



6-1964

Analysis of the Relationship of Items on an Employment Application to Length of Service

Margery Hidenach White
Western Michigan University

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

Recommended Citation

White, Margery Hidenach, "Analysis of the Relationship of Items on an Employment Application to Length of Service" (1964). *Master's Theses*. 4042.

https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/masters_theses/4042

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 Master's Theses by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks at WMU. For more information, please contact wmu-scholarworks@wmich.edu.



ANALYSIS OF THE RELATIONSHIP OF ITEMS ON AN
EMPLOYMENT APPLICATION TO LENGTH OF SERVICE

by

Margery Hindenach White

A thesis presented to the
Faculty of the School of Graduate
Studies in partial fulfillment
of the
Degree of Master of Arts

Western Michigan University
Kalamazoo, Michigan
June 1964

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>PAGE</u>
Problem and Literature Review	1
Method	10
Results	12
Discussion	16
Summary	19
References	20
Appendices	21

ANALYSIS OF THE RELATIONSHIP OF ITEMS ON AN EMPLOYMENT APPLICATION TO LENGTH OF SERVICE

Certain factors on an application blank may be predictive of length of service and of job success. If personal history items which successfully differentiate between the short-term and long-term employee or the desirable and undesirable employee can be identified, it would assist in the selection process.

A review of recent research concerning factors on an employment application as related to job success reveals that, although considerable research was done in this area during the early 1950's, there has not been much published in the past two years. Apparently there are three reasons for this: (1) early results indicated high validity but questionable retest reliability so other methods such as testing have gained in popularity; (2) variables in each company required validation in each situation and if there was no new contribution in technique the results were probably not reported; and (3) the lack of adequate criteria for evaluating job performance has created validation problems.

The need for further research on the use of weighted application blanks is indicated by many reports. Unscientific, subjective selection results in weighted bias which is not related to job success. This area was investigated in a research project by Triandis (1963). It is assumed that each manager has a list of characteristics he considers likely to lead to job effectiveness and another list he considers

likely to lead to job failure. These characteristics would differ between managers and the weights given to negative characteristics are greater than the weights given to the positive. Some characteristics--race, sex, and religion--are probably irrelevant to job success but may still have a substantial influence on the decision process. The questionnaire results from personnel managers and students in Illinois and Greece indicate that in both cultures weight is given to characteristics such as age, race, and sex which are probably not correlated with job success but which, under certain conditions, might bar most of the older Negro women candidates from the job. Triandis research indicates the need for further validation of the characteristics that personnel directors consider important for job success.

The purpose of a study by Owens (1962) was to develop rules for the writing and evaluation of life-history items to assist in the selection of those items possessing high retest reliability. Retest reliability has been one of the problems related to the use of life-history items as predictors of success. Consistent and inconsistent life-history items were selected from a list of 200 which had been administered twice to the same group of students with a two-month interval. Four rules were significant in differentiating the consistent from the inconsistent items. Rule 1: Brevity is desirable. By line count the average length among the consistent items was two and for the inconsistent it was two and one-half. Rule 2: Whenever possible, numbers should be used to graduate and define options or alternatives.

Rule 3: Either all response options should be covered or an escape option provided. This relates to the research findings on the forced-choice method whereby forcing improves validity but decreases reliability. Rule 4: Items should carry a neutral or pleasant connotation for the respondent. A respondent selects fewer options which tend to place him in an unfavorable light on a retest than on an initial testing, thereby decreasing reliability.

The purpose of research by Hoose (1963) was to determine if application blank items could successfully differentiate between desirable and undesirable engineers, and if the items found predictive in one concern are also predictive in another. Criterion to distinguish successful and unsuccessful groups was promotion from junior to senior engineer on one hand and forced resignation on the other. The responses on every item on the application were analyzed and items that did not differentiate between desirable and undesirable engineers were discarded. The items that differentiated significantly were assigned weights and the applications for all individuals in the criterion group were scored and plotted graphically. A cut-off score was established so as to select the greatest proportion of desirable engineers. The research by Hoose was conducted in two companies and in Company A, 15 items out of 63 were found to differentiate significantly between the groups of desirable and undesirable engineers. The predictive items were age, weight, marital status, age at marriage, number of children, education, type of degree, quartile of class, grade point, activities in college, reason for leaving last job, father's occupation, military

service, rank in military service, and what he would like to be doing in 10 years. Had Company A used scores on a weighted application blank in hiring engineers, 96% of the successful and 12% of the unsuccessful would have been hired while 88% of the unsuccessful and only 4% of the successful would have been rejected.

In Company B similar results were obtained with differences, however, quantitatively and qualitatively between the two companies. These results indicate that weighted application blanks must be fitted to the specific company since items successful in one company are not necessarily effective in another. The possible benefits from a scientifically constructed weighted application are plentiful and further investigation of this screening method is recommended.

A study by Morrison (1962) is designed to better understand the discriminating personal characteristics of research scientists. Seventy-five life-history items of 418 scientists were related to three criteria of research performance. The performance criteria consisted of supervisory ratings on creativity, over-all performance and number of patent disclosures during a 5-year period. The correlation between over-all performance and creativity was .54. The correlations between these and patent disclosures were .14 and .18 respectively. Five factors, accounting for 23% of the variance, were extracted from the 75 life-history items. Some of these factors may be more observable and very saleable so they would influence the over-all performance ratings. The result could be that on a subjective rating the truly creative person may receive a less favorable evaluation

than he merits. This could distort the criteria and make the correlations less valid.

