview. In situations where there is a low level of agreement on poor candidates the tendency for negative initial impressions may serve as a source of error. Overall there was little evidence that preinterview impressions led to strong confirmatory biases in the questions asked but also no support was found for the hypothesis that preinterview impressions would lead to a verbal confirmation.

Finally, Phillips and Dipboye (1989) tested eight propositions from a process model of the selection interview. According to the model, interviewers' preinterview impressions of an applicant bias the interview and processing of information. Phillips and
Dipboye used managers from a large international financial services corporation as interviewers and candidates for a position as account executive were interviewed. Very few studies have utilized an actual interview process with the actual interviewers and candidates to evaluate the results.

The interview was the second stage of a three-part process. After the interview, the qualified candidates were referred to a simulation exercise as the final selection process. Prior to the interview, the interviewer received the candidates' paper credentials and rated them on 16 items: 14 dimensions related to the simulation exercise; one item was qualification for the job and one was their final overall recommendation. Also after the interview, using the same 16 items, the interviewers provided their impressions. In addition, the interviewer was asked to evaluate 1) how they felt the candidate performed in the interview; 2) if the performance in the interview was indicative of the candidate's qualifications for the job; and 3) how confident they were in predicting if the candidate would be hired.

This research intended to evaluate the extent to which preinterview impressions would predict subsequent events in the interview. The interviewers' preinterview evaluations were positively related to postinterview evaluations of candidates' qualifications. Interviewers with favorable preinterviews impressions were more likely to attribute good interview performance to the candidates' qualifications for the job and poor performance to external factors. Preinterview impressions were not indicative of time spent in questioning of candidates. The findings did partially support the model and the contention that information received before the interview predisposes the interviewers to reject or accept the candidate. These results would indicate that to improve the interview all phases of the process need to be taken into account, which would include making the preinterview evaluations valid.
Preinterview impressions seem to impact the interview process; therefore, it is essential to understand if recruiters use certain qualifications to evaluate candidates prior to the interview process and during the interview. The Uniform Guidelines on Employment and Selection (1978) stipulated that employment decisions must be based on job criteria. Interestingly research indicates that criteria viewed as positive during the interview often was not related to job criteria. Hakel, Dobmeyer and Dunnette (1970) studied three content dimensions on resumes of accounting students seeking positions as accountants to evaluate the importance of (1) scholastic standing, (2) business experience, and (3) interests and activities. The information provided on 24 resumes came from systematically varying the three content dimensions on each resume. The resumes were evaluated by 22 male recruiters from CPA firms with a median age of 37 and median interviewing experience of four years and twenty male students in an introductory psychology course with a median age of 19. For the interviewer, scholastic standing, business experience and interests all contributed significantly to the overall suitability of a candidate, but the data show that these interviewers depended overwhelmingly on information about scholastic standings. For the students all three content areas were significant to the overall suitability of the candidate. The interviewers gave much lower ratings to resumes portraying average and low level scholastic standings than did the students.

This research indicates that characteristics of the candidate are related to the decisions made about them, but not all characteristics of the candidate are equally important. Even though an interviewer's evaluative task is to combine all available information and make a decision, these investigations found that only scholastic standing played a major role. As in other research (Mayfield and Carlson, 1966 and Webster, 1964), unfavorable information received has double the impact of favorable information.

Campion (1978) looked at other variables that influenced an interviewer's evaluation of candidates during on-campus interviewing. The subjects were 17 recruiters
from a variety of industrial and academic organizations interviewing a total of 170 candidates. Each interviewer saw 3 to 24 candidates with a mean of 10. Candidate's information used to predict these interviewers' evaluations was taken from candidate's information found on the placement center registration form. The independent variables employed in this study were as follows: (1) sex (male scored positive), (2) academic major (scored positive if congruent with position applied for), (3) involvement in college sports (any mention scored positive), (4) membership in a fraternity or sorority (scored positive), (5) reception of any honor or scholarship or other special award (any mention scored positive), (6) membership in college clubs or committees or other organizations besides a fraternity of sorority (scored positive), (7) held office in any college organization (scored positive), (8) membership in professional societies or any other organization outside college (scored positive), and (9) undergraduate grade-point average (scored continuously) (Campion, 1978, p. 948).

It appeared that undergraduate grade point average, membership in a fraternity or sorority and membership in professional societies were the best combination of characteristics for positive evaluations by interviewers. There was a difference between academic and industrial interviewers evaluations. Honors received and fraternity or sorority membership impressed industrial interviewers while academic interviewers seemed more impressed with membership in professional societies and undergraduate grade point averages.

Campion's (1978) study agreed with other research finding on the following three points. First, Hakel, Dobmeyer, and Dunnette (1970) found that interviewer decisions may be based on only one or two kinds of information. The results of the study agree in that typically only two variables accounted for most of the explained variance. Second, Cohen and Bunker (1975) found that males and females were more likely to be recommended for traditionally role-congruent jobs although other qualifications were
constant. The present results concur in that women seemed to have an advantage for academic jobs and men for industrial jobs. Finally, Ulrich and Trumbo (1965) have speculated that variables having to do with personal relations and motivations are the two areas which contribute most to interviewers' decisions. Examinations of the best predictors of evaluations noted in this study show that the first two variables entering the regression equations typically include a personal relations variable, e.g., membership in a fraternity or sorority or membership in a professional society, and a variable representing motivation, e.g., undergraduate grade point average or honors received (Campion, 1978, p. 951).

Hafer and Hoth (1981) took Campion's (1978) research a step further. Employers who regularly conduct on-campus recruiting and college business majors were asked to rank list 26 job selection attributes. Oral communication and motivation were ranked highest by both groups. Employers ranked initiative, assertiveness and loyalty as the next highest attributes, while students ranked enthusiasm, appearance and work experience next highest. Leadership was ranked sixth and appearance ranked tenth by employers, whereas students ranked leadership as tenth and appearance fourth. In this research it appeared that the students might have a misconception of highest priority selection attributes chosen by employers, therefore affecting their interview behavior and interviewing results.

As seen in the following research these attributes do change but many continue to be evaluated as essential. Technical managers at 3M Corporation were surveyed by Steele (1981) in an attempt to assist recruiters in selecting candidates who met the requirements that these managers felt were essential in prospective employees. The managers making the decisions had an understanding of the demands of the position for which the applicant was being considered. The most important factor on the application which was rated first by 41% of the managers was work experience, followed by the college curriculum pursued, and the grades in their courses. The least important was military experience, references,
and availability date. When they were given a predetermined list of applicant attributes, the managers ranked them as follows:

1. Work Experience
2. Curriculum
3. Grades
4. Degree Level
5. Extracurricular Activities
6. Technical Hobbies
7. Salary Request
8. Geographic Preferences
9. Availability Date
10. References
11. Military Experience

In addition, Steele also asked what did the employing managers consider the single most important qualification for an employee under their supervision, disregarding curriculum and degree level. Motivation was reported 43% of the time followed by enthusiasm for the job 26% of the time.

Resumes are a critical component of the interview process for graduating students as well as experienced professionals. Accounting students resumes were reviewed in the research by Hakel, Dobmeyer, and Dunnette (1970). Olney (1982) investigated the changes by personnel manager from 1974 to 1981 in preferences of resume content. This research reported that college course information along with grade point average, salary requirement and civic, church and social work were more important in 1981 than in 1974. Helwig (1985) designed three different resumes styles to be reviewed by corporate recruiters to see if they had a favorite style. Style A was traditional, Style B was similar and was two pages long and Style C was a narrative style resume. All three resumes had the same employment objective, education and work experience. Seventy-one recruiters from 50 corporations reviewed each of the resumes and completed the survey. Corporate employers preferred the traditional style resume because it had distinct headings, was uncluttered and one-page in length. The researcher reported that written comments from a
few recruiters indicated that honors, achievements and extracurricular activities should be added to the resume because students have limited work experience.

In a similar vein, Spinks and Wells (1988) actually surveyed the chief Human Resources managers of the Fortune 500 companies. This survey asked a series of questions concerning candidates appearance and the interview process and evaluation. A similar survey was also completed in 1980. There are some interesting results that are similar and some differences from previous studies reported.

In the 1987 study personal appearance and dress were rated as very important, while in the 1980 study and the one by Hafer and Hoth (1981), personal appearance was not listed as being as important. Interviewers from this study wanted to learn about the candidates work experience, scholastic background, military experience and extracurricular activities. Those employers in 1980 who felt scholastic achievement was important were even more strongly committed to this belief in 1987. This agrees with all previous reviewed research (Campion, 1978; Hafer and Hoth, 1981; Hakel, Dobmeyer, Dunnette, 1970; and Steele, 1981). Candidates during the interview were expected to stress their qualifications for the job, learn as much as possible about the company beforehand and exhibit a sincere interest in the position. In addition, the candidates were expected to point out during the interview the contributions they could make to the company as well as the contributions they hoped to make to their own personal careers.

Finally, the survey in 1987 indicated that there appeared to be a trend that employers were less concerned about a candidate's career aspirations, career objectives and career advancement and more concerned with candidates who were willing to relocate. These trends seem to indicate a growing concern for the company and their expectations of what an employee can do for the company and less concern for the welfare of the employee.
Taylor and Snezek (1984) investigated what the recruiter evaluated as important content in the interview and the candidate's impression of the content of the interview. In this study on-campus recruiters rated 25 topics believed to be frequently discussed in an interview from most important to least important. Candidates on the recruiters' schedules were asked to indicate whether or not the 25 topics were mentioned during the interview. The results of the research revealed a low level of agreement between recruiters' importance ratings and candidates' report of interview content. It appears from this study that recruiters often fail to mention topics they believe are important during the campus interview. There was also little agreement among recruiters in which topics should be covered. Candidates indicated that extracurricular and non-academic aspects of university life (e.g., reasons for choosing career, for choosing college) were most frequently mentioned during the interview. Recruiters may ask these questions to learn more about motivation and student interpersonal skills as indicated in the study by Campion (1978).

An additional study attempting to examine what factors were used by recruiters to evaluate job applicants was completed by Kinicki and Lockwood (1985). Recruiters from manufacturing, service and public firms participated in an interview workshop for graduating students and 91 business students were interviewed. After analysis, interview impressions and attraction were found to be significant predictors of recruiters' hiring decisions. Using subjective criteria undermines the selection procedure and provides little defense that the candidate was selected on valid job-related criteria. Kinicki and Lockwood gave two plausible reasons for the findings. First, since subjects were college seniors, there may not have been distinguished amounts of relevant work experience to evaluate; and second, that many on campus recruiters use the college interview as a merely screening interview. The second interview is conducted by supervisors or others who will work directly with the candidate. Once again, this is a concern for the non-traditional students
since interview impressions could be that the recruiters assumes college graduates should be 21 to 24 years old.

The Civil Rights Act of 1964, specifically Title VII, the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967 (including its many amendments), the Vocational Rehabilitation Act of 1973 and the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1991 have attempted to legislate fairness in employment practices. The advancement of these protected classes have not been significant, however, thus calling to question whether legislation can make a difference in the possibility of bias in the interviewing and subsequent hiring processes.

**Sex discrimination**

Discrimination against women has been documented during recruiting and hiring (Blau, 1984; Cohen & Bunker, 1975; Dipboye, Arvey & Terpstra, 1977; Etaugh & Riley, 1980; Vecchiotti & Korn, 1980; and Wiback, Dipboye and Fromkin, 1973) in their salaries once they are hired (Boyer & Cuestan, 1975; Corcoran, Duncan & Ponza, 1984), the promotions which they receive (Halaby, 1979; Larwood & Blackmore, 1978; Rosen & Jerdee, 1974, Rosenbaum, 1984) and employment in general (Rielley & Baron, 1984; Sandler, 1980; Terborg, 1977). Although there is evidence that women are being given greater opportunities than before, there is also evidence that both overt and more subtle forms of discrimination continue (Beattie & Diehl, 1979; Morrison, 1987).

"Women currently constitute the majority of college students and will continue to do so. Of the women currently enrolled, 40 percent are over twenty-five. By the early 1990s, those over twenty-five will constitute half or more of the women enrolled." (Millard, 1991, p. 36). There have been three separate studies (Schein, 1973; Keeley, 1983; and Powell and Posner, 1983) which have reviewed characteristics of women as compared to those of men and a sex unspecified candidate. All three studies have found that there are
stereotypical views held both by men and women that may affect women in competing for professional positions.

Schien (1973) had subjects rate the extent to which 92 adjectives and descriptive terms were characteristic of women in general, men in general and successful middle managers. Managers were found to be more similar to men than to women on 60 of the 86 items for which the groups significantly differed. Keeley (1983), using the Applicant Attributes Questionnaire (a questionnaire designed to assess sex-roles stereotypes), had college recruiters complete one of three forms: female applicants for professional employment, male applicants for professional employment or sex-unspecified successful applicants for professional employment. As in the study above, male applicants were described in a manner comparable to the way sex-unspecified applicants were, female applicants were not. Female applicants were described as significantly different than male applicants. Female applicants, in general, were not perceived to have the attributes desired in applicants for professional positions.

Powell and Posner (1983) surveyed corporate recruiters from a private West Coast University using the Bern Sex-Role Inventory. Similar results were found as in the studies by Schein (1973) and Keeley (1983). A strong preference for new employees with masculine characteristics was found. The Powell and Posner study evaluated the results on another dimension, that of gender-bias scores. The sample was divided into two groups. Recruiters in the high male orientation group placed more importance on personal attributes than objective factors. It appears that these recruiters might be more affected by attributes such as personality, attractiveness and good health than the applicant's work experience. None of these differences was explained by recruiters' gender.

Shaw (1972) investigated whether so called "negative traits" (feminine gender or physical disabilities) in the employment context operate to a greater degree in occupational categories such as a management trainee or occupations requiring specialized and perhaps
advanced training, such as engineer or scientist. College recruiters were divided according
to the type of position for which they normally recruited and were given descriptive
resumes and photographs of hypothetical college graduates. Shaw found that women were
discriminated against to a greater degree when the general position— one that relied on the
recruiter's implicit personality theory— was being filled. Physical disabilities were not
significant determinants in any hiring decisions.

Male college recruiters were utilized in this study by Cohen and Bunker (1975) to
assess sex-role stereotypes on hiring decisions. All recruiters evaluated only one candidate
(male or female) for one position (editorial assistant or personnel technician). Each
recruiter received a job description, a completed application blank, an interview
transcription, a performance evaluation form, and an adjective rating scale. The results
indicated that sex discrimination may occur at the very initial stages of the job selection
process— the recruitment interview when either female or male candidates apply for
positions for which the traditional sex-orientation is incongruent with their sex.

