



Western Michigan University
ScholarWorks at WMU

Masters Theses

Graduate College

4-1979

An Analysis of Pre and Post Employment Interview Opinions Held by Applicants in a University Job Placement Center

Robert J. McAvoy
Western Michigan University

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/masters_theses



Part of the Industrial and Organizational Psychology Commons

Recommended Citation

McAvoy, Robert J., "An Analysis of Pre and Post Employment Interview Opinions Held by Applicants in a University Job Placement Center" (1979). *Masters Theses*. 2013.

https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/masters_theses/2013

This Masters Thesis-Open Access is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate College at ScholarWorks at WMU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Masters Theses by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks at WMU. For more information, please contact wmu-scholarworks@wmich.edu.



AN ANALYSIS OF PRE AND POST EMPLOYMENT
INTERVIEW OPINIONS HELD BY APPLICANTS
IN A UNIVERSITY JOB PLACEMENT CENTER

by

Robert J. McAvoy

A Thesis
Submitted to the
Faculty of The Graduate College
in partial fulfillment
of the
Degree of Master of Arts

Western Michigan University
Kalamazoo, Michigan
April, 1979

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

With the completion of this thesis, I would like to give thanks to those individuals from whom I have benefited in their aid, advice, constructive criticism, and encouragement. I would especially like to thank Dr. Richard Schmidt for his guidance and criticism throughout the project. I would also like to thank Dr. John Nangle for his suggestions in developing the questionnaires, and in editing the thesis, and Dr. Chester Arnold for his aid in securing subjects, facilitating the collection of data, and allowing me much freedom at the Placement Services. I would also like to thank Dr. Jack Asher for his help in the organization of parts of the thesis, and Mr. Brian Archer for his assistance in the computer analysis of the data.

Robert John McAvoy

INFORMATION TO USERS

This was produced from a copy of a document sent to us for microfilming. While the most advanced technological means to photograph and reproduce this document have been used, the quality is heavily dependent upon the quality of the material submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or notations which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting through an image and duplicating adjacent pages to assure you of complete continuity.
2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a round black mark it is an indication that the film inspector noticed either blurred copy because of movement during exposure, or duplicate copy. Unless we meant to delete copyrighted materials that should not have been filmed, you will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame.
3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., is part of the material being photographed the photographer has followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin filming at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. If necessary, sectioning is continued again—beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.
4. For any illustrations that cannot be reproduced satisfactorily by xerography, photographic prints can be purchased at additional cost and tipped into your xerographic copy. Requests can be made to our Dissertations Customer Services Department.
5. Some pages in any document may have indistinct print. In all cases we have filmed the best available copy.

University
Microfilms
International

300 N. ZEEB ROAD, ANN ARBOR, MI 48106
18 BEDFORD ROW, LONDON WC1R 4EJ, ENGLAND

1313064

MCADY, ROBERT JOHN
AN ANALYSIS OF PRE AND POST EMPLOYMENT
INTERVIEW OPINIONS HELD BY APPLICANTS IN A
UNIVERSITY JOB PLACEMENT CENTER.

WESTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY, M.A., 1979

University
Microfilms
International 300 N. ZEEB ROAD, ANN ARBOR, MI 48106

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | | PAGE |
|---------|--|------|
| | ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS | ii |
| | LIST OF TABLES | iv |
| CHAPTER | | |
| I | INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| | The Purpose and its Background . . . | 1 |
| | The Hypotheses Tested | 8 |
| II | METHOD | 13 |
| | Selection of the Sample | 13 |
| | Collection of the Pre-Interview Data | 14 |
| | Collection of the Post-Interview Data | 17 |
| III | RESULTS | 23 |
| | Scoring Procedure for the Post- Interview Questionnaire | 32 |
| | Comparison of Means | 37 |
| IV | DISCUSSION | 68 |
| V | SUMMARY | 87 |
| VI | BIBLIOGRAPHY | 92 |
| VII | APPENDICES | 96 |

LIST OF TABLES

| TABLE | | PAGE |
|-------|--|------|
| 1 | Percent of the Pre-Interview Group Who Completed the Post-Interview Questionnaire | 27 |
| 2 | Distribution of Subjects by Employment Group and Sex | 28 |
| 3 | Distribution of Graduate and Undergraduate Subjects by Sex and Employment Group | 30 |
| 4 | Career Areas Sought | 32 |
| 5 | Distribution of Geographic Preferences | 34 |
| 6 | Comparing Opinion Change about the Company across Categories of Careers | 35 |
| 7 | Comparing Change in Estimate of the Probability of a Job Offer across Categories of Careers | 36 |
| 8 | Comparison of the Means on the Post-Interview Questionnaire for the Overall, Accountant, and General Business Groups | 39 |
| 9 | Comparison of the Means, for Accountant and General Business Whose Opinion about the Company Increased | 42 |
| 10 | Comparison of the Means, for Accountant and General Business Whose Opinion about the Company Remained the Same | 46 |
| 11 | Comparison of the Means, for Accountant and General Business Whose Opinion about the Company Decreased | 49 |
| 12 | Comparison of the Means for the Overall Sub-samples for Increased Opinion versus Remain the Same Opinion | 52 |

LIST OF TABLES (cont.)

| TABLE | | PAGE |
|-------|---|------|
| 13 | Comparison of the Means for the Overall Subsamples for the Decreased Opinion versus the Remain the Same Opinion . . . | 57 |
| 14 | Comparison of the Means for the Overall Subsamples for the Decreased Opinion versus the Increased Opinion | 59 |
| 15 | Comparison of the Change in Opinion about the Company to the Perceived Competence of the Interviewer | 62 |
| 16 | Comparison of the Post-Interview Opinion about the Company to the Perceived Competence of the Interviewer | 63 |
| 17 | Comparison of the Change in Estimate of a Job Offer to the Perceived Competence of the Interviewer | 64 |
| 18 | Comment Section Listing | 65 |

INTRODUCTION

The interview has long been used as the major element in almost all recruitment and employee selection activities. The interview has been used in the hopes of solving the problems of attracting to and placing suitably qualified individuals in various positions within organizations. The other problem is in attracting qualified individuals who will also remain in the organization. The interview must be structured in order to accomplish both goals.

Although much time and great amounts of money have been applied to develop sound and effective recruitment programs, the validity of such programs, especially the interview portion, has long been under attack. Early research has contained statements focusing upon recruitment and selection to the effect that any intelligent individual may be just as capable as a professional interviewer in judging applicants by interviews (Snow, 1924). A review of the literature throughout the years has shown relatively little which disagrees with that statement. Wagner (1949) in his summary of the employment interview, concluded that the interview is useful for the following purposes: rough screen-

ing from among a large number of applicants, selecting one from a very small number of applicants, and making assessments when certain traits can most accurately be evaluated through an interview. Mayfield (1964) stated that the interview is of little value when used as it had been in a selection situation.

With such criticism throughout the years, it would appear likely that much research had gone into developing a more useful tool for selection. However, Dunnette and Bass (1963) noted that there has been great resistance by personnel management to carry out fundamental research on its own practices and techniques. Few of the publications on the interview actually reported the results of experiments. Earlier research by Wagner (1949) surveyed 106 titles concerned with the interview as a means of evaluation. He found 25 involved experiments, and the remaining 81 only presented contradictory opinion. Wright (1969) concurred with that pattern, stating that only one out of four reports on the interview provided quantitative evidence in its research. Most publications today are simply statements of opinions, handbooks, or guides for interviewers. A.C. Shaw (1968) found in his survey of different companies an even more appalling lack of quantitative evidence. He found that

93% of the companies he surveyed had made no systematized attempt to validate their interviewing programs.

Because of this lack of any substantial quantitative evidence in a field with seemingly endless possibilities for study, the writer became interested in the investigation of the interview as it is used as a selection device. How has the interview been used as a selection device? The first purpose of the selection interview should be to gather information about the applicant (Landy and Trumbo, 1976). Although that statement sounds relatively simplistic, the information gathered from such an interview may be difficult to evaluate. As long ago as 1924, it was stated that only fair agreement existed between judges in the evaluation of the best and the worst applicants, and individuals between those two extremes were rated quite differently by different judges (Snow, 1924). Corey (1933) found that when interviewing teachers, the results from the interview were not very reliable. Adams and Smeltzer (1936) reported that a greater degree of objectivity is needed in the interview situation. Webster (1959) cited examples in which different interviewers rated the same candidate differently. Mayfield (1964) reported that a major source of variability was attributable to the fact that different interviewers

weighed the same information differently.

Much of the complication of the research on the interview has had to do with the lack of comparability between various studies. Scott (1916), in one of the earliest studies of the interview, hoped to solve that problem by attempting to reduce the interview process into measurable terms or units. Wagner (1949) in his review sought a more standardized interview, stating that any validity and reliability present may otherwise be highly specific to the situation and to the interviewer. Bugental (1953), using a split-half technique, found inconsistency in the interview when comparing one-half of the interview with the other half. Yonge (1956) stated that much mistrust in the investigations of the interview is due to the diversity of the data, and of the results. Other researchers also called for more structure and standardization in the interview (Mayfield, 1964; Shaw, J., 1952; Wentworth, 1953).

The question must be addressed as to whether any of the research has resulted in the interview being considered at all useful and effective. Wagner (1949), in his review, found that some of the research indicated that interviews could successfully predict job success. J. Shaw (1952) stated that the structured interview may be effective in

contributing objective data to the selection process. Another study concluded that the interview can be a useful tool in order to obtain facts and to orient the applicant to the job (Campbell, Prien, and Brailey, 1960). The preceding study was one of the first to not treat the one-way communication of information about the applicant as the only major purpose of the interview. McNamara (1964) reported that the preliminary interview is effective as an initial look at the applicant, and can be quite purposeful if it is used to obtain a "general impression". Downs (1968), even though he treated the interview situation as only a one-way communication process about the applicant, stated that the degree of validity and reliability depended upon the skill of the interviewer. An effective interviewer can create an effective interview. This final study by Downs is typical in that it serves as an example that most quantitative studies did not deal with the effects of the interview upon the applicant. Seldom was there research that dealt with the effects of the degree of communication of information about the job, and the effects of the skill of the interviewer upon the applicant. Due to the limited amount of research directed at that particular area, the writer directed his attention to the effect of the inter-

view process upon the job applicant.

It was decided, for practical purposes as well as educational, that the subjects of the study would be college students recruited at a University Placement Service. College recruitment, however, has been shown to have its own problems as illustrated by Wright (1969), who pointed out the overuse of the interview may be one of the major weaknesses in college recruitment. Wanous (1977), in his research, stated that in college recruitment the interviewers may be overzealous in their attempt to sell the company to the applicant, and thus create inflated expectations. Such expectations, when not fulfilled once the applicant becomes an employee, may later lead to a high rate of turnover, greater job dissatisfaction, and absenteeism. These are some of the main problems that an effective recruitment program would attempt to combat. With that reasoning, the interview should be realistic, so that individuals may match themselves to organizations using both complete and accurate information.

Schmitt and Coyle (1976) concluded that the interview in college recruitment programs should serve to attract competent personnel, rather than be used to select. Those individuals, thus screened, could then be evaluated by more

thorough means. The selection interview then would serve a dual purpose by not only obtaining information about the applicant, but also by conveying accurate information to the applicant concerning the organization. Thus, an applicant is more likely to accept a job offer, if one is extended, based upon a realistic appraisal. By providing such information to not only those candidates deemed as likely candidates for employment but also to those likely to be rejected, the interview then serves to become a valuable "public relations" device when used effectively by the company. This is important, since that same company may, at a later time, want that individual for employment.

In addition to investigating the effects of the interview and the interviewer upon the applicant, the decision-making process of the applicant is also to be studied. That is, identifying those factors leading to the applicants' assessment of the interview and appraisal of the recruiting organization as a prospective employer. Mayfield (1964) asked the decision-making process be studied, since most of the previous research had only dealt with the final results of the job interview. In the limited amount of previous available research data, it was found that applicant decisions were affected by characteristics of the interviewer:

personality, manner of delivery, and by the adequacy of information he provided. This would affect the applicant's opinion about the company, and in turn may affect the applicant's expectations of the likelihood of a job offer, and the probability of accepting such an offer (Schmitt and Coyle, 1976). Wanous (1977) found realism in the interview resulted in more effective evaluations and decisions.

Specific items of information deemed important by college students being interviewed were summed up very well by Allen (1955), who reported that a job congruent with an individual's training and interests, and the opportunities for advancement were most important. Allen also included opportunity for training, company locale, and starting salary as quite important. This was also supported by later research (Barlow, 1965; Barmeier and Kellar, 1957).

Because of the limited amount of quantitative research on the interview, especially from the point of view of the job applicant, the investigator planned to study how applicants were affected by the interview situation, and to identify factors that appear to bear upon any decisions made or opinions held. The following hypotheses were tested:

- I. When comparing the pre-interview opinions

about a company with the post-interview opinions, changes will occur in some of the individuals surveyed, which may be due to the interview experience.

II. Changes in opinion about a company, from the pre-interview period to the post-interview period, will be related to aspects of the style of the interviewer.

III. Changes in opinion about the company, from the pre-interview period to the post-interview, will be related to how effectively and comprehensively the interviewer communicated various items of information about the job and the company.

IV. Applicants seeking careers in accounting will show differences in their evaluation of various factors of the interview when compared to the evaluation by those individuals who are pursuing a more "general business" type of career.

V. Perceptions of the competence of the interviewer by the applicant will be related to the change in opinion about the company from the pre-interview period to the post-interview period.

VI. Perceptions of the competence of the interviewer will be related to the post-interview opinion about the company.

VII. The change in the estimate of the probability of a job offer, from the pre-interview period to the post-interview period, will be related to the perceived competence of the interviewer.

The first hypothesis is based on the assumption that the interview will have an effect upon the applicant. Previous research does support that statement, and the

method this investigator employs will be able to assess the effects of the interview in a controlled setting so that the interview will be the independent variable, with any change in opinion identified as the dependent variable. It has been assumed that the approximate one-week time period between the administration of the pre-interview questionnaire to the post-interview questionnaire will have little, if any, effect upon the opinion about the company involved.

The second hypothesis will investigate the effect the interviewer has upon the applicant in the interview setting. Since the interview is a situation of dynamic interplay, not only will the interviewee have an effect upon the interviewer, but the interviewer must also influence the interviewee. By investigating the style employed by the interviewer (as perceived by the interviewee), different factors of the interviewer's techniques, personality, habits, etc., can then be identified to determine if the factors have any effect upon the applicant, as they are employed in the interview situation.

