Corporate Recruiters: How Job Responsibility and Gender Influence Employment Selection of New College Graduates

Philip D. Gardner
Research Administrator

Dave Nixon
Research Assistant

November, 1991

Collegiate Employment Research Institute
Career Development and Placement Services
113 Student Services Building
Michigan State University
East Lansing, MI 48824
(517) 355-9510

Career Development and Placement Services
Division of Student Affairs and Services
Vernicka K. Tyson
Acting Director
Michigan State University
113 Student Services Building
East Lansing, MI 48824

Price: $5.00

Corporate Recruiters: How Job Responsibility and Gender Influence Employment Selection of New College Graduates

Philip D. Gardner
Research Administrator

Dave Nixon
Research Assistant

November, 1991

Collegiate Employment Research Institute
Career Development and Placement Services
113 Student Services Building
Michigan State University
East Lansing, MI 48824
(517) 355-9510

For graduating college students, a major step in the transition from college to work involves contact with corporate employers. Recruiters often present the first impression students receive of a company. These initial impressions will strongly influence the interest in a company and if selected for employment, contribute to the initial success of the new employee. The individuals conducting recruiting activities and the methods used to select new employees will have influence not only on the organization but the graduates seeking employment. Major changes have occurred over the past two decades that have altered the composition of the workforce in many organizations, as well as the type of person who may be recruiting, and how recruiters conduct their business.

Enactment of the 1972 Equal Employment Opportunity Act opened organizations to employees previously not considered in the hiring process. Women, racial groups and more recently, handicappers could no longer be excluded from consideration for employment. About this time, women began to select non-traditional academic majors, such as engineering, accounting, computer science, management, and medicine. Women in increasing numbers have entered traditionally male occupations where almost 50% of business and medical and approximately 25% of engineering graduates are now women.

Changes in the corporate organizational structure also occurred during the 1980s. This period marked the realization by U.S. companies that they would no longer dominate the world economy; but rather share a role. In response to this challenge, organizations restructured, retrenched, and reorganized their workforce; retooled the technology used in their operations; reduced labor costs and improved work productivity; and demanded wage and benefit concessions from employees. The changing economic reality also changed the methods for recruiting new employees. Employers renewed their interest in selection validity (Reilly and Chao, 1982); quantifiable criteria to select the most appropriate person for a position.

As students face a rapidly changing economy in the 1990s, a systematic understanding of the dynamics of the hiring process is needed but does not exist. Part of the problem resides in the fact that we know very little about recruiters. Who they are (age, sex, educational background)? How much influence do they have in hiring decisions? What information do they use to evaluate candidates? A search for answers to these types of questions forms the basis for this study. Answers will provide a framework for examining their implications on the transition from college to work for college students.

Literature on Recruiting Process

The major thrust of the literature on the hiring process focuses on the dynamics of the interview. A recent volume, edited by Eder and Ferris (1989), reviewed and integrated existing research efforts on employment interviews. Even though research has advanced our understanding of employment interviews, the authors repeatedly addressed lingering concerns over selection validity, interview structure and hiring decisions. Unfair discrimination in interviews and the unreliability of hiring decisions based often on subjective criteria served as the focal points for promoting better interviewing skills.

See Review Papers Rynes, Heneman; Schwab review (1980) Harris & Fink (1987) Taylor & Bergmann (1987) Powell (1987)

In the integrative model for the employment interview, interviewer characteristics were assumed to influence pre-interview impressions held by recruiters. The literature pertinent to this component failed to mention whether individual recruiter characteristics (e.g. age, sex, years spent recruiting) affected the outcomes or post-interview decisions. Recruiters were however, impressionistic; candidate appearance played a major role in final hiring decisions (Dipboye, 1989). Hakel (1982) demonstrated that the order information was presented influenced decisions. However, there was no discussion of recruiter characteristics in this volume.

Linden and Partons (1989) integrated the individual differences of recruiters into the hiring process. Attention was given to self-esteem, status, and self-monitoring. Beyond introducing these dimensions, little effort went into measuring recruiter characteristics and associating them with employment decisions. Thus, the conclusions provided little guidance to improve interview situations (Goodale, 1989).

Excellent point

A profile of recruiters across time is lacking in the literature. Capturing the movement in the composition or make-up of the recruiter population over a period of time can reveal responses to public policy and economic changes. One recruiter profile study, conducted by Jauquet and Parlin (1977) in the early 1970s, found that college recruiters were white, college-educated males, usually between the ages of 20 and 35. Their discussions implied that the majority of the 125 respondents were involved in full-time recruiting activities.