Wernimont (1962) reevaluated the weighted application blank for office personnel in a company where the blank had been used for six years. The purpose of this study was to reevaluate a weighted application blank developed by Kirchner and Dunnette in 1957 on the basis of female office personnel hired in 1954. The subjects in the sampling held essentially the same types of jobs as those in the earlier study and were employees of the same company. The criterion for both studies was tenure.

The application blank responses were reweighted by using all new female office workers hired in 1959. The long-term group was compared with the short-term group on 37 variables. Sixteen were found to differentiate on the basis of at least a 10% difference in the frequency of responses between the two groups. Weights were then assigned to responses for each variable.

The new total scores effectively differentiated between long- and short-term groups. The difference between the means was statistically significant as 84% of the long-term exceeded the median of the short-term and none of the long-term scored below the first quartile of the short-term.

The variables weighted differently in 1959 include length of time in last position, number of past positions, age and office training. New variables were average high school grade, type of work in last position,

anticipated length of service, salary expected, position desired and evidence of leadership statement. The variables that were consistent were high proficiency at shorthand; did not leave the last job for pregnancy, marriage, sickness or home problems; and will begin work one week or more from now.

The tetrachoric r 's between total application blank scores and tenure by Dunnette (1960) were: 1954--.74; 1955--.61; 1956--.38. The 1960 study obtained a tetrachoric r of .07 based on the same weights and utilizing one-fourth of the weighted application scores of female office employees hired in 1959.

Wernimont's study indicates that there was a slow but continuous deterioration of the ability to the weights to distinguish long- from short-term employees. After five years the results were little better than chance. The scores on the revised weights of variables show a tetrachoric r of .57 with tenure.

The maximum time to use weights depends on many factors--economic conditions, locale, type of industry, selection ratio, criterion used and others, but this study suggests that weights ought to be reviewed every 3-5 years.

Tiffin (1947) analyzed personnel data for long- and short-term employees on a semi-skilled factory job. The data used were age, years of education, height, weight, marital status, and number of dependents. The results indicate that, at the time of employment, employees who stay at least nine months (long-term) on the job are

older, have had less formal education, are more frequently married, and have more dependents than employees who leave prior to three months (short-term). In hiring under these conditions employees should be sought who are at least 30 years old, have not finished over ten years of schooling, are married, and have at least one (preferably more) dependent.

Mosel (1952) utilized personal data to predict department store sales performance. The criterion was sales performance. High and low criterion groups were used. Twelve of forty-two items on an application proved to distinguish between the two groups at the .05 confidence level. These items were age, years of formal education, years of previous selling experience, weight, height, time on last job, time on next to last job, domicile, type of principal experience, number of dependents, marital status, and time lost on job in last two years.

The results indicate that the best performers (low selling cost employees) in order of discrimination are between 35 and 54 years of age, have had 13 to 16 years of formal education, have had over five years previous selling experience, over 160 pounds, have been on next to last job five years or less, living in a boarding house, have been on their last job as a minor executive over five years, between 59 and 62 inches in height, have one to three dependents, widowed, and have had no lost time in the last two years. A cut-off score was developed whereby 92% of the high performers would have been selected and 56% of the poor performers rejected.

Stone (1956) summarizes the early research reported on weighted application blanks. He indicates that this research demonstrated

the predictive value of personal factors in selection of employees for certain types of jobs. The earliest research was conducted with salesmen, particularly in insurance and department stores. Sales were the criteria in the analysis as for this type of work it is the most objective method of distinguishing between the successful and the unsuccessful. Stone (1956) reported further studies utilizing a weighted application blank for selection of clerical workers, supervisors, cab drivers, pilots and factory workers. The technique can be applied in any company have a relatively large number of employees doing the same kind of work. When turnover is high or training costly it may be particularly valuable. Ohmann (Stone, 1956) utilized a weighted application blank at Tremco Manufacturing Company for selection of salesmen and obtained a validity coefficient of 0.67. Kerr and Martin (Stone, 1956) validated a check list based on employment applications and obtained a correlation of 0.35 with a criterion of supervisory ratings. Worthington (Stone, 1956) developed a personal-history blank to predict success on almost any job in any company but this has not been broadly enough applied to have been validated.

Super (Farnsworth, 1963) indicates there is ample evidence to encourage use of selected items from biographical information blanks in personnel selection as significant relationships with criteria of job success. The most difficult part of validation of application factors and also of testing programs is the establishment of valid criteria for evaluating job performance. Although much research is being done in this area, the subjective nature of the

results makes correlation with other factors difficult. These studies indicate that the more objective measures such as attendance, tenure, publications, and patent disclosures may create a "halo" or may be unrelated to over-all ratings. Although recent research indicates the value of continued investigation of the problem, real progress will be related to the development of valid criteria of job performance.

The purpose of this study is to analyze items on employment applications of clerical workers to determine what items, if any, may distinguish between short-term and long-term employees.