The third hypothesis is concerned with the degree of job and company information given to the applicant in the interview. In the communication to the interviewee of

various intrinsic (job-related) and extrinsic (environment-related) factors, it is hoped that various items can be identified as vital to a successful interview situation, from the point of view of the applicant. Intrinsic factors can be such items as opportunities for advancement and variety in the job. Extrinsic factors can be identified as such items as pay or fringe benefits. When these items are communicated properly, the interviewer may get suggestions as to what constitutes a "complete" interview. The more comprehensive the communication of important items, the more complete is the interview.

The fourth hypothesis investigates the effect of different career choices. The assumption is that individuals pursuing one career area will show differences from those individuals in another career area. If supported, this hypothesis will add to previous evidence that different employment groups assign more importance to some factors than do other employment groups.

The fifth hypothesis under study pertains to an investigation of a relationship between the overall perception of the competence of the interviewer and changes in opinion about the company from the pre-interview period to the post-interview period.

The sixth hypothesis, similar to the fifth, pertains to a comparison of the opinion about the company, after the interview, with the perceived competence of the interviewer by the applicant. It is presumed that there is a relationship between the competence of the interviewer and the effect it has upon the final evaluation of the company by the applicant involved.

The seventh hypothesis compares the change in estimated probability of a job offer, by the applicant, to the perceived competence of the interviewer. It is presumed that the interviewer will affect the candidate's expectations about a job offer, from the pre-interview period to the post-interview period, on the basis of how well or thoroughly the interviewer conducts the employment interview.

In addition to testing specific hypotheses, the investigator of this study also examined comments by the applicants, and other pertinent data.

METHOD

Selection of the Sample

The subjects were one hundred and thirty-four students at Western Michigan University who were registered at the Placement Services, and who were looking for employment in a business field. Selection of the subjects depended upon whether the students would be willing to complete a questionnaire both before and immediately after an interview with a recruiter. A brief explanation of the study was given to the students before the presentation of the pre-interview questionnaires. The bulk of the subjects were students who expected to graduate in April of 1978, although some of the students would be graduating in the summer of 1978.

Thirty-eight of the subjects were applying for jobs as accountants, while the remaining ninety-six were interested in more general business fields.

The subjects in the study commenced interviewing with the campus recruiters beginning the week of February thirteenth, and concluded on February twenty-fourth, 1978. Pre-interview information was collected approximately one

week before the recruitment interview, and the post-interview information was collected immediately after the interview. Approximately two hundred students were given the pre-interview questionnaire to complete. Of these, one hundred and sixty-one students returned the pre-interview questionnaire. From that group, one hundred and thirty-four remained to complete a post-interview questionnaire. Some students either canceled their interviews, or did not show up, while others were eliminated because the researcher was unable to reach the student after the interview was finished.

Collection of the Pre-Interview Data

In order to facilitate the gathering of information, a questionnaire was utilized. The questionnaire was administered at the University Placement Services. The presentations of the pre-interview questionnaires were on February sixth and on February thirteenth for the "general business" sample, and on February seventh and February fourteenth for the "accountant" group. These pre-interview questionnaires were presented approximately one week before the interviews themselves. The collection of pre-interview data was accomplished within five minutes after the stu-

dents had signed up for specific interview dates with recruiters from the particular companies. The questionnaire took approximately three minutes to complete, and after completion, they were given to the researcher as the students were leaving the room being used for signing up for the employment interviews.

In order to better elicit cooperation, as well as familiarize the students with the study, the investigator explained to the group the purpose of the study and how the results would be utilized. It was also explained that the information received would be kept in the strictest confidence, and in no way would the subject be identified with the results. It was also explained that those filling out the first questionnaire would later be contacted and asked to fill out a second questionnaire. Anonymity was again stressed.

The pre-interview questionnaire was divided into two sections (See Appendix A). The first contained a statement by the investigator that the questionnaire was part of a research project by a graduate student in Industrial Psychology, which would lead to the completion of a master's thesis. It was also explained that the Placement Service would be using the results in order to help develop better

seminars or workshops to further prepare the individuals using the Service. This section also stressed that anonymity would be maintained at all times, and that the inclusion of names would only be used for matching up of pre-interview questionnaires with post-interview questionnaires. It was in this section that the students signed their names giving their permission to be used as subjects in the study.

The second section of the pre-interview questionnaire dealt with information about the company to be interviewed. Those items included: name of the company, date and time of the interview, and the position applied for by the applicant.

The second section also included the following pertinent questions about each subject: Is this your first interview at the University Placement Service?; Are you currently a student? (only current students were used); What is your geographic preference?; Are you a graduate or undergraduate?; and Are you a male or female?

This second section also elicited opinions from the subjects in three categories: opinion about the company, estimate of a probable job offer, and estimate of accepting a job offer. Opinions were measured using a five-point

Likert-type scale. The weighting values ranged from 5 for "very high" to 1 for "very low" responses. The numerical weightings permitted means to be derived, as well as a set of pre-interview and post-interview comparison scores.

Collection of Post-Interview Data

One week after the pre-interview data was collected, a second questionnaire was presented to the job applicants. This was done immediately after the interview, when the applicant had finished and had left the interview room. The applicant completed the questionnaire at the same desk where the investigator was stationed. All of the post-interview questionnaires were completed in this manner. An accurate record of the date and the time of the interview was important to permit the investigator to be present to administer the questionnaire immediately after the interview had been completed.

The post-interview was divided into five sections (See Appendix B). The first section consisted of two questions, asking the applicant's opinion of the company, and the applicant's opinion of the competence of the interviewer. The second section contained four questions concerning the applicant and his/her estimate of the probability that a

job offer with the particular company would be forthcoming, and what steps would be taken by the subject if no offer was made.

The third section of the post-interview questionnaire asked the applicants to rate the interviewer, or the "impressions" about the interviewer, on thirteen items concerning the interviewer's style. These items pertained to the following descriptions of the interviewer: articulate, self-controlled, asked relevant questions, etc. (For a complete listing of the items, see Appendix B). This section of the questionnaire was developed in order to assign importance to the various factors of the recruiter's style. This list was derived in part from a previous study on the employment interview (Schmitt and Coyle, 1976). The remaining portion of the list was composed of items deemed most important by the investigator in the employment interview process. The list was designed to include factors that would not only describe the interviewer who was skilled in "human relations," but also one who would not only extract as much relevant information about the applicant as possible, but who as well would provide the applicant with as much relevant information about the company as possible. This list in-

cluded descriptors which could be used to differentiate the "warm" interviewer from the "professional, business-like" interviewer.

The fourth portion of the questionnaire dealt with different aspects of the companies involved, and how well the interviewers communicated these to the applicants. The list contained sixteen items, in addition to two "summary" items. The "communication" items included the following: starting pay expectations, opportunities for advancement, locale, training programs, etc. (For a complete listing, see Appendix B.) The two summary items were, "To what degree did you acquire relevant information about the company?" and "To what degree did the company acquire relevant information about you?".

The portion of the questionnaire was employed in order to study the importance of "communication aspects" of an interviewer. In this section the job applicant could describe how his interview had been directed by the interviewer in terms of the "information gathering" process. These items were selected by the investigator as items that would be important to the job candidate in terms of future job satisfaction. They could be described as reflecting "what is important to the employee, in order for him/her to be satisfied with his/her job?." Again, it

was here that the job applicant could show whether it was more important for the interviewer to be "warm and congenial" or for the interviewer to be one who tried to gather and disseminate pertinent information.

The fifth section of the questionnaire asked questions regarding the length of the interview, proportion of time that the interviewer spoke, and the overall self-assessment about the applicant's "performance in the interview." The scoring categories for those questions was as follows:

Length of the interview: Over 45 minutes; 30-45 minutes; 20-30 minutes; 10-20 minutes; and Less than 10 minutes.

% of time the interviewer spoke: 80-100%; 60-80%; 40-60%; 20-40%; and 0-20%.

Self-assessment of the individual's performance in the interview: VERY GOOD; GOOD; AVERAGE; BELOW AVERAGE; VERY POOR.

At the end of the questionnaire, a "comment" section was included in order to provide subjects with an opportunity to offer reactions to the interview that were not covered by the rest of the questionnaire.

The scoring technique used in the post-interview questionnaire was a variation of the Likert-scoring technique, with a five-point scale similar to that of the pre-

interview questionnaire. The scoring for the section dealing with interviewer style used the following numerical values for the response alternatives:

- 5 - VERY FAVORABLE impression
- 4 - FAVORABLE impression
- 3 - AVERAGE impression
- 2 - BELOW AVERAGE impression
- 1 - VERY POOR impression

Also included in the scoring was a column for the candidate to mark UNABLE TO COMMENT.

A similarly weighted scale was used in that part of the questionnaire asking about "how comprehensively the interviewer communicated" about various aspects of the company. In this section, the scoring was as follows:

- 5 - VERY HIGH degree
- 4 - HIGH degree
- 3 - AVERAGE degree
- 2 - BELOW AVERAGE degree
- 1 - VERY LOW degree

Also, a column was provided in the event no discussion took place about a certain aspect. This column was identified as NOT DISCUSSED, and given a numerical value of zero.

The primary objective in this section was to identify those employment interview factors related to changes in opinion about a company. They were used to ascertain the nature of the changes, if any, and to identify spe-

cific factors that may be associated with attitude changes. By comparing the pre-interview questionnaire responses with those of the post-interview questionnaires, changes in opinion could then be identified. Once identified, the changes were divided into groups on the basis of the direction of change (decrease, remain the same, increase), and the factors related to these groups could then be identified.

Scoring Technique for Evaluating Changes in Opinion about the Company

The procedure for evaluating changes in opinion about the company was as follows:

1. The pre-interview questionnaire of each subject was matched with his/her post-interview questionnaire.
2. For each subject, the question pertaining to the OVERALL OPINION about the company to be interviewed on the pre-interview questionnaire was matched with the question pertaining to the OVERALL OPINION of the company just interviewed on the post-interview questionnaire.
3. If there was no difference in opinion about the company when comparing the questionnaires, the subject was marked as REMAIN THE SAME.
4. If there was a positive change of direction in the opinion about the company, no matter the magnitude, the subject was marked as INCREASE.

5. If there was a negative change of direction in the opinion about the company, no matter the magnitude, the subject was marked as DECREASE.

6. The groups, once designated as REMAIN THE SAME, INCREASE, and DECREASE, were then subdivided into those seeking a career in general business, and those seeking a career in accounting.

Scoring Procedure for Evaluating Interviewer Competence

The scoring procedure for the evaluation of the "competence of the interviewer" used the frequency of subjects in each of five categories: VERY HIGH; HIGH; AVERAGE; LOW; and VERY LOW.

Scoring weights used for the four items on the post-interview questionnaire concerning a job offer, were as follows:

1. Assign a value to the different categories of the applicant's "estimate"; i.e. a value of five assigned to VERY HIGH CHANCE; four assigned to HIGH CHANCE; three assigned to AVERAGE CHANCE; two assigned to LOW CHANCE; and one assigned to VERY LOW CHANCE.

2. The means and standard deviations for the items were then computed for those values, for the samples to be investigated.

The technique used for scoring the thirteen items associated with IMPRESSIONS OF THE INTERVIEWER, was done

in the same fashion, except that if the subject chose the category UNABLE TO COMMENT, it was not used in the computation of the mean.

The technique used for the scoring of the eighteen items on HOW COMPREHENSIVELY THE INTERVIEWER COMMUNICATED, also utilized the computation of the means and standard deviations of the numerical values assigned to the categories of rating, but in this case, instead of an UNABLE TO COMMENT category, a NOT DISCUSSED category was added. This category was assigned a value of zero, and was included in the computation of the mean scores and standard deviations.

For the questions about the LENGTH OF THE INTERVIEW, and PERCENT OF TIME THE INTERVIEWER SPOKE, the midpoint of each category was assigned as the value for that category (eg., for the item LENGTH OF THE INTERVIEW, the interval 20-30 minutes was assigned a numerical value of 25 minutes).

For all items on the post-interview questionnaire, overall mean scores were computed for the entire sample, for the group of accountants, and for the group of general business. Also the mean scores and standard deviations were computed for all 37 items for each group of

subjects who "increased" their opinion about the company, whose opinion about the company "remained the same," and who "decreased" their opinion about the company. These categories of increased, remain the same, and decreased, were further sub-divided into the Overall group, the General Business group, and the Accountant group. The mean scores and standard deviations were also computed for each item in those sub-categories.

RESULTS

The final sample size available for the administration of the post-interview questionnaire was one hundred and thirty-four. This represented 83.2% of the one hundred and sixty-one individuals who had returned the pre-interview questionnaire (see Table 1). Twenty-seven subjects were eliminated for the following reasons:

The investigator was unable to reach the subject after his/her interview. (n=12)
The subject canceled his/her interview. (n=5)
The subject was not a current student. (n=2)
Contamination factor. (Investigator spoke with the interviewer) (n=8)

All of the subjects appeared cooperative, and many exhibited interest in the study. None of the subjects were eliminated due to incomplete or incorrect completion of the questionnaires.

TABLE 1

Percent of the Pre-Interview Group Who
Completed the Post-Interview Questionnaire

| Employment Group | Pre-Interview Questionnaire (N) | Post-Interview Questionnaire (N) | Percent Follow-up |
|---------------------|---------------------------------------|--|----------------------|
| Accountant | 49 | 38 | 77.6 |
| General Business | 112 | 96 | 85.7 |
| TOTAL | 161 | 134 | 83.2 |

The final sample contained thirty-five women (26.1%) and ninety-nine men (73.9%) (see Table 2). When divided into Accountant versus General Business groups, the percentages of male and female remained fairly stable, with an approximate ratio of three men to one woman.

TABLE 2

Distribution of Subjects by
Employment Group and Sex

| Employment Group | Male (N) | Female (N) | % of Group Male | % of Group Female |
|---------------------|-------------|---------------|--------------------|----------------------|
| Accountant | 28 | 10 | 73.7 | 26.3 |
| General Business | 71 | 25 | 74.0 | 26.0 |
| TOTAL | 99 | 35 | 73.9 | 26.1 |

Table 3 shows the group of subjects broken down by graduate versus undergraduate enrollment status. The following data results: 87.3% of the subjects are undergraduates and 12.7% are graduate students. From an examination of Table 3, it can also be noted that there were no female graduate students interviewing for general business positions. The largest percentages of subjects were undergraduate males in both the accountant and general business groups. Also worthy of mention is that only 6.3% of the general business group were graduate students, whereas 28.9% of the accountant group were graduate students.