Dipboye, Fromkin and Wiback (1975) designed a study to examine bias during the
screening of candidates' resumes. Thirty male college recruiters and 30 male college
students reviewed and ranked 12 bogus resumes for a position as a manager of a furniture
department in a large department store. The scholastic standing, sex and attractiveness of
the candidates were systematically varied in each resume. As hypothesized, both groups
preferred males to females, attractive to unattractive applicants, and applicants of high
scholastic standing to those with lower scholastic records. As the researcher noted, "The
training and experience of professional interviewers did not give them immunity from the
tendency to discriminate on the basis of sex and physical attractiveness" (p.42).

In an attempt to partially replicate the above research, Dipboye, Arvey and Terpstra
(1977) used student interviewers. In addition, the researchers wanted to investigate the
possible interactions of candidates' sex and physical attractiveness with the interviewer sex
and attractiveness in determining employment evaluations. This study, as did the former study, found that the most qualified candidate for the managerial position was the highly qualified attractive male. In this study, bias against female candidates was limited to the highly attractive and unattractive and was less pronounced when the candidate was moderately attractive. Neither interviewer sex nor physical attractiveness was identified with the ratings or choice of candidates. Women were as biased as men in their evaluation of candidates.

In a study evaluating the qualifications and employability of males or females for a supervisory position, Dipboye and Wiley (1977) utilized 66 college recruiters. Half the recruiters viewed a videotape of either a passive male or female; half saw either a moderately aggressive male or female. Self-presentation style made an important contribution to the outcome of the interview and moderately aggressive females were as appealing as moderately aggressive males. While the findings of the study are optimistic, it must be remembered that the female sex-role stereotype suggests that women are less aggressive than men, but also that they should be less aggressive. "In a more ambiguous situation, it is questionable as to whether or not a female would regularly be assessed as being as aggressive as a male even when she was" (p. 2).

Trying to replicate the above study by adding the element of ambiguity (defining the requirements less clearly), Dipboye and Wiley (1978) assumed male judges would rely more on their stereotypic image of what constitutes a qualified candidate for a managerial position thus resulting in less favorable ratings for females. Although the match between candidate and the job was more uncertain with meager specified job requirements, the more unambiguous situations did not result in bias against female applicants. The former research findings (Dipboye and Wiley, 1977) were supported.

Muchinsky and Harris (1977) examined male and female candidates for suitability in a managerial role in a predominately female occupation, a predominately male
occupation and a sexually mixed occupation. The academic qualifications of the candidates were varied. The results indicated that applicants with superior qualifications received equal considerations for employment regardless of their sex or the sex-type of the position. Similarly, applicants with low qualifications were equally judged unsuitable. When the qualifications were average, discrimination on the basis of sex was found for all three occupations. The findings of this study supported the results reported by Terborg and Ilgen (1975) where stereotypes were found to influence decisions when little was known about the female's potential and that the impact of sex-role stereotypes diminishes with greater information.

In a study designed to investigate the impact of varying the sex composition of the applicant pool for a managerial position, Heilman (1980) had 100 male and female MBA students evaluate a female candidate for a specific managerial position. The subjects were told that to truly evaluate any one candidate, it was necessary to have a sense of the candidate pool. Subjects were given information about seven other candidates and they were lead to believe that zero, one, two, three or all of the other candidates were female. The results demonstrated that the proportion of women in the pool can impact the personnel decision making. Consistent with Taylor and Fiske (1977) and Kanter (1977), proportional representation was shown to impact the reactions to an individual female. The female candidate was judged less favorably when females were at or below 25% of the candidate pool. In these conditions, the candidate was judged to be less qualified with lower potential and was less likely to be recommended for a managerial position.

Rosen and Jerdee (1974) devised an in-basket exercise to investigate the impact of sex-role stereotypes on the personnel decisions of 95 bank supervisors. In this research, the bank supervisors were found to be biased against women in personnel decisions related to promotion, development and supervision. In addition, the findings suggested that when the particular decision is ambiguous and only partial information is available to the decision
maker that an individual is most likely to rely on preconceived attitudes, such as sex-role stereotypes to help them make decisions.

In a survey of subscribers to the Harvard Business Review, Rosen and Jerdee (1974) found that both male and female subjects were likely to discriminate against women in the selection of a purchasing manager, the nomination of an employee to attend a training conference, advice giving to a junior executive and conflict resolution over work related social obligations. Haefner’s findings (1977) not only are in agreement but tend to generalize the results of several other studies that women, at least highly competent ones are discriminated against (Rosen & Jerdee, 1977; Schein, 1973).

Despite the changes in sex-roles in contemporary society as contrasted to previous decades, research continues to confirm the existences of pervasive and persistent sex segregation in the workplace. Since 1900, sex segregation appears to have been stable. The stability is surprising in the light of the enormous changes that have taken place in the structure of the economy: turnover in occupations as obsolete occupations disappear and new ones develop; narrowing of educational differentials between men and women, particularly since World War II; and most recently, increasing similarity in work patterns of men and women over their lifetime. (Reskins, 1986).

In the past women have not had equal opportunity in the labor market and they have faced discrimination in hiring, pay, and advancement. This is even more critical for the adult college woman who may also face age discrimination as she tries to compete after completing her degree. The non-traditional college woman who is entering undergraduate programs twice as often as her male counterpart sees this education as an opportunity to advance and may face barriers that she did not anticipate. Equal employment opportunity is an established goal of national policy: it is to contribute to better utilization of the country’s human resources, economic growth as well as full participation of all members of society in the nation’s political social and economic life. The specific nature of stereotypes that
interviewers hold concerning women may well influence their evaluation of these candidates during the interview. To the extent that stereotypes are basically negative, deviate from the perception of what is needed for the job or translate into different expectations and standards of evaluation for non-traditional women college graduates, stereotypes may well have the effect of lowering the evaluation by interviewers even when candidates are equally qualified for the entry level college position.

**Age discrimination**

Troll (1975) in her book, *Early & Middle Adulthood*, comments that older people, women, and African-American people all have difficulty finding work commensurate with their education, earning the same pay as others doing the same work, and holding onto their jobs if they do get them. In addition, age discrimination against high competent older workers clearly exists in the employment setting. Another study by Triandis (1963) found similar results for American personnel directors who indicated that they preferred not to hire 55 year old individuals at lower levels in the organization. By using sex and age biases employers are eliminating some of the most qualified candidates for the job market.

Some would suggest that ageism is a form of prejudice and discrimination that individuals experience at various points in their lives. Individuals may be too young to vote, drive or drink alcohol, too young to receive a pension and Medicare, or too old to teach in a university. They contend that because it is both too cumbersome and too costly for public policy generally to recognize the diversity among persons of the same age, ageism is inherent in all age-based entitlement programs. “Ageism obviously can involve discrimination or prejudice for or against young, middle-aged, or old individuals” (Kimmel, 1988, p. 175).

Similarly, Manpower, Incorporated, has launched an unofficial campaign to seek out older employees. The myth that old dogs cannot learn new tricks is clearly proven
wrong by Manpower's experience with its older recruits. Manpower now trains its employees, young and old, for computer literacy via a specially developed Skillware program. (Stackel, L. 1988) There are many areas in relation to age and employment that have been studied. To date no one has researched the on-campus interviewing process and the non-traditional graduate to any extent. Age-bias in interviewing has been addressed through legislation to protect those 40 to 70, but there are many new college graduates entering the job market, some for the first time at age 25 through 39, who are not covered by law, but who may be subtly eliminated from new college graduate positions because of age.

Employers are concerned about these individuals competing with the traditional graduates in the training programs. In a 1981 study, personnel administrators were asked to rate their awareness of mid-life career redirection. Some of the greatest drawbacks they mentioned were salary and interpersonal relationships. They felt there may be a problem working for supervisors and with co-workers who are much younger than the mid-life persons (Brody & Reynolds, 1981). In the survey the respondents were more positive about hiring women entering the job market for the first time, than men and women changing from one career to another. In discussions with recruiters who visit campus, concern about salary expectations and competition with younger persons has been a constant theme. In addition, recruiters have been concerned about the motivation and commitment it takes to successfully compete in the training programs. These non-traditional graduates have successfully competed against the 18-22 year old and have often managed this while working and with family responsibilities.

Arvey (1979) reviewed the literature and found evidence that indicated that the interview process tends to yield judgments and evaluation about minority groups (blacks, females, handicapped persons and elderly) that make it less probable that they will be hired
or promoted than non-minority groups even though the members of the two groups have substantially equal qualifications.

Studies have shown that younger workers are preferred over older workers (Arvey, 1979; Arvey et al, 1987; Bird & Fisher, 1986; Gorden, Rozell & Baxter, 1988; Connor et al, 1978; Craft et al, 1979; Haefner, 1977; Kasschau, 1977; Locker-Connor & Walsh, 1980; Rosen & Jerdee, 1976, 1976, 1977, 1979). Bias against an older job applicant is a function of negative stereotypes held by interviewers and prospective employers. A study by Kasschau (1977) asked Black, Mexican American and white residents of Los Angeles county aged 45-74 about their experiences with race and age discrimination in finding a job or staying in a job. The data suggested both the persistence of race and age discrimination is prevalent in our social system. Of the respondents, substantial numbers had either experienced discrimination in their own lives or that of their friends. Other studies on age discrimination found that even though individuals felt they were discriminated against, they seldom reported it (Kasschau, 1973).

Bird and Fisher (1986) replicated a study conducted more than 30 years earlier (Kirchner & Dunnette, 1954). The attitudes toward older employees of hourly and supervisory personnel in a manufacturing plant were studied. The researchers were interested in comparing the attitudes of employees in 1985 with those of employees in 1954. The findings showed no overall improvement in age bias in 30 years. As in the earlier research, hourly employees held a more positive attitude toward older workers than did supervisors. Even though the supervisors were older on the average than the hourly workers, they held less positive attitudes toward older workers.

Several studies have reviewed interviewing of older and younger applicants (Arvey et al, 1987; Cleveland, Festa & Montgomery, 1988; Connor et al, 1978; Craft et al, 1979; Gordon, Rozell & Baxter, 1988; Haefner, 1977; Locke-Connor & Walsh, 1980) and found that age did affect hiring decisions. Craft et al (1979) used MBA students to describe their
impression of hypothetical people as employees. Each subject was given one description of an employee either 35, 50, 60 or 70 years old, and asked to evaluate them from a list of 28 employment related objectives. In addition, they were asked: "Would you hire such a person as a regular employee? What is your reasoning?" The findings showed, given such basic characteristics for each of the age groups--35, 50, 60, or 70--the subjects used similar adjectives to describe job quality, performance and activity level of the candidates. Interestingly enough the data indicated less willingness to hire a 60 or 70 year old than a 35 or 50 year old. The only apparent difference was the age of the candidate.

Two hundred eighty-six employers from the state of Illinois were used in a study by Haefner (1977) to assess hypothetical candidates in which race, sex, age and competence were used as stimuli. In this study race was not a factor. Of course, this does not necessarily prove that race is no longer a discriminatory issue. Discrimination against highly competent women and older workers for semi-skilled jobs existed in this study.

Cleveland, Festa and Montgomery (1988), realizing that the workforce is shifting toward a higher proportion of older workers, studied how the applicant pool composition affected employment decisions. Based on Kanter's (1977) work which found the proportion of women or men in a department affects behaviors, evaluations and interactions and Shinar's (1978) research suggested the perception of jobs itself changes as the proportion of male or female workers in the positions changes. The researchers hypothesized that as the number of older applicants in the pool increases, they would receive more favorable ratings. Graduate students were used as subjects. The results indicated that the proportion of older workers can have an effect on personnel decisions regarding the older applicants. When the proportion of older applicants was low, the applicant was rated less hirable and lower in advancement potential.

Although the gender composition of a job has been examined extensively, little research has been directed toward assessing the relationship of age compositions of a job
and perceptions or decisions regarding an older worker. This research on job perceptions suggests that if the proportion of male, female, older, younger, and other characteristics of workers in a job changes, the perception of the job itself may be modified (Shinar, 1978). If job perceptions are modified with changes in the compositions of the work force, the likelihood of bias for some individuals in personnel decisions may change. This finding suggests that one method of reducing bias against members of different minority groups (i.e. racial minorities, females, and older workers) might be to change the decision-maker's perceptions of the job (Cleveland & Landy, 1983; Heilman, 1983).

Simulated videotapes were utilized in assessing the effect of accountability, age and job level on the evaluation of job applicants (Gordon, Rozell and Baxter, 1988). It was hypothesized that as accountability increased, more biased evaluations would result. The study did indeed find that when accountability increased, there were more positive recommendations for younger applicants and more negative recommendations for the older applicants. The use of videotape stimulus material provided an extension of previous research, but undergraduate students in business were utilized as subjects, who tend to be more lenient in their evaluations. Rosen and Jerdee's (1976) research has focused on age-stereotyping more closely associated with an older person's abilities and potentials in work situations. Realtors and undergraduate business students rated the average 60 year old and 30 year old on 65 personal characteristics scored on four work-related scales: performance capacity, potential for development, stability and interpersonal skills. The older person was perceived to be significantly less capable of effective performance and rated lower on potential for development. Their findings suggest age stereotyping could have potentially damaging effects on older employees' career progress. Not all characteristics attributed to older workers were negative. Older workers were perceived to be more stable than younger workers and with interpersonal skills there is not a clearly defined stereotype regarding age differences.
In another study, Rosen & Jerdee (1976) found similar age-stereotyping results when studying managerial problems. In this study undergraduate business students were studying managerial problems dealing with older and younger employees on six different issues: resistance to change; lack of creativity; cautiousness; lower physical capabilities; disinterest in technology change and untrainability. The hypothesis was that when negative stereotypes about age are relevant to a work situation, older workers are potential victims of discriminatory managerial decisions. In this study, for example, when the older worker was perceived as rigid and resistant to change the managerial decision favored avoiding efforts to correct the employee's performance whereas with the younger employee, efforts were made to correct the employee's behavior. Also, when the older employee's skills became outdated, the decision to terminate the employee rather than invest in retraining was favored.

While age difference in intelligence and intellectual performance is not conclusive, Baltes and Shaie (1976) concluded that general intellectual decline in old age is largely a myth. In contrast, Botwinick (1977) has concluded that intellectual ability decline is clearly part of the aging picture. Horn (1978) distinguished between two types of intelligence which exhibit different patterns of change during adulthood. Crystallized intelligence (abilities to define words) increases while fluid intelligence (abilities to visualize objects in space) decreases. All researchers appear to agree that intellectual decline does occur late in life. But it also appears that large individual differences occur as it relates to intelligence and age. Cross-sectional studies have repeatedly shown the performance on intelligence tests begin to drop at age 30 and continues to decline markedly through the rest of adulthood.