METHOD

Fifty-one factors on an application blank for a small manufacturing company were itemized. Certain items, such as, social security number, telephone number, citizenship, consent for a pre-placement physical and consent for vaccination were omitted because of their lack of omentation to the problem. Other items for which there could be numerous answers were grouped under arbitrary headings designed to be inclusive but not specific.

The subjects were all the clerical workers hired by the company from January 1, 1960, through June 30, 1961. The total sample was 103 but six people had to be deleted because of insufficient records so that the final group was 97, about 22% of the total female clerical staff.

Several criteria were considered for evaluating performance including supervisor's appraisals, attendance, job level, and length of service. Appraisals have such questionable validity and vary from supervisor to supervisor so this was felt to be an inadequate criterion. Attendance was difficult to reduce to a suitable denominator except over a considerable period of time. Job level was related to appraisal, attendance, and tenure as well as background. Length of service was the most specific and objective of the criteria available and also extremely important because of the time and expense involved in training new office people so it was the criterion chosen.

The sample was divided into three groups. The first group was made up

of those terminated prior to January, 1964. There were 59 in this group and their length of service ranged from less than three months to 36 months. The second group was the 26 who were employed less than 12 months. The third group was the 38 still employed on January, 1964, with a minimum of 30 months and a maximum of 35 months of service.

The answers on the application blank were tabulated for each group and the total responses and the percent were calculated for each group.

RESULTS

Ten items showing a difference of 20% or more between the responses of the long-term employees and short-term employees were selected as indicating a possible relationship to length of service. Table I shows the responses of Group I, long-term, and Group II, short-term, to these ten items: age, marital status, living arrangements, starting salary expected, presently employed, type of present work, reason for change, time on present job, type of last employment, and school subjects best liked. The number and the percent of responses in each group are indicated and also the percent of difference between the groups. The tabulations for the items are in Appendix A.

Thirty-one percent of Group I (long-term) were over age 25, whereas, only 12% of Group II (short-term) were over age 25. Seventy-seven percent of Group II were in the 20 to 25 years range - 22% more than those in Group I. Twenty-eight percent of Group I were over age 30 and 13% over 40 years as compared to only 4% of Group II over age 30. This would indicate that there is a tendency for the woman over 30 years old to remain on the job longer.

The 54% difference in marital status between Group I and Group II is significant. In Group I, 66% were single, 11% were divorced, widowed, or parted. It could be concluded from this that on the basis of tenure, the single, divorced, widowed, or parted woman would continue employment longer than the married woman.

Twenty-five percent more of Group I than of Group II were living with

parents. Twenty-eight percent more of Group II than of Group I were renting.

Although 21% more of Group II than of Group I indicated an expected starting salary of less than \$65 a week, 29% of Group I gave no answer to this item. However, 24% of Group I expected a starting salary of over \$70 a week compared to 8% of Group II so there is apparently a tendency for the long-term group to expect a larger starting salary than the short-term group.

More of the long-term group than of the short-term group were presently employed in office work. The long-term group was more apt than the short-term group to desire a change for a better opportunity or to be dissatisfied with present job.

Thirty-four percent of Group I had been on their present job more than three years, whereas, none of Group II had been on the job more than three years. Eight percent of Group II had been on the job more than one year compared to 52% of Group I. This would indicate that not only are long-term employees more apt to be presently employed but that they have also been on their present job longer than the short-term group. Fifty-five percent of Group I had had more than one previous employer, whereas, 77% of Group II had had more than one previous employer, which indicates that the short-term employee had changed jobs more frequently.

Little difference between the two groups was indicated in relation to typing, shorthand, and English but 27% more of those in Group I than

in Group II liked business and 25% more liked mathematics.

Several other items such as personal insurance, relatives employed, participation in sports, types of course, school awards, and consult employer could have been evaluated but the large per cent of no answers would have reduced the sample so much that any conclusion might be faulty.

TABLE I
ITEMS WITH THE LARGEST DIFFERENCE

	Group I Still Employed as of 1/64		Group II Employed Less Than 12 Months		% of Group I Less % of Group II
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	
1. Age in Years	Average	26.34	Average	23.23	3.11 Years
Under 20	6	16	3	11	+5
20-25	20	53	20	77	-22
26-30	1	3	2	8	-5
31-35	4	10	-	-	+10
36-40	2	5	-	-	+5
Over 40	5	13	1	4	+9
2. Marital Status					
Married	9	23	20	77	-54
Single	25	66	5	19	+47
Divorced	1	3	-	-	+3
Widowed	2	5	1	4	+1
Parted	1	3	-	-	+3
3. Living Arrangements					
Own Home	2	5	-	-	+5
Buying	6	16	4	15	+1
Renting	10	26	14	54	-28
Boarding	2	5	1	4	+1
Live With Parents	18	48	6	23	+25
No Answer	-	-	1	4	-4
4. Starting Salary Expected					
Less Than \$65	12	31	13	50	-21
\$66 to \$70	6	16	7	27	-11
\$71 to \$75	6	16	1	4	+12
\$76 to \$80	2	5	1	4	+1
\$81 to \$85	1	3	-	-	+3
No Answer	11	29	4	15	+14
5. Presently Employed					
Yes	27	71	11	42	+29
No	11	29	14	54	-25
No Answer	-	-	1	4	-4
6. Type of Present Work					
Office	25	66	8	31	+35
Other	2	5	3	11	-6
7. Reason for Change					
Better Opportunity	17	45	3	11	+34
Marriage	-	-	2	8	-8
Dissatisfied	6	16	1	4	+12
Other	4	10	5	19	-9
8. Time on Present Job					
Less Than 6 Months	5	13	6	23	-10
6 Months to 1 Year	2	5	3	11	-6
1 to 2 Years	4	10	1	4	+6
2 to 3 Years	3	8	1	4	+4
More Than 3 Years	13	34	-	-	+34
9. Type of Last Employment					
Office	20	53	19	73	-20
Other	11	29	5	19	+10
10. School Subjects Best Liked					
Typing	21	55	10	39	+16
Shorthand	14	37	7	27	+10
English	15	40	13	50	-10
Business	19	50	6	23	+27
Mathematics	15	40	4	15	+25