TABLE 3

Distribution of Graduate and Undergraduate
Subjects by Sex and Employment Group

| Group | Accountant (N) | % of Total Accountant Group | General Business (N) | % of Total General Business |
|------------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Graduate | | | | |
| Male | 7 | 18.4 | 6 | 6.3 |
| Female | 4 | 10.5 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Undergraduate | | | | |
| Male | 21 | 55.3 | 65 | 67.7 |
| Female | 6 | 15.8 | 25 | 26.0 |
| Graduate TOTAL | 11 | 28.9 | 6 | 6.3 |
| Undergraduate TOTAL | 27 | 71.1 | 90 | 93.7 |

% of subjects graduate students: 12.7%

% of subjects undergraduate students: 87.3%

Table 4 displays the frequency with which interviews dealt with specific kinds of career areas. It is assumed that those seeking an accountant position will remain fairly focused in their career choices, when it applies to entry-level positions, whereas those in a "general business" area were more likely to pursue different directions with respect to career areas sought.

In this sample, the largest single group was in the marketing/sales area (32.1%), with the accountant group closely following (28.4%). Management commanded a significant share of the sample (12.7%); however, the remaining career areas sought were represented by only a few applicants in each.

TABLE 4
Career Areas Sought

| Career Sought | Frequency | % of TOTAL SAMPLE ^a |
|------------------------------------|-----------|-----------------------------------|
| Sales/Marketing | 43 | 32.1 |
| Accounting | 38 | 28.4 |
| Management | 17 | 12.7 |
| Systems and Design | 7 | 5.2 |
| Administration | 3 | 2.2 |
| Industrial Engineering | 3 | 2.2 |
| Personnel | 3 | 2.2 |
| Retail | 3 | 2.2 |
| Financial Management | 2 | 1.5 |
| Computer Programming | 2 | 1.5 |
| Product Engineering | 2 | 1.5 |
| Supervisor | 2 | 1.5 |
| Mechanical Engineering | 2 | 1.5 |
| Electrical Engineering | 1 | .7 |
| Research | 1 | .7 |
| Technical Services | 1 | .7 |
| Unspecified - Any available career | 4 | 3.0 |

^a Percentages do not equal 100%, due to rounding.

The distribution of the subject's geographic preferences is found in Table No. 5. Some subjects had more than one geographic preference, hence some duplication of subjects in more than one preference category occurred, causing the total N to exceed the actual sample size. Of this total, 85 subjects (63.4%) chose the midwest as one of their preferences, and 32 subjects (23.9%) stated that they had no preference. The remainder of the group were fairly well divided among the other geographic areas: east (5.2%); south (6.7%); southwest (5.2%); and far west (9.0%).

When looking at geographic preferences for the career groups, the accountants had more definite preferences, whereas those in the general business were more open to residing in any area. 81.6% of the accountants chose the midwest as at least one of their preferences, and only 5.3% stated that they had no preference. In contrast, 56.3% of the general business group chose the midwest, and 31.3% had no specific preference.

It may be of interest to note that a space was provided for a geographic preference of "other," but no one selected that category. In the so-called "Sun Belt"

(South, Southwest, and Far West) only 28 subjects (20.9%) chose that area as one of their preferences.

TABLE 5

Distribution of Geographic Preferences

| Group | Midwest | Far West | South | Southwest | East | None |
|--|---------|-------------|-------|-----------|------|------|
| Accountant (N) ^a | 31 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 |
| % of total N of accountants ^b | 81.6 | 5.3 | 7.9 | 7.9 | 5.3 | 5.3 |
| % of TOTAL SAMPLE | 23.1 | 1.5 | 2.2 | 2.2 | 1.5 | 1.5 |
| General Business (N) ^a | 54 | 10 | 6 | 4 | 5 | 30 |
| % of total N of general business ^b | 56.3 | 10.4 | 6.3 | 4.2 | 5.2 | 31.3 |
| % of TOTAL SAMPLE | 40.3 | 7.5 | 4.5 | 3.0 | 3.7 | 22.4 |
| Total group (N) ^a | 85 | 12 | 9 | 7 | 7 | 32 |
| % of TOTAL SAMPLE | 63.4 | 9.0 | 6.7 | 5.2 | 5.2 | 23.9 |

^aTotals exceed original sample sizes because more than one geographic preference was possible per subject.

^bPercentages exceed 100% for the same reason.

Table 6 compares opinion change across categories of careers, and shows that almost one-half of the subjects (49.3%) changed their opinion about the company after the interview.

TABLE 6
Comparing Opinion Change
about the Company
Across Categories of Careers

| Group | Opinion Decreased | Opinion Remained the Same | Opinion Increased |
|--|----------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------|
| Accountant | | | |
| N | 8 | 22 | 8 |
| % of overall | 38.1 | 32.4 | 17.8 |
| General Business | | | |
| N | 13 | 46 | 37 |
| % of overall | 61.9 | 67.6 | 82.2 |
| Overall (N) | 21 | 68 | 45 |
| Overall N divided by TOTAL Sample N | 15.7% | 50.7% | 33.6% |

Similar to Table 6, Table 7 compares the change in estimate of the probability of a job offer across categories of careers and shows that 60.5% of the candidates maintained the same estimate of a job offer with the particular company.

TABLE 7

Comparing Change in Estimate
of the Probability of a Job Offer
Across Categories of Careers

| Group | Estimate Decreased | Estimate Remained the Same | Estimate Increased |
|--|-----------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Accountant | | | |
| N | 6 | 24 | 8 |
| % of overall | 26.1 | 29.6 | 26.7 |
| General Business | | | |
| N | 17 | 57 | 30 |
| % of overall | 73.9 | 70.4 | 73.3 |
| Overall (N) | 23 | 81 | 38 |
| Overall N divided by TOTAL Sample N | 22.4% | 60.5% | 17.2% |

Comparison of Means

The findings in this study will be presented by comparing the mean scores of the different groups identified, and testing the significance of the differences in those groups having changes in opinion about the company. This study of significant differences is the principal purpose of this investigation. Other tables of results compare the frequencies of occurrence on various selected categories of the questionnaire. The last table in the results section presents a collection of statements written by the subjects in the "comment" section.

Table 8 compares the mean scores of the various items on the post-interview questionnaire, for the overall sample, the sub-sample whose employment goals were in accounting, and the sub-sample whose goals were of a general business nature. For the overall sample, the item means fell in the "3.5 - 4.5" range, except for: estimate of pursuing another job with the same company at a later time, if not offered one (2.61); starting pay (1.77); turnover and absenteeism (1.47); relationships with co-workers (3.02); types of people at the company (2.84); financial picture of the company (2.61); fringe benefits

(1.83); current trends in the occupational area (2.56); and opportunity for supervisory feedback (2.99).

The highest mean score for the accountants and general business sub-samples, and for the overall sample, was "willing to answer question" (4.50, 4.61, and 4.58 respectively). High mean scores were also obtained for the items: the interviewer was self-controlled (4.16, 4.26, and 4.23); the interviewer was poised, relaxed, and friendly (3.87, 4.41, and 4.26).

There was very little difference between accountants (29.24 minutes) and general business (31.04 minutes) in the mean length of the interview. The percentage of time the interviewer spoke was also relatively similar, with the accountants indicating (52.11%) slightly less than the general business's (56.61%). For both groups, the interviewer tended to speak slightly more than half the time.

TABLE 8

COMPARISON OF THE MEANS ON THE POST-INTERVIEW QUESTIONNAIRE
FOR THE OVERALL, ACCOUNTANT, AND GENERAL BUSINESS GROUPS

| ITEM | ACCOUNTANT | | GEN.BUS. | | OVERALL | |
|--|----------------|------|----------------|------|----------------|------|
| | N ^a | Mean | N ^a | Mean | N ^a | Mean |
| Estimate of a job offer | 38 | 3.21 | 96 | 3.50 | 134 | 3.39 |
| Estimate of accepting job | 38 | 3.92 | 96 | 3.81 | 134 | 3.82 |
| Estimate of another interview | 38 | 3.47 | 96 | 3.63 | 134 | 3.56 |
| If not offered a job, estimate of pursuing another job with the same company | 38 | 2.38 | 96 | 2.71 | 134 | 2.61 |
| THE INTERVIEWER: | | | | | | |
| Was candid in opinions | 37 | 4.03 | 94 | 4.02 | 131 | 4.02 |
| Was willing to answer questions | 38 | 4.50 | 96 | 4.61 | 134 | 4.58 |
| Asked relevant questions | 38 | 3.97 | 96 | 4.04 | 134 | 4.02 |
| Was conscientious about interview | 38 | 4.05 | 95 | 4.15 | 133 | 4.12 |
| Sensed applicant's feelings and view of work | 38 | 3.92 | 94 | 3.98 | 132 | 3.96 |
| Seemed to enjoy his job | 38 | 3.92 | 96 | 4.15 | 134 | 4.11 |
| Was articulate | 36 | 4.11 | 94 | 4.13 | 130 | 4.12 |
| Had interest in applicant's out- side interests and contributions | 37 | 3.70 | 95 | 3.70 | 132 | 3.70 |
| Asked applicant's opinions | 37 | 3.24 | 96 | 3.56 | 133 | 3.47 |
| Was self-controlled | 38 | 4.16 | 95 | 4.26 | 133 | 4.23 |
| Was aggressive and persistent | 38 | 3.40 | 96 | 3.53 | 134 | 3.49 |

TABLE 8 (cont.)

| | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|----|------|----|------|-----|------|
| Was poised, relaxed, and friendly | 38 | 3.87 | 96 | 4.41 | 134 | 4.26 |
| Had pleasant physical appearance | 38 | 3.87 | 96 | 4.31 | 134 | 4.18 |

| How COMPREHENSIVELY interviewer communicated the following items: | ACCOUNTANT N= 38 Mean | GEN.BUS. N= 96 Mean | OVERALL N= 134 Mean |
|---|-----------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| Starting pay expectations | 1.29 | 1.96 | 1.77 |
| Variety in the job | 3.87 | 3.71 | 3.75 |
| Typical entry-level job (for college graduates) | 3.76 | 3.74 | 3.74 |
| Relationships with co-workers | 3.29 | 2.91 | 3.02 |
| Policies, procedures, and philosophy of the company | 3.40 | 3.42 | 3.41 |
| Turnover and absenteeism | 1.42 | 1.47 | 1.47 |
| Products and/or services | 3.58 | 3.43 | 3.47 |
| Types of people at the company | 3.11 | 2.73 | 2.84 |
| Financial picture of company | 1.79 | 2.94 | 2.61 |
| Fringe benefits | 1.68 | 1.91 | 1.83 |
| Opportunities for advancement | 3.55 | 3.87 | 3.78 |
| Training programs | 3.74 | 3.91 | 3.86 |
| Current trends in occupational area | 2.37 | 2.64 | 2.56 |
| Locale | 3.97 | 3.91 | 3.93 |
| Opportunity for supervisory feedback | 3.26 | 2.87 | 2.99 |

TABLE 8 (cont.)

| | | | |
|--|-------|-------|-------|
| Opportunity for self-fulfilling career | 3.47 | 3.65 | 3.60 |
| Degree applicant acquired RELEVANT information about the company | 3.84 | 3.87 | 3.87 |
| Degree company acquired RELEVANT information about the applicant | 3.79 | 3.71 | 3.73 |
| Length of the interview (minutes) | 29.24 | 31.04 | 30.53 |
| % of the time interviewer spoke | 52.11 | 56.61 | 55.34 |

^aNote: N varies due to some applicants choosing category UNABLE TO COMMENT.

Table 9 is the first of three tables pertaining to the investigation of possible significant differences that may exist between the mean scores of the items in the questionnaire for the accountant and general business groups. Table 9 compares the mean scores of the employment groups who increased their opinion about the company after the interview, and ascertains any significant differences between the accountants and the general business sample. A two-tailed test at the .01 significance level was used. There were no significant differences for any of the item comparisons.

TABLE 9

Comparison of the Means
for Accountant and General Business
Whose Opinion about the Company Increased

| ITEM | ACCOUNTANT Mean | GEN.BUS. Mean | t-value* |
|--|--------------------|------------------|-------------------|
| Estimate of a job offer | 3.38 | 3.57 | N.S. ^a |
| Estimate of accepting job | 4.13 | 3.97 | N.S. |
| Estimate of another interview | 3.88 | 3.81 | N.S. |
| If not offered job, estimate of pursuing another job with same company | 2.50 | 2.89 | N.S. |

TABLE 9 (cont.)

THE INTERVIEWER:

| | | | |
|---|------|------|------|
| Was candid in opinions | 4.63 | 4.11 | N.S. |
| Was willing to answer questions | 4.75 | 4.81 | N.S. |
| Asked relevant questions | 4.50 | 4.22 | N.S. |
| Was conscientious about interview | 4.63 | 4.28 | N.S. |
| Sensed applicant's feelings and view of work | 4.13 | 4.23 | N.S. |
| Seemed to enjoy his job | 4.50 | 4.35 | N.S. |
| Was articulate | 4.63 | 4.23 | N.S. |
| Had interest in applicant's outside interests and contributions | 4.00 | 3.76 | N.S. |
| Asked applicant's opinions | 3.63 | 3.73 | N.S. |
| Was self-controlled | 4.63 | 4.31 | N.S. |
| Was aggressive and persistent | 4.00 | 3.62 | N.S. |
| Was poised, relaxed, friendly | 4.63 | 4.60 | N.S. |
| Had pleasant physical appearance | 4.50 | 4.43 | N.S. |

TABLE 9 (cont.)

| How COMPREHENSIVELY interviewer communicated the following: | ACCOUNTANT Mean | GEN.BUS. Mean | t-value* |
|--|--------------------|------------------|-------------------|
| Starting pay expectations | 1.50 | 1.87 | N.S. ^a |
| Variety in the job | 4.13 | 4.11 | N.S. |
| Typical entry-level job (for college graduates) | 3.88 | 3.87 | N.S. |
| Relationships with co-workers | 3.75 | 2.73 | N.S. |
| Policies, procedures, and philosophy of the company | 3.50 | 3.35 | N.S. |
| Turnover and absenteeism | 2.38 | 1.43 | N.S. |
| Products and/or services | 3.75 | 3.30 | N.S. |
| Types of people at the company | 3.50 | 2.49 | N.S. |
| Financial picture of company | 2.63 | 3.35 | N.S. |
| Fringe benefits | 1.88 | 2.11 | N.S. |
| Opportunities for advancement | 4.00 | 3.95 | N.S. |
| Training programs | 3.38 | 4.08 | N.S. |
| Current trends in occupational area | 2.00 | 2.84 | N.S. |
| Locale | 3.63 | 3.92 | N.S. |
| Opportunity for supervisory feedback | 3.75 | 2.84 | N.S. |
| Opportunity for a self-fulfilling career | 4.25 | 3.60 | N.S. |

TABLE 9 (cont.)

| | | | |
|--|-------|-------|------|
| Degree applicant acquired RELEVANT information about company | 4.13 | 4.05 | N.S. |
| Degree company acquired RELEVANT information about applicant | 4.13 | 3.87 | N.S. |
| Length of interview (minutes) | 31.00 | 31.68 | N.S. |
| % of time interviewer spoke | 50.00 | 56.35 | N.S. |

*(.01, df = 43, two-tailed; $n_1=8$, $n_2=37$; $t = 2.697$)

^aN.S. = non-significant

Table 10 compares the means, and displays the results of testing for any significant differences, between the accountants and general business groups whose opinion remained the same. Using a two-tailed test at the .01 level, it was shown that there were no significant differences for any of the item comparisons.