Age concerns with more mature workers has been documented through studies concerning employment (Arvey, 1979; Bower, 1952; Cleveland, Festa, & Montgomery, 1988; Rosen & Jerdee, 1976) and the study of adults has been taken seriously. As the
American work force ages, negative attitudes about older workers are an increasing concern. Several studies have validated that older workers can experience problems in the workplace affecting selection as well as upward mobility (Arvey and Mussio, 1973; Axelbank, 1972; Cleveland, Festa and Montgomery, 1988; and Heafner, 1977). Until relatively recently, little research examined development during the middle years of adulthood. Prior to the work of Neugarten (1986), Knox (1977), Maas and Kuypers (1977), Cross (1981) and others, most development theory lead us to believe that little development happens after early adulthood. Some views of middle age emphasize its stability. The middle-aged are seen as consistent, conservative, and responsible; the leaders of society and the parents of the next generation. Other views emphasize the changes which occur during this period. Some researchers view mid-life as a period of transition and crises (Levison, 1978; Sheehy, 1977, 1982; and Valliant, 1977), while others view mid-life primarily as a period of transition and minimizes the role of crises in adult development (Neugarten, 1986).

Every society is age-graded and every society has a system of social expectations regarding age-appropriate behavior. The individual passes through a socially regulated cycle from birth to death as he/she passes through the biological cycle: a succession of socially delineated age-statuses, each with its recognized rights, duties and obligations. There exists a socially prescribed timetable for ordering major life events (Neugarten, 1986). The non-traditional students are going against this ordering and are making sacrifices to reach a special goal that they feel education will afford them.

The inevitability of an inexorable pressure to change is indigenous to all human experience including the entire adult span. The extension of this basic principle from childhood to the adult years permits the discarding of the anachronistic notion that adulthood is a stable period of five decades with rapid deterioration and decline at the end as the only variation (Bocknel). Since sequences in development usually lead to increasing
differentiation of the person and his/her behavior, the older we get the more complex we become and thus the more distinctive from other persons. Diversity among people increases with age (Knox, 1977; Maas, Kuypers, 1977). There are differences that occur from generation to generation. The development of adult abilities, interests, activity patterns and coping mechanisms reflect in part the societal context in which the individual lived as a child and as an adult (Schaie, 1988). Adulthood is replete with problems and opportunities and requirements for adjustments and response (Knox, 1977). For example, most workers in the U.S. are engaged in specialized jobs that did not exist a generation or two ago.

Research suggests that middle age, potentially the most powerful stage for influencing others, can also be one of the most troublesome. There is something about mid-life, many researchers feel (Gould, 1978; Jacques, 1965; Levison, 1978; Vaillant, 1977) that makes it a difficult stage to negotiate. On the other hand, middle-age is the period of the highest development and greatest emotional energy (Merriman, 1980). The tendency in middle-age toward a male-female role reversal is supported by much of the literature. Jung observes that in middle age "the husband discovers his tender feelings, and the wife, her sharpness of mind." Middle age is not so easily compartmentalized--it is the inter-relationship of psychological, physical, familial and career factors which is important. Introspection and self-analysis may bring about a career assessment or conversely, career evaluation may precipitate self-analysis which then affects other aspects of the individual's life (Merriman, 1980).

In a perfect world, employee selection and evaluation would be free from sex and age bias, thus eliminating discrimination. Unfortunately, empirical evidence is equivocal on this issue (Arvey, 1979; Landy & Farr, 1980, Nieva & Gutek, 1980; Walsh, J.P., Weinber, R.M. and Fairfield, M.L., 1987). Like racism and sexism, ageism is presumed to be responsible for social avoidance and segregation, hostile humor, discriminatory
practices and policies, and a conviction that elderly individuals are a drain on society.

(Gatz, M. & Pearson, C.G., 1988)

Some stereotypes—however unflattering—are accurate, at least for some proportion of older people. We know that all old people are not alike, but questionnaires do not permit this sort of differentiation. More recently, Schonfield (1982) evaluated the probabilistic nature of attitudes toward the aged. Of 10 common misbeliefs, 3 were endorsed by the majority of respondents: inflexibility, loneliness, and religiosity. However, when instructed to indicate which statements were representative of at least 80% of older people, their endorsement dropped dramatically. Thus, stereotyping may be a much weaker phenomenon than previously supposed (Gatz, M. & Pearson, C.G., 1988).

Many age differences that are reported in the literature, instead of being "caused" by aging, are more likely to be attributable to differences in demographic characteristics and cohort-specific experiences than adverse maturational changes (Schaie, K.W., 1988). Reports of research findings that are suggestive of lowered competence or other adverse characteristics of the elderly are often not adequately examined for their congruence with other relevant studies in the aging literature (Schaie, K.W., 1988). Nevertheless, there remain large proportions of the population that have suffered no behavioral deficits until very advanced age or that may even have increased their performance over previous levels due to favorable life experiences or programmed interventions. (Schaie, 1984; Schaie & Willis, 1986).

Factors influencing study design

Much of the research presented has used students as subjects. When recruiters or managers have been used the results have been different, since the student subjects are found to be more lenient in their evaluations of candidates. When recruiters and managers have been used, many studies have used just males. In this study, in an attempt to represent
the changing workforce in which women will make up 45%, and to increase the
generalizability to on-campus recruiting, the sample had equal numbers of women and men.

In addition, Muchinsky and Harris (1977) had indicated in their research that "when
the applicant possesses average qualifications, being perceived as neither a 'shoo-in' nor a
'dud' judgment of raters will be influenced by factors extraneous to the applicant's
qualifications, such as stereotypical impression induced by the nature of the profession or
the nature of the role in question" (p.104). Therefore, in this research an attempt was made
to present candidates that appear to be slightly above average to allow the extraneous
factors, such as age bias affect the results.

Summary

This chapter presented a review of the literature. Chapter Three describes the
procedures used to conduct the study.
CHAPTER III
METHODOLOGY

This chapter describes the procedures and selected methods of data analysis used in conducting this study. The following will be discussed: the research sample; a description of the instrument; materials development; the method of data collection; and the method of data analysis.

Sample

One thousand four hundred and sixty corporate employer members of the College Placement Council (CPC) and 526 educational employer members of the Association for School College and University Staffing (ASCUS) were identified as possible participants for this study. These participants were selected because CPC and ASCUS are the two major professional associations that encompass members who interview and screen new college graduates through on-campus recruiting. Membership provides employers and college and university career planning and placement staff an opportunity for networking, attending professional development seminars and keeping abreast of new techniques and technologies in the profession. Corporate and government employers are usually members of the CPC, while education employers join ASCUS.

Participating employers received a letter which explained the purpose of the study and a postcard on which to indicate their willingness or unwillingness to participate in the study (Appendix A). Eight hundred and thirty employers responded. Seven hundred and
twenty five agreed to participate. A sample of 480 of these employers were selected by field and by gender; the breakdown was as follows: 80 male and 80 female business recruiters; 80 male and 80 female engineering recruiters; and 80 male and 80 female education recruiters. In the original education sample, there were not enough female recruiter participants. Therefore, 22 female education recruiters from The Ohio State University and Arizona State University were solicited to assure cells with equal number of men and women.

While the participants in this study are in fact a fairly representative sample of corporate and educational recruiters in the United States involved in on-campus recruiting of new college graduates, there may be one limitation, as the sample may not include representatives from small company or educational employers. Thus, the results may not be generalized to all employers in the United States. However, the main emphasis of the study is on-campus recruiting of college graduates, and many small employers do not use this method of recruiting new employees.

Instrumentation

The following comprise the parts of the instrumentation used to collect the data for the study.

College Interview Summary (CIS)—The major dependent variable for the study were ratings on the College Interview Summary (CIS), an instrument created for this research. The CIS is an evaluation form closely resembling a typical rating sheet used by college recruiters. The CIS was developed for this study in several stages.

First, samples of college interviewing forms used by several major employers were examined and adapted for this study. Second, seven items from the Age Stereotype Questionnaire (ASQ, Rosen & Jerdee, 1976) were included in the CIS. The original ASQ was designed for use in evaluating employees, and consisted of a list of 65 characteristics
classified into four subscales: performance capacity, stability, potential for development, and interpersonal skills. In the Rosen and Jerdee (1976) study, respondents rated older and younger employees on each item on the ASQ according to a ten-point scale ranging from "Not accurate" (0) to "Very accurate" (9). The split-half reliability for the subscales of the ASQ ranged from .73 to .85, indicating acceptably high internal consistency. The seven items from the ASQ that were selected for inclusion in the CIS have been found to be sensitive to age bias; these seven items were embedded within the "Job-related personal qualifications" subscale, and included: ability to communicate, team work ability, initiative, adaptability, openness, being energetic, working under pressure.

This initial draft of the CIS was then reviewed by six corporate employers, who evaluated the form along the following dimensions: a) the extent to which the draft CIS reflected the typical information gathered in on-campus interviews; b) whether any questions or information that should be included were missing; c) whether the evaluation scales were understandable; and d) whether the form was a satisfactory on-campus recruiting tool (Appendix B). The CIS was slightly modified in response to recruiter suggestions.

Because education recruiters typically use different evaluation procedures than corporate recruiters, samples of education interview evaluation forms were collected from three school districts. In addition, four education recruiters evaluated the draft CIS for its appropriateness for education interviews. Examination of typical education evaluation forms and educators' responses to the corporate version of the CIS prompted further revisions. Specifically, a section assessing "job related performance characteristics" of the type important to the recruitment of teachers, was included on the CIS. This section was used only on the education recruiters' form.

The final version of the CIS contained two sections: a) applicant rating scales and recommendation for a second interview; and b) demographic information. The applicant
rating scales contained a total of 23 items, subdivided into four subscales:
education/training (6 items); job-related performance characteristics (6 items; this section
was included on the education recruiters' form only); job-related personal ability
characteristics (10 items including the 7 age bias items from the ASQ); and an overall rating
of the applicant (1 item). All 23 items evaluating the applicant were assessed on a scale
from "superior" (5) to "Unacceptable" (1). Cronbach's alpha reliabilities were computed
on the subscales of the College Interview Summary from the data gathered in this study.
Alphas of .75, .86, and .92 were found for the education/training, job-related performance
characteristics, and job-related ability characteristics subscales, respectively. For the
personal/professional training characteristics subscales -- completed only by the raters of
education interviews, the alpha was .84. After the participants evaluated the interviewees
across these 23 items, they were asked to make a recommendation about whether the
applicant should be invited for a second interview. These ratings were assessed on a three
point scale from "would recommend" (3) through "Uncertain" (2) to "would not
recommend" (1).

The third section of the CIS included eight questions requesting background and
demographic information from the recruiters: type of organization recruiter works for; size
of the employer; level of responsibility of recruiter; number of years of college recruiting
experience; region of the country in which recruiter is located; and age, sex, and race of
recruiter. Two versions of the CIS were used: one for business and engineering recruiters,
omitting the job-related performance characteristics subscale, and the full set of subscales,
including the job-related performance characteristics, for the education recruiters.

Materials development

In order to examine the effects of age, gender, and field on recruiters' evaluations,
it was necessary to develop materials that were as similar as possible across these three
dimensions. The following sections describe the development of the resumes and mock interview audiotapes. All materials went through several evaluations to ensure comparability across the age conditions (younger versus older), and across gender and field.

**Resumes**—The resumes used in this study were developed to reflect slightly above average background and ability levels in order to maximize the probability of assessing potential age bias (Muchinsky and Harris, 1977). First, drafts of sample resumes from the fields of accounting, engineering, and education were developed based on actual student resumes. These business and engineering draft resumes were evaluated by ten seasoned corporate recruiters and the education drafts resumes were evaluated by five seasoned education recruiters in the following areas: objectives, grade point average, educational background, experience, activities and honors, and readability of the resume. All ratings were assessed on a 5-point scale from "outstanding" (5) to "poor" (1). In addition, an overall rating for the resume was obtained on the same 5-point scale (Appendix C).

No formal statistical analysis was performed on the ratings due to the very small sample size. However, mean ratings for all resumes across fields were visually examined to identify the resumes that reflected the slightly above average version sought for the study. Three resumes, one per field, with slightly above average ratings were identified, and minor revisions were made in the accounting resume to ensure comparability. The activities and honors section in the first draft of the accounting resume was rated rather poorly. This section was replaced by an activities and honors section from another accounting resume rated in the average range. An elementary education resume was used because it was the only education resume rated appropriately. The initial engineering and education resumes were not modified.

**Photographs**—The age condition (younger versus older) in this study was manipulated through the use of photographs attached to the resume. It was therefore
necessary to establish that the photographs would be perceived as younger versus older, but that the photographs were similar across other important dimensions, particularly on attractiveness.

The researcher photographed 20 individuals, 10 male and 10 female, of varying ages. These photographs were then evaluated by a class of 28 graduate students on two characteristics, age and attractiveness (Appendix D). Class members merely guessed an age, then rated each photographed individual on a scale from "very unattractive" (1) to "very attractive" (5).

Means and standard deviations for the age and attractiveness ratings were computed, and t-tests were conducted between all possible pairs of scores. The "younger" photos selected for use in the study were those of a female and male, each rated average in attractiveness and about 23 years old. No significant differences were found across gender for the age or attractiveness ratings. Photographs of "older" male and female interviewers were likewise similar across age (about 35) and attractiveness ratings (no significant differences on the t-tests). Finally, there were no significant differences on t-tests on attractiveness ratings between the younger and older pairs; however, t-tests did reveal significant differences between the younger and older pairs on the age ratings. This latter finding strongly suggested that the age manipulation would be consistently perceived by participants. The same photographs were used on all resumes across the three fields.

Audiotapes--Separate interviews by field were used in this study; however, the interviews were developed to be as similar as possible save for the types of questions unique to the field. Further, because of the need to examine differences in evaluations by gender, parallel male and female versions of the interviews were necessary. Thus, audiotape development activities included designing comparable scripts across fields, identifying male and female voices whose quality was judged comparably and could be
taken as the voice of either the younger or older interviewee, and finally, evaluating the actual audiotapes for similarity across dimensions not manipulated.

First, six men and six women were audiotaped responding to a job interview question. A class of 22 graduate students in the social sciences listened to the tapes and evaluated voice quality on a scale from "very pleasant" (5) to "very unpleasant" (1). Students also guessed the age, race, and gender of the speaker (Appendix E).

Only those "voices" where gender was properly identified were used. Further, any voice rated by any student as being from an ethnic group other than Anglo was eliminated to minimize the chance of potential race bias confounding the results. Of the male and female actors left, the sample tapes with voices rated as ranging from 20 to 40 were selected to ensure that the voice could match either the younger or older interviewee.

After the actors were selected, the actual audiotapes were developed in three phases. First, transcripts of several mock interviews in each of the fields, accounting, electrical engineering, and education, were used as the basis for writing initial transcripts for the interviews in this study. Six corporate recruiters evaluated the business and engineering draft transcripts and 10 education recruiters evaluated the education transcript (Appendix F). First, the questions asked in the interview were evaluated: recruiters assessed whether the questions were appropriate and whether additional questions should be asked. Next, the interviewee responses were evaluated on a 4-point scale, from "poor" (1) to "very good" (4). The transcript ratings were generally very favorable; recruiters judged the interview as comparable to typical on-campus interviews. Minor modifications were made in the draft transcripts in responses to recruiter feedback and suggestions (Appendix G).