Jauquet's and Parlin's major implication was the increased likelihood of discrimination in the interview process. They speculated that without proper training unsystematic recruitment procedures would be utilized. The "management by objectives" philosophy which was prevalent during this period was also viewed as contributing to discrimination. Without actual hiring data, confirmation of these concerns could not be made.

No other study could be found that examined recruiters visiting college campuses since 1977. The prevailing changes in the composition of the work force and the structure of the economy would suggest that the "typical recruiter" may be different today than fifteen years ago.

Competing stereotypes of recruiters have developed through general observations of the recruiting process. Organizational behaviorists often hold a perception that recruiters are tired, elder statesmen of the organization who have been put out to pasture. In their final efforts for the organization, these individuals are asked to identify and recruit new members. A more cynical view from this perspective: individuals who are no longer performing productively would be moved into the less harmful recruiting function.

Placement professionals on college campuses, however, generally hold the opposite view. Recruiters are viewed as young, human resource professionals who know little about college recruiting, but are placed in those positions to learn more about the company. Tenure in recruiting for these individuals is short; only a couple of years, before moving to another position. The rapid turnover of recruiters further contributes to the breakdown in long standing relations between corporations and colleges and universities.

The times now warrant an examination of the recruiters likely to visit college campuses during the 1990s. This exercise will not only profile changes in the "typical recruiter" but explore several issues that underlie the literature on employment interviews. Two recruiter characteristics were considered central to understanding recruiting on college campuses in the 90s. First, the appearance of women in male-dominated fields, and in human resource positions would suggest that women would comprise a greater proportion of the recruiters on college campuses. Women may bring a different perspective to the recruiting process that could influence candidate selection.

Second, as part of corporate restructuring, many middle management positions were eliminated, including recruiters assignments. Restructuring introduced a need to be more efficient in the identification and hiring of new candidates. Those organizational members with the most knowledge of available positions being filled would have a better understanding of the type of person best suited to fill that position. Job responsibilities were often modified with fewer individuals serving as full-time recruiters. More organizational members were assigned to recruiting tasks as a part-time job requirements, volunteered or were directed to recruit by their supervisors. The extent to which recruiting responsibilities comprised a recruiters assignment could also influence candidate evaluations and the selection process.

Using these two characteristics, gender and level of recruiting responsibility, comparisons were made between recruiting activities, training in interviewing and hiring procedures, information use in candidate selections, job satisfaction and career aspirations.

METHOD

Sample

In order to obtain a representative sample of recruiters, eleven university placement offices throughout the country agreed to distribute surveys to employer representatives visiting their campuses. Nine campuses distributed 100 surveys in a manner that maximized the randomness of their samples. Efforts were made to insure that women and minorities were properly represented. Two other placement offices conducted more extensive sampling, distributing 750 and 900 surveys respectively. A total of 2,550 surveys were distributed.

Survey

A questionnaire was designed to capture different facets of an individual's experience as a recruiter. After several demographic questions concerning education, type of company, work history, and job description, the participants were asked to describe their working conditions while recruiting, ie. number of campuses visited and number of interviews conducted, and the training received in employee selection and interviewing.

The next section was directed at those individuals whose recruiting activities would be used in their job performance evaluations. Questions focused on quotas, bonuses, performance rating factors, and level of competition among the organization's recruiters.

Questions in the third section covered the interviewing and hiring processes. Specifically, information was sought on the types of interviews conducted by the recruiters (structured vs. unstructured), details known to the interviewer about the job descriptions of positions availabel to candiates recruited, and the candidate characteristics (ie. gender, grade point average) used in prescreening and hiring decisions. The pre-screening characteristics were identical to those used by Gardner et al. (1990) in their study of candidate characteristics used by recruiters in prescreening. The hiring characteristics were compiled from the literature on employee hiring decisions. Additional questions explored the recruiter's role in the actual hiring decision. A final set of questions focused on the recruiters level of job satisfaction and career ambitions.

Response

A total of 943 responses (37%) were received. The response rate from the nine offices ranged from 24% to 46% while the response rate from the remaining two offices were 28% and 44%, respectively. No statistical differences were found on key demographic variables (ie. age, sex, and type of company) and work experiences (ie. number of years recruiting, number of college visits, and hours worked) variables between the two large samples and the sample from the nine offices. Several surveys contained missing data but introduced no bias into the results. Thus, all respondents were included in these analyses.