TABLE 10

Comparison of the Means
for Accountant and General Business
Whose Opinion about the Company Remained the Same

| ITEM | ACCOUNTANT Mean | GEN.BUS. Mean | t-value* |
|--|--------------------|------------------|-------------------|
| Estimate of a job offer | 3.32 | 3.46 | N.S. ^a |
| Estimate of accepting job | 3.91 | 3.83 | N.S. |
| Estimate of another interview | 3.55 | 3.61 | N.S. |
| If not offered job, estimate of pursuing another job with same company | 2.41 | 2.83 | N.S. |
| THE INTERVIEWER: | | | |
| Was candid in opinions | 3.91 | 4.02 | N.S. |
| Was willing to answer questions | 4.46 | 4.59 | N.S. |
| Asked relevant questions | 4.05 | 4.02 | N.S. |
| Was conscientious about interview | 4.14 | 4.15 | N.S. |
| Sensed applicant's feelings and view of work | 4.00 | 3.98 | N.S. |
| Seemed to enjoy his job | 3.91 | 4.15 | N.S. |
| Was articulate | 4.18 | 4.13 | N.S. |
| Had interest in applicant's out- side interests and contributions | 3.86 | 3.76 | N.S. |
| Asked applicant's opinions | 3.33 | 3.76 | N.S. |
| Was self-controlled | 4.14 | 4.26 | N.S. |

TABLE 10 (cont.)

| | | | |
|----------------------------------|------|------|------|
| Was aggressive and persistent | 3.32 | 3.48 | N.S. |
| Was poised, relaxed, friendly | 4.14 | 4.39 | N.S. |
| Had pleasant physical appearance | 4.23 | 4.28 | N.S. |

| How COMPREHENSIVELY Interviewer communicated the following: | ACCOUNTANT Mean | GEN.BUS. Mean | t value |
|--|--------------------|------------------|------------|
| Starting pay expectations | 1.27 | 2.20 | N.S. |
| Variety in the job | 4.00 | 3.46 | N.S. |
| Typical entry-level job (for college graduates) | 3.86 | 3.65 | N.S. |
| Relationships with co-workers | 3.55 | 3.11 | N.S. |
| Policies, procedures, and philosophy of the company | 3.68 | 3.48 | N.S. |
| Turnover and absenteeism | 1.64 | 1.39 | N.S. |
| Products and/or services | 3.68 | 3.46 | N.S. |
| Types of people at the company | 3.18 | 2.96 | N.S. |
| Financial picture of company | 1.82 | 2.65 | N.S. |
| Fringe benefits | 2.00 | 1.87 | N.S. |
| Opportunities for advancement | 3.55 | 3.91 | N.S. |
| Training programs | 3.82 | 3.83 | N.S. |
| Current trends in the occupational area | 2.59 | 2.57 | N.S. |
| Locale | 4.09 | 3.83 | N.S. |

TABLE 10 (cont.)

| | | | |
|--|-------|-------|------|
| Opportunity for supervisory feedback | 3.68 | 2.94 | N.S. |
| Opportunity for a self-fulfilling career | 3.59 | 3.74 | N.S. |
| Degree applicant acquired RELEVANT information about company | 3.96 | 3.80 | N.S. |
| Degree company acquired RELEVANT information about applicant | 3.96 | 3.63 | N.S. |
| Length of interview (minutes) | 28.96 | 31.15 | N.S. |
| % of time interviewer spoke | 51.82 | 57.39 | N.S. |

* (.01, df = 66, two-tailed; $n_1=22$, $n_2=46$; $t = 2.656$)

^aN.S. = non-significant

Table 11 compares the means, with results for tests of significant differences, between the accountants and the general business groups whose opinion about the company decreased after the interview. Using a two-tailed test at the .01 significance level, it was shown that there were no significant differences for any of the item comparisons.

TABLE 11

Comparison of the Means
for Accountant and General Business
Whose Opinion about the Company Decreased

| ITEM | ACCOUNTANT Mean | GEN.BUS. Mean | t-value* |
|--|--------------------|------------------|-------------------|
| Estimate of a job offer | 2.75 | 2.77 | N.S. ^a |
| Estimate of accepting job | 3.75 | 2.92 | N.S. |
| Estimate of another interview | 2.88 | 2.85 | N.S. |
| If not offered job, estimate of pursuing another job with same company | 2.25 | 1.62 | N.S. |
| THE INTERVIEWER: | | | |
| Was candid in opinions | 3.71 | 3.42 | N.S. |
| Was willing to answer questions | 4.38 | 3.77 | N.S. |
| Asked relevant questions | 3.25 | 3.31 | N.S. |
| Was conscientious about interview | 3.25 | 3.46 | N.S. |
| Sensed applicant's feelings and view of work | 3.50 | 3.00 | N.S. |
| Seemed to enjoy his job | 3.38 | 3.46 | N.S. |
| Was articulate | 3.17 | 3.46 | N.S. |
| Had interest in applicant's out- side interests and contributions | 3.00 | 3.08 | N.S. |
| Asked applicant's opinions | 2.63 | 2.85 | N.S. |
| Was self-controlled | 3.75 | 3.77 | N.S. |

TABLE 11 (cont.)

| | | | |
|----------------------------------|------|------|------|
| Was aggressive and persistent | 3.00 | 3.15 | N.S. |
| Was poised, relaxed, friendly | 3.63 | 3.62 | N.S. |
| Had pleasant physical appearance | 3.50 | 3.69 | N.S. |

| How COMPREHENSIVELY interviewer communicated the following: | ACCOUNTANT Mean | GEN.BUS. Mean | t value |
|--|--------------------|------------------|------------|
| Starting pay expectations | 1.13 | 1.23 | N.S. |
| Variety in the job | 3.13 | 3.15 | N.S. |
| Typical entry-level job (for college graduates) | 3.25 | 3.39 | N.S. |
| Relationships with co-workers | 2.13 | 2.31 | N.S. |
| Policies, procedures, and philosophy of the company | 2.50 | 3.08 | N.S. |
| Turnover and absenteeism | .50 | 1.46 | N.S. |
| Products and/or services | 3.13 | 3.46 | N.S. |
| Types of people at the company | 2.50 | 2.39 | N.S. |
| Financial picture of the company | .88 | 2.69 | N.S. |
| Fringe benefits | .63 | 1.15 | N.S. |
| Opportunities for advancement | 3.13 | 3.15 | N.S. |
| Training programs | 3.88 | 3.39 | N.S. |
| Current trends in occupational area | 2.13 | 2.62 | N.S. |
| Locale | 4.00 | 3.85 | N.S. |

TABLE 11 (cont.)

| | | | |
|--|-------|-------|------|
| Opportunity for supervisory feedback | 1.63 | 2.54 | N.S. |
| Opportunity for a self-fulfilling career | 2.38 | 3.23 | N.S. |
| Degree applicant acquired RELEVANT information about company | 3.25 | 3.31 | N.S. |
| Degree company acquired RELEVANT information about applicant | 3.00 | 3.23 | N.S. |
| Length of the interview (minutes) | 28.25 | 28.85 | N.S. |
| % of time interviewer spoke | 55.00 | 54.62 | N.S. |

* (.01, df=19, two-tailed; $n_1=8$, $n_2=13$; $t = 2.861$)

^aN.S. = non-significant

Table 12 begins a series of three tables which reflects the main thrust of this investigation. This series compares the means, with tests of significance, for the items in the questionnaire across the different changes of opinion for the occupational groups combined.

Table 12 compares the means of the "increased" opinion subsample with those of the "remain the same" opinion subsample for the occupational groups combined, using a one-tailed test at the .01 level. The results revealed one item (financial picture) showing a significant difference in the comparison of the means.

TABLE 12

Comparison of the Means
for the Overall Subsamples
for Increased Opinion Versus Remain the Same Opinion

| ITEM | INCREASED Mean | R.T.S. Mean | t-value* |
|--|-------------------|----------------|-------------------|
| Estimate of a job offer | 3.53 | 3.41 | N.S. ^a |
| Estimate of accepting job | 4.00 | 3.85 | N.S. |
| Estimate of another interview | 3.82 | 3.59 | N.S. |
| If not offered job, estimate of pursuing another job | 2.82 | 2.69 | N.S. |
| THE INTERVIEWER: | | | |
| Was candid in opinions | 4.21 | 3.99 | N.S. |
| Was willing to answer questions | 4.80 | 4.54 | N.S. |
| Asked relevant questions | 4.27 | 4.03 | N.S. |
| Was conscientious about interview | 4.34 | 4.15 | N.S. |
| Sensed applicant's feelings and view of work | 4.21 | 3.99 | N.S. |
| Seemed to enjoy his job | 4.38 | 4.07 | N.S. |
| Was articulate | 4.30 | 4.15 | N.S. |
| Had interest in applicant's out- side interests and contributions | 3.80 | 3.79 | N.S. |
| Asked applicant's opinions | 3.71 | 3.63 | N.S. |
| Was self-controlled | 4.36 | 4.22 | N.S. |

TABLE 12 (cont.)

| | | | |
|----------------------------------|------|------|------|
| Was aggressive and persistent | 3.69 | 3.43 | N.S. |
| Was poised, relaxed, friendly | 4.60 | 4.31 | N.S. |
| Had pleasant physical appearance | 4.44 | 4.27 | N.S. |

| How COMPREHENSIVELY interviewer communicated the following: | INCREASED Mean | R.T.S. Mean | t value |
|--|-------------------|----------------|------------|
| Starting pay expectations | 1.80 | 1.90 | N.S. |
| Variety in the job | 4.11 | 3.63 | N.S. |
| Typical entry-level job (for college graduates) | 3.87 | 3.72 | N.S. |
| Relationships with co-workers | 2.91 | 3.25 | N.S. |
| Policies, procedures, and philosophy of the company | 3.38 | 3.54 | N.S. |
| Turnover and absenteeism | 1.60 | 1.47 | N.S. |
| Products and/or services | 3.38 | 3.54 | N.S. |
| Types of people at the company | 2.67 | 3.03 | N.S. |
| Financial picture of company | 3.22 | 2.38 | 2.41 |
| Fringe benefits | 2.07 | 1.91 | N.S. |
| Opportunities for advancement | 3.96 | 3.79 | N.S. |
| Training programs | 3.96 | 3.82 | N.S. |
| Current trends in occupational area | 2.69 | 2.57 | N.S. |
| Locale | 3.87 | 3.91 | N.S. |

TABLE 12 (cont.)

| | | | |
|--|-------|-------|------|
| Opportunity for supervisory feedback | 3.00 | 3.18 | N.S. |
| Opportunity for a self-fulfilling career | 3.71 | 3.69 | N.S. |
| Degree applicant acquired RELEVANT information about company | 4.07 | 3.85 | N.S. |
| Degree company acquired RELEVANT information about applicant | 3.91 | 3.74 | N.S. |
| Length of interview (minutes) | 31.56 | 30.44 | N.S. |
| % of time interviewer spoke | 55.22 | 55.59 | N.S. |

* (.01, df = 111, one-tailed; $n_1=45$, $n_2=68$; $t = 2.363$)

^aN.S. = non-significant

Table 13 compares the means for the "decreased" opinion subsample with those of the "remain the same" opinion subsample for the occupational groups combined, using a one-tailed test at the .01 level. The results revealed significant differences for 19 items. Four of those were the items concerning the applicant and his/her estimate of the probability that a job offer would be forthcoming, and steps to be taken if no offer were made.

All mean scores for the interviewer's style were significantly higher for the "remain the same" subgroup, ex-

cept for the items: the interviewer "was candid in opinions" and "was aggressive and persistent." Two items pertaining to the communication of various aspects of the company proved to have significantly higher mean scores for the "remain the same" subgroup. Those items were "relationships with co-workers" and "opportunity for supervisory feedback."

Both items dealing with "relevant information" had significantly higher mean scores for the remain the same subgroup than for the means scores for the decreased subgroup.

TABLE 13

Comparison of the Means
for the Overall Subsamples
for Decreased Opinion Versus Remain the Same Opinion

| ITEM | DECREASED Mean | R.T.S. Mean | t value * |
|--|-------------------|----------------|--------------|
| Estimate of a job offer | 2.76 | 3.41 | 3.30 |
| Estimate of accepting job | 3.24 | 3.85 | 2.41 |
| Estimate of another interview | 2.86 | 3.59 | 3.24 |
| If not offered job, estimate of pursuing another job with same company | 1.86 | 2.69 | 2.75 |

TABLE 13 (cont.)

THE INTERVIEWER:

| | | | |
|--|------|------|-------------------|
| Was candid in opinions | 3.53 | 3.99 | N.S. ^a |
| Was willing to answer questions | 4.00 | 4.54 | 3.10 |
| Asked relevant questions | 3.29 | 4.03 | 3.14 |
| Was conscientious about interview | 3.38 | 4.15 | 3.89 |
| Sensed applicant's feelings and view of work | 3.19 | 3.99 | 3.77 |
| Seemed to enjoy his job | 3.43 | 4.07 | 3.01 |
| Was articulate | 3.37 | 4.15 | 3.17 |
| Had interest in applicant's outside interests and contributions | 3.05 | 3.79 | 2.42 |
| Asked applicant's opinions | 2.75 | 3.63 | 3.43 |
| Was self-controlled | 3.76 | 4.22 | 2.53 |
| Was aggressive and persistent | 3.10 | 3.43 | N.S. |
| Was poised, relaxed, friendly | 3.63 | 4.31 | 3.33 |
| Had pleasant physical appearance | 3.62 | 4.27 | 3.64 |

| How COMPREHENSIVELY interviewer communicated the following: | DECREASED Mean | R.T.S. Mean | t value |
|--|-------------------|----------------|------------|
| Starting pay expectations | 1.19 | 1.90 | N.S. |
| Variety in the job | 3.14 | 3.63 | N.S. |
| Typical entry-level job (for college graduates) | 3.33 | 3.72 | N.S. |

TABLE 13 (cont.)

| | | | |
|--|-------|-------|------|
| Relationships with co-workers | 2.24 | 3.25 | 2.75 |
| Policies, procedures, and philosophy of the company | 2.86 | 3.54 | N.S. |
| Turnover and absenteeism | 1.10 | 1.47 | N.S. |
| Products and/or services | 3.33 | 3.53 | N.S. |
| Types of people at the company | 2.43 | 3.03 | N.S. |
| Financial picture of company | 2.00 | 2.38 | N.S. |
| Fringe benefits | .95 | 1.91 | N.S. |
| Opportunities for advancement | 3.14 | 3.79 | N.S. |
| Training programs | 3.57 | 3.82 | N.S. |
| Current trends in occupational area | 2.43 | 2.57 | N.S. |
| Locale | 3.91 | 3.91 | N.S. |
| Opportunity for supervisory feedback | 2.19 | 3.18 | 2.40 |
| Opportunity for a self-fulfilling career | 2.91 | 3.69 | N.S. |
| Degree applicant acquired RELEVANT information about company | 3.29 | 3.85 | 3.39 |
| Degree company acquired RELEVANT information about applicant | 3.14 | 3.74 | 3.13 |
| Length of interview (minutes) | 28.62 | 30.44 | N.S. |
| % of time interviewer spoke | 54.76 | 55.59 | N.S. |

*(.01, df = 87, one-tailed; n = 21, n = 68; t = 2.376)

^aN.S. = non-significant

Table 14 compares the means of the "decreased" opinion subsample with those of the "increased" opinion subsample for the occupational groups combined, using a one-tailed test at the .01 level. The results revealed all items involving estimates of the probability of a job offer to be significantly higher for the increased opinion subgroup.