After the transcripts were modified, audiotapes of interviews for each field, by the male and female actors, were recorded. The same interviewer, a female, served across all interviews. As an additional check, the completed audiotapes were qualitatively evaluated by 8 experienced career services staff members. Age estimates ranged from 22 to 45; the
audiotaped interviews were perceived as very similar to typical on-campus interviews; and the interviewees were perceived as generally believable.

**Procedures**

During the Fall of 1992, the 480 participating employers were sent: a) resume with a photo; b) an audio-tape of the interview; and c) an evaluation form. Each individual evaluated only one resume and taped interview (Appendix I). Employers received materials on interviews in their field: business, engineering or education. Each employer was randomly assigned by field, to one of the four conditions: male candidate 23; male candidate 35; female candidate 23; female candidate 35. The appropriate materials (resume with photo, audio-tape of the interview, College Interview Summary, and return envelope) were sent to each subject accompanied by a cover letter (Appendix J).

The education recruiter letter had an additional paragraph added to the letter since most student teaching does not happen until the semester before graduation and the letter was sent out prior to when the candidate would have student taught (Appendix K).

In the cover letter the researcher explained the time needed to review the resume, listen to the audiotape and complete the survey. In addition, the researcher confirmed that the confidentiality of the survey responses would be honored. To assure that participants’ responses would be treated confidentially, the return envelope rather than the College Interview Summary was coded. Thus, when each envelope was returned, it was logged in so that participate who had responded would not be sent follow-up postcards. Five weeks after the packet of materials was sent out, a reminder postcard (Appendix L) was sent to recruiters who had not returned the College Interview Summary.

Three hundred and three (63 percent) College Interview Summary forms were returned; 141 (46.5) percent were from females and 159 (52.4 percent) were from males and 3 (1 percent) did not complete the demographic data.
Data analysis

The major dependent variables in this study were the three subscales of the College Interview Summary: Education and Training, Job Related Performance Characteristics, and Job Related Personal Ability Characteristics. The effects of field, age and gender of the interviewee and on the three major dependent variables were analyzed via a $3\times2\times2$ MANOVA (3 fields: business, engineering, and education; by 2 sexes: male and female; by 2 ages of interviewee: 23 and 35). Significant multivariate main and interaction effects were followed up via univariate ANOVAs and Newman-Keuls post-hoc comparison procedures.

The effects of field, age and gender of interviewee on interviewer ratings were also analyzed via an analyses of the two other dependent variables (overall ratings and recommendation for a second interview). Overall ratings of the interview and recommendation for a second interview were analyzed via 3 way ANOVAs; main and interaction effects were followed by Newman-Keuls post hoc comparison procedures.

Finally, a $2\times2$ ANOVA was conducted on the personal/professional subscale from the College Interview Summary for education interviews only.

Summary

This chapter has described the procedures used in the completion of the study. Chapter Four presents the findings.
CHAPTER IV
FINDINGS

This chapter presents the findings of this study. Data are presented as they relate to a national sample of recruiters who interview on campuses across the United States for business, engineering and education. The data will be presented as they relates to the major questions in the study. Data are presented in tables and relevant aspects are discussed following each table.

Sample

A sample of 480 on campus recruiters were selected for the study: 80 male and 80 female business recruiters; 80 male and 80 female engineering recruiters; and 80 male and 80 education recruiters. Each recruiter was sent a copy of a resume with a photo, an audiotape and a College Interview Summary. Three hundred and three (63 percent) College Interview Summary forms were returned; 141 (46.5 percent) were from females and 159 (52.4 percent) were from males and 3 (1 percent) did not complete the demographic data. The analysis by field was as follows: 47 male and 51 female business recruiters; 57 male and 43 female engineering recruiters; and 55 male education and 47 female education recruiters. Tables 2 through 8 summarize the demographic data which were collected to provide further analysis and to review the generalizability of the results.

Table 2 presents the data on the distribution of the respondents by organizational classification.
Table 2

Distribution of Respondents by Organizational Classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industrial Classification</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accounting-Public</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aerospace, Electronic &amp; Instruments</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Automotive &amp; Mechanical Equipment</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banking, Finance &amp; Insurance</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bldg. Mat., Manuf., &amp; Const.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemicals, Drugs &amp; Allied Products</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical Machinery &amp; Equipment</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food &amp; Beverage Processing</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glass, Paper, Pkg. &amp; Allied Prod.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merchandising &amp; Services</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metals &amp; Metals Products</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petroleum &amp; Allied Products</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research and/or Consulting Org.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tire and Rubber</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities - Public(Inc.Transp.)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Government</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local/State Government</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Profit Org. &amp; Educ. Inst.</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>32.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Identified</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It should be noted that 99 (32.7 percent) of the respondents identified non-profit organization and education institution as their organizational classification because this was the only category available for the educational recruiter. Education recruiters represented one third of the sample. The variety of recruiters represented by the sample affords considerable generalizability.
Table 3

Size of the Organization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - 499</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 - 999</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>16.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000 - 2999</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>26.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3000 - 4999</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000 - 9999</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 10,000</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No indication</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The respondents represented not only small but very large employers therefore, the generalizability of the results should be considered appropriate for small as well as large employers.

Table 4

Level of Responsibility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recruiter</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>28.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First-level manager</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle-level manager</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>29.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior-level manager</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>27.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No indication</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The respondents were asked to identify their level of responsibility. As can be seen in the Table 4, they appeared to be relatively balanced between the categories, except for the first level manager. Even though first level managers represented a smaller part of the sample, the fact that the recruiter, middle-level and senior-level manager were represented almost equally would assume that the results have good generalizability.
Table 5

**Number of Years of Experience In College Recruiting/Personnel**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - 4</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>28.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - 9</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>23.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - 14</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 - 19</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 - 24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 and over</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No indication</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The mean years of experience was slightly over ten years, but as the table indicates the majority of the respondents had 14 or less years experience.

Table 6

**Region of the Country**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>26.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>31.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>24.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No indication</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The College Placement Association and Association of School, College and University Staffing memberships from which the sample was taken was distributed as follows: West 378 (18.8 percent); North 603 (30 percent); South 502 (25 percent); and East 525 (26.1 percent). The original sample distribution was as follows: West 113 (23.5 percent); North 148 (30.8 percent); South 123 (25.2 percent); and East 96 (20 percent).
The differences in distribution from the CPC and ASCUS membership and the original sample can be explained by the fact that the researcher had an equal representation of males and females in the sample and the need to solicit additional female recruiters from Ohio and Arizona to make the education cells equal. The response from the West was greater than either the CPC and ASCUS membership or the original sample, but it can be explained because of recruiters familiarity with the researcher.

Table 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24 or below</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-39</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-44</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-49</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-54</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-59</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-64</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 or above</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No indication</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The median age of the employers was 40 - 44. The sample is older than the recruiters reported by Garder and Nixon (1991), but their sample did not include education recruiters. Educational recruiters are often experienced teachers and personnel types who have previously been teacher, therefore that population tends to be older.
Table 8

Race of the recruiter

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaskan Native</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, non-Hispanic</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>84.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Pacific Islander</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not indicated</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The respondents actually are fairly representative of the typical recruiter as described by Gardner and Nixon (1991) in which 92% of the recruiters were white.

Of those who responded with the College Interview Summary form, it appears that the results should be generalizable across organizational classifications, size of organization, level of responsibility, experience, region of the country, race and age of the recruiter.

Results

The major question examined in this study was whether field, age and gender interact in terms of how on-campus recruiters evaluate applicants.

T-tests by gender of the participants (recruiters) were conducted for all dependent variables; no significant differences emerged. Therefore, all subsequent analyses were collapsed across rater gender.
A 3 X 2 X 2 MANOVA (field: accounting, engineering, education; by age: younger or older interviewees; by gender of interviewee) was conducted on the three subscales from the CIS that all raters completed (i.e., education/training, job-related performance characteristics, and job-related personal ability characteristics). No significant two or three-way interactions emerged. The sole significant multivariate main effect was found for field \( F (6,566)=12.41, p<.001 \) as shown in Table 9.

Table 9
Summary Table for Three Factor MANOVA on CIS Subscales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Field</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.232</td>
<td>12.41 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field by Age</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field by Gender</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>1.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age by Gender</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field by Age</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.097</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***p < .001

Note. Value for multivariate tests of significance based on Pillais' tests. Df = 6,566 for main effect for field and interactions involving field. Df = 3,282 for other tests.
Means and standard deviations for the major dependent variables, broken down by field, by age, and by gender are presented in Tables 10, 11 and 12. Means and standard deviations for the major dependent variables broken down by field, age and gender are presented in Table 13.

Table 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscales</th>
<th>Accounting</th>
<th></th>
<th>Engineering</th>
<th></th>
<th>Education</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M  SD N</td>
<td>M  SD N</td>
<td>M  SD N</td>
<td>M  SD N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>__________________________</td>
<td>__________</td>
<td>__________</td>
<td>__________</td>
<td>__________</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education/Training</td>
<td>3.70 .51 97</td>
<td>3.69 .41 100</td>
<td>3.52 .50 103</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal/Professional</td>
<td>— — —</td>
<td>— — —</td>
<td>3.75 .55 103</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job-related Performance</td>
<td>3.90 .51 97</td>
<td>4.10 .50 99</td>
<td>3.58 .57 101</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job-related Personal</td>
<td>3.74 .56 97</td>
<td>3.91 .53 100</td>
<td>3.72 .58 102</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Rating</td>
<td>3.77 .59 84</td>
<td>3.87 .51 90</td>
<td>3.76 .65 87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Interview?</td>
<td>2.66 .63 97</td>
<td>2.75 .58 99</td>
<td>2.67 .59 100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 11

Means and Standard Deviations for Interview Ratings by Age of Interviewee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscales</th>
<th>Younger</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Older</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education/Training</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal/Professional</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job-related Performance</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job-related Personal</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Rating</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Interview?</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12

Means and Standard Deviations for Interview Ratings by Gender of Interviewee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscales</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Female</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education/Training</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal/Professional</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job-related Performance</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job-related Personal</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Rating</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Interview?</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 13

Means and Standard Deviations for Interview Ratings Subscales by Field, Age, and Gender of Interviewee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscales</th>
<th>Accounting</th>
<th></th>
<th>Engineering</th>
<th></th>
<th>Education</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Younger</td>
<td>Older</td>
<td>Younger</td>
<td>Older</td>
<td>Younger</td>
<td>Older</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education/Training</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal/Professional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job-related Performance</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job-related Personal</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Rating</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Interview?</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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A two-way (age by gender of interviewee) ANOVA was conducted on the personal/professional training characteristics subscale, the subscale completed only by raters of the education interviews. No significant main or interaction effects emerged for this analysis as noted in Table 14.

Table 14

Summary Table for Two-Factor ANOVA on Personal/Professional Scale for Education Interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>df</th>
<th>mean square</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age by Gender</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Finally, three-way (field by age by gender) ANOVAs were conducted on the two one-item summary scales from the CIS. No significant interactions were observed for the "overall rating" of the interview. However a significant three-way interaction was found \([F(2, 246) = 4.74, p < .01]\) on ratings for recommendation for a second interview (all \(ps < .05\)). Neuman-Keuls follow-up tests indicated that the ratings for the older male accounting interviewees were significantly lower than the ratings for the younger male accounting and younger and older female accounting interviewees. That is, despite the absence of any significant differences between older or younger interviewees on any other scale, older male accountants were recommended for a second interview significantly less often than younger male and younger and older female accountants. Further, younger men interviewing for engineering positions were rated significantly lower than older men or women. No significant differences by age or gender were observed for the education interviews. Table 15 presents the summary table for three factor ANOVAs on "overall" evaluation and recommendations for second interviews.
Table 15

Summary Table for Three Factor ANOVAs on "Overall" Evaluation and Recommendations for a Second Interview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Rating</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>mean square</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Field</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>3.49 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field by Age</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field by Gender</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age by Gender</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field by Age</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation for Second Interview</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>mean square</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Field</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.76 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field by Age</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field by Gender</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age by Gender</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field by Age</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>4.95 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05  
** p < .01  
*** p < .001
The other research questions were as follows:

Do on-campus recruiters evaluate younger interviewees more positive than older interviewees? No significant differences for age main effects were found. Do on-campus recruiters evaluate male interviewees more positive than female interviewees? No significant difference for gender main effect was found. And finally, do on-campus recruiters evaluate interviews differently across fields? A significant multivariate main effect on the three College Interview Summary subscales was found for field $[\text{F} (6, 566) = 12.41, \ p < .001]$. Follow-up univariate ANOVAs on the field main effect revealed significant main effects for field for all three dependent variables $[\text{F} (2, 284) = 4.85, \ p < .008$ for education/training; $\text{F} (2, 284) = 24.69, \ p < .001$ for performance; and $\text{F} (2, 284) = 3.60, \ p < .03$ for personal characteristics] as shown in Table 16.
Table 16

Follow-up Three-Factor Univariate ANOVAs on CIS Subscales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>df</th>
<th>mean square</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education Scale</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>4.85  **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field by Age</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field by Gender</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age by Gender</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field by Age by Gender</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Job Performance** |
|---------------------|----|-------------|-------|
| Field               | 2  | 6.79        | 24.69  *** |
| Age                 | 1  | .09         | .34   |
| Gender              | 1  | .39         | 1.44  |
| Field by Age        | 2  | .43         | 1.55  |
| Field by Gender     | 2  | .62         | 2.27  |
| Age by Gender       | 1  | .16         | .59   |
| Field by Age by Gender | 2 | .13         | .48   |
| Error               | 284| .27         |       |

| **Personal Characteristics** |
|-----------------------------|----|-------------|-------|
| Field                       | 2  | 1.12        | 3.60  *  |
| Age                         | 1  | .10         | .32   |
| Gender                      | 1  | .14         | .46   |
| Field by Age                | 2  | .02         | .05   |
| Field by Gender 2           | 2  | .86         | 2.76  |
| Age by Gender 2             | 1  | .07         | .23   |
| Field by Age by Gender      | 2  | .08         | .25   |
| Error                       | 284| .31         |       |

* p < .05  
** p < .01  
*** p < .001
Neuman-Keuls follow-up tests on these main effects indicated that ratings on the education/training subscale were significantly higher for the accounting and engineering interviews than for the education interview (all ps for follow-up tests significant at .05). For the job-related performance characteristics subscale, the engineering interviews were rated higher than the accounting interviews, which were, in turn, rated significantly higher than the education interviews. For the job-related personal ability characteristics subscale, the engineering interviews were rated significantly higher than either of the other two interviews.