RESULTS

Recruiters were primarily white (92%), males (75%) and approximately half (51%) were between the ages of 20 and 35. Women were younger than men with an average age of 31 compared to 38 ($t = 9.64, p < .001$). Full-time recruiters comprised 12% of the sample while another 38% considered themselves part-time recruiters. Twenty-five (25) percent volunteered to recruit and the final 25% were directed to recruit by their supervisors. While only 21% of the women were full-time recruiters (men 9%) ,this represented 45% of all full-time recruiters; 27% of the men volunteered to recruit (17% of women), representing 82% of all the volunteers.

Nearly all respondents had attained a bachelor's degree (96%). Slightly more men (35%) than women (30%) had received a master's degree. Considering all formal education beyond a bachelors, 44% of the men had post-baccalaureate experiences while 35% of the women had pursued coursework beyond a bachelor's degree. Volunteers were more likely to have earned master's degrees than members of the other recruiter groups.

Only 23% of these degrees were earned in human relations fields of business administration, personnel administration, management, and labor and industrial relations (another 13% mentioned completion of personnel courses). Degrees were received in business (finance, accounting, marketing and advertising totaling 24%), the social sciences (18%), engineering (15%), arts and letters (4%), and communications (2%). Approximately 57% of the women's educational experience and training was in the field of business, primarily personnel and general business. Women also received degrees in the social sciences (20%), arts and letters

(12%) and engineering (12%). Among full-time recruiters, the most common degree was personnel administration (47%) with another 24% receiving degrees in one of the social sciences.

Based on job descriptions and the position held within organizations, 14% of the recruiters were in engineering and sales, 34% in human resources and 51% in management. The remaining 1% were in other positions. Half the women were in human resources (37% of total in this group) and 37% in management However, this latter figure represented only 19% of the total number in management. Few women were in engineering and sales positions (12% of all respondents) or 22% of the total women. Full-time recruiters were primarily in human resources positions (80%) while volunteers and those directed to recruit were from management (61%).

Approximately 51% of the recruiters represented manufacturing companies while 31% were from service employers (banks, insurance companies and hospitals) and 18% represented public agencies and research firms. While 40% of the women represented manufacturing, they actually comprised only 20% of the recruiters in this category. Women were more likely to be from service (32% of total) and public agencies/research firms (31% of total).

Experience and Training

Respondents had worked for two companies at this point in their careers. They had been working between 9 and 15 years with more than 75% of that time with their current employer (Table 1). Women had fewer years of work experience than men ($t = 9.68, p < .001$); full-time and directed recruiters had also worked fewer years than volunteers and part-time recruiters. A similar pattern emerged for recruiting experience. The average number of years spent recruiting was 5.4 years. Men, averaging 6 years, had 2.3 more years than women ($t = 5.76$, $p < .001$).

These years of experience built upon the training received in recruiting and interviewing techniques. Over 60% of the time spent in interview/recruiting training was formal training (Table 2). Formal training through courses, seminars and workshops was the most prevalent means of receiving instruction on interviewing. No formal training was received by 10% of the respondents. Formal training was augmented by informal methods such as working with mentors and outside reading.

Full-time recruiters received nearly twice as much training as volunteers and directed recruiters: 10 days compared to 5 days. Full-time recruiters also had two more days of training than part-time recruiters. Volunteers and directed recruiters spent little time with mentors--slightly under a day. Full-time recruiters spent at least two days with their mentors.

Both men and women had about the same amount of training, averaging approximately seven days. Women reported more of their training from college course work and mentors than did

men. (The difference in amount of time devoted to these sources was significant at the .001 level.)

Recruiting Activities

As expected, full-time recruiters spent more time on college campuses: averaging 11 weeks: visiting between 8 to 9 campuses each year, and conducting approximately 77 interviews (Table 3). These levels were nearly twice those of part-time recruiters who spent five weeks on campuses, visited four campuses and held an average of 39 interviews. Volunteers and directed recruiters only went to two campuses and held an average five interviews during their one to two weeks on campus. Volunteers and directed recruiters traveled to more specific campuses, confining their travel to 2-3 states compared to the 3-6 states for other recruiters.

Women were involved in more recruitment activities than men visiting more campuses, conducting about 10 more interviews, spending more time in those interviews, and also spending more time on campuses and traveling. Men and women did not differ noticeably on the length of their work days, the number of daily interviews they scheduled nor the geographic area they covered.