DISCUSSION

The purpose of this analysis was to determine what personal history items might distinguish between long-term and short-term clerical workers and the results indicate that certain factors may have a relationship to this criterion. Since the groups were relatively small and percentages were used, an item could appear significant purely by chance. The items related to present employment reduced the sample to the extent that it would be dangerous to make any assumptions or comparisons.

Several items identified as significant may well be interrelated. There may be a relationship between living arrangements and marital status as the single women would be more apt to live with parents than would the married women; therefore, only the marital status would be necessary. A similar relation may exist between last employment, time of employment, and changes in employment.

Several areas for further investigation were suggested by the study. No evaluation was made of the relationship of age to marital status and further study could be undertaken to determine whether there is a difference in length of service between young married women and older married women. The item related to present employment could be analysed further to determine its relationship to marital status as there may be a greater tendency for the single girl to be employed than the married. No evaluation was made of the husband's occupation but there is a possibility that a number of the married applicants

may be wives of students, who have recently moved to the community and are currently unemployed for this reason. This also would limit the length of their service to the period the husband is in school.

The subjects best liked might be an interesting area for further study, not only from the standpoint of job tenure and success, but in relationship to vocational guidance. Because a continued shortage of qualified clerical people is anticipated, school counselors might find helpful a further evaluation of subjects liked in relation to success on clerical jobs.

The hiring practice may have affected the results of the study as supervisors seeking long-term employees may have selected older, single women. Additional investigation could be undertaken to determine whether tenure had been a more heavily weighted factor than performance in selection. Perhaps the outstanding person had been by-passed for the mediocre but long-term candidate.

A sampling of applications of employees could be analysed according to the ten items indicating a difference between short-term and long-term employees. A prediction of length of service could be made based on this analysis and compared with actual service. This would serve as a cross-validation of the present study.

The two items that appear to be the most closely related to length of service are age and marital status. The other items may be important only because of their relationship to age or marital status. The results of this study are similar to other research reported and

gives support to employment practices using age and marital status as requirements for selection, the labor market permitting, when length of service is important. It is necessary to emphasize that the length of service is the criterion and other factors may be more important in relationship to job success. In developing a weighted application blank it would be important to evaluate the relationship with other criteria before setting arbitrary standards. The results of this study and other research indicate that personal-history items may be analysed for specific jobs and the results contribute to better selective procedures.

SUMMARY

In evaluating information on an application blank, age, marital status, living arrangements, starting salary expected, whether presently employed, the type of work on present job, the reason for changing jobs, the time on the present job, the type of work on last job, and school subjects best liked may be items that will assist in distinguishing long-term prospects from short-term.

The best employment risk using the criterion of tenure would be the older, single woman, who lives with her parents. She would expect a higher starting salary, be presently employed and have been on her present job more than a year and probably more than three years. The subjects she liked best in school would have been business, mathematics, and typing.

It is possible to assign weights for the items based on percentage differences and establish cut-off points in terms of hiring practices. Since tenure is only one factor to be considered in employing clerical workers, this study was intended only as a guide in evaluating application information and not as a means of establishing arbitrary standards. The continued shortage of well-qualified clerical people will make it necessary to continue to hire people whose anticipated tenure will be relatively short-term but these items may assist in making decisions when there is a choice between candidates who are equally qualified in other respects and also in selection of people for key positions requiring expensive and long training.

REFERENCES

Farnsworth, Paul R. (ed.), Annual Review of Psychology. Palo Alto: Annual Reviews, Inc., 1963.

Ghiselli, Edwin E. and Brown, Clarence W., Personnel and Industrial Psychology. New York, 1955.

Guion, Robert M., "Criterion Measurement and Personnel Judgments." Personnel Psychology, XIV (Summer 1961).

Hoose, James W., "Weighted Application Blank for Engineers." Personnel Journal, XLII (March 1963).

Morrison, Robert F., Owens, William A., Glennon, J. R. and Albright, Lewis E., "Factored Life History Antecedents of Industrial Research Performance." Journal of Applied Psychology, IVL (August 1962).

Mosel, James N., "Prediction of Department Store Sales Performance from Personal Data." Journal of Applied Psychology, Vol. XXXVI, February 1952.

Owens, William A., Glennon, J. R., and Albright, L. E., "Retest Consistency and the Writing of Life History Items." Journal of Applied Psychology, IVL (October 1962).

Stone, C. Harold and Kendall, William E., Effective Personnel Selection Procedures. Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 1956.

