

DIFFERENTIAL PRESENTATION OF QUALIFICATIONS
IN THE RESUME: AN EMPIRICAL INVESTIGATION

A Thesis
Presented to
the Faculty of the Department of Psychology
University of Houston

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
of Master of Arts

By
Mary G. Watson
Summer, 1986

Acknowledgements

I want to thank Bart Osburn, my committee chair, without whose advice, counsel, and unflagging support this thesis would not have been completed. I also want to thank Jim Baxter and Bob Wegmann, my committee members, whose ideas, comments and suggestions--and patience--were most appreciated.

I also want to thank the faculty of the Management Department of the University of Houston graduate business school for their enthusiastic cooperation in generously making available their students as subjects and their class time for administering the resume questionnaires.

Finally, I want to thank Deborah Callahan, Sharon James, and Andrew Picarello, job seekers who not only allowed me to use their resumes in this research, but who also invested their own time in preparation of personal attributes resumes. Without them, this research would not have been possible.

DIFFERENTIAL PRESENTATION OF QUALIFICATIONS
IN THE RESUME: AN EMPIRICAL INVESTIGATION

An Abstract of a Thesis
Presented to
the Faculty of the Department of Psychology
University of Houston

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
of Master of Arts

By
Mary G. Watson
August, 1986

Abstract

This study investigated differential presentation of qualifications in the resume on three interviewing outcomes. 123 graduate business students responded to resumes of actual job seekers written in traditional or personal attributes styles. This research found 1). that personal attributes resumes are not universally more effective, but 2). where they provide relevant information not given in the traditional resume they are more effective, and 3.) resumes designed to improve initial and final impressions did not increase effectiveness. Results were discussed in terms of schemas and the social cognitive issue of the relationship between impressions of people and decisions about them. Applications to career changers were discussed along with suggestions for future research.

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
Method	8
Subjects	8
Resumes	9
Manipulation of relevancy	10
Manipulation check	14
Procedure	14
Dependent Variables	15
Analysis	16
Results	17
Manipulation Check	17
Interrater Reliability	17
Hypothesis 1	17
Hypothesis 2	19
Discussion	20
References	31
Tables	35
Table 1 - Perceptions of Relevance of Information	35
Table 2 - Ratings of Offer of Interview	36
Table 3 - Ratings of Pre-Interview Impressions	37
Table 4 - Evaluations of Qualifications	38
Table 7 - Perceptions of Accuracy	41

Differential Presentation of Qualifications
in the Resume: An Empirical Investigation

The resume is a classic case of impression management (Porter, Lawler & Hackman, 1975). The uses of the resume in the pre-interview phase of the employment process--as a mailed introduction, as an initial interview screening hurdle, and, for professionals, as preparation for the interviewer in place of the application blank--assure its importance. However, in spite of the resume's central role in the very earliest stages of the selection process, there is little scientific knowledge about it.

There are at least two types of questions that can be asked in research involving the resume. The first type asks about the influence and importance of applicant characteristics on employment outcomes. These characteristics--race and sex in discrimination research, and scholastic standing, prior work experience and other qualifications in more broadly based selection research--are typically manipulated by systematically varying the content of constructed

resumes. The resume is thus used as the experimental stimulus material, as a stand-in for an interview of an actual applicant. Examples of this type of research are Ruck (1980) and Hakel, Dobmeyer and Dunnette (1970) studying applicant qualifications; and studies reviewed by Arvey (1979) studying discrimination.

A second major type of question that can be asked concerns the effectiveness of the manner in which information is presented in the resume. From the perspective of a person looking for employment, personal characteristics such as race, sex, educational background and prior work experiences are fixed. Clearly, these "givens" vary over a wide range, from the applicant whose education specifically prepared him or her for the position applied for and whose experience is highly relevant to an applicant whose education was less directly related and whose work experience is more varied and less relevant. However, these less obviously qualified applicants may be capable of effective job performance due to skills transferable across situations, an effective characteristic work style, skills learned in secondary duties in other positions, experiences gained in non-

work settings, or other factors or combinations of factors.