Recruitment

Recruiters enter the interview with information on the positions for which they are seeking candidates. All recruiters were provided with information on the knowledge and skills needed for the jobs they were filling. Women used job descriptions to a greater extent than men (Table 4). Men, on the other hand, had more personal experience with positions, having worked in these positions during their careers. Women built their understanding of the required job skills through information given them. Men gained their understanding through their own first-hand observations and participation in the positions.

Is this a leap or do you have content analysis to back this up?

Is this info from content analysis?

The first step in the on-campus recruitment process may involve the pre-screening of candidate resumes. Academic institutions permit various levels of pre-screening. Some only allow a certain percentage of the recruiter's schedule to be pre-selected while others permit the entire schedule to be pre-selected. The recruiters sort through resumes, key on important pieces of information, and identify the most qualified candidates for interviews. What information do recruiters typically rely on when making these decisions?

When asked to rate their use of a selected candidate characteristics recruiters indicated that academic major was clearly the most often used selection criteria (Table 5). Three additional factors were also very useful: work experience, grade point average, and communication skills. Leadership and extracurricular activities were moderately useful while lists of courses taken, amount of education financed, and gender were not considered not important to their decisions.

Recruiters were still involved in the selection process when candidates made their visits to the plants or company offices. Nearly 61% indicated that they almost always participated in plant visits. In the final selection, 97% provided input on the candidates with 63% having "a great deal" of influence in this decision.

Asked about what criteria they would use if completely responsible for making the hiring decision, recruiters focused on verbal communication skills, reasoning, work experience, and a set of personal traits that included confidence, initiative and motivation (Table 5). Nearly as important were "fit to organization's image" and academic major. Female recruiters differed by placing less emphasis on academic major and more on communication skills, leadership, and personal traits. Women also placed more importance on "fit to organization's image." While rated of little importance, men gave more importance to a candidate's age.

When comparing types of recruiters, several patterns were found. Full-time recruiters placed more importance on personal traits in addition to verbal skills and work experience. Volunteers and directed recruiters would use factors that encompassed technical skills and specific competencies, such as academic major, course content, reasoning and work experience; playing down personal traits except for initiative.

The mix of important hiring factors was not markedly different among groups, except for the significant differences noted above. However, the positioning of item means suggest that full and part-time recruiters and volunteers and directed recruiters may utilize slightly different criteria. If the hiring decisions were to be made by full and part-time recruiters, the criteria would not emphasize academic nor special honors and awards; rather verbal skills, leadership and personal traits, including appearance, would prevail. Volunteers and directed recruiters concentrated more on academic and communication criteria.

Job Satisfaction and Career Orientation

All participants were highly satisfied with their jobs but part-time recruiters were significantly more satisfied than the other groups (Table 6). When the Job Descriptive Index (JDI) was used to measure the recruiters' satisfaction with recruiting and their other job responsibilities (only one measure required from full-time recruiters), both measures indicated a high level of satisfaction with their jobs and their recruiting activities.

Respondents actually seemed to enjoy recruiting slightly more than their jobs. This was particularly true for volunteers and directed recruiters. Getting away from the office was appealing; a change of pace from daily routines. Individuals who were reluctant to recruit, because it was not part of their job duties, were very satisfied with their experiences. No one appeared to dislike recruiting.

Full-time recruiters were not noticeably different from other recruiters in their career goals. They were the least likely to consider their careers' plateaued (low probability of promotion) or even pinnacled (already in highest position desired); they expected to stay in their position approximately the same amount of time as other recruiters (5 years); they were not overly

eager to leave their present company for another organization even though they believed that they could obtain a better position with another company. Directed recruiters reported a very similar pattern concerning their career outlooks.

Some differences were found between part-time recruiters and the other groups. Part-time recruiters rated themselves slightly higher on the plateau and pinnacle scales; yet they remained optimistic about their career options and the job assignments available to them. Volunteers tended to fall between part-time recruiters and full-time/directed recruiters on these measures.

More significant differences were found between men and women over career goals and job satisfaction. While holding similar levels of job satisfaction on both the general scale and the JDI scale, women's satisfaction with their remaining job responsibilities was significantly lower than men's satisfaction (Table 6). Men expected to stay in their current positions for another six years; women, however, expected to stay less than five years.

Consistent with this latter finding, women believed that their careers were not plateaued nor pinnacled. Men on the other hand felt that their careers were slightly more plateaued or pinnacled. The gender means were statistically different on these two variables ($t = 4.68$ and $t = 4.03$, respectively $p < .001$). While both men and women were optimistic about their future career opportunities and their abilities to obtain a new position, women were more willing to leave their present companies for another position ($t = 2.86, p < .001$) and expected future assignments to have increased responsibilities ($t = 3.23, p < .001$).