A significant main effect for field was also found for the "overall rating" of the interview [F (2, 246) = 4.34, p < .01]. Follow-up tests on the main effect for field indicated that the engineering interviews were rated significantly higher than either the accounting or the education interviews as shown in Table 13.

Summary

This chapter offered the findings of the study. Chapter Five presents a summary of the study, conclusions drawn from the findings, and recommendations for further study and for the interviewing process.
CHAPTER V
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The final chapter of this investigation consists of a summary of the study, conclusions drawn from the data presented in Chapter Four, and selected recommendations for further studies and for Career Services offices.

Summary

The student body at colleges and universities has changed. Of the twelve and a half million students enrolled today, forty percent are over twenty-five years of age or non-traditional while only two million are what used to be called traditional, that is eighteen to twenty-two year-old full-time campus residents (Millard, 1991). These non-traditional students are being accepted to the postsecondary education to fill the classes that the traditional student filled during the sixties. In most cases their attendance at a university or college represents a departure from their normal life style.

There are many reasons why these non-traditional students come to the colleges and universities, but the reason stated most often is career related (Sewell, 1984). Even though the college graduate has competed effectively in the job market, thus far, from 1990 - 2005 employment projections for the college graduate indicate that approximately 70% can expect to find jobs requiring a college degree (Shelly, 1992). Since there will be more graduates than jobs, it is essential that the non-traditional graduate be able to compete for the 70% of the positions available and not have the added burden of age-bias to inhibit them from competing in the college job market.
The labor force is growing older. Today the average American worker is 39 years old and more than 14 million people over age 55 are now working. By the year 2010, over-55 workers will make up 25% of the U.S. work force. When studying managerial problems, Rosen and Jerdee (1976) found that when older workers are perceived as rigid and resistant to change, the managerial decisions favored avoiding efforts to correct the employee's performance whereas with the younger employee, efforts were made to correct the employee's behavior. Also, when the older employee's skills became outdated, the decision to terminate the employee rather than invest in retraining was favored. Insuring that the non-traditional graduate does not inherit these problems as they try to compete in the college market place is essential. If the non-traditional college graduate can compete effectively and get hired for the college skilled position, it is hoped that they will not throughout their career be perceived as the older than average trainee, and first line manager.

The intent of this study was to investigate the attitudes of on-campus recruiters toward non-traditional graduates, more specifically, the study examined attitudes indicative of age-bias in college recruiters. Specifically it questioned whether or not a significant relationship existed between business, engineering and education recruiters and evaluation of non-traditional graduates.

Resumes with a photo, an audiotape of an interview and a College Summary Interview form was mailed to a sample of 480 business, engineering and education recruiters. Three hundred and three (63 percent) of the College Summary Interview forms were returned. Of those recruiters who responded, all industrial classifications were represented with 99 (32.7 percent) of the respondents identifying the non-profit organization and education institutions as their classification, since one third of the study was aimed at education recruiters. The respondents represented small, medium and large size employers, various levels of recruiting and management responsibilities, varying
degrees of experience, different ages, races and geographic locations. The gender make was 141 (46.5 percent) females and 159 (52 percent) males. Each cell had at least 10 female and 10 male respondents.

T-tests by gender of the participants (recruiters) were conducted for all dependent variables; no significant differences emerged, therefore, all subsequent analyses were collapsed across rater gender. A 3 X 2 X 2 MANOVA (field: accounting, engineering, education; by age: younger or older interviewees; by gender of interviewee) was conducted on the three subscales from the CIS that all raters completed. No significant two or three-way interactions emerged. The sole significant multivariate main effect was found for accounting. Follow-up univariate ANOVAs on the field main effect revealed significant main effects for all three dependent variables (education/training, performance, and personal characteristics).

Conclusions

The overall results suggest that age and gender bias are not widespread phenomena among college recruiters. On the other hand, the findings of age differences on recommendations for second interviews is of concern. It may be that recruiters carefully and fairly evaluate job applicants on the basis of their interview performance and on their resume. However, when it comes to who will continue in the interview process, decisions may not be made as fairly. This calls for future research that focuses specifically on decision points rather than solely upon interview evaluations.

The major finding in the study was the tendency of recruiters to recommend older business interviewees for second interviews less often than younger business interviewees. The fact that no significant differences were found for age or gender on any other rating scale makes the results for the interview recommendations all the more important. Apparently recruiters do not actively discriminate by age or gender when evaluating the
content of resumes and interviews. However, it also appears that age bias does creep in for business recruiters at the point where recommendations are made for a second interview -- the very ratings that are most crucial to the job seeker. It is concluded that based on the findings of this exploratory study that age-bias may affect the recruiters decisions as to who is referred for a second interview.

A second finding of the study was the tendency of recruiters in different fields to evaluate similar candidates differently. Standards for evaluation appear to be higher in education than in the two other fields, but particularly engineering. That is, the engineering interviewees were rated significantly higher across most of the dependent variables than the education interviewees, and sometimes higher than the business interviewees. These results may simply be due to the fact that educators, as a group, must be highly socially skilled whereas those social skills are not as crucial for engineering graduates. Based on this finding it is concluded that a differential evaluation standard exists across fields even when candidates are similar.

Additional Findings:--Even though an attempt was made to make the candidate appear as average as possible, the interviewees may have been "too good" -- ratings tended to be high, so there may have been a "ceiling effect," -- that is, the ratings were so high that there was not much room at the top to pick up differences that may have been there. In Table 17 recruiter recommendations for second interviews across all areas effectively shows the "ceiling effect."
Table 17

Analysis of Number of Recruiter Recommendations for Second Interview by Field, Age and Gender of Interview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Business</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Engineering</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Education</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Younger</td>
<td>Older</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Younger</td>
<td>Older</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Younger</td>
<td>Older</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, 2nd Interview</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, 2nd Interview</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Several recruiters commented on the interview itself. They stated that the interviewer did not probe for more specific information. The following were some of the comments written by the recruiters about the candidates:

(Engineer male, 35) In "real life," few (if any) students answer that many questions so well...it must have been a rehearsed session. If not, I'll take him !!!!!!!!!

(Engineer female, 23) The enthusiasm is there, yet the candidate sounded coached. Unbelievable. The questions are general/generic and solicit general/generic responses. The work she did to get funding was great. I would have liked to hear more specific situation questions.

(Engineer female, 23) Appeared to be good candidate--confident about her skills, yet not arrogant. I would definitely have interest for in-depth 2nd interview given a job opportunity.
(Engineer male, 23) Heavy on the "I" giving an indication of high opinion of himself. His discussion also gave the impression that he would not be a team person. He would be better off doing research.

(Engineer male, 23) I believe the candidate was too general in responses and allowed to "drift" in the interview. There is a fine line between aggressiveness and b.s., I think he crossed it.

(Engineer male, 23) Candidate sounded too "Canned" and some answers bordered on arrogant.

It was very interesting to see that what one recruiter evaluated as confidence in the young female engineer, three other recruiters evaluated as arrogant in the young male engineering graduate. As in the study, younger men interviewing for engineering positions were rated significantly lower than older men or women.

The following two comments about the older engineering female graduate also exhibits a very different attitude than the comments earlier about the younger male engineer.

(Engineer female, 35) In several years' experience with college and other recruiting, I have interviewed hundreds of candidates. This candidate is more poised and certainly better able to communicate than most of the candidates I have interviewed. This candidates responses were certainly well prepared and thought out. I would suggest that the interviewer ask the candidate to be more specific i.e. give examples of how she has worked well with others, and examples of problem solving ability and team work.

(Engineer female, 35) I would have liked the interviewer to probe-or follow up on applicants responses. It was question-answer, question-answer-like a cook book-should have been more interactive-could have gleaned more from Ms. Doyle-test and challenge more.

In education, two recruiters commented that the male candidate was referred to the second interview because of a need for male teachers in elementary school. As stated earlier, standards for evaluating education candidates appeared to be higher than in the two other fields. The following comments from the recruiters would validate that finding.
(Education male, 23) The audio-tape was an interesting concept in the presentation of a personality. My impression was of a young man eager to begin a role in life that he had worked hard to achieve. He began in a judgmental tone with "iron-fisted: rule and referred to a defiant nature in a student as a behavior he ignored rather than addressed. However, as the interview progressed, statements became more relaxed and his understanding and concern for helping children to meet their potential became evident.

(Education male, 23) Questions concerning specific situations and possible solutions would help. Also what does candidate bring in his own personality. I assume a level of subject expertise-what else does he bring.

(Education male, 35) We would need to ask specific questions related to our vision and mission statement, etc. Need for males in elementary education.

(Education female, 35) Voice quality somewhat "flat," some animation would be good--ideas seem good--but presentation is important.

There was no significant difference in the attitudes of male and female recruiters in the response to the traditional and non-traditional student. In most research that used male and female interviewers, a difference in results due to sex has not been found (Heilman & Saruwatari, 1979; Heilman & Stopeck, 1985; Landy & Farr, 1983; Morrow et al, 1990; Muchinsky & Harris, 1977; Shore & Thornton, 1986).

Recommendations

In terms of future research, several recommendations can be made:

First, it is recommended that a replication of this study be conducted in which recruiters a) are queried on how and why they decide to recommend candidates for second interviews, b) are requested to recommend candidates for second interviews with "their" organization, and c) are asked to view a video-taped or "live" interview to provide better data and show age-bias.

The recent research findings by Rynes and Gerhart (1990) in which employers evaluations were different when assessments of firm specific employability was compared to general employability. It appears that employers rate candidates higher when rating for overall employability versus "employability in your firm." Firm specific responses have
shown shared organization membership influences assessments of fit to a greater extent than general employability responses. Using the results from the research of Rynes and Gerhart (1990), a greater bias may be perceived when recruiters rate candidates for their organization. In addition, a videotaped or "live" interview would have eliminated using photos on the resume and provide an opportunity for the interviewer to assess the non-verbal cues as well as the verbal cues. In addition, the interviewer would have a constant reminder of the age of the candidate.

Second, it is recommended that a study be conducted to evaluate if standards for evaluation are different across fields (business, engineering and education) and perhaps within fields; i.e. for different majors in business, engineering and education.

Third, it is recommended that a study be conducted to examine differences in characteristics among recruiters across fields.

Several recommendations are presented for Career Services offices to assist non-traditional students to compete more effectively in the employment market.

First, it is recommended that programs be developed to assist non-traditional students to: a) be aware of potential biases that may exist in the marketplace and learn how to combat them, b) to develop successful job search strategies beyond on-campus recruiting, and c) to develop informed career decisions which will utilize both their past and present experiences.

Second, Career Services offices should initiate contact with other employers who will better utilize non-traditional students' skills and abilities and years of experience.

Third, Career Services offices should offer seminars to inform and educate on-campus recruiters about potential age bias in recruiting non-traditional students.

Finally, Career Services offices need to evaluate recruiting schedules to insure that non-traditional students are being referred for second interviews as often as traditional graduates.
APPENDICES
July 31, 1992

John E. Cole, Asst. Superintendent
Morongo Unified School Dist.
Personnel Services
P.O. Box 1209
29 Palms, CA 92277

Dear John:

Trying to complete a dissertation is a challenge, but it also often requires assistance from friends and professionals in the field. I'm no different! After many years of existing as an "All But Dissertation" person, I am now trying to finish my research and complete the program.

In order to do this, I need your assistance by reviewing one resume, an audio-tape of a portion of an interview and an evaluation form. I estimate that it should take you about 30 minutes for the entire project.

I plan to send the packet of information out in late August.

If you feel that you would have time to assist me, please return the enclosed postcard. If you do not have time, would you please refer this letter to someone else in your organization who is involved in on-campus recruiting?

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at (602) 965-2350, Arizona State University, Career Services.

Thank you for your help in advance.

Sincerely,

Jean E. Eisel
Director, Career Services
RETURN POSTCARD

(BUSINESS, ENGINEERING)

NAME
ADDRESS
CITY STATE ZIP

Major emphasis of recruiting (check one);
Engineering    Business    Both
Will you participate?

(EDUCATION)

NAME
ADDRESS
CITY STATE ZIP

Major emphasis of recruiting (check one)
    Elementary    Secondary    Both
Will you participate?    Yes    No
APPENDIX B

COLLEGE ON-CAMPUS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM

1. Does this instrument reflect the kind of information typically gathered at an on-campus interview?   Yes___No___

Comments____________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________

2. Is there any missing information or questions?
   Yes____No____

Comments____________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________

3. Is there anything you do not understand?
   Yes____No____

Comments____________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________

4. Is this a good tool for an on-campus interview?
   Yes____No____

Comments____________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________

Return to Jean Eisel, Arizona State University

Fax 602 965-2120
APPENDIX C

RESUME EVALUATION FORM

PLEASE EVALUATE EACH RESUME USING THE FOLLOWING RATINGS:

1. OUTSTANDING; 2. HIGH; 3. AVERAGE; 4. ADEQUATE; 5. POOR

RESUME #1
A. OBJECTIVE________________ B. EDUCATION___________
C. GRADE POINT AVERAGE______ D. EXPERIENCE__________
E. ACTIVITIES & HONORS______ F. READABILITY__________
G. OVERALL______________

RESUME #2
A. OBJECTIVE________________ B. EDUCATION___________
C. GRADE POINT AVERAGE______ D. EXPERIENCE__________
E. ACTIVITIES & HONORS______ F. READABILITY__________
G. OVERALL______________

RESUME #3
A. OBJECTIVE________________ B. EDUCATION___________
C. GRADE POINT AVERAGE______ D. EXPERIENCE__________
E. ACTIVITIES & HONORS______ F. READABILITY__________
G. OVERALL______________

RESUME #4
A. OBJECTIVE________________ B. EDUCATION___________
C. GRADE POINT AVERAGE______ D. EXPERIENCE__________
E. ACTIVITIES & HONORS______ F. READABILITY__________
G. OVERALL______________

RESUME #5
A. OBJECTIVE________________ B. EDUCATION___________
C. GRADE POINT AVERAGE______ D. EXPERIENCE__________
E. ACTIVITIES & HONORS______ F. READABILITY__________
G. OVERALL______________

NAME___________________________________________
INDUSTRY________________________________________
YEARS IN THE BUSINESS___________________________

THANK YOU FOR YOUR HELP!
APPENDIX D
PHOTO EVALUATION FORM

Directions: Part 1: Indicate in the appropriate space the age you guess the person in each photo to be.

A._________  F._________  K._________  P._________
B._________  G._________  L._________  Q._________
C._________  H._________  M._________  R._________
D._________  I._________  N._________  S._________
E._________  J._________  O._________  T._________

Part II: Use the following scale to rate the attractiveness of the person in each photo:

1 = VERY UNATTRACTIVE
2 = UNATTRACTIVE
3 = AVERAGE
4 = ATTRACTIVE
5 = VERY ATTRACTIVE.