Tiffin, Joseph and McCormick, Ernest J., Industrial Psychology. Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1958.

Tiffin, Joseph, Parker, B. T. and Habersat, R. W., "The Analysis of Personnel Data in Relation to Turnover on a Factory Job." Journal of Applied Psychology, Vol. XXXI, December 1947.

Triandis, Harry C., "Factors Affecting Employee Selection in Two Cultures." Journal of Applied Psychology, XLVII (April 1963).

Welch, Josephine, Stone, C. Harold and Paterson, Donald G., How to Develop a Weighted Application Blank. Research and Technical Report 11, Industrial Relations Center, University of Minnesota, (February 1952).

Wernimont, Paul F., "Reevaluation of a Weighted Application Blank for Office Personnel." Journal of Applied Psychology, XLVI (December 1962).

BRANCH OFFICES
ANTA 2, GA.
Fifth Street N.W.
ON 15, MASS.
Deerfield Street
AGO 19, ILLINOIS
1 East 87th Street
INNATI 37, OHIO
O Para Drive
ELAND 1, OHIO
O Chester Avenue
AS 4, TEXAS
4 N. Cent. Expressway
ER 17, COLORADO
O East 48th Avenue
AS CITY 8, MO.
S Troost Avenue
ISLAND, N.Y.
Glen Cove Rd.

THE UPJOHN COMPANY

KALAMAZOO, MICHIGAN

EMPLOYMENT APPLICATION

Please read form through carefully and then fill out in your own handwriting

21

BRANCH OFFICES
LOS ANGELES 38, CALIF.
900 N. Cahuenga Blvd.
MEMPHIS 17, TENN.
4805 East Summer Ave.
MINNEAPOLIS 40, MINN.
4650 Olson Memorial
Highway
NEW YORK 14, NEW YORK
40 Seventh Ave., South
Philadelphia 8, Pa.
401 N. Broad Street
PORTLAND 12, OREGON
1333 N.E. Union Ave.
SAN FRANCISCO 5, CALIF.
199 First Street
WASHINGTON 13, D.C.
6130 N. Capitol Street

75-170

Issued by..... Date.....
Name..... Phone.....
Street..... City..... Zone..... State.....

PERSONAL AND FAMILY INFORMATION

Birth..... U.S. Citizen?..... Social Security Number.....
Married..... Widowed..... Divorced..... Separated..... Number of brothers..... Sisters.....
Name..... Occupation.....

Please give the following information for your wife or husband and all children

NAME	BIRTH DATE	RELATION	NAME	BIRTH DATE	RELATION

HEALTH RECORD

Height..... Date you last consulted physician..... Reason.....
Lost from work during last two years and reason.....
Occupational injuries and diseases for which you have received workmen's compensation.....
Physical limitations.....
Do you take a pre-employment physical examination at our expense?..... Do you consent to vaccination?.....

GENERAL INFORMATION

Home..... Buying..... Renting..... Boarding..... Live with parents..... Relatives..... Do you maintain home?.....
Kinds of personal insurance do you carry?.....
and relationships of relatives employed by this Company.....
of friends employed by this Company who know you well.....
What trade or business organizations are you active and what offices have you held?.....
What sports do you actively participate?..... Other recreational interests.....

EDUCATION

TYPE OF SCHOOL	NAME OF SCHOOL AND LOCATION	ATTENDED		GRADUATED?	COURSE TAKEN	Diploma, Certificate or Degree and Date Received
		From	To			
High school						
Junior high school						
Elementary school						
College						
Business training						

Major subjects..... Minor subjects.....
School prizes, honors or awards.....
What extra-curricular activities did you engage?.....
School offices or positions of leadership did you hold?.....
Proportion of your school expenses did you earn?..... How?.....

UNITED STATES MILITARY SERVICE

Branch of Service..... Inducted..... Enlisted..... Commissioned..... Entry rank..... Date.....
Type of discharge..... Rank at time of discharge..... Discharge date.....
Military occupational specialties (Army) or ratings held (Navy).....
Special training received or service schools attended and dates.....
To what veterans' organizations do you belong?..... Are you receiving a pension?.....
What status do you have in any Federal or State military reserve organization?.....

OCCUPATIONAL INFORMATION

Type of work desired..... Starting salary expected.....
Other types of work for which you are qualified.....

PRESENT EMPLOYER

Name of Company..... Type of business.....
Address: Street..... City..... Zone..... State.....
Title of position..... Description of work.....
.....
.....
Name and title of your supervisor..... Salary..... Date employed.....
Reason for considering change..... May we consult your employer?.....

FORMER EMPLOYERS (begin with the last or one preceding your present position)

Name of Company..... Type of business.....
Address: Street..... City..... Zone..... State.....
Title of position..... Description of work.....
.....
.....
Name and title of your supervisor..... Employed from.....to.....
Reason for leaving..... Salary.....

Name of Company..... Type of business.....
Address: Street..... City..... Zone..... State.....
Title of position..... Description of work.....
.....
.....
Name and title of your supervisor..... Employed from.....to.....
Reason for leaving..... Salary.....

Name of Company..... Type of business.....
Address: Street..... City..... Zone..... State.....
Title of position..... Description of work.....
.....
.....
Name and title of your supervisor..... Employed from.....to.....
Reason for leaving..... Salary.....