DISCUSSION

The dramatic changes with the U.S. economy have apparently had little impact on the composition of college recruiters. Today, like twenty-five years ago, the typical recruiter can be described as a college-educated, white male between the ages of 20 and 35. Several notable changes have occurred, however. Few recruiters serve as full-time recruiters. In fact, 50% of today's recruiters are line or production managers who volunteered or were asked to recruit for a short time. This change had a noticeable impact on the recruiting process, especially in terms of candidate evaluations.

Neither of the basic stereotypes drawn by observers of the recruiting process were supported under closer scrutiny. Everyone seemed to enjoy recruiting. It was not perceived as an onerous assignment; rather, recruiting was viewed as more satisfying than other aspects of their jobs. Part-time and volunteer recruiters appeared to be more established in their careers and less likely to consider a move. These recruiters brought stability to the recruiting corps. Women were more eager than men to move to new positions. Yet they still planned to serve another four to five years as a recruiter. The majority of these recruiters were expected to participate in recruiting activities for 8 to 15 years before moving on to other positions.

The possible increase in discrimination that Jauquet and Parlin attributed to the lack of proper personnel training by recruiters could not be substantiated. This study revealed the rather limited training was received by all recruiters. A good portion of the training was obtained through informal sources, such as mentors. Recruitment techniques seemed to be learned through observation of others and trial and error. Does this low level of training infer an increase in hiring discrimination? The answer really depends on the diversity goals of the company and how well they are articulated by upper management. Discrimination can best be examined by monitoring an organization's actual hiring practices. Also, might past practice just be perpetrated

Poorly trained recruiters can unexpectedly introduce bias into the interview process by asking improper questions. Civil rights laws in most states carefully define the differences between appropriate and inappropriate questions. Respondents indicated that training methods covering interview questions were of limited value.

Information usage showed different patterns among recruiter groups. Full and part-time recruiters and women utilized a wider range of characteristics to evaluate candidates for interviews. Volunteers, directed recruiters and men focused on academic majors and grade point averages. In addition to these characteristics, full and part-time recruiters included work experiences and inferences about communication abilities. At the time of the hiring decision, volunteers and directed recruiters remained focused on specific work-related skills while full and part-time recruiters considered more general characteristics, such as confidence and initiative.

The increased importance placed on fit to organization's image and appearance by full and part-time and female recruiters does interject concern about potential discrimination. These characteristics have been found by researchers to lead to discrimination.

Research on attractiveness has indicated that attractiveness has helped males obtain any type of job; attractiveness only aided females seeking clerical positions (Heilman and Saruwatari, 1979). Attractive women are particularly disadvantaged when seeking management positions. Thus, it was surprising to find female recruiters who placed high importance on appearance. Using characteristics such as fit with an organization's image and appearance inject bias and unfair discrimination into the process. The concern raised by this study is that recruiters who receive the most training may inadvertently introduce more bias into the selection process than other recruiters.

An easy recommendation to organizations would be to increase training time devoted to recruiting techniques and processes. However, the quantity of training time is not the critical issue (unless the organization offers no training at all). Rather, the concerns focus on the quality of the training content and the underlying hiring/personnel policies that support the recruitment process. Three key questions need to be addressed:

1. Is the diversity components of the organization's personnel policy consistent with recruitment policies?

2. Is the information or criteria used to prescreen and evaluate candidates free from bias? Recruiters need to be aware that criteria such as appearance and fit to organizational image can lead to biases in the selection process. Personal traits and skills that can be more objectively weighed in the evaluation need to be used. By defining the organizational image, traits should surface that can best describe the organization. Recruiters may be required to provide candidates with specific information on job tasks, organizational culture, job performance standards, and the individual's role in the organization in order to determine if candidates possess the desired traits.

3. Do students have information on the recruiter who will be conducting the interview? Students encounter a variety of recruiters as they proceed through their job search. In one interview, the recruiter may be a full-time human resource specialist; in the next interview, the student may encounter a line manager. Without a profile of the recruiter, a student is likely to approach each interview in the same manner. If the student's style does not match the recruiter's orientation, the outcome of the interview could be disappointing for both parties. Organizations should consider providing career or placement centers with biographical profiles of the recruiters who will be holding the interviews. For example: (a) Amy Smith, personnel manager for XYZ, will be interviewing candidates for non-technical positions. Ms. Smith has been with XYZ for 10 years, serving the last five years as campus recruiter. Ms. Smith seeks well-rounded students who can fill a variety of positions within the company. (b) Larry Brown, line manager of XYZ, will be interviewing mechanical engineering graduates for positions as fabric design analyst. Mr. Brown has been with XYZ for 15 years. He has worked with our advanced production process for the past five years. He recruits on selected campuses when openings occur in his division.