All items pertaining to the interviewer's style, except for: the interviewer "was candid," "had interest in applicant's outside interests and contributions," and "was aggressive and persistent"; proved to possess significantly higher mean scores for the "increased" opinion subgroup. In the communication of the various aspects of the company, the following items had significantly higher mean scores for the "increased" subsample: variety in the job, financial picture of company, fringe benefits, opportunities for advancement, and opportunity for a self-fulfilling career. Also significantly higher for the "increased" subgroup were the items: degree applicant acquired relevant information about company, and degree company acquired relevant information about applicant.

TABLE 14

Comparison of the Means
for the Overall Subsamples
for Decreased Opinion Versus Increased Opinion

| ITEM | DECREASED Mean | INCREASED Mean | t-value* |
|--|-------------------|-------------------|----------|
| Estimate of a job offer | 2.76 | 3.53 | 3.95 |
| Estimate of accepting job | 3.24 | 4.00 | 3.26 |
| Estimate of another interview | 2.86 | 3.82 | 4.40 |
| If not offered job, estimate of pursuing another job with same company | 1.86 | 2.82 | 3.44 |
| THE INTERVIEWER: | | | |
| Was candid in opinions | 3.53 | 4.21 | N.S. |
| Was willing to answer questions | 4.00 | 4.80 | 5.28 |
| Asked relevant questions | 3.29 | 4.27 | 4.43 |
| Was conscientious about interview | 3.38 | 4.34 | 3.75 |
| Sensed applicant's feelings and view of work | 3.19 | 4.21 | 3.41 |
| Was articulate | 3.37 | 4.30 | 2.81 |
| Had interest in applicant's out- side interests and contributions | 3.05 | 3.80 | N.S. |
| Asked applicant's opinions | 2.76 | 3.71 | 3.32 |
| Was self-controlled | 3.76 | 4.36 | 2.46 |
| Was aggressive and persistent | 3.10 | 3.69 | N.S. |

TABLE 14 (cont.)

| | | | |
|----------------------------------|------|------|------|
| Was poised, relaxed, friendly | 3.62 | 4.60 | 5.25 |
| Seemed to enjoy his job | 3.43 | 4.38 | 4.43 |
| Had pleasant physical appearance | 3.62 | 4.44 | 4.41 |

| How COMPREHENSIVELY interviewer communicated the following: | DECREASED Mean | INCREASED Mean | t value |
|--|-------------------|-------------------|------------|
| Starting pay expectations | 1.19 | 1.80 | N.S. |
| Variety in the job | 3.14 | 4.11 | 3.75 |
| Typical entry-level job (for college graduates) | 3.33 | 3.87 | N.S. |
| Relationships with co-workers | 2.24 | 2.91 | N.S. |
| Policies, procedures, and philosophy of the company | 2.86 | 3.38 | N.S. |
| Turnover and absenteeism | 1.10 | 1.60 | N.S. |
| Products and/or services | 3.33 | 3.38 | N.S. |
| Types of people at the company | 2.43 | 2.67 | N.S. |
| Financial picture of company | 2.00 | 3.22 | 2.66 |
| Fringe benefits | .95 | 2.07 | 2.45 |
| Opportunities for advancement | 3.14 | 3.96 | 2.64 |
| Training programs | 3.57 | 3.96 | N.S. |
| Current trends in occupational area | 2.43 | 2.69 | N.S. |
| Locale | 3.91 | 3.87 | N.S. |

TABLE 14 (cont.)

| | | | |
|--|-------|-------|------|
| Opportunity for supervisory feedback | 2.19 | 3.00 | N.S. |
| Opportunity for a self-fulfilling career | 2.91 | 3.71 | 2.53 |
| Degree applicant acquired RELEVANT information about company | 3.29 | 4.07 | 4.55 |
| Degree company acquired RELEVANT information about applicant | 3.14 | 3.91 | 3.72 |
| Length of interview (minutes) | 28.62 | 31.56 | N.S. |
| % of time interviewer spoke | 54.76 | 55.22 | N.S. |

* (.01, df = 64, one-tailed; $n_1=21$, $n_2=45$; $t = 2.390$)

^aN.S. = non-significant

Table 15 compares the change in opinion about the company across three categories of the "perceived competence" of the interviewer (VERY HIGH, HIGH, LOW). Using a chi-square test for independence, the obtained $\chi^2 = 22.085$. This obtained value exceeds the tabled value ($\chi^2 = 13.3$ at the .01 level, $df = 4$).

TABLE 15

Comparison of the Change in Opinion
about the Company
to the Perceived Competence of the Interviewer

| PERCEIVED COMPETENCE | OPINION CHANGE (pre- to post-interview) | | | TOTAL |
|-------------------------|---|-----------------|-----------|-------|
| | Increase | Remain the Same | Decrease | |
| Very High | 25 | 23 | 1 | 49 |
| High | 13 | 30 | 10 | 53 |
| Low ^a | <u>7</u> | <u>14</u> | <u>11</u> | 32 |
| TOTAL | 45 | 67 | 22 | |

$\chi^2 = 22.085$ (Tabled $\chi^2 = 13.3$, .01 level, $df = 4$) -

^aThe Low category was developed from collapsing frequencies in the average, low, and very low categories.

Table 16 compares the perceived competence of the interviewer across three categories of the post-interview opinion of the company by the applicant. Using a chi-square for independence, the obtained $\chi^2 = 42.84$, which exceeds the tabled value ($\chi^2 = 13.3$ at the .01 level, $df = 4$).

TABLE 16

Comparison of the Post-Interview Opinion
about the Company
to the Perceived Competence of the Interviewer

| POST-INTERVIEW OPINION OF COMPANY | PERCEIVED COMPETENCE | | | TOTAL |
|--------------------------------------|----------------------|----------|------------------|-------|
| | Very High | High | Low ^a | |
| Very High | 30 | 12 | 3 | 45 |
| High | 18 | 35 | 16 | 69 |
| Low ^a | <u>1</u> | <u>6</u> | <u>13</u> | 20 |
| TOTAL | 49 | 53 | 32 | |

$\chi^2 = 42.85$ (Tabled $\chi^2 = 13.3$, .01 level, $df = 4$)

^aThe low category was developed from collapsing frequencies in the average, low, and very low categories.

Table 17 compares the change in estimate of a job offer (from the pre-interview questionnaire to the post-interview questionnaire) across three categories of the perceived competence of the interviewer. Using a chi-square test for independence, the obtained $\chi^2 = 24.098$, which exceeds the tabled value ($\chi^2 = 13.3$ at the .01 level, $df = 4$).

TABLE 17

Comparison of the Change in Estimate
of a Job Offer
to the Perceived Competence of the Interviewer

| PERCEIVED COMPETENCE | ESTIMATE CHANGE (pre- to post-interview) | | | TOTAL |
|-------------------------|--|-----------------|-----------|-------|
| | Increase | Remain the Same | Decrease | |
| Very High | 19 | 26 | 3 | 48 |
| High | 7 | 39 | 8 | 54 |
| Low ^a | <u>4</u> | <u>16</u> | <u>12</u> | 32 |
| TOTAL | 30 | 81 | 23 | |

$$\chi^2 = 24.098 \quad (\text{Tabled } \chi^2 = 13.3, .01 \text{ level, } df = 4)$$

^aThe Low category was developed from collapsing frequencies in the average, low, and very low categories.

Table 18 is a list of comments written in the "comment" section of the post-interview questionnaire. Most of the comments deal with the interviewer or the applicant's performance in the interview. One comment questioned the structure of the questionnaire, and other comments discussed specific items or aspects of the interview, interviewer, or company.

TABLE 18

Comment Section Listing

"When compared with some of the other interviews, I found him to be hesitant to initiate probing questions, rather seemed to let me direct interview direction, and generally non-assertive. However, he was able to answer questions about firm with familiarity and could contrast areas I brought up."

"I am looking for work in California which can hurt my chances for a second interview - I plan to interview in Calif. whether I am invited or not."

"The man I interviewed with was very subtle and boring. This is constructive criticism not meant to be mean. If he, the interviewer, represents the firm typical worker at _____ I really don't think I could enjoy working there."

"I'm getting better at this! I think - I hope. This company (_____) was one that I was very interested in so I made sure that I was doing my best."

TABLE 18 (cont.)

"Probably a job offer."

"He talked too much! I almost fell asleep!"

"Interviewer tried to put across a friendly image of both himself and his company, but it was overdone and turned me off somewhat."

"It was an excellent interview. The interviewer was interested & informed."

"Interviewer was extremely personable, relaxing, & friendly. I enjoyed the interview immensely."

"OK."

"We didn't talk about the company as much as about myself. I expect to talk more about the company in a Future (sic) interview, which I am confident I will receive (sic)."

"Interviewer was very courteous and easy to talk to."

"Because the degree that I am graduating with is totally unrelated to banking, I feel that I have little chance for a job offer from this company. However, I signed up for the interview because I had worked previously during the summer for ____."

"A complete transition in the opinion I now hold from the opinion I originally held. Very impressed with the company as a whole & the style of the interviewer."

"The interviewer seemed very disinterested - yawning often. His questions were irrelevant and didn't offer the chance to show the qualities I have."

"____'s representatives were very considerate & congenial."

"Interviewer was not a professional interviewer. He is a sales rep given the opportunity to 'get away' for a couple days."

"One of the best interviews and interviewers I've had. It

TABLE 18 (cont.)

was not even in a field of primary interest. The interviewer asked different questions than is usual."

"On questionnaire (sic) structure: Possibility of invalid info. because of breakdown of times (20-30, 30-45 ect (sic))."

"This was my first interview and although I was weak in my questions about the company I was very confident and relaxed."

"Most relaxing interview to date. Put me at ease like no one else has. Professional at the same time."

"Asked a lot of difficult questions."

"Asked about family - first to do so."

"This was my first interview and I really didn't know what to expect. The interviewer didn't ask me any ridiculous questions. They all pertained to what I might be able to do for _____ and what they could do for me. Salary wasn't discussed, but only because I didn't inquire. The interviewer was young, friendly, and he set me at ease by asking about my outside interests and school life in general."

DISCUSSION

In the discussion of the results of this study, much of the attention will be focused upon the seven hypotheses proposed in the Introduction. Through this discussion, the relative importance of various factors of the organization, interview, and the interviewer may be ascertained.

The first hypothesis stated that when comparing the pre-interview opinion of a company with the post-interview opinion of that same company, changes will occur in some of the individuals during the interview experience. The results from Table 6 suggested support for that hypothesis. It was shown that almost one-half of the individuals sampled changed their opinion about the companies. The breakdown of the percentages revealed that a total of 49.3% of the sample (66 individuals) changed their opinion, with 15.7% decreasing their opinion about the company, and 33.6% increasing their opinion about the company.

On the basis of these findings, and due to the amount of control in the collection of the data for the study, it may be stated that the major reason for changes in opinion

about the company was likely due to the interview process itself. Very little time elapsed (approximately one week) from the time the pre-interview opinion was polled to the time the post-interview data was taken. Also, since the interview was "fresh" in the applicant's mind (the post-interview opinion was polled within five minutes after the conclusion of the interview), the portrayal of the interview could be given by the applicant with a minimum influence of forgetting or other possible intervening variables.

Of the subjects who did change their opinion about the company, more than a two to one ratio (45 applicants to 21) existed for those increasing their opinion to those decreasing their opinion. This suggests that expectations about the job and company were more likely to be inflated as a result of the interview. This is at odds with the proposal by Wanous (1977) who proposed that the interviewer should impart realistic information about the company that would not lead to unrealistic expectations. Wanous stated that instead of "selling" the job and company, realism would give an accurate job and company picture and would later result in fewer problems of job dissatisfaction and turnover. Even though the results may or may not signify

realism in the interview, they did give support, or justification, for using the interview as a public relations device, since 84.3% of the applicants either remained the same in their opinion about the company (50.7%) or increased their opinion about the company (33.6%). This does not lend support to Wright (1969) who felt the interview in college recruiting may be overused. The interview's use remains justifiable if only for its role in public relations of a company.

The second hypothesis stated that any change in opinion about a company, from the pre-interview phase to the post-interview phase, will be related, in part, to the style of the interviewer. The results supported this hypothesis in the comparisons of the means scores of the items pertaining to the interviewer's style.

The greatest effect of the interviewer and the interviewer's style on the opinion of the company was revealed in the data of the "decreased" opinion subgroup. In the comparison of the "decreased" opinion subgroup to the "remain the same" opinion subgroup, eleven of the thirteen items relating to the interviewer showed significant differences, with both "personal relations" aspects, and "outward, physical" characteristics important. The inter-

viewer was rated only "average" (mean of 3.0) on the characteristics in the "decreased" opinion sample, while the "remain the same" opinion sample rated the interviewer "high" (mean of 4.0) on the same characteristics. Personal relations was mentioned previously as important for the interviewer in earlier research (Hakel and Schuh, 1971; Ulrich and Trumbo, 1965) in evaluating job applicants, and also important to the applicant for identifying a good interviewer. Schmitt and Coyle (1976) also found agreement with the results of that research.

From these results, it is suggested that a recruiter who lacks social skills or good appearance will tend to reflect a negative image upon the company. The results of the overall group lend support to the statement that a skillful, trained interviewer should probably be employed in the initial screening of candidates. This supports previous research (Downs, 1968; Mayfield, 1964; McMurry, 1947; Schmitt and Coyle, 1976) calling for recruiters well-trained in the use of the interview as a selection device.