Name of Company..... Type of business.....
Address: Street..... City..... Zone..... State.....
Title of position..... Description of work.....
.....
.....
Name and title of your supervisor..... Employed from.....to.....
Reason for leaving..... Salary.....

SUPPLEMENTAL OCCUPATIONAL INFORMATION

USE ADDITIONAL SHEETS IF NECESSARY

school subjects did you like the best?.....

courses have you had in chemistry, mathematics, biology or other physical science?.....

you type?..... Words per minute..... Can you write shorthand?..... Words per minute.....

office machines and equipment can you operate and how much experience have you had with each?.....

be the office functions and activities in which you are particularly interested.....

what shop or factory machines, tools and equipment have you had experience and for what length of time?.....

be the type of shop or factory work in which you are particularly interested.....

any further information which you feel will help us to better understand your qualifications and interests.....

REFERENCES

List people who know you well but do not refer to relatives, former employers, employees of the Company, or casual acquaintances

NAME	ADDRESS	OCCUPATION	HOW LONG KNOWN

The Upjohn Company appreciates your interest in employment and will retain your application in the active reference file a reasonable time for consideration when suitable opportunities become available.

Individuals are selected for employment on the basis of their qualifications and where more than one person is considered capable of performing the job, careful attention is given to selecting the person best qualified.

Preliminary selection of applicants for job openings is made on the basis of the information supplied on the form which you have just completed and employment is predicated on the truthfulness of the facts which you have submitted.

Should further information or interviews be required you will be contacted by the Employment Office. It will be helpful if you report promptly changes in address, phone number, or occupational qualifications but otherwise frequent visits or other contacts are not necessary to receive consideration.

Signature

Date

ROUTING OF APPLICATION

SUPERV.

COMMENTS

DATE _____

BELOW A

Over-All..

BELOW A

AVERAGE A

TESTS

SCORE

ACTION

INT.

DAT

INTERVIEWER'S COMMENTS

APPENDIX A
ANALYSIS OF APPLICATION ITEMS

Items on Application	Total Terminated Total 59		Employed Less Than 12 Months Total 26		Still Employed As Of 1/64. Minimum of 30 Months Total 38	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Address						
Kalamazoo - Portage	44	74.6	21	80.8	26	68.4
Other	15	25.4	5	19.2	12	31.6
Age in Years	Average 22.24		Average 23.23		Average 26.34	
Marital Status						
Married	36	61.0	20	77.0	9	23.7
Single	21	35.6	5	19.2	25	65.8
Divorced	1	1.7	-	-	1	2.6
Widowed	1	1.7	1	3.8	2	5.3
Parted	-	-	-	-	1	2.6
Siblings						
Brothers						
None	13	22.0	6	23.2	13	34.2
1	28	47.4	11	42.3	15	39.5
2	9	15.3	5	19.2	5	13.2
3	6	10.2	2	11.5	3	7.9
4	1	1.7	1	3.8	1	2.6
5	-	-	-	-	1	2.6
More Than 5	1	1.7	-	-	-	-
No Answer	1	1.7	1	3.8	-	-
Sisters						
None	15	25.4	5	19.2	8	21.1
1	24	40.7	9	34.7	20	52.6
2	13	22.0	8	30.8	7	18.4
3	1	1.7	1	3.8	-	-
4	2	3.4	-	-	2	5.3
5	2	3.4	2	7.7	-	-
More Than 5	1	1.7	-	-	1	2.6
No Answer	1	1.7	1	3.8	-	-
Father's Occupation						
Professional	4	6.8	1	3.8	1	2.6
Business	16	27.1	7	26.9	9	23.7
Agricultural	5	8.5	2	7.7	5	13.2
Semiskilled	16	27.1	7	26.9	8	21.1
Unskilled	11	18.6	4	15.4	7	18.4
Deceased	5	8.5	3	11.6	6	15.8
Retired	-	-	-	-	1	2.6
No Answer	2	3.4	2	7.7	1	2.6
Children						
Yes	15	25.4	4	15.4	10	26.3
No	44	74.6	22	84.6	28	73.7
Age of Children						
Less Than One	7	11.9	1	3.8	-	-
1 Year to 5 Years	7	11.9	4	15.4	3	7.9
5 Years to 12 Years	-	-	-	-	4	10.5
12 Years to 18 Years	-	-	-	-	4	10.5
Over 18 Years	-	-	-	-	2	5.3
Weight	Average 121.4 lbs.		Average 124 lbs.		Average 122.7 lbs.	
Height	Average 5'4.7"		Average 5'4.4"		Average 5'4"	