A._________  F._________  K._________  P._________
B._________  G._________  L._________  Q._________
C._________  H._________  M._________  R._________
D._________  I._________  N._________  S._________
E._________  J._________  O._________  T._________
APPENDIX E

VOICE EVALUATION FORM

DIRECTIONS: Indicate in the appropriate spaces below the age, gender, ethnicity and voice quality of the person in each scenario.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGE M/F</th>
<th>GENDER</th>
<th>ETHNICITY</th>
<th>VOICE QUALITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WHITE (W)</td>
<td>1 = VERY PLEASANT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BLACK (B)</td>
<td>2 = PLEASANT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HISPANIC (H)</td>
<td>3 = SLIGHTLY PLEASANT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ASIAN (A)</td>
<td>4 = SLIGHTLY UNPLEASANT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5 = UNPLEASANT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6 = VERY UNPLEASANT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a)

b)

c)

d)

e)

f)

g)

h)

i)

j)

k)

l)

Thank you for your assistance! Jean Eisel
APPENDIX F

TRANSCRIPT EVALUATION FORM

PLEASE EVALUATE THE FOLLOWING SCRIPT FOR AN ON-CAMPUS SCREENING INTERVIEW.

1. Are the questions comparable to those that might be asked of a new college graduate during an on-campus interview?
   Yes_____ No_____(If no, please explain)

2. Are there additional questions that should be asked during a typical on-campus interview? If so, please list them.

3. In evaluating the responses given to each question, would you please rate each response using the following ratings?

   Question 1 _________  Question 2 _________
   Question 3 _________  Question 4 _________
   Question 5 _________  Question 6 _________
   Question 7 _________  Question 8 _________
   Question 9 _________  Question 10 _________

OVERALL__________

Thank you for your help
BUSINESS INTERVIEW

1. Tell me about yourself?

I am a senior this year. I work well with people and I enjoy working in groups. I've had opportunities for work experience and have joined several organizations while at Arizona State. I chose Arizona State because of the accounting program's reputation, it was large, and it seemed like I'd have many opportunities to get involved. I've enjoyed my accounting classes and I have been challenged in most of them. School's basically taught me to budget my time and learn to work well in groups; but also to be an individual. By that I mean, I had to go see my professors when I had problems, and take control of my own actions and do things for myself. Because if you don't, you'll get lost in the crowd.

2. Why did you choose Accounting?

I've always enjoyed working with numbers and I am an analytical type person. As I got into the major, I found that I enjoyed understanding how a company works. I learned about different companies through my course work, that even though the principles are the same, accounting for a manufacturing organization is different than accounting for a service organization. I feel there is a lot of job security in accounting, since the basis of all corporations are the accounting functions. I felt with this knowledge I could go anywhere within the organization.

3. What did you like the most about your accounting classes and least and why?

I liked the courses that required problem solving, courses where you had to analyze the information and develop your own solution. It was challenging because there wasn't just one solution. I found those courses interesting because you had to draw so much information together to solve the problem. And the courses I liked the least were the beginning courses with debits and credits. They were tedious and boring because most of what you did was memorization.

4. How did you contend with the pressure of managing your classes, involvement on-campus and other work experience?

I took it day by day. I used my day timer all the time, because budgeting my time was critical in order to balance all the things I wanted to do in a day. I sit down the night before and write down everything I have to do the next day. First of all it helps me get to sleep because I don't lie there thinking about what I have to do. It also helps keep things in perspective and focused on what I need to do. And granted, there are days I don't get to half of the things on the list because other things come up, but I think that is part of learning how to budget your time. I try to keep on top of things. I don't let myself get behind, especially with school work which can happen real easily. The last 2 years I was taking 18 hours a semester. That taught me that I can't get behind. I started to see that the more I did, the better I budgeted my time and the more I got done. I just got more efficient at things. In addition, I get a lot of support from my friends and my family which helped a lot.

5. Tell me about your work experience and what you feel it will give you for your future employment?

I have had three positions that I believe have complimented my academic experience. At Motorola, I had my first exposure to accounting and had the opportunity to gain some excellent programming skills that have been helpful in both college and my other work positions. At Sun Country
Industries and Mesa Sales, I gained more exposure to accounting and developed more confidence in my abilities. Since both companies were small, I had the opportunity to take on many responsibilities and get a good feel for working as a team. At Mesa Sales, I also was involved in sales and that gave me an appreciation of dealing with customers and listening to what they want. It taught me how to be customer oriented. I believe these three positions helped me focus my career goals and confirm my interest in an accounting career.

6. How would your supervisor describe you?

First...Motivated! I get to work on time and I'm willing to stay until everything is finished. I will even volunteer to come in if they need me. Also, a good listener. I listen to what the customers ask and I ask questions when I am not sure what they are looking for. Next, I'd say curious or interested?

I ask questions. I ask my supervisor when I do not understand a statement or a bill rather than just putting the information into the data base. I also try to understand how this information effects other areas. Finally, they definitely would say I am detail oriented.

7. Tell me about your leadership experience and give a specific example.

I feel that when I am elected into a position that those people who voted me into the position, respect me and my decisions. When I get into a group I will be level headed and not just thinking in my ways, but thinking for the whole group. I learned that you need to be able to adapt to each situation, to the people around you and listen to what people are saying; I just think this is all part of being a leader.

For example, when I was elected as the College of Business representative, I had to work with the larger student government organization, ASASU, and insure that the various student organizations in the College of Business got equal representation for funding from ASASU. I sent a letter to all the presidents of the organizations within the College of Business outlining dates for submission of funding requests and offered to help them prepare their proposals. This was never done before, and last year, each college of business student organization applied and received funding. Prior to last year, some groups never even applied for funding because they were not aware of the option.

8. What are your short and long term goals?

I plan to take the CPA exam in May. Initially, I would like the opportunity to get a broad exposure to all areas of accounting. Long range, I want to move into management. I plan to do whatever is necessary, even if that means taking on additional assignments or further education to achieve this goal.

9. What do you have to offer?

I have good leadership skills. I have been involved in a lot of our campus organizations and have held leadership positions in almost all the projects that I have been involved with, and I think I've been very effective. I have good communication skills that enable me to communicate both with superiors and my colleagues. I'm committed to any duties that are assigned to me and I try to manage my time well and meet regular deadlines. I also think I have good problem solving skills. I think when you put all this together, I'm an ideal candidate for this position.

10. What are you looking for from a company?

I am looking for variety. I'm also looking for responsibility and the opportunity to take initiative on a variety of tasks, set some of my own goals and be able to evaluate myself. When I evaluate myself, I'm usually harder on myself than other people are which pushes me. I motivate myself a lot through that.
I'm really results oriented in everything I do and I want to work for a company that lets me be an individual. I like working under someone who can give me some directions as well as delegate authority. I enjoy working in a group and I've learned when to take on a leadership role and when to allow someone else's to lead. I am hoping to be a part of an organizations that allows me to be an active team member.
ENGINEERING INTERVIEW

1. Tell me about yourself

I am a senior this year. I work well with people and I enjoy working in groups. I have had opportunities for engineering work experiences and have joined several organizations while at Arizona State. I chose Arizona State because of the College of Engineering's reputation, it was large, and it seemed like I'd have many opportunities to get involved. I have enjoyed my engineering classes and I have been challenged in most of these classes. College has basically taught me to budget my time and learn to work well in groups; but also be an individual. By that I mean I had to go see my professors when I have problems, and take control of my own actions and do things for myself. Because if you don't, you'll get lost in the crowd.

2. Why did you choose engineering?

I'm an analytical type person and I always enjoyed math and science, especially physics. I realized a career in electrical engineering was a good choice because of my fascination for new technologies developing in the computer industry. I wanted to understand how things work and learn how to develop new ways to communicate better with machines.

3. What did you like the most about your engineering courses and least and why?

I especially liked the upper division courses that required problem solving analysis, where you had to analyze information and develop your own solutions. I found those courses most challenging because you had to draw so much information together to solve the problem. The courses I liked least were the beginning courses which seemed to be mostly memorization.

4. How did you contend with the pressure of managing your classes, involvement on-campus and your work experience?

I took it day by day. I used my day timer all the time, because budgeting my time was critical in order to balance all the things I wanted to do in a day. I sit down the night before and write down everything I have to do the next day. First of all it helps me get to sleep because I don't lie there thinking about what I have to do. It also helps keep things in perspective and focused on what I need to do. And, granted, there are days I don't get to half of the things on the list because other things come up, but I think that's part of learning how to budget your time. I try to keep on top of things. I don't let myself get behind, especially with school work which can happen real easily.

The last 2 years I was taking 18 hours a semester, except when I co-oped, that experience taught me that I can't get behind. I started to see that the more I did, the better I budgeted my time and the more I got done. I just got more efficient at things. In addition I got a lot of support from my friends and my family which helped a lot.

5. Tell me about your work experience and what you feel it will give you for your future employment?

As a tutor, I got to communicate with a lot of people and I had to explain a lot of things to students in English, instead of what is in the books, which seems to be in some other language! It is a learning experience, because I talk with people and I feel good when they actually understand what I am saying and they do, because they tell me.
But my experiences at Williams Air Force Base and then at McDonnell Douglas were extremely challenging! At the Air Force Base, I had the opportunity to actually design a software program which was used for data analysis for the F-16 Dome simulator. For this work, I received an award from the laboratory and that made the experience even more exciting! I felt like I made a difference! While at McDonnell Douglas, I got to work on software for the Apache Control System. Hardware improvements were being made and I had to revise the simulation software! I believe these experiences coupled with my academic work at ASU have qualified me for the engineering program you described in your literature.

6. How would your supervisor describe you?

First, Motivated! I get to work on time and if necessary I stay as long as needed to assist a student with a problem. Also, a good listener. I listen to the questions students have and I ask them questions to make sure I understand their problems. Curious or interested? I ask questions, I ask many questions about new programs or hardware and I try to learn all I can about it. I talk to my supervisor, when I do not understand a concept. Finally, they definitely would say that I am detail oriented.

7. Tell me about your experience with Leadership?

I feel that when I'm elected into a position, that those people who voted me into the position, respect me and my decisions. That when I get into a group I will be level headed and not just thinking in my ways, but thinking for the whole group. I learned that you need to be able to adapt to each situation, to the people around you and listen to what people are saying: I just think this is all part of being a leader.

As secretary of the Association of Computing Machinery, I had the opportunity to help our group get some funding from ASASU, our student government. I was aware that student organizations could apply for funding, so I met with our college council representative for proposal and funding information. I wrote the proposal and received approval from the association members to present it to ASASU.

Because the funding is competitive, I also showed it to our advisor and the college council representative and got their backing. I even requested time to speak in front of the Senate to present our proposal. We did get the funding! This was the first time our group received monies from ASASU. Because of the funding, we were able to put on a seminar and bring in an outside speaker.

8. What are your short and long term goals?

Initially I would like the opportunity to get a broad exposure to the different engineering applications, such as the rotating program that you have. I think that will give me an opportunity to see the type of work done in each area. As you can see from my resume, I am particularly interested in communication applications. Long range, I would like to become a project leader because I feel in this position, I would have an opportunity to contribute the most. I'm also interested in continuing my engineering education because I believe that is the way to keep current and aware of new technologies.

9. What do you have to offer?

I think I have the potential to be an outstanding engineer, because I tried to learn as much as possible in my classes and my experience at McDonnell Douglas and Williams Air Force Base. They gave me an opportunity to apply my course work and gain confidence in my abilities as an engineer.

I have good leadership skills. I've been involved in a lot of our campus organizations and have held leadership positions in almost all the projects that I have been involved with and I think I've been very effective. I feel I have good communication skills that enable me to communicate both with superiors and
my colleagues. I'm committed to any duties that are assigned to me and I try to manage my time well and meet regular deadlines. I also think I have good problem solving skills which I used in all my engineering classes because I always had project assignments which required some problem solving techniques.

I think when you put all this together I'm an ideal candidate for the position.

10. **What are you looking for from a company?**

I am looking for variety. I'm also looking for responsibility and the opportunity to take initiative on a variety of tasks, set some of my own goals and be able to evaluate myself. When I evaluate myself I'm usually harder on myself than other people are which pushes me. I motivate myself a lot through that. I'm really results oriented in everything I do and I want to work for a company that lets me be an individual.

I like working under someone who can give direction and delegate authority. I enjoy working in a group and I've learned when to take on a leadership role and when to follow someone else's lead. I am hoping to be a part of an organization that allows me to be an active team member.
EDUCATION INTERVIEW

1. Tell me about yourself?

I am a senior this year. I work well with people and I enjoy working in groups. I have had several classroom experiences, all in the Washington District. The four semester teaching experiences were invaluable because I found that teaching really is the right profession for me. I chose Arizona State because of the College of Education's reputation, it was large, and it seemed like I would have many opportunities to be involved. I have enjoyed my education classes and I have been challenged in most of my classes here. School's basically taught me to budget my time and learn to work well in groups, but also at ASU you have to be an individual. By that I mean, I had to go see my teachers when I had problems, and take control of my own actions and go ahead and do things for myself, because if you don’t you'll get lost.

2. Why do you want to become a teacher?

Well, I really like to help children; helping children to reach their potential. Through my practicum and student teaching experiences I had the opportunity to work with all kind of children with different needs. I feel that I enjoyed working with students and I believe that I can make a difference. I would really like to help each student learn. It is exciting to assist students in understanding concepts and encourage them to meet their potential.

3. Who do you think is most responsible for a student's learning, the teacher, the student or the parents?

I think it is my responsibility to see that the children learn, and it's also the parents' responsibility to see that they learn at home, if they have a homework assignment or a reading assignment, whatever it happens to be. I would give one-third to each: the student, the parents and myself. I think it is my responsibility to see that the children learn, and their responsibility to attempt to learn, and it's their parents' responsibility to follow-up at home. I feel that as far as that goes, I do see it as my job that they learn, and if they don't learn, I feel like I've failed as well. I would also like to try to involve the students and their parents in the learning process.

4. Describe your most difficult student discipline situation, and how you handled it. What was the outcome?

My most difficult student was a little boy. At first, he was in need of a lot of attention, his behavior was outlandish in class, different types of defiant behaviors to get attention. He came from a broken home and I think that may have affected him.

At first I had a hard time. I was being real iron-fisted with him. I tried to control his behavior, which didn't seem to work. I eventually started to ignore some of this behavior. I figured it was more or less an attention-getting device. Then, I began praising him for his good behavior and letting him know what I expected of him.

I told him he could do anything, I tried to instill in him that he could be a good student, because he was a bright student.

It just was a matter of his making an effort, and that appropriate behavior was his responsibility. Others respected him if he did things that were expected of him. As I ignored his bad behavior and praised him for positive efforts, it helped and eventually his disruptive behavior stopped.
5. What grading system works for you?

I've been using a fairly traditional grading system as far as that goes. I am going to try some remedial things, in fact, and I expect success from my students. Usually if a student doesn't meet 70% or better we just sit down, we'll have a mini lesson, and we'll go over the skills again.