Inspection of the results when comparing the "decreased" opinion subgroup to the "increased" opinion subgroup (see Table 14) revealed similar results to those of

the "decreased" - "remain the same" comparison. In the comparison of the mean scores, ten items showed significantly higher scores for the "increased" opinion subgroup. However, in the comparison of the means for the "increased" opinion subgroup to the "remain the same" subgroup (see Table 12), the results gave no support to the hypothesis, with none of the items pertaining to the interviewer's style showing any significant differences. When taking into account that there were few significant differences between the "increased" opinion subgroup and the "remain the same" subgroup, but many significant differences between the "decreased" opinion subgroup and the "remain the same" subgroup, the following can be stated: when interviewing applicants in a recruiting situation, skillful or trained recruiters will probably prevent the applicants from lowering their opinion about the company, but they will not seem to cause any significant raising of opinions. These results for the second hypothesis are in accord with those by Fearing and Fearing (1942) who stated that decisions are made as a consequence of the "dynamic interplay" between the applicant and the interviewer, and with those by Schmitt and Coyle (1976) who found interviewer personality and manner of delivery important.

The third hypothesis stated that changes in opinion about the company, from the pre-interview to the post-interview period, will be related, in part, to how effectively the interviewer communicated information about the company. The results supported that hypothesis in the comparisons made on the data.

Comparisons of the means of the "decreased" opinion versus the "remain the same" subgroups (see Table 13) revealed results which lend support to the third hypothesis. On the item, "degree applicant acquired RELEVANT information about the company," the "decreased" opinion sample had a significantly lower mean score than the "remain the same" subgroup. This suggests that if the "relevant" information is not covered sufficiently in the interview, the applicant is apt to lower his/her opinion of the company. Therefore, any statement or conclusion, would include that it is important for the interviewer to sufficiently communicate various relevant factors of the company to the applicant. He/she should not dwell upon any one aspect, nor attempt to communicate everything in the interview, for it is unlikely that it will raise an applicant's opinion of the company, but rather maintain an already established opinion. The time saved probably can

instead be better utilized to learn more about the applicant. (The last part of this statement results from the comparisons between the "increased" opinion subgroup and the "remain the same" subgroup, which will be covered later).

What is "relevant" information? The items having the highest mean scores for the "remain the same" subgroup were determined as those items with means over 3.5. Those items were: locale, training programs, opportunities for advancement, typical entry-level job, policies, procedures, and philosophy of the company, opportunity for a self-filling career, variety in the job, and products and/or services. These items, when communicated sufficiently to the applicant, are the items most likely to maintain the applicant's opinion of the company at the same or higher level. Insufficient communication of those highly rated items, in all probability, led to part of the decreased opinion about the company by the applicant. This data confirms previous research (Campbell, Prien, and Brailey, 1960; Lopez, 1975; Mayfield, 1964; Schmitt and Coyle, 1976).

Not only should the applicant acquire relevant information about the company, but the first purpose of

the selection interview is still to get an initial look at the candidate, or a "general impression." The item "degree company acquired relevant information about the applicant" briefly summarizes this part of the interview. Comparison of that item for the "decreased" opinion subgroup versus the "remain the same" subgroup revealed a significant difference. In the comparison of the "decreased" opinion subgroup versus the "increased" subgroup, a significant difference was also revealed for that same item. The comparison of the "increased" opinion subgroup to the "remain the same" subgroup, however, showed no significant difference. From these comparisons, it suggests that it is likely there is reason to direct the interview so that the applicant is able to present himself/herself adequately in order not to cause any lowering of opinion about the company. This does not assure any increase in opinion, however. Just as there was no significant difference in the comparison of means for the item "degree company acquired relevant information about the applicant" for the "increased" versus the "remain the same" subgroups, there were few significant differences when contrasting the "increased" versus the "remain the same" subgroups for the degree of communication of the various

items about the company. In the items, "degree applicant acquired RELEVANT information about the company" and "degree company acquired RELEVANT information about the applicant," no significant differences were detected (both items had mean scores about 4.0) for the "increased" versus the "remain the same" subgroups.

How does one collect and disperse relevant information? Perhaps the most efficient means of dealing with information gathering by both the applicant and the company is by the employment of a structured interview as cited before in earlier research (Maas, 1963; McMurry, 1947; Shaw, J., 1952; Wagner, 1949). Through the successful use of the structured interview, the various relevant aspects of the company can be communicated adequately, and the applicant can present himself/herself fully.

Finally, from these comparisons, it can be concluded an inordinate amount of time should not be spent on communicating various aspects about the company, in the hopes of enriching the opinion of the company among the members of a job applicant pool. The opinion about the company is not likely to become any better due to the increased efforts of trying to treat completely the various aspects of

the company. This lends support to Lopez (1975) and Schneider (1975) who stated that information dispensed in the interview should consist of the information that the employee would need to make a decision in the near future. However, Lopez (1975) also felt that by giving a clear picture of the organization, the applicant will be more apt to choose that company over another. Those feelings are not directly supported in this data, but that may be largely due to the fact that this data is based on campus recruitment interviews, which serve more as a screening device for both the company and the applicant.

Some mention of the items, "length of the interview" and "percentage of time the interviewer spoke" should be made. For all comparisons, (see Tables 12, 13 & 14), there were no significant differences between the different changes in opinion about the company.

The interviews were scheduled in thirty minute blocks by the Placement Services office. The mean times for the interviews for the various subgroups ranged from 28.62 minutes to 31.56 minutes. This is in accord with Anderson (1960) who determined that the length of the interview was about the same for the group the recruiter had accepted as for the group the recruiter rejected. Tupes (1950)

felt longer interviews contributed little, if any, to any validity in personality-trait ratings, so it is not necessary for interviews, especially those used in recruiting, to be longer than scheduled.

The item, percentage of time the interviewer spoke, also revealed no significant differences, with the means of the various subgroups ranging from 54.76% to 55.59%. From this, it can be concluded that the interviewers talk slightly more than did the applicants in the interview, no matter the outcome. Daniels and Otis (1950) and Uhrbrock (1933) disclosed similar findings in their research.

The fourth hypothesis states that applicants seeking career in accounting will show differences in various factors of the interview, when compared to the individuals in a more general business type of career. An investigation of the results (see Tables 9, 10, & 11) gives little support to that hypothesis. None of the items were significantly different for these comparisons. These results are in discord with McMurry (1947) who felt that different jobs could result in different interviews. However, a possible reason that there were no significant differences in the aspects of the interview between the accountants and the general business, is because the in-

dividuals in the two sub-samples had one very important shared attribute: all were currently Western Michigan University students. Each individual had the same previous occupation --student-- which may have been the overriding factor of influence in the study.

The fifth hypothesis stated that the competence of the interviewer will be related to the change in opinion about the company from the pre-interview to the post-interview period. From the results in Table 15, the hypothesis was supported. If the applicant rated the interviewer "very high" in competence, the data suggests that the applicant will also tend to either increase his/her opinion about the company, or at least remain the same. The results disclosed that 25 of those applicants did increase their opinion about the company, while 23 did not change their opinions. Of all the applicants who rated the interviewer "very high," only one individual decreased his opinion of the company.

If the interviewer is perceived as "low" in competence, it is suggested that the opinion about the company will either remain the same or decrease. Only 7 of the applicants who rated the interviewer low ($N = 32$) increased their opinion about the company. The data sug-

gests that an incompetent interviewer will not help in raising the opinion about the company by the applicant.

For the applicants who rated the interviewer as "high" in competence, the results are not as clear-cut. Approximately one-half (30) of the applicants experienced no change in opinion. The remainder (23) was divided fairly evenly between the "increased" opinion group and the "decreased" group. Therefore, only in the extreme ratings of the competency of the interviewer does it appear to effect opinion change in the applicants.

The sixth hypothesis, similar to the fifth, states that the perceptions of the competence of the interviewer will be related to the post-interview opinion of the company. The results in Table 16 support that hypothesis. Of the forty-nine applicants who rated the interviewer very high, all but one had a high or very high opinion of the company. In addition, 30 of the applicants who rated the interviewer very high ultimately rated the opinion about the company as very high.

Of the fifty-three individuals who rated the interview high, only 6 rated the company low in opinion. The remainder chose either a very high opinion about the company (12), or a high opinion about the company (35).

Thirty-two applicants rated the interviewer low. Of those, only 3 gave a very high opinion about the company as a post-interview opinion. The remainder was fairly well divided between the high opinion (16) and the low opinion (13).

Since the chi-square test for independence was significant at the .01 level, it can be stated that the differential competency of the interviewer reflects both favorably and unfavorably upon the company. This lends support to Mayfield (1964), who called for trained interviewers in the interview situation.

The seventh hypothesis stated that the change in the estimate of the chances of receiving a job offer, from the pre-interview to the post-interview period, will be related to the perceived competence of the interviewer. The results, using a chi-square test for independence, also supported the hypothesis, since it was significant at the .01 level. The results in Table 17 disclosed that of the 30 individuals who increased their estimate of the probability of a job offer, 19 also perceived the interviewer as very high in competence, and seven more perceived the interviewer as high. Only four of the applicants rated the interviewer as low.

Of the 23 applicants who decreased their estimate of the chances of a job offer, twelve rated the interviewer as low, and 11 rated the interviewer as at least high. In the applicant pool whose estimate of a job offer remained the same ($N = 81$), 65 rated the interviewer as either very high (26) or as high (39).

From this data, it is suggested that the subjects who decreased their estimates of a job offer also tended to rate the recruiter both high and low. Also, if the applicant increases his/her estimate of a job offer, he/she is likely to rate the interviewer highly. This also appears to be true for those subjects whose estimate of a job offer tended to remain the same.

Since the applicants are not likely to place the fault upon the interviewer for the failure to do well in a job interview (as suggested by the data), the reason for a lower (or higher) estimate of a job offer may be instead due to the match-up of the job and applicant, as stated by Schneider (1975). Since the applicant is seeking information about the company, that information will likely be used by the candidate for future career decisions. This is also one more reason to establish initial expectations realistically. Any match-up should be due

to complete and accurate information (Wanous, 1977).

At this time, the inspection of the comment section at the end of the post-interview questionnaire (see Table 18) should be discussed. The interviewer, in terms of negative perceptions, was variously described as hesitant, non-assertive, subtle and boring, tried to put across a friendly image...but was overdone, disinterested, not a professional interviewer. On the positive side, the interviewer was described as familiar (with the firm) and could contrast (aspects of the firm), interested and informed, extremely personable, relaxing, friendly, very courteous and easy to talk to, considerate and congenial, able to put (the applicant) at ease, professional, and asked about (applicant's) family. Of these comments about the interviewer, only one comment is surprising: interviewer seemed very disinterested - yawning often. Despite that particular interviewer, most of the comments were of a positive nature both for the interviewers, and the interviews, in general.

The investigator recognizes that this study has certain limitations. The sample was not representative of college seniors or graduates in general. Since only those seeking careers in accounting or areas of general

business participated in the study, many occupations and academic areas were excluded. As a result, those in the military, teaching, journalism, etc., were not included in the study. It is quite possible that those individuals would show differences in the interview, and rate other aspects differently from applicants in the business world.

Another limitation in the study is the failure to investigate sex differences. Not only could different occupations show differences, but sex differences may appear when studied. Therefore, when sample size and focus permits, the investigation of sex differences should be conducted, especially due to recent expansion of the EEOC jurisdiction. For similar reasons, an investigation of racial differences should be conducted, for it was another limitation of the study resulting from small sample sizes.

The sample size as such was another limiting factor of the study. One hundred and thirty-four applicants can only be characterized as a sample of adequate size at best, especially in the investigation of the accountants. A larger sample may have provided more conclusive results. Not only was sample size a limiting

factor, but since there was a large series of t-tests, some of the results may have been significant due to chance.

Future research could also investigate the effects of geographic preferences on the opinion about companies. The effects of geographic mobility may then be identified.

Another limitation of the study is that the investigator could not specifically determine what effected changes in opinion about the company. Changes could have come about due to the interviewer, the communication aspects, both, or neither. There is always the possibility that the change was due to a factor not identified on the questionnaire. As such, no causal statements other than conditional ones can be made.

Although limitations are present in this study, it is hoped that the investigation did provide some new knowledge, and also lends support to previous knowledge in the employment interview strategies. Although not a definitive study, it nevertheless contributed some conclusions to the recruitment interview.

It was concluded that the opinions about a company by an applicant can change due to a recruitment interview. It was also concluded that the opinion is probably due in

part, to the interviewer's style, and in part to how well relevant information is communicated to the applicant.

The data also led the investigator to conclude that relevant information should be discussed, but the interviewer should not spend a great deal of time explaining everything. It was also concluded that there is little difference in the length of the interview for the various "opinion" subgroups (increased, remain the same, decreased). In addition, it was concluded that the interviewer tends to speak slightly more than the applicant in the interview.

It was found that the perceived competence of the interviewer was related to changes in opinion about the companies, and to the final evaluation of them. The perceived competence of the interview was also found to be related to the change in the estimate of the probability of a job offer.

Due to the relative lack of similar data that exists in this field, this study has probably provided some useful conclusions for the recruitment interview, and aided in establishing a base for future research for the recruitment interview, and perhaps for the employment interview in general.

SUMMARY

The purpose of this study was to investigate the various factors of the employment interview, as it is used in campus recruiting, and to identify the aspects of the interview and the interviewer's style that may influence any change in opinion of a company by the applicant.

One hundred and thirty-four students who were registered at the University Placement Services at Western Michigan University served as the subjects of the study. These subjects were split into two groups: accountants (thirty-eight applicants) and those pursuing a more "general business" career (ninety-six).

The data was collected through the use of a pre-interview and a post-interview questionnaire. The pre-interview questionnaire was administered approximately one week before the interview would occur. The post-interview questionnaire was administered within five minutes after the interview had taken place.

The pre-interview questionnaire was divided into two parts. The first part contained a statement by the investigator explaining the purpose of the questionnaire, how the results would be utilized, and that anonymity

would be maintained at all times.

The second part of the pre-interview questionnaire contained questions pertaining to information about the company to be interviewed. Those items included name of the company, date and time of the interview, position applied for, opinion of the company, estimate of a job offer, and estimate of accepting job. The second part also included questions of pertinent information about the applicant. Those questions included whether it was a first interview, whether the applicant was a current student, geographic preferences, sex of applicant, and graduate or undergraduate status.

The post-interview questionnaire was divided into five parts. The first asked the applicant's opinion about the company and of the competence of the interviewer. The second part asked questions pertaining to the applicant's estimate of a job offer. The third part consisted of thirteen items pertaining to the interviewer's style of interviewing, and asked the applicant to rate the interviewer on those aspects. The fourth part dealt with different aspects of the company, and how well the interviewer communicated those items. The fifth part of the questionnaire asked length of the interview, percentage of time

the interviewer spoke, and subject's opinion of his/her own overall performance. Also included was a "comment section."