   Profile can provide information that will allow students to prepare better for the interview. Clues are provided to the types of information the recruiter will be seeking.

Students engaged in a job search need to realize that they will encounter different types of recruiters. Profiles like those described above will probably not be available. In the initial phases of the interview, while the interviewer is learning about the candidate, the candidate needs to learn something about the interviewer. If the interviewer is not a line manager, the candidate not only has to determine what skills are being sought but probe about organizational roles and culture. This interviewer will probably be looking for technical skills and personal traits that fit the organization. If the interviewer should be a line manager, the interview will focus more on technical skills and business acumen pertaining to the production processes and operational environment overseen by the line manager. Being prepared for either type of interviewer is a key prerequisite for success in today's job search.

Technical skills and competencies will be crucial in the hiring process, regardless of the type of recruiter. Students will need to demonstrate their application of their skills and competencies to work situations. What happens if the competency has not been developed in a work setting? For example, have you evaluated the performance of a co-worker? Most students have not developed this skill in a work environment. Instead of avoiding the question with a rambling response, students should use metaphors and draw upon experiences in other

settings, such as; evaluating candidates for house manager or the critique of essays in an English class. These situations speak to one's ability to develop criteria to evaluate performance.

A problem many students face is sustaining the flow of information in both directions in the interview. David Cannon (1991) contends that students send out mixed signals. They want concrete, specific information about a job; yet remain non-commital about themselves. This paradox frustrates recruiters who revealed in this study they would like as much information as possible about a candidate. Thus, the interview pits one individual seeking specific information against another individual who finds it difficult to reveal specific information. As a result, the interview becomes a contest which both parties can eventually loose. In seeking information, as well as providing information, both students and recruiters may have to adjust some of their expectations in order to establish the dialogue necessary to complete the interview stage of the recruitment process.

Today's recruiters, who are similar in many respects to recruiters twenty years ago, will have a major impact on this decade's college students. Recruiters now bring to college campuses a broader mix of experiences and expectations. College students will not be dealing with a homogenous set of evaluation criteria or recruiting standards. That these standards be free of bias and that the student's complete set of skills and competencies be fairly examined, are the best hope for securing the best match between employer and new college graduates.

Do you have any info on # of eventual offers accepted. Keep for a criterion.

TABLE 1: Basic Characteristics of Recruiters: Job Responsibility and Gender

	Responsibilities				Gender	
Recruiter Characteristics	Full-Time	Part-Time	Volunteer	Directed	Men	Women
Number of recruiters	112 (12%)	353 (38%)	232(25%)	239 (25%)	712	231
Age (years)	33.6	37.9	37.7	34.9	38	31*
Gender (% women)	45	24	18	25	—	25
Education (level)	Bachelor's	Bachelor's	Master's	Bachelor's	Master's	Bachelor's*
Type of organization (%):						
Manufacturing	38	47	64	51	55	40 (20)[1]
Service	43	31	20	35	28	38 (32)
Public/Research	18	21	15	14	16	21 (31)
Responsibilities (%):						
Full-time					9	21 (47)[1]
Part-time					38	36 (24)
Volunteer					27	17 (18)
Directed					26	25 (25)
Position in organization (%):						
Management	16	48	61	61	55	37 (19)[1]
Human Resources	80	48	26	26	29	50 (37)
Engineering/Non-Technical	4	4	13	13	15	12 (22)
Organizations worked for (number)	2.0	2.0	1.7	1.6	2	2
Total work experience (years)	9	13	15	10	11.15	5.10
Years with current employer (years)	7.2	10.2	11.6	8.8	10.8	6.6*
Recruiting experience (years)	2.5	2.8	2.6	2.5	6.0	3.7*
Recruiting for present company (years)	2.0	2.3	2.2	1.9	4.9	3.0*
Number of employees (average)	7,702	5,376	13,134	7,699	8,049	8,308

[1]Numbers in parentheses represent the percentage of women in this category. For example, 40% of women recruiters represent manufacturing organizations; women comprise 20% of all recruiters from manufacturing organizations.

*Significantly Different at $p < .001$.