However, if enough students haven't mastered the skill then I think I haven't taught it appropriately, if they didn't catch it the first time, we'll go back and review it.

I think there are some special students that get 70-80%, and for them that might be an A, as opposed to a student, a bright student that gets 90%, and also deserves an A.

But I try to instill in my students to give their best effort. If their best effort is a C, I'll accept that as long as they give their best.

6. What should teachers expect from the principal?

I think care or support. Know they are there for them. If a teacher does encounter a problem, be it with a parent or student, to know they have that support. Not only let them know they have that support but follow it up with action, and be willing to help the teacher. At times if we get into a certain situation with a parent, be willing to sit down as a 3-way team and help resolve it. I guess the main thing is, be a support system. Let them know you are there for them.

7. What do you want your students to have gained from you when they are ready to leave your classroom?

Self confidence. I want them to learn the lessons, but also I want them to learn to think logically; how to use the methods that we have learned, not just individual methods but also the way to go about learning in everyday life. I want them to find that learning is fun.

8. What new ideas would you like to initiate in your classroom when you start teaching?

Parent involvement, I think is real important. Parents are so busy, I think students are missing a lot. I would like to try creative ways to get the parents more involved with their children, by either sending home projects maybe once a week or something they have to do with their child to help the parents have a better understanding of what their children are capable of doing or where they need to improve.

9. Would you describe an outstanding teacher to me?

I think an outstanding teacher is one who uses a child-centered approach to developing self-esteem and instilling a desire to learn in each student. Each child has unique concerns and problems. It is important to understand differences in children when teaching them and to use a variety of teaching methods because students may have different learning styles.

10. What do you see yourself doing to improve yourself and improve yourself as a teacher?

In order to grow I see myself working hard and spending a lot of time reading about different teaching methods. Trying new ways of learning, trying different avenues, learning new approaches that I haven't been exposed to that may work in the classroom. I'm a big advocate of team teaching. I would hope that other teachers would be willing to share ideas with me and I am very willing to share ideas with them. I will try anything that can help me improve myself as a teacher and improve my students' learning.
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INTERVIEW TAPES EVALUATION FORM

Interview tapes reviews

Business--Male
Age of interviewee______
Was the interview similar to on-campus interviews? Yes___ No____
Was the interviewee believable? Yes___ No____

Business--Female
Age of interviewee______
Was the interview similar to on-campus interviews? Yes___ No____
Was the interviewee believable? Yes___ No____

Engineering--Male
Age of interviewee______
Was the interview similar to on-campus interviews? Yes___ No____
Was the interviewee believable? Yes___ No____

Engineering--Female
Age of interviewee______
Was the interview similar to on-campus interviews? Yes___ No____
Was the interviewee believable? Yes___ No____

Education--Male
Age of interviewee______
Was the interview similar to on-campus interviews? Yes___ No____
Was the interviewee believable? Yes___ No____

Education--Female
Age of interviewee______
Was the interview similar to on-campus interviews? Yes___ No____
Was the interviewee believable? Yes___ No____

Evaluator:
Male____ Female_______
Age_____
Years working in Career Services_______
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OBJECTIVE
An entry level position in accounting to gain experience in audit and tax.

EDUCATION
ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY Tempe, Arizona
Bachelor of Science, Accounting, May 1993
GPA 3.02/4.0

Academic Highlights:
-Advanced Tax, Partnership Law and Professional Writing.
-Authored Accounting 322 Ethics research paper now on reserve at Hayden Library.
-ASU.
-Two semesters on the Dean’s List.
-Coursework includes 16 hours of speech and communication.

EXPERIENCE
MESA SALES INCORPORATED Mesa, Az.
Accounting Clerk and Sales Assistant (11/91 - Present)
• Accounts Payable/Accounts Receivable - processed payments on computerized Peachtree system.
• Database Entry - entered customer purchase records on Lotus 1-2-3.
• Payroll - assisted in processing of payroll on computerized Peachtree system.
• Customer Service - sales, customer assistance, and cashiering.

SUN COUNTRY INDUSTRIES Phoenix, Az.
Accounting Clerk (6/90 - 11/91)
• Accounts Payable/Accounts Receivable - processes payments on specialized computer system.
• Claim Correspondent - processed claims against vendors for defective merchandise.
• General Ledger - responsible for making journal entries and generating financial statements on specialized computer system.

MOTOROLA CREDIT UNION Scottsdale, Az.
Junior Programmer (9/89 - 6/90)
• Coordinated and processed work between accounting EDP using RPGII.
• Previously handled loan processing.

ACTIVITIES
Beta Alpha Psi (Accounting Honorary)
Golden Key National Honor Society
Business College Council Representative
Chairperson, Careers Committee

PERSONAL
Financed 100% of my education

AVAILABILITY
May 1993

REFERENCES
References furnished upon request
D. K. DOYLE

2416 E. Longmore Street
TEMPE, AZ 85287
(602) 969-6561
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May 1993
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TEMPE, AZ 85287
(602) 969-6561

OBJECTIVE
Engineering position with an emphasis on the coding and hardware for analog or
digital communication.

EDUCATION
ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY Tempe, Arizona
Bachelor of Science, Electrical Engineering, May 1993
GPA 3.0/4.0

Academic Highlights:
- Applied the Motorola DSP56000 to perform real time digital signal processing.
- Taken courses in analog and digital communication, analog filter design, digital
  signal processing, error correcting codes, data communication systems, and feedback
  systems.

EXPERIENCE
MCDONNELL DOUGLAS HELICOPTER COMPANY Mesa, Az.
Summer Intern (May 92-August 92)
- Revised, tested, and documented simulation software for Advanced Apache
  Backup Control System interfacing the existing program with hardware
  improvements to virtually automate all tests.

WILLIAMS AIR FORCE BASE Chandler, Az.
Cooperative Education • Programmer (May 91-Dec. 91)
- Designed and implemented software to perform data analysis on variables
  collected from an F-16 Dome Simulator for studies being done on air combat
  maneuverability on the Air Combat Maneuvering Performance Measurement
  System (ACMPMS) for research.
- Maintained management duties of the VAX 11/780 and 6300-10 such as system
  upgrades, backups, configuration control, and hardware maintenance.
- Assisted users with VMS operating system utilities/commands and also software
  applications that exist on the VAX such as Wordperfect, 20/20 Spreadsheet and
  ALL-IN-ONE.
- Received a Notable Achievement award from the laboratory.

ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY Tempe, Az.
Lab Assistant/Grader/Tutor (Sept. 89-present)
Computer Science Department
- Assisted students on the IBM PC laboratory with Wordperfect, DBASEIII Plus, and
  SuperCalcIV.
- Tutored students in Fortran, Pascal, WordPerfect, DBASEIII Plus, and
  SuperCalcIV.
- Assisted system administrator in maintenance of hardware.

ACTIVITIES
- Association of Computing Machinery
  Secretary (1991-1992)
- Eta Kappa Nu (Electrical Engineering Honorary)

SKILLS
Computer Skills
- System Software packages:
  Silicon Graphics IRIS
  ZENIX/UNIX operating system
  Autocad
- Languages: C, Small, Pascal, Fortran, Assembly, Lisp and DCL
- Certificate of completion for Digital's Vax System Management I course

AVAILABILITY
May 1993
D. K. DOYLE

2416 E. Longmore Street
TEMPE. AZ 85287
(602) 969-6561

OBJECTIVE
Engineering position with an emphasis on the coding and hardware for analog or digital communication.

EDUCATION
ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY  Tempe, Arizona
Bachelor of Science, Electrical Engineering. May 1993
GPA 3.01/4.0

Academic Highlights:
- Applied the Motorola DSP56000 to perform real time digital signal processing.
- Taken courses in analog and digital communication, analog filter design, digital signal processing, error correcting codes, data communication systems, and feedback systems.

EXPERIENCE
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Summer Intern (May 92-August 92)
• Revised, tested, and documented simulation software for Advanced Apache Backup Control System interfacing the existing program with hardware improvements to virtually automate all tests.
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Cooperative Education - Programmer (May 91-Dec. 91)
• Designed and implemented software to perform data analysis on variables collected from an F-16 Dome Simulator for studies being done on air combat maneuverability on the Air Combat Maneuvering Performance Measurement System (ACMPMS) for research.
• Maintained management duties of the VAX 11/780 and 6300-10 such as system upgrades, backups, configuration control, and hardware maintenance.
• Assisted users with VMS operating system utilities/commands and also software applications that exist on the VAX such as Wordperfect. 20/20 Spreadsheet and ALL-IN-ONE.
• Received a Notable Achievement award from the laboratory.

ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY  Tempe, Az.
Lab Assistant/Grader/Tutor (Sept.89-present)
Computer Science Department
• Assisted students on the IBM PC laboratory with Wordperfect, DBASEIII Plus, and SuperCalc IV.
• Tutored students in Fortran, Pascal, WordPerfect, DBASEIII Plus, and SuperCalc IV.
• Assisted system administrator in maintenance of hardware.

ACTIVITIES
• Association of Computing Machinery
  Secretary (1991-1992)
• Eta Kappa Nu (Electrical Engineering Honorary)

SKILLS
Computer Skills
• System Software packages:
  Silicon Graphics IRIS
  ZENIX/UNIX operating system
  Autocad
• Languages: C, Shamlil, Pascal, Fortran, Assembly, Lisp and DCL
• Certificate of completion for Digital's Vax System Management I course

AVAILABILITY
May 1993
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ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY Tempe, Arizona
Bachelor of Science, Electrical Engineering, May 1993
GPA 3.0/4.0
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Summer Intern (May 92-August 92)
- Revised, tested, and documented simulation software for Advanced Apache Backup Control System interfacing the existing program with hardware improvements to virtually automate all tests.

WILLIAMS AIR FORCE BASE Chandler, Az.
Cooperative Education - Programmer (May 91-Dec. 91)
- Designed and implemented software to perform data analysis on variables collected from an F-16 Dome Simulator for studies being done on air combat maneuverability on the Air Combat Maneuvering Performance Measurement System (ACMPMS) for research.
- Maintained management duties of the VAX 11/780 and 6300-10 such as system upgrades, backups, configuration control, and hardware maintenance.
- Assisted users with VMS operating system utilities/commands and also software applications that exist on the VAX such as Wordperfect, 20/20 Spreadsheet and ALL-IN-ONE.
- Received a Notable Achievement award from the laboratory.

ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY Tempe, Az.
Lab Assistant/Grader/Tutor (Sept.89-present)
Computer Science Department
- Assisted students on the IBM PC laboratory with Wordperfect, DBASEIII Plus, and SuperCalc IV.
- Tutored students in Fortran, Pascal, WordPerfect, DBASEIII Plus, and SuperCalc IV.
- Assisted system administrator in maintenance of hardware.

ACTIVITIES
- Association of Computing Machinery Secretary (1991-1992)
- Eta Kappa Nu (Electrical Engineering Honor)ry

SKILLS
Computer Skills
- System Software packages:
  - Silicon Graphics IRIS
  - ZENIX/UNIX operating system
  - Autocad
- Languages: C, Slaml, Pascal, Fortran, Assembly, Lisp and DCL
- Certificate of completion for Digital's Vax System Management I course

AVAILABILITY
May 1993
OBJECTIVE

Engineering position with an emphasis on the coding and hardware for analog or digital communication.

EDUCATION

ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY  Tempe, Arizona
Bachelor of Science, Electrical Engineering, May 1993
GPA 3.01/4.0

Academic Highlights:
- Applied the Motorola DSP56000 to perform real time digital signal processing.
- Taken courses in analog and digital communication, analog filter design, digital signal processing, error correcting codes, data communication systems, and feedback systems.

EXPERIENCE

MCDONNELL DOUGLAS HELICOPTER COMPANY  Mesa, Az.
Summer Intern (May 92-August 92)
- Revised, tested, and documented simulation software for Advanced Apache Backup Control System interfacing the existing program with hardware improvements to virtually automate all tests.

WILLIAMS AIR FORCE BASE  Chandler, Az.
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- Maintained management duties of the VAX 11/780 and 6300-10 such as system upgrades, backups, configuration control, and hardware maintenance.
- Assisted users with VMS operating system utilities/commands and also software applications that exist on the VAX such as Wordperfect, 20/20 Spreadsheet and ALL-IN-ONE.
- Received a Notable Achievement award from the laboratory.

ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY  Tempe, Az.
Lab Assistant/Grader/Tutor (Sept.89-present)
Computer Science Department
- Assisted students on the IBM PC laboratory with Wordperfect, DBASEIII Plus, and SuperCalcIV.
- Tutored students in Fortran, Pascal, WordPerfect, DBASEIII Plus, and SuperCalcIV.
- Assisted system administrator in maintenance of hardware.

ACTIVITIES

- Association of Computing Machinery
  Secretary (1991-1992)
- Eta Kappa Nu (Electrical Engineering Honorary)

SKILLS

Computer Skills
- System Software packages:
  Silicon Graphics IRIS
  ZENIX/UNIX operating system
  Autocad
- Languages: C, Small, Pascal, Fortran, Assembly, Lisp and DCL
- Certificate of completion for Digital’s Vax System Management I course

AVAILABILITY

May 1993
D. K. DOYLE

2416 E. Longmore Street
TEMPE, AZ 85287
(602) 969-6561

OBJECTIVE
An elementary teaching position which would best utilize my programmatic design skills, educational background, and training to enhance the instructional program of that district.

EDUCATION

B.A. ELEMENTARY EDUCATION, MAY 1993
EARLY CHILDHOOD EMPHASIS
Arizona State University, Tempe, Az.
G.P.A. 3.1/4.0. Financed 100% of educational expenses through full and part time employment as well as various scholarships.

LICENSES

Arizona: Elementary Certificate

EXPERIENCE

WASHINGTON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT Phoenix, Az.
Student Teacher, Arroyo School (Jan. 93 - May 93)
• Planned and implemented lesson plans using EEI strategies for 30 second grade students
• Monitored and adjusted curriculum using all mandated materials and supplements
• Maintained sole responsibility for instruction for 3/4 of time during student teaching
• Taught whole group, small group, learning center, and independent learning
• Maintained grades for students in all subjects
• Compiled mid-term reports and 9 week grades for report cards
• Issued weekly reports on all students progress to parents
• Involved in all parent-teacher conferences, both formal and informal
• Supervised parent volunteers and classroom aides

Practicum Experience, Roadrunner School (Sept. 92 - Dec. 92)
• Assisted and observed a classroom of 24 kindergarten students

Practicum Experience, Sunset School (Jan. 92 - May 92)
• Assisted and observed a classroom of 28 first grade students

Practicum Experience, Arroyo School (Sept. 91 - Dec. 91)
• Assisted and observed a classroom of 28 second grade students

SMITH'S FOOD Tempe, Az.
Bakery Sales and Production (Sept. 91 - Present)
• Produced bakery products and assisted in selling

ABCO FOODS Tempe, Az.
Courtesy Clerk, General Merchandise, Bakery and Receiving (Feb. 89 - Aug. 91)
• Maintained the bakery in the grocery department and maintained the non-food department

PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATIONS
• Special Olympics Volunteer
• Golden Key National Honor Society
• Dean's List

INTERESTS
Music, horseback riding, traveling, and water sports

REFERENCES
References furnished upon request
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OBJECTIVE
An elementary teaching position which would best utilize my programmatic design
skills, educational background, and training to enhance the instructional program
of that district.