Analysis of the data revealed that many factors were related to changes in opinion about the company. It was concluded that the major reason for a change in opinion about the company by the applicant is probably due to the interview. It was suggested that the interview remains useful as a public relations device for the company.

The testing of the hypotheses resulted in the following:

- 1) When comparing the pre-interview opinion about a company with the post-interview opinion, changes do occur in the opinion of some of the individuals, and it was concluded, that the change in opinion is probably due to the interview.

- 2) Any change in opinion about a company is due, in part, to the style of the interviewer.

- 3) Any change in opinion about a company is due, in part, to how effectively the interviewer communicated the relevant information about the company.

- 4) Individuals seeking careers in accounting revealed little difference in the manner in which they evaluated

various factors of the interview as compared to the general business group.

5) The competence of the interviewer is related to the change in opinion about the company, from the pre-interview to the post-interview period.

6) The perceptions of the competence of the interviewer are related to the post-interview opinion about the company.

7) Changes in the probability of receiving a job offer, from the pre-interview questionnaire to the post-interview questionnaire, is related to the perceived competence of the interviewer.

It was also concluded that factors of locale, training programs, opportunities for advancement, typical entry-level job, policies, procedures, and philosophy of the company, and products and/or services were the most relevant factors of information on the post-interview questionnaire, and should be communicated to the applicant in the interview.

It was found that the length of the interview was not a determining factor in the interview, and that the interviewer will tend to speak slightly more than the applicant in the interview.

It was found that the interviewer lacking in personal characteristics regarded as important to the candidate, as well as the interviewer who does not sufficiently communicate relevant information to the applicant, is likely to result in a "decrease" in the positiveness of opinions about the company. However, those interviewers portrayed by possession of most of the important personal characteristics, and who sufficiently communicate relevant information to the applicant, did not insure that the applicant will increase his opinion about the company, but rather maintain the opinion already established.

It was recognized by the investigator that the study did have certain limitations, in that the sample was not representative of college seniors or graduates in general. It was also limited in that a study of sex differences, or racial differences, was not done. The sample size was only adequate, especially as it related to the accountant sample. Finally, the investigator was unable to specifically determine what effected the changes in opinion of the company. Despite these limitations, it is felt that the investigation did provide some new knowledge, and also lent support to previous knowledge in the employment interview.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adams, C.R., and Smeltzer, C.H., The scientific construction of an interviewing chart. Personnel, 1936, 13, 14-19.
- Allen, Louis A., Conducting an effective program of campus recruitment. Personnel, 1955, 30, 22.
- Anderson, C.W., The relation between speaking times and decision in the employment interview. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1960, 44, 267-268.
- Barmeier, R.E., and Kellar, R.J., How college graduates evaluate job factors. Personnel, 1957, 33, 490-494.
- Barlow, Walter G., Discontent among engineers. Journal of College Placement, 1965, 25, 24-25, 72, 74, 76.
- Bugental, J.F.T., Explicit analysis of topical concurrences in diagnostic interviewing. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1953, 9, 3-6.
- Campbell, Joel T., Prien, Erich P., and Brailey, Lester G., Predicting performance evaluations. Personnel Psychology, 1960, 13, 435-440.
- Corey, Stephen M., The interview in teacher selection. Journal of Educational Research, 1933, 26, 525-531.
- Crissy, W.J.E., The employment interview - research areas, methods, and results. Personnel Psychology, 1952, 5, 73-85.
- Daniels, Harry W., and Otis, Jay L., A method for analyzing employment interviews. Personnel Psychology, 1950, 3, 425-444.
- Downs, C.W., What does the selection interview accomplish? Personnel Administration, 31, 1968, 8-14.

- Dunnette, Marvin D., and Bass, Bernard M., Behavioral scientists and personnel management. Industrial Relations, 1963, 2, 115-130.
- Fearing, F., and Fearing, F.M., Factors in the appraisal interview considered with particular reference to the selection of public personnel. Journal of Psychology, 1942, 14, 131-153.
- Hahn, Lawrence J., The influence of extrinsic and intrinsic decision factors on company selection among college seniors. Unpublished master's thesis, Western Michigan University, 1969.
- Hakel, M.D., and Schuh, A.J., Job applicant attributes judged important across seven divergent occupations. Personnel Psychology, 1971, 24, 45-52.
- Landy, Frank J., and Trumbo, Don A., Psychology of Work Behavior, Homewood, Illinois: The Dorsey Press, 1976.
- Lipsett, Laurence, and Gebhart, Mahlon, Identifying managers. Personnel Journal, 1966, 45, 205-208, 219.
- Lopez, Felix M., Personnel Interviewing, (2nd ed.), New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975.
- Maas, J.B., The patterned scaled-expectation interview: reliability studies on a new technique. American Psychologist, 1963, 18, 438.
- McMurry, Robert N., Validating the patterned interview. Personnel, 1947, 23, 263-272.
- McNamara, Walter J., Use of test data in selection and placement. Applying Behavioral Science Research in Industry, Industrial Relations Monograph, No. 23, 1964.
- Mayfield, Eugene C., The selection interview - a re-evaluation of published research. Personnel Psychology, 1964, 17, 239-260.
- Newman, S.H., Bobbit, J.M., and Cameron, D.C., The reliability of the interview in an officer candidate evaluation program. American Psychologist, 1946, 1, 103-

109.

Sarbin, T.R.A., A contribution to the study of actuarial and individual methods of prediction. American Journal of Sociology, 1942, 48, 593-603.

Schmitt, Neal, and Coyle, Brian W., Applicant decisions in the employment interview. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1975, 61, 184-192..

Scneider, B., Organizational climate: Individual preferences and organizational realities revisited. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1975, 60, 459, 465.

Scott, Walter Dill, Selection of employees by means of quantitative determinations. Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 1916, 65.

Shaw, A.C., The anatomy of college recruiting. Journal of College Placement, 1968, 28, 81-82.

Shaw, A.W., Personnel Management, 1923, 26.

Shaw, Jack, The function of the interview in determining fitness for teacher training. Journal of Educational Research, 1952, 45, 667-681.

Snow, A.J., An experiment in the validity of judging human ability. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1924, 8, 339-346.

Tupes, E.C., An evaluation of personality-trait ratings obtained by unstructured assessment interviews. Psychological Monographs, 1950, 64, 11, Whole No. 317.

Uhrbrock, R.S., Analysis of employment interviews. Personnel Journal, 1933, 12, 98-101.

Ulrich, L., and Trumbo, D., The selection interview since 1949. Psychological Bulletin, 1965, 63, 100-116.

Wagner, Ralph, The employment interview: a critical summary. Personnel Psychology, 1949, 2, 17-46.

- Wanous, John P., Organizational entry: the individual's viewpoint. Perspectives on Behavior in Organizations, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1977, 131-134.
- Webster, Edward C., Decision making in the employment interview. Personnel Administration, 1959, 22, 15-22.
- Wentworth, Palmer, How to improve employment interview. Personnel Journal, 1953, 32, 46-49.
- Wright, O.R., Jr., Summary of research on the selection interview since 1964. Personnel Psychology, 1969, 22, 391-413.
- Yonge, K.A., The value of the interview: an orientation and a pilot study. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1956, 40, 25-31.

Appendix A: Pre-Interview Questionnaire

This questionnaire is a part of the research for a graduate student in Industrial Psychology. The results received will hopefully be used in the successful completion of a Master's thesis. In the future, the findings may help students, like yourself, using the Placement Service by providing information to individuals concerning the interview experience. The Placement Service will also be able to use the findings in order to develop possible seminars or workshops around certain aspects of the interview, and perhaps help in the development of a more useful interview process for the interviewer and for the student.

This questionnaire will ask some facts about yourself, your opinions of certain companies, and in a later questionnaire, factors specifically concerning your interview at the Placement Service. This information you give in the questionnaire will be kept in the strictest confidence and will in no way in its presentation identify you with the results. Once the first questionnaire is matched with the follow-up, all records of the names of the participants will be disposed of as soon as possible.

Your anonymity will be maintained at all times. No one will have access to the data, at any time, other than the researchers. The companies with whom you will interview will never have access to the questionnaires, your names, and/or your answers.

If you agree to have your experience in the interview be used in the data of this study, please sign in the space provided.

PLEASE SIGN HERE _____

If you have any questions, or at any time wish to withdraw from the study, please contact Robert McAvoy at 383-3116. Thank you for your time and assistance, for your aid may result in a helpful tool for others.

PLEASE FILL IN THE BLANK

1. Company with whom you will interview _____
2. Date and time of the interview _____
3. Position you are applying for _____
(as specific as possible)
4. Is this your first interview at the University
Placement Service? _____
5. Are you currently a student at WMU? _____

PLEASE CIRCLE THE RESPONSE MOST APPROPRIATE FOR YOU

6. U.S. Geographic preference-- midwest; south; southwest;
east; far west; none; other
7. GRADUATE or UNDERGRADUATE student
8. MALE or FEMALE
9. What is your overall opinion
of the company
you will interview?

| | | | | |
|--------------|------|----------------------------|-----|-------------|
| VERY HIGH | HIGH | NEITHER HIGH NOR LOW | LOW | VERY LOW |
|--------------|------|----------------------------|-----|-------------|
10. What is YOUR ESTIMATE you will
be offered a job
with this company?

| | | | | |
|------------------------|----------------|-------------------|---------------|-----------------------|
| VERY HIGH chance | HIGH chance | AVERAGE chance | LOW chance | VERY LOW chance |
|------------------------|----------------|-------------------|---------------|-----------------------|
11. What is YOUR ESTIMATE you will
accept a job with
this company, if
it is offered?

| | | | | |
|------------------------|----------------|-------------------|---------------|-----------------------|
| VERY HIGH chance | HIGH chance | AVERAGE chance | LOW chance | VERY LOW chance |
|------------------------|----------------|-------------------|---------------|-----------------------|

Appendix B: Post-Interview Questionnaire

PLEASE CIRCLE THE MOST APPROPRIATE RESPONSE

| | VERY HIGH OPINION | HIGH OPINION | AVERAGE OPINION | LOW OPINION | VERY LOW OPINION |
|--|-------------------------|-----------------|--------------------|----------------|------------------------|
| What is YOUR OVERALL OPINION of the company just interviewed? | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| What is YOUR OVERALL OPINION of the competence of the interviewer? | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|

| | VERY HIGH CHANCE | HIGH CHANCE | AVERAGE CHANCE | LOW CHANCE | VERY LOW CHANCE |
|--|------------------------|----------------|-------------------|---------------|-----------------------|
| What is YOUR ESTIMATE of getting a job with this company? | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| What is YOUR ESTIMATE you will accept a job offer with this company if it is offered? | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| Do you feel you will receive another inter- view with this company? | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| If you do <u>not</u> hear from this company, will you pursue another job with this same company? | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |

PLEASE RATE THE INTERVIEWER, OR YOUR IMPRESSIONS OF THE INTERVIEWER, on the following aspects of the interviewer's style. The questions use a five-point scale of rating of 5-VERY FAVORABLE impression; 4-FAVORABLE impression; 3-AVERAGE impression; 2-BELOW AVERAGE impression; 1-VERY POOR impression; and 0-UNABLE TO COMMENT.

| THE INTERVIEWER: | VERY FAV. | FAV. | AVE. | BELOW AVE. | VERY POOR | UNABLE TO COMMENT |
|--|--------------|------|------|---------------|--------------|-------------------------|
| WAS CANDID IN OPINIONS | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| WAS WILLING TO ANSWER QUESTIONS | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| ASKED RELEVANT QUESTIONS | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| WAS CONSCIENTIOUS ABOUT THE INTERVIEW | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| SENSED YOUR FEELINGS AND VIEW OF WORK | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| SEEMED TO ENJOY HIS JOB | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| WAS ARTICULATE | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| HAD INTEREST IN YOUR OUTSIDE INTERESTS AND CONTRIBUTIONS | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| ASKED YOUR OPINIONS | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| WAS SELF-CONTROLLED | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| WAS AGGRESSIVE AND PERSISTENT | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| WAS POISED, RELAXED, AND FRIENDLY | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| HAD A PLEASANT PHYSICAL APPEARANCE | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |

PLEASE RATE HOW COMPREHENSIVELY THE INTERVIEWER communicated with you concerning the following aspects of the company, or of the job. (deg. means degree; N.D. means NOT DISCUSSED).

| | VERY HIGH deg. | HIGH deg. | AVERAGE deg. | AVERAGE deg. | VERY LOW deg. | N.D. |
|---|----------------------|--------------|-----------------|-----------------|---------------------|------|
| STARTING PAY EXPECTATIONS | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| VARIETY IN THE JOB | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| TYPICAL ENTRY-LEVEL JOB (for college graduates) | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| RELATIONSHIPS WITH CO-WORKERS | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| POLICIES, PROCEDURES, AND PHILOSOPHY OF THE COMPANY | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| TURNOVER AND ABSENTEEISM | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| PRODUCTS AND/OR SERVICES | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| TYPES OF PEOPLE AT THE COMPANY | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| FRINGE BENEFITS | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| OPPORTUNITIES FOR ADVANCEMENT | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| TRAINING PROGRAMS | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| CURRENT TRENDS IN THE OCCUPATIONAL AREA | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| LOCALE OF THE COMPANY | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| OPPORTUNITY FOR SUPERVISORY FEEDBACK | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| OPPORTUNITY FOR A SELF- FULFILLING CAREER | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |

| | VERY HIGH deg. | HIGH deg. | AVERAGE deg. | BELOW AVERAGE deg. | VERY LOW deg. |
|---|----------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|
| TO WHAT DEGREE DID <u>YOU</u> ACQUIRE RELEVANT INFORMATION ABOUT THE COMPANY? | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| TO WHAT DEGREE DID THE <u>COMPANY</u> ACQUIRE RELEVANT INFORMATION ABOUT YOU? | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| LENGTH OF THE INTERVIEW: | OVER 45 minutes | 30 - 45 minutes | 20 - 30 minutes | 10 - 20 minutes | LESS THAN 10 minutes |
| % OF TIME THE INTERVIEWER SPOKE: | 80-100% | 60-80% | 40-60% | 20-40% | 0-20% |
| WHAT IS YOUR <u>OVERALL</u> <u>OPINION OF YOUR</u> <u>PERFORMANCE</u> IN THE INTERVIEW | VERY GOOD | GOOD | AVERAGE | BELOW AVERAGE | VERY POOR |

COMMENTS:

Appendix C: Mean Scores and Standard Deviations
for the Employment Groups Whose Opinions
Increased, Remained the Same, and Decreased
about the Company

| ITEM | ACCOUNTANT | | GENERAL BUSINESS | | OVERALL | |
|--|------------|------|---------------------|------|---------|------|
| | Mean | S.D. | Mean | S.D. | Mean | S.D. |
| Increase in Opinion | | | | | | |
| Estimate of a job offer | 3.38 | .70 | 3.57 | .72 | 3.53 | .72 |
| Estimate of accepting job | 4.13 | .60 | 3.97 | .75 | 4.00 | .73 |
| Estimate of another interview | 3.88 | .78 | 3.81 | .80 | 3.82 | .80 |
| If not offered a job, estimate of pursuing another job with same company | 2.50 | 1.23 | 2.89 | 1.01 | 2.82 | 1.06 |
| THE INTERVIEWER: | | | | | | |
| Was candid in opinions | 4.63 | .70 | 4.11 | 1.05 | 4.21 | 1.02 |
| Was willing to answer questions | 4.75 | .43 | 4.81 | .39 | 4.80 | .40 |
| Asked relevant questions | 4.50 | .50 | 4.22 | .87 | 4.27 | .83 |
| Was conscientious about interview | 4.63 | .48 | 4.28 | 1.09 | 4.34 | 1.02 |
| Sensed applicant's feelings and view of work | 4.13 | .78 | 4.23 | 1.23 | 4.21 | 1.16 |
| Seemed to enjoy his job | 4.50 | .50 | 4.35 | .85 | 4.38 | .80 |
| Was articulate | 4.63 | .48 | 4.23 | 1.25 | 4.30 | 1.18 |
| Had interest in applicant's outside interests and contributions | 4.00 | 1.23 | 3.76 | 1.20 | 3.80 | 1.20 |

Increase in Opinion (cont.)

| ITEM | ACCOUNTANT | | GEN.BUS. | | OVERALL | |
|---|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| <u> </u> | <u> </u> | <u> </u> | <u> </u> | <u> </u> | <u> </u> | <u> </u> |
| Asked applicant's opinions | 3.63 | 1.22 | 3.73 | 1.11 | 3.71 | 1.13 |
| Was self-controlled | 4.63 | .48 | 4.31 | 1.07 | 4.36 | 1.00 |
| Was aggressive and persistent | 4.00 | .87 | 3.62 | 1.02 | 3.69 | 1.01 |
| Was poised, relaxed, friendly | 4.63 | .48 | 4.60 | .59 | 4.60 | .57 |
| Had pleasant physical appearance | 4.50 | .71 | 4.43 | .68 | 4.44 | .69 |
| How COMPREHENSIVELY interviewer communicated the following items: | | | | | | |
| Starting pay expectations | 1.50 | 1.58 | 1.87 | 1.77 | 1.80 | 1.75 |
| Variety in the job | 4.13 | .78 | 4.11 | .83 | 4.11 | .82 |
| Typical entry-level job (for college graduates) | 3.88 | .93 | 3.87 | 1.07 | 3.87 | 1.05 |
| Relationships with co-workers | 3.75 | .83 | 2.73 | 1.50 | 2.91 | 1.46 |
| Policies, procedures, and philosophy of the company | 3.50 | 1.41 | 3.35 | 1.34 | 3.38 | 1.36 |
| Turnover and absenteeism | 2.38 | 1.93 | 1.43 | 1.67 | 1.60 | 1.76 |
| Products and/or services | 3.75 | 1.48 | 3.30 | 1.54 | 3.38 | 1.54 |
| Types of people at the company | 3.50 | 1.00 | 2.49 | 1.77 | 2.67 | 1.70 |
| Financial picture of the company | 2.63 | 2.12 | 3.35 | 1.53 | 3.22 | 1.67 |

Increase in Opinion (cont.)

| ITEM | ACCOUNTANT | | GEN.BUS. | | OVERALL | |
|--|------------|-------|----------|-------|---------|-------|
| Fringe benefits | 1.88 | 1.90 | 2.11 | 1.86 | 2.07 | 1.87 |
| Opportunities for advancement | 4.00 | .50 | 3.95 | 1.29 | 3.96 | 1.19 |
| Training programs | 3.38 | 2.00 | 4.08 | 1.02 | 3.96 | 1.28 |
| Current trends in occupational area | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.84 | 1.53 | 2.69 | 1.66 |
| Locale | 3.63 | 1.73 | 3.92 | 1.30 | 3.87 | 1.39 |
| Opportunity for supervisory feedback | 3.75 | 1.48 | 2.84 | 1.69 | 3.00 | 1.69 |
| Opportunity for a self-fulfilling career | 4.25 | .66 | 3.60 | 1.17 | 3.71 | 1.13 |
| Degree applicant acquired RELEVANT information about company | 4.13 | .33 | 4.05 | .73 | 4.07 | .68 |
| Degree company acquired RELEVANT information about applicant | 4.13 | .60 | 3.87 | .94 | 3.91 | .89 |
| Length of interview (minutes) | 31.00 | 6.00 | 31.68 | 8.20 | 31.56 | 7.86 |
| % of time interviewer spoke | 50.00 | 10.00 | 56.35 | 17.66 | 55.22 | 16.73 |

Appendix C (cont.)

Remain the Same in Opinion

| ITEM | ACCOUNTANT | | GENERAL BUSINESS | | OVERALL | |
|--|------------|------|---------------------|------|---------|------|
| | Mean | S.D. | Mean | S.D. | Mean | S.D. |
| Estimate of a job offer | 3.32 | .63 | 3.46 | .85 | 3.41 | .79 |
| Estimate of accepting job | 3.91 | .85 | 3.83 | 1.03 | 3.85 | .97 |
| Estimate of another interview | 3.55 | .66 | 3.61 | 1.01 | 3.59 | .91 |
| If not offered a job, estimate of pursuing an- other job with same company | 2.41 | 1.19 | 2.83 | 1.26 | 2.69 | 1.25 |
| THE INTERVIEWER: | | | | | | |
| Was candid in opinions | 3.91 | .79 | 4.02 | .85 | 3.99 | .83 |
| Was willing to answer questions | 4.46 | .50 | 4.59 | .71 | 4.54 | .65 |
| Asked relevant questions | 4.05 | 1.11 | 4.02 | .90 | 4.03 | .97 |
| Was conscientious about interview | 4.14 | .81 | 4.15 | .75 | 4.15 | .77 |
| Sensed applicant's feel- ing and view of work | 4.00 | .52 | 3.98 | .87 | 3.99 | .78 |
| Seemed to enjoy his job | 3.91 | .67 | 4.15 | .93 | 4.07 | .86 |
| Was articulate | 4.18 | .58 | 4.13 | .92 | 4.15 | .83 |
| Had interest in appli- cant's outside interests and contributions | 3.86 | 1.23 | 3.76 | 1.22 | 3.79 | 1.22 |
| Asked applicant's opinions | 3.33 | 1.08 | 3.76 | .94 | 3.63 | 1.02 |

Remain the Same in Opinion (cont.)

| ITEM | ACCOUNTANT | | GEN.BUS. | | OVERALL | |
|---|------------|------|----------|------|---------|------|
| Was self-controlled | 4.14 | .69 | 4.26 | .74 | 4.22 | .72 |
| Was aggressive and persistent | 3.32 | .76 | 3.48 | .95 | 4.31 | .90 |
| Was poised, relaxed, friendly | 4.14 | .81 | 4.39 | .77 | 4.31 | .79 |
| Had pleasant physical appearance | 4.23 | .59 | 4.28 | .74 | 4.27 | .70 |
| How COMPREHENSIVELY interviewer communicated the following items: | | | | | | |
| Starting pay expectations | 1.27 | 1.60 | 2.20 | 1.75 | 1.90 | 1.76 |
| Variety in the job | 4.00 | 1.09 | 3.46 | 1.54 | 3.63 | 1.43 |
| Typical entry-level job (for college graduates) | 3.86 | 1.39 | 3.65 | 1.43 | 3.72 | 1.42 |
| Relationships with co-workers | 3.55 | 1.08 | 3.11 | 1.52 | 3.25 | 1.41 |
| Policies, procedures, and philosophy of the company | 3.68 | 1.22 | 3.48 | 1.46 | 3.54 | 1.39 |
| Turnover and absenteeism | 1.64 | 1.85 | 1.39 | 1.65 | 1.47 | 1.72 |
| Products and/or services | 3.68 | 1.22 | 3.46 | 1.31 | 3.53 | 1.29 |
| Types of people at the company | 3.18 | 1.37 | 2.96 | 1.47 | 3.03 | 1.45 |
| Financial picture of the company | 1.82 | 1.77 | 2.65 | 1.86 | 2.38 | 1.87 |
| Fringe benefits | 2.00 | 1.71 | 1.87 | 1.79 | 1.91 | 1.76 |

Remain the Same Opinion (cont.)

| ITEM | ACCOUNTANT | | GEN.BUS. | | OVERALL | |
|--|------------|-------|----------|-------|---------|-------|
| Opportunities for advancement | 3.55 | 1.44 | 3.91 | 1.08 | 3.79 | 1.22 |
| Training programs | 3.82 | 1.44 | 3.83 | 1.46 | 3.82 | 1.46 |
| Current trends in occupational area | 2.59 | 1.85 | 2.57 | 1.72 | 2.57 | 1.76 |
| Locale | 4.09 | 1.16 | 3.83 | 1.29 | 3.91 | 1.26 |
| Opportunity for supervisory feedback | 3.68 | 1.43 | 2.94 | 1.59 | 3.18 | 1.58 |
| Opportunity for a self-fulfilling career | 3.59 | 1.27 | 3.74 | 1.37 | 3.69 | 1.34 |
| Degree applicant acquired RELEVANT information about company | 3.96 | .71 | 3.80 | .68 | 3.85 | .69 |
| Degree company acquired RELEVANT information about applicant | 3.96 | .71 | 3.63 | .73 | 3.74 | .74 |
| Length of the interview (minutes) | 28.96 | 7.52 | 31.15 | 8.17 | 30.44 | 8.03 |
| % of time interviewer spoke | 51.82 | 11.92 | 57.39 | 17.87 | 55.59 | 16.39 |

Appendix C (cont.)

Decrease in Opinion

| ITEM | ACCOUNTANT | | GENERAL BUSINESS | | OVERALL | |
|--|-------------|-------------|---------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| | <u>Mean</u> | <u>S.D.</u> | <u>Mean</u> | <u>S.D.</u> | <u>Mean</u> | <u>S.D.</u> |
| Estimate of a job offer | 2.75 | .66 | 2.77 | .80 | 2.76 | .75 |
| Estimate of accepting job | 3.75 | 1.30 | 2.92 | .83 | 3.24 | 1.11 |
| Estimate of another interview | 2.88 | .78 | 2.85 | .86 | 2.86 | .83 |
| If not offered a job, estimate of pursuing an- other job with same company | 2.25 | 1.20 | 1.62 | .74 | 1.86 | .99 |
| THE INTERVIEWER: | | | | | | |
| Was candid in opinions | 3.71 | 1.70 | 3.42 | 1.20 | 3.53 | 1.41 |
| Was willing to answer questions | 4.38 | .70 | 3.77 | .80 | 4.00 | .82 |
| Asked relevant questions | 3.25 | .97 | 3.31 | .72 | 3.29 | .83 |
| Was conscientious about interview | 3.25 | .66 | 3.46 | .84 | 3.38 | .79 |
| Sensed applicant's feel- ings and view of work | 3.50 | .87 | 3.00 | 1.04 | 3.19 | 1.01 |
| Seemed to enjoy his job | 3.38 | .99 | 3.46 | .63 | 3.43 | .79 |
| Was articulate | 3.17 | 1.97 | 3.46 | .63 | 3.37 | 1.37 |
| Had interest in appli- cant's outside interests and contributions | 3.00 | 1.41 | 3.08 | 1.00 | 3.05 | 1.17 |
| Asked applicant's opinions | 2.63 | .70 | 2.85 | 1.03 | 2.76 | .92 |

Decrease in Opinion (cont.)

| ITEM | ACCOUNTANT | | GEN. BUS. | | OVERALL | |
|---|------------|------|-----------|------|---------|------|
| Was self-controlled | 3.75 | .83 | 3.77 | .58 | 3.76 | .68 |
| Was aggressive and persistent | 3.00 | .50 | 3.15 | 1.03 | 3.10 | .87 |
| Was poised, relaxed, friendly | 3.63 | 1.11 | 3.62 | .74 | 3.62 | .90 |
| Had pleasant physical appearance | 3.50 | 1.00 | 3.69 | .46 | 3.62 | .72 |
| How COMPREHENSIVELY interviewer communicated the following items: | | | | | | |
| Starting pay expectations | 1.13 | 1.54 | 1.23 | 1.37 | 1.19 | 1.44 |
| Variety in the job | 3.13 | 1.05 | 3.15 | 1.29 | 3.14 | 1.21 |
| Typical entry-level job (for college graduates) | 3.25 | 1.30 | 3.39 | 1.27 | 3.33 | 1.29 |
| Relationships with co-workers | 2.13 | 1.90 | 2.31 | 1.38 | 2.24 | 1.60 |
| Policies, procedures, and philosophy of the company | 2.50 | 1.12 | 3.08 | 1.39 | 2.86 | 1.32 |
| Turnover and absenteeism | .50 | 1.00 | 1.46 | 1.74 | 1.10 | 1.57 |
| Products and/or services | 3.13 | 1.45 | 3.46 | 1.34 | 3.33 | 1.39 |
| Types of people at the company | 2.50 | 1.12 | 2.39 | 1.33 | 2.43 | 1.26 |
| Financial picture of the company | .88 | 1.36 | 2.69 | 1.68 | 2.00 | 1.80 |
| Fringe benefits | .63 | 1.11 | 1.15 | 1.29 | .95 | 1.25 |

Decrease in Opinion (cont.)

| ITEM | ACCOUNTANT | | GEN.BUS. | | OVERALL | |
|--|------------|-------|----------|-------|---------|-------|
| Opportunities for advancement | 3.13 | 1.05 | 3.15 | 1.03 | 3.14 | 1.04 |
| Training programs | 3.88 | 1.27 | 3.39 | 1.39 | 3.57 | 1.37 |
| Current trends in occupational area | 2.13 | 1.27 | 2.62 | 1.33 | 2.43 | 1.33 |
| Locale | 4.00 | .87 | 3.85 | .77 | 3.91 | .81 |
| Opportunity for supervisory feedback | 1.63 | 1.73 | 2.54 | 1.69 | 2.19 | 1.76 |
| Opportunity for a self-fulfilling career | 2.38 | 1.65 | 3.23 | .89 | 2.91 | 1.31 |
| Degree applicant acquired RELEVANT information about company | 3.25 | .43 | 3.31 | .61 | 3.29 | .55 |
| Degree company acquired RELEVANT information about applicant | 3.00 | 1.00 | 3.23 | .58 | 3.14 | .77 |
| Length of interview (minutes) | 28.25 | 7.48 | 28.85 | 6.95 | 28.62 | 7.16 |
| % of time interviewer spoke | 55.00 | 23.98 | 54.62 | 20.98 | 54.76 | 22.17 |