TABLE 2: Days of Training Received by Job Responsibilities and Gender (Average)

	Job Responsibilities				Gender	
Source	Full-time	Part-time	Volunteer	Directed	Men	Women
Formal						
In-house seminars	1.74	1.63	1.43	1.09	1.51	1.31
Company workshops	1.41	1.32	1.14	.73	1.19	.97
University courses	.96	.71	.33	.43	.52	.80*
Outside workshops	1.16	.82	.46	.38	.67	.72
Convention Sessions	1.17	.84	.47	.40	.69	.71
Total	6.44 61%	5.32 65%	3.83 67%	3.03 59%	4.58	.71
Informal						
Mentor	2.28	1.32	.80	.91	1.15	1.45*
Reading on own	1.83	1.54	1.04	1.15	1.36	1.38
Total	4.11 39%	2.86 35%	1.84 33%	2.06 41%	2.51	2.83
Total Training Days (Average)	10.55	8.18	5.67	5.09	7.09	7.34

*Significantly Different at $p < .001$.

TABLE 3: Working Conditions of Recruiters Based on Their Involvement in Recruiting Activities (Means)

	Job Responsibilities				Gender	
Work Conditions	Full-Time	Part-Time	Volunteer	Directed	Men	Women
Campuses visited per year (av)	8.5	4	2	2	2	3
Interviews in last year (av)	77	39	5	5	27	37
Weeks on campus (av)	11.23	4.82	1.79	1.61	3.49	5.68
Days of traveling (av)	2.99	2.33	1.89	1.81	2.13	2.31
Length of work day (hours)	10.32	10.00	9.70	9.69	9.93	9.75
Time spent prescreening (%)	5	6	5	5	5	5
Time spent interviewing (%)	40	60	53	55	52	57
Daily interviews (av)	12.16	11.68	11.79	11.65	11.69	11.99
Size of recruiting area (av)	6 states	3-6 states	3 states	2 states	3-6 states	3-6 states

TABLE 4: Background Information and Experience with Positions Availabe to be Filled (Means)

(1) = Full-time (2) = Part-time (3) = Volunteer (4) = Directed

	Job Responsibilities				Gender	
Source	Full-time	Part-time	Volunteer	Directed	Men	Women
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)		
Job Descriptions	3.61	3.66	$3.29^{2,4}$	3.62	3.48	3.79
Specific Information	4.29	$4.39^{3,4}$	4.05	4.11	4.23	3.79*
Personal Experience	$3.37^{2,3,4}$	$3.92^{3,4}$	4.38	4.44	4.22	3.76
Structured Interviews	3.11	$3.25^{3,4}$	3.06	3.07	3.13	3.17

Superscripts indicate that these groups were significantly different at the .05 level or less.

TABLE 5: Characteristics Used to Evaluate Candidates at Prescreening and Their Importance at Time of Hiring

Characteristics	Job Responsibilities: Full-Time	Part-Time	Volunteers	Directed	Gender: Men	Women
Prescreening: Usage [a]						
Major	3.62	3.99[1]	4.13[1]	3.91	4.05	3.97
Work experience	3.84	3.72	3.78	3.76	3.75	3.81
Grade point average	3.25	3.56	3.68[1,4]	3.41	3.77	3.82
Communication ability	3.82	3.57	3.13[1,2]	3.15[1,2]	2.78	4.10*
Leadership/extracurricular	3.42[3,4]	3.37[3,4]	3.04	2.88	3.12	3.35*
Courses taken	2.35	2.67	2.82[1]	2.75	2.96	2.94
Education financed	2.72[3,4]	2.55[3,4]	2.18	2.12	2.76	2.95
Gender	1.21	1.23	1.19	1.11	1.94	1.83
Hiring Decision: Importance [b]						
Academic						
Major	3.53[2,3,4]	3.82[3]	4.22	3.97[3]	3.97	3.79*
Course content	3.21	3.38	3.54[1]	3.40	3.39	3.45
Grade point average	3.40	3.58	3.66	3.43[2,3]	3.52	3.52
Communication						
Written	3.66	3.63	3.67	3.74	3.64	3.73
Verbal	4.55	4.48	4.31[1,2,4]	4.44	4.39	4.56*
Reasoning	3.90	4.13	4.11	4.06	4.09	4.06
Leadership/Training						
Leadership/extracurricular	3.84[3,4]	3.75[3,4]	3.54	3.54	3.61	3.77*
Work experience	4.16	3.98	4.00	4.00	3.97	4.14*
Special training	2.83	2.97	3.04	3.06	3.01	2.94
Awards/honors	3.00	3.15	3.13	3.06	3.10	3.10