Items on Application	Total Terminated Total 59		Employed Less Than 12 Months Total 26		Still Employed As Of 1/64. Minimum of 30 Months Total 38	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Lost Time in Last 2 Years						
None	19	32.1	9	34.6	9	23.7
Less than 5 Days	20	33.9	8	30.8	16	42.1
6 to 15 Days	9	15.3	4	15.4	3	7.9
More Than 16 Days	5	8.5	2	7.7	3	7.9
No Answer	6	10.2	3	11.5	7	18.4
Reason for Lost Time						
Surgery	2	3.4	2	7.7	1	2.6
Personal Illness	27	45.8	12	46.2	17	44.7
Other	2	3.4	-	-	4	10.5
No Answer	3	5.1	-	-	2	5.3
Occupational Injury						
Yes	2	3.4	2	7.7	1	2.6
No	40	67.8	16	61.5	29	76.3
No Answer	17	28.8	8	30.8	8	21.1
Physical Limitations						
Yes	2	3.4	1	3.8	1	2.6
No	51	86.4	22	84.6	32	84.2
No Answer	6	10.2	3	11.6	5	13.2
Living Arrangements						
Own Home	-	-	-	-	2	5.3
Buying	12	20.3	4	15.4	6	15.8
Renting	22	37.3	14	53.8	10	26.3
Boarding	3	5.1	1	3.8	2	5.3
Live With Parents	21	35.6	6	23.2	18	47.3
Live With Relatives	-	-	-	-	-	-
No Answer	1	1.7	1	3.8	-	-
Maintain Home						
Yes	10	16.9	3	11.5	6	15.8
No	5	8.5	4	15.4	6	15.8
No Answer	44	74.6	19	73.1	26	68.4
Personal Insurance						
Yes	41	69.5	21	80.0	22	57.9
No	13	22.0	5	19.2	10	26.3
No Answer	5	8.5	-	-	6	15.8
Relatives Employed						
Yes	21	35.6	7	26.9	10	26.3
No	30	50.8	13	50.0	27	71.1
No Answer	8	13.6	6	23.1	1	2.6
Friends Employed						
Yes	40	67.8	18	69.2	23	60.5
No	15	25.4	6	23.1	14	36.9
No Answer	4	6.8	2	7.7	1	2.6
Business Organization						
Yes	3	5.1	1	3.8	6	15.8
No	31	52.5	14	53.8	22	57.9
No Answer	25	42.4	11	42.4	10	26.3
Sports						
Yes	50	84.7	22	84.7	26	68.4
No	6	10.2	3	11.5	8	21.1
No Answer	3	5.1	1	3.8	4	10.5

Items On Application	Total Terminated Total 59		Employed Less Than 12 Months Total 26		Still Employed As of 1/64. Minimum of 30 Months Total 38	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Education						
High School	23	39.0	12	46.1	17	44.7
2 Yr. Secretarial College	17	28.8	6	23.1	10	26.4
Business School	-	-	-	-	3	7.9
College	19	32.2	8	30.8	9	23.7
Other (In Addition to Above)	4	6.8	-	-	1	2.6
Graduated						
Yes	32	54.2	17	65.4	27	71.1
No	27	45.8	9	34.6	11	28.9
Graduated						
High School	21	35.5	12	46.2	17	44.7
2 Yr. Secretarial College	8	13.6	2	7.7	5	13.2
Business School	-	-	-	-	2	5.3
College	2	3.4	3	11.5	3	7.9
High School Plus Other	1	1.7	-	-	-	-
Course						
Business	36	61.0	15	57.7	28	73.7
Other	22	37.3	10	38.5	9	23.7
No Answer	1	1.7	1	3.8	1	2.6
Major						
Business	27	45.7	10	38.5	15	39.5
Other	28	47.5	14	53.8	20	52.6
No Answer	4	6.8	2	7.7	3	7.9
Minor						
Business	9	15.3	2	7.7	4	10.5
Other	41	69.4	18	69.2	26	68.4
No Answer	9	15.3	6	23.1	8	21.1
School Awards						
Yes	41	69.4	19	73.1	21	55.2
No	9	15.3	3	11.5	9	23.7
No Answer	9	15.3	4	15.4	8	21.1
Extra Curricular Activities						
Yes	53	89.8	21	80.8	35	92.1
No	3	5.1	3	11.5	1	2.6
No Answer	3	5.1	2	7.7	2	5.3
School Offices						
Yes	43	72.9	18	69.3	21	55.2
No	10	16.9	5	19.2	12	31.6
No Answer	6	10.2	3	11.5	5	13.2
School Expenses Earned						
None	9	15.3	7	26.9	11	28.9
0 to 25%	17	28.8	8	30.8	10	26.3
26% to 50%	13	22.0	5	19.2	4	10.5
51% to 75%	1	1.7	-	-	5	13.2
76% to 100%	13	22.0	4	15.4	6	15.8
No Answer	6	10.2	2	7.7	2	5.3
Military Service						
Yes	-	-	-	-	-	-
No	59	100.0	26	100.0	38	100.0