EDUCATION
B.A. ELEMENTARY EDUCATION, MAY 1993
EARLY CHILDHOOD EMPHASIS
Arizona State University, Tempe, Az.
G.P.A. 3.1/4.0. Financed 100% of educational expenses through full and part time
employment as well as various scholarships.
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Arizona: Elementary Certificate

EXPERIENCE
WASHINGTON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT Phoenix, Az.
Student Teacher, Arroyo School (Jan. 93 - May 93)
• Planned and implemented lesson plans using EEI strategies for 30 second grade
students
• Monitored and adjusted curriculum using all mandated materials and
supplements
• Maintained sole responsibility for instruction for 3/4 of time during student
• Instructed, tested, provided evaluation, and maintained grades for students in all
• Compiled mid-term reports and 9 week grades for report cards
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• Involved in all parent-teacher conferences, both formal and informal
• Supervised parent volunteers and classroom aides

Practicum Experience, Roadrunner School (Sept. 92 - Dec. 92)
• Assisted and observed a classroom of 24 kindergarten students

Practicum Experience, Sunset School (Jan. 92 - May 92)
• Assisted and observed a classroom of 28 first grade students

Practicum Experience, Arroyo School (Sept. 91 - Dec. 91)
• Assisted and observed a classroom of 28 second grade students

SMITH'S FOOD Tempe, Az.
Bakery Sales and Production (Sept. 91 - Present)
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# COLLEGE INTERVIEW SUMMARY

**CANDIDATE**

## EDUCATION/TRAINING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONSIDERATIONS</th>
<th>EVALUATION (circle appropriate rating)</th>
<th>Above</th>
<th>Below</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Choice of School/Major</td>
<td>5........4........3........2........1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educ. Match with opening</td>
<td>5........4........3........2........1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Educational Plans</td>
<td>5........4........3........2........1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Education/Training</td>
<td>5........4........3........2........1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accomplishments</td>
<td>5........4........3........2........1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra Curricular Act.</td>
<td>5........4........3........2........1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## JOB RELATED PERFORMANCE CHARACTERISTICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONSIDERATIONS</th>
<th>EVALUATION (circle appropriate rating)</th>
<th>Above</th>
<th>Below</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Interests</td>
<td>5........4........3........2........1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Related Work Experience</td>
<td>5........4........3........2........1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accomplishments</td>
<td>5........4........3........2........1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Assignments</td>
<td>5........4........3........2........1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choice of Work</td>
<td>5........4........3........2........1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>5........4........3........2........1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## JOB RELATED PERSONAL ABILITY CHARACTERISTICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONSIDERATIONS</th>
<th>EVALUATION (circle appropriate rating)</th>
<th>Above</th>
<th>Below</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DEMONSTRATES</td>
<td>5........4........3........2........1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Ability to Communicate (Oral and Written)</td>
<td>5........4........3........2........1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Work Ability</td>
<td>5........4........3........2........1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiative</td>
<td>5........4........3........2........1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enthusiasm</td>
<td>5........4........3........2........1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaptability</td>
<td>5........4........3........2........1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Judgement</td>
<td>5........4........3........2........1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness</td>
<td>5........4........3........2........1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being Energetic</td>
<td>5........4........3........2........1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working under Pressure</td>
<td>5........4........3........2........1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem Solving Ability</td>
<td>5........4........3........2........1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## OVERALL RATING (circle)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Above</th>
<th>Below</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Superior</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Would you recommend this candidate for a second interview?

- [ ] Would recommend for second interview
- [ ] Uncertain
- [ ] Would not recommend second interview
Classification Data (for tabulation purposes only)

Please circle the most appropriate response, or fill in the blank when appropriate.

1. Type of organization by which you are employed (indicate the most descriptive classification):
   1) Accounting-Public
   2) Aerospace, Electronic and instruments
   3) Automotive and Mechanical Equipment
   4) Banking, Finance and Insurance
   5) Building Materials, Manufacturers and Construction
   6) Chemicals, Drugs and Allied Products
   7) Electrical Machinery and Equipment
   8) Food and Beverage Processing
   9) Glass, Paper, Packaging and Allied Products
   10) Merchandising and Services
   11) Metals and Metals Products
   12) Petroleum and Allied Products (Including Natural Gas)
   13) Research and/or Consulting Organizations
   14) Tire and Rubber
   15) Utilities - Public (Including Transportation)
   16) Federal Government
   17) Local/State Government
   18) Non-Profit Organizations and Educational Institutions
   19) Other

2. Size (number of employees) of the organization for which you have recruiting responsibilities: ____________________________ employees.

3. Level of responsibility:
   1) Recruiter
   2) First-level manager
   3) Middle-level manager
   4) Senior-level manager

4. Number of years of experience in college recruiting/Personnel: _______ years.

5. Region of the country in which you are located:
   1) PACIFIC - Washington, Oregon, California, Hawaii, or Alaska.
   3) WEST NORTH CENTRAL - North Dakota, South Dakota, Minnesota, Nebraska, Iowa, Kansas, or Missouri.
   4) EAST NORTH CENTRAL - Wisconsin, Michigan, Illinois, Indiana, or Ohio
   5) WEST SOUTH CENTRAL - Texas, Oklahoma, Arkansas, or Louisiana.
   6) EAST SOUTH CENTRAL - Kentucky, Tennessee, Mississippi, or Alabama.
   7) SOUTH ATLANTIC - West Virginia, Maryland, Delaware, District of Columbia, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, or Florida.
   8) NEW ENGLAND - Maine, Vermont, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Connecticut, or Rhode Island.
   9) MIDDLE ATLANTIC - New York, New Jersey, or Pennsylvania.
6. Age
   1) 24 or below
   2) 25-29
   3) 30-34
   4) 35-39
   5) 40-44
   6) 45-49
   7) 50-54
   8) 55-59
   9) 60-64
  10) 65 or above

7. Sex
   1) Male
   2) Female

8. Race
   1) Black
   2) Hispanic
   3) American Indian or Alaskan Native
   4) White, Non-Hispanic
   5) Asian or Pacific Islander

Results of the study
Would you like to receive results of this study? Yes ___ No ___

Thank you for your assistance.
# COLLEGE INTERVIEW SUMMARY

**CANDIDATE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EDUCATION/TRAINING CONSIDERATIONS</th>
<th>EVALUATION (circle appropriate rating)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choice of School/Major</td>
<td>Superior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educ. Match with opening</td>
<td>Superior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Educational Plans</td>
<td>Superior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Education/Training</td>
<td>Superior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accomplishments</td>
<td>Superior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra Curricular Act.</td>
<td>Superior</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PERSONAL/PROFESSIONAL TRAINING CHARACTERISTICS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONSIDERATIONS</th>
<th>EVALUATION (circle appropriate rating)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional Attitude</td>
<td>Superior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy of Education</td>
<td>Superior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age/Grade Level Suitability</td>
<td>Superior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject Matter Competence</td>
<td>Superior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline &amp; Class Mgmt.</td>
<td>Superior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivational Strategies</td>
<td>Superior</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**JOB RELATED PERFORMANCE CHARACTERISTICS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONSIDERATIONS</th>
<th>EVALUATION (circle appropriate rating)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Interests</td>
<td>Superior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Related Work Experience</td>
<td>Superior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accomplishments</td>
<td>Superior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Assignments</td>
<td>Superior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choice of Work</td>
<td>Superior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>Superior</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**JOB RELATED PERSONAL ABILITY CHARACTERISTICS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONSIDERATIONS</th>
<th>EVALUATION (circle appropriate rating)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Ability to Communicate (Oral and Written)</td>
<td>Superior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Work Ability</td>
<td>Superior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiative</td>
<td>Superior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enthusiasm</td>
<td>Superior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaptability</td>
<td>Superior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Judgement</td>
<td>Superior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness</td>
<td>Superior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being Energetic</td>
<td>Superior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working under Pressure</td>
<td>Superior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem Solving Ability</td>
<td>Superior</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
OVERALL RATING (circle) Above Below
Superior Average Average Average Unacceptable

Would you recommend this candidate for a second interview?

_____ Would recommend for second interview
_____ Uncertain
_____ Would not recommend second interview

Classification Data (for tabulation purposes only)
Please circle the most appropriate response, or fill in the blank when appropriate.

1. Type of organization by which you are employed (indicate the most descriptive classification):
   1) Accounting-Public
   2) Aerospace, Electronic and instruments
   3) Automotive and Mechanical Equipment
   4) Banking, Finance and Insurance
   5) Building Materials, Manufacturers and Construction
   6) Chemicals, Drugs and Allied Products
   7) Electrical Machinery and Equipment
   8) Food and Beverage Processing
   9) Glass, Paper, Packaging and Allied Products
   10) Merchandising and Services
   11) Metals and Metals Products
   12) Petroleum and Allied Products (Including Natural Gas)
   13) Research and/or Consulting Organizations
   14) Tire and Rubber
   15) Utilities - Public (Including Transportation)
   16) Federal Government
   17) Local/State Government
   18) Non-Profit Organizations and Educational Institutions
   19) Other

2. Size (number of employees) of the organization for which you have recruiting responsibilities: ___________________ employees.

3. Level of responsibility:
   1) Recruiter
   2) First-level manager
   3) Middle-level manager
   4) Senior-level manager

4. Number of years of experience in college recruiting/Personnel: ______ years.

5. Region of the country in which you are located:
   1) PACIFIC - Washington, Oregon, California, Hawaii, or Alaska.
   3) WEST NORTH CENTRAL - North Dakota, South Dakota, Minnesota, Nebraska, Iowa, Kansas, or Missouri.
   4) EAST NORTH CENTRAL - Wisconsin, Michigan, Illinois, Indiana, or Ohio
   5) WEST SOUTH CENTRAL - Texas, Oklahoma, Arkansas, or Louisiana.
   6) EAST SOUTH CENTRAL - Kentucky, Tennessee, Mississippi, or Alabama.
7) SOUTH ATLANTIC - West Virginia, Maryland, Delaware, District of Columbia, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, or Florida.

8) NEW ENGLAND - Maine, Vermont, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Connecticut, or Rhode Island.

9) MIDDLE ATLANTIC - New York, New Jersey, or Pennsylvania.

6. Age  
1) 24 or below  
2) 25-29  
3) 30-34  
4) 35-39  
5) 40-44  
6) 45-49  
7) 50-54  
8) 55-59  
9) 60-64  
10) 65 or above

7. Sex  
1) Male  
2) Female

8. Race  
1) Black  
2) Hispanic  
3) American Indian or Alaskan Native  
4) White, Non-Hispanic  
5) Asian or Pacific Islander

Results of the study
Would you like to receive results of this study? Yes ___ No ___

Thank you for your assistance.
APPENDIX J

COVER LETTER (BUSINESS AND ENGINEERING)
December 18, 1992

Mr. William D. Chatman  
Chief Administrative Officer  
MacLean Oddy & Associates Inc.  
1445 Ross Ave., Ste. 3900  
Dallas, TX 75202 4750

Dear Mr. Chatham:

Thank you for returning the postcard I sent you this summer and agreeing to assist me with my dissertation. The information for you to review is complete. I am finally ready to have you review a graduating senior's resume and an audio-tape of a segment of an on-campus interview. The College Interview Summary form is general, but will hopefully give me data about the on-campus interview process. I realize that many organizations use specialized interviewing procedures or processes, but for this research, could you please respond to the interview information and use the College Interview Summary form to evaluate the interview.

I anticipate that reviewing the resume, listening to the audio-tape of the interview and completing the College Interview Summary will take about fifteen minutes. As your responses will play an important role in the success of my research, I hope you will complete the questionnaire as soon as possible and no later than January 6, 1993.

A return envelope is enclosed for your convenience. To preserve your confidentiality, neither your name nor your organization's name will appear on the questionnaire. As a high response rate is needed for this study to be successful, the return envelope is coded with a number so that I will know whether or not to send you a follow-up questionnaire. Your questionnaire will be separated from the envelope before the envelope is used to check off your name so that your responses will remain anonymous.

As I believe the results of this study will be as important and interesting to you as they are to me, I have provided at the end of the questionnaire a means by which you can obtain a summary copy of the results. Once again, your confidentiality will be respected.

Thank you for your cooperation and assistance.

Sincerely,

Jean E. Eisel, Director of Career Services  
Arizona State University
APPENDIX K

COVER LETTER (EDUCATION)
Dear Frank:

Thank you for returning the postcard I sent to you this summer and agreeing to assist me with my dissertation. The information for you to review is complete. I am finally ready to have you review a graduating senior's resume and an audio-tape of a segment of an on-campus interview. The College Interview Summary form is general, but will hopefully give me data about the on-campus interview process. I realize that many organizations use specialized interviewing procedures on processes, but for this research, could you please respond to the interview information and use the College Interview Summary form to evaluate the interview.

While reviewing the applicant, since it is for a May graduate, please evaluate the information assuming that the student has already had his/her student teaching experience.

I anticipate that reviewing the resume, listening to the audio-tape of the interview and completing the College Interview Summary will take about fifteen minutes. As your responses will play an important role in the success of my research, I hope you will complete the questionnaire as soon as possible and no later than January 6,

A return envelope is enclosed for your convenience. To preserve your confidentiality, neither your name nor your organization's name will appear on the questionnaire. As a high response rate is needed for this study to be successful, the return envelope is coded with a number so that I will know whether or not to send you a follow-up questionnaire. Your questionnaire will be separated from the envelope before the envelope is used to check off your name so that your responses will remain anonymous.

As I believe the results of this study will be as important and interesting to you as they are to me, I have provided at the end of the questionnaire a means by which you can obtain a summary copy of the results. Once again, your confidentiality will be respected.

Thank you for your cooperation and assistance.
Sincerely,

Jean E. Eisel, Director of Career Services
Arizona State University
APPENDIX L

REMINDER POSTCARD

To: Mary McDonald
From: Jean Eisel
Re: Dissertation Study

This is a reminder to have you please return the College Interview Summary that was sent to you in late December. If you have already sent it, thank you. If not, could I request that you please return it as soon as possible and no later than February 5th. Fax 602-965-2120 (please include 3 digit code on the bottom left hand corner of return envelope). THANK YOU!!
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