TABLE 5 Continued:

	Job Responsibilities				Gender	
	Full-Time	Part-Time	Volunteers	Directed	Men	Women
Personal						
Confidence	4.30	4.21	3.99[1,2,4]	4.27	4.17	4.22
Maturity	3.73	3.70	3.25[1,2,4]	3.53	3.53	3.60
Initiative/motivation	4.39[3]	4.28	4.19	4.23	4.21	4.41*
Fit to organization image	4.13[3,4]	3.96[3,4]	3.58	3.73	3.79	3.96*
Gender	.96	1.13	.96	.84	1.28	1.21
Age	1.42	1.57[3,4]	1.37	1.28	1.53	1.35*
Appearance	3.77	3.78	3.32[1,2,4]	3.56[1,2]	3.61	3.62

Superscripts indicate that these groups were statistically different in their use of information or their importance at the .05 level. For example, part-time recruiters were significantly higher in their prescreening use of major than full-time.

*Significant differences between men and women at .05 level.

[a] Usage was measured on a 5 point scale where 1 = not at all useful to 5 = very useful.

[b] Importance was measured on a 5 point scale where 1 = not very important to 5 = very important.

TABLE 6: Job Satisfaction and Career Expectations (Means)

	Job Responsibilities				Gender	
	Full-Time	Part-Time	Volunteer	Directed	Men	Women
JOB SATISFACTION						
Recruiting (JDI)	37.40	37.70	38.70	38.20	38.01	37.25
Job (JDI)	—	35.50	33.60	34.20	33.00	28.45*
Job overall (scale 1 to 5)	4.32	4.35[4]	4.31	4.17	4.31	4.22
CAREER EXPECTATIONS						
Stay in current position (years)	5.60	6.70	5.50	5.10	6.25	4.74
Plateau reached	2.01	2.49[1,4]	2.27	2.10	2.39	1.92*
Pinnacle reached	2.11	2.36[4]	2.15	1.96	2.27	1.88*
Obtain new position	3.62	3.74	3.87	3.85	3.79	3.77
Career opportunities (frustrated)	1.86	1.90	1.96	1.97	1.93	1.91
Leave for new position	2.77	2.80	2.67	2.79	2.69	2.95*
Increased responsibilities	4.22	4.01[4]	4.13	4.24	4.06	4.30*

Superscripts indicate that these groups were significantly different at the .05 level; i.e. part-time was significantly higher in the feeling their careers were plateaued than full-time (1) and directed (4).

*Significant differences between men and women at the .05 level.

REFERENCES

Cannon, D. 1991. "Generation X: The way they do the things they do." Journal of Career Planning and Employment. Vol L1, No. 2, pp. 57-62.

Dipboye, R.L. 1989. "Threats to the incremental validity of interviewer judgments." in. R.W. Eder and G. R. Ferris (eds). The Employment Interview. (pp. 45-60). Newbury Park, LA: Sage Publications.

Eder, W. and Ferris, R. 1989. The Employment Interview. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Gardner, P. D ,Kozlowski, S. W. J. and Hults, B. M. 1991. "Will the real prescreening criteria please stand up?" Journal of Career Planning Employment. Vol LI, No 2, pp 57-60.

Goodale, J. G. 1989. "Effective employment interviewing." in. R. W. Eder and G. R. Ferris (eds). The Employment Interview. (pp. 307-324). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Haker, M. D. 1982. "Employment interviewing." in. K. M. Rowland & G. R. Ferris (eds). Personnel Management. (pp. 102-104). Boston: Alvin & Bacon.

Heilman, M. E. and Saruwatari, L. R. 1979. "When beauty is beastly: The effects of appearance and sex on evaluations of job applicants for managerial and non-managerial jobs." Organizational Behavior and Human Performance. Vol 23, pp. 371-386.

Jauquet, A. M. and Parlin, B. W. 1977. "A typical recruiter." Journal of Career Planning & Employment, Summer, pp. 33-35.

Linden, R. G. and Partons, C. K. 1989. "Understanding interpersonal behavior in the employment interview: A reciprocal interation analysis." In. R. W. Eder and G. R. Ferris (eds). The Employment Interview. (pp. 307-324). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Reilly, R. R. and Chao, G. T. 1982. "Validity and fairness of some alternative employee selection procedures." Personnel Psychology, 35, 1-62.

Security Files

Monday 1:30