Items On Application	Total Terminated Total 59		Employed Less Than 12 Months Total 26		Still Employed As of 1/64. Minimum of 30 Months Total 38	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Type of Work Desired						
Secretarial	31	52.5	13	50.0	22	57.9
General Office	19	32.2	8	30.8	12	31.6
Other	9	15.2	7	26.9	4	10.5
No Answer	2	3.3	-	-	3	7.9
Starting Salary Expected						
Less Than \$65	25	42.4	13	50.0	12	31.6
\$66 to \$70	16	27.1	7	26.9	6	15.8
\$71 to \$75	3	5.1	1	3.8	6	15.8
\$76 to \$80	2	3.4	1	3.8	2	5.3
\$81 to \$85	-	-	-	-	1	2.6
More Than \$85	-	-	-	-	-	-
No Answer	13	22.0	4	15.5	11	28.9
Number of Other Types Work Qualified For						
1	24	40.7	13	50.0	13	34.2
2	9	15.2	4	15.4	11	28.9
3	1	1.7	-	-	2	5.3
No Answer	25	42.4	9	34.6	12	31.6
Presently Employed						
Yes	28	47.5	11	42.3	27	71.1
No	30	50.8	14	53.9	11	28.9
No Answer	1	1.7	1	3.8	-	-
Type of Present Work						
Office	21	35.6	8	30.8	25	65.8
Other	7	11.9	3	11.5	2	5.3
Reason For Change						
Better Opportunity	11	18.6	3	11.5	17	44.8
Marriage	2	3.4	2	7.7	-	-
Dissatisfied	2	3.4	1	3.8	6	15.8
Other	11	18.6	5	19.3	4	10.5
No Answer	2	3.4	-	-	-	-
Present Salary						
Less Than \$65	22	37.3	9	34.7	14	36.8
\$66 to \$70	1	1.7	-	-	2	5.3
\$71 to \$75	-	-	-	-	4	10.5
\$76 to \$80	-	-	-	-	3	7.9
\$81 to \$85	-	-	-	-	-	-
More Than \$86	2	3.4	1	3.8	2	5.3
No Answer	3	5.1	1	3.8	2	5.3
Time On Present Job						
Less Than 6 Months	11	18.6	6	23.1	5	13.2
6 Months to 1 Year	7	11.9	3	11.5	2	5.3
1 to 2 Years	5	8.5	1	3.8	4	10.5
2 to 3 Years	4	6.8	1	3.8	3	7.9
More Than 3 Years	1	1.7	-	-	13	34.2
Consult Employer						
Yes	22	37.3	8	30.8	18	47.4
No	-	-	-	-	7	18.4
No Answer	6	10.2	3	11.5	2	5.3

Items On Application	Total Terminated Total 59		Employed Less Than 12 Months Total 26		Still Employed As of 1/64. Minimum of 30 Months Total 38	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Number of Previous Employers						
None	3	5.1	1	3.8	7	18.4
1	15	25.4	4	15.4	10	26.3
2	18	30.6	8	30.8	8	21.1
3	11	18.6	7	26.9	4	10.5
More Than 3	11	18.6	5	19.3	9	23.7
No Answer	1	1.7	1	3.8	-	-
Type of Last Employment						
Office	41	69.4	19	73.1	20	52.6
Other	14	23.7	5	19.2	11	28.9
Reason for Leaving						
Pregnancy	9	15.3	2	7.7	3	7.9
Marriage	6	10.2	5	19.2	1	2.6
Better Job	2	3.4	-	-	3	7.9
Dissatisfied	1	1.7	1	3.8	4	10.5
Discharged	-	-	1	3.8	-	-
Other	37	62.7	15	57.7	19	50.0
No Answer	-	-	-	-	1	2.6
School Subjects Best Liked						
Typing	30	50.8	10	38.5	21	55.3
Shorthand	18	30.5	7	26.9	14	36.8
English	29	49.2	13	50.0	15	39.5
Business	19	32.2	6	23.1	19	50.0
Mathematics	15	25.4	4	15.4	15	39.5
Took Science or Mathematics						
Yes	55	92.5	24	92.3	34	89.5
No	3	5.8	2	7.7	1	2.6
No Answer	1	1.7	-	-	3	7.9
Type						
Yes	59	100.0	26	100.0	37	97.4
No	-	-	-	-	1	2.6
Words Per Minute - Type						
Less Than 40	7	11.9	4	15.4	2	5.3
41 to 50	11	18.6	7	26.9	5	13.2
51 to 60	21	35.7	6	23.1	7	18.4
More Than 61	10	16.9	5	19.2	12	31.6
No Answer	10	16.9	4	15.4	11	28.9
Shorthand						
Yes	42	71.2	17	65.4	25	65.8
No	13	22.0	8	30.8	13	34.2
No Answer	4	6.8	1	3.8	-	-
Words Per Minute - Shorthand						
Less Than 80	7	11.9	4	15.4	-	-
81 to 100	15	25.4	7	26.9	11	28.9
101 to 120	9	15.3	2	7.7	7	18.4
More Than 121	1	1.7	2	7.7	1	2.6
No Answer	10	16.9	2	7.7	6	15.9
Office Equipment Experience						
Calculator	24	40.7	10	38.5	20	52.6
Dictaphone	23	39.0	8	30.8	17	44.7
Copy Machine	23	39.0	10	38.5	17	44.7
Adding Machine	40	67.8	20	76.9	25	65.8
Other	24	40.7	12	46.2	12	31.6
No Answer	3	5.1	1	3.8	-	-

Items On Application	Total Terminated Total 59		Employed Less Than 12 Months Total 26		Still Employed As of 1/64. Minimum of 30 Months Total 38	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Interest Indicated						
Typing	25	42.4	10	38.5	15	39.5
Secretarial Work	24	40.7	10	38.5	16	42.1
Receptionist	12	20.3	2	7.7	5	13.2
Bookkeeping	9	15.3	4	15.4	8	21.1
Other	14	23.7	7	26.9	9	23.7
No Answer	6	10.2	3	11.5	4	10.5