Because a resume is, of necessity, a very short summary of an applicant's background, it is limited to a very small subset of the possible information bearing on qualifications. Well within the bounds of accuracy, the applicant can highlight or minimize information by varying the amount of space devoted to individual facts, the order in which they are presented, how they are described, etc. An important research question, then, concerns the impact of differential approaches to presentation of background information on interviewing outcomes.

Research on this question is limited. Resume format, and to a lesser extent content, has been studied through surveys of corporate recruiters or personnel professionals. These professionals express preferences for some aspects of form such as length, order of presentation of information, and neatness (Stephens, Watt, & Hobbs, 1979; "What Businessmen Look For," 1975), and of content, particularly a preference for certain categories of information (Feild & Holley, 1976). One study (Helwig, 1985) directly compared three distinct styles of resume--the traditional style,

the "qualifications brief" popularized by Lathrop (1977), and a narrative style--by asking recruiters to read an example of each type prepared for a fictional college senior and to express preferences. This study found clear preferences for the traditional style, followed by the Lathrop style, followed by the narrative style. Each of these styles was considered as a whole, that is, there was no attempt to separate issues of form and content.

Only one study to date has experimentally manipulated the manner in which information is presented in the resume. Oliphant and Alexander (1982) suggested that for information such as sex when the applicant is female, presenting this information unambiguously in the resume may negatively bias consideration of the applicant. They investigated the "determinateness" of the resume, that is, its lack of ambiguity, on recommendation for an interview, by manipulating whether "negative" information was presented clearly or ambiguously (use of initials instead of a name for females, for example). A main effect for academic achievement for an entry-level management trainee position was found (resumes where academic achievement was not given received lower

ratings than where academic achievement was low) and several interactions among sex, age, and marital status were found. It was concluded that "ambiguity distorts the evaluation process but not in a consistent manner." (p. 841)

The present study asks the research question: "Given the job seeker's educational background, work history and personal characteristics, does the way in which qualifications are presented on a resume make a difference?"

Previous research (Hakel et al., 1970; Ruck, 1980) has found that qualifications account for the largest percentage of variance in resume evaluations (47% and 75%, respectively). This implies that job seekers with relevant work or educational experience should highlight this experience on their resume. However, this also implies that job seekers whose work and educational history has been less directly relevant to the target position may need to find other means of demonstrating their qualifications in their resume. Lathrop's (1977) proposal within the popular literature that applicants use a "qualifications brief" as a way to accomplish this has received a great deal of

attention from job seekers and professionals in the job search field.

Lathrop (1977) advocates describing work experience and educational background in terms of the applicant's personal skills, attributes, characteristic work style, and quality of work, instead of the traditional approach of describing job duties of previous positions held. This is analogous to Pearlman's (1980) attribute requirement and job-oriented categories of job descriptions.

Research to date predicts that job seekers with relevant work experience in similar organizations and conventionally appropriate educational backgrounds will be preferred to those with more varied backgrounds, regardless of resume approach. The skills/attributes/-quality of work/characteristic work style approach provides information about the applicant which may not be apparent in the traditional resume. Thus, assuming job title and minimal information about previous positions is provided, personal attributes descriptions should offer more relevant information about the applicant than a traditional listing of job duties and credentials. The present study hypothesizes that personal attributes descriptions will be more effective

than descriptions based on job duties for applicants of all backgrounds, but especially for applicants with relevant qualifications that are not apparent in previous job duties.

H1: A resume describing work and educational experience in terms of the applicant's skills, attributes, quality of work, and/or characteristic work style will lead to more favorable employment outcomes than one describing this experience in terms of previous job duties. This will be true for all applicants, but especially for those who have qualifications relevant to the position which are not reflected in previous job duties.

This study also investigates a specific issue of resume form. Lathrop (1977) emphasizes the importance of initial and final impressions and begins "qualifications briefs" with strongly worded statements of job objective that emphasize the applicant's strengths and focus on the needs of the employer and ends them with closing statements which recapitulate applicant strengths. The importance of primacy and recency effects are clearly supported by the

psychological impression formation literature (Hastie & Carlson, 1980), and thus

H2: Strongly worded opening and closing sections in a resume result in more positive employment outcomes than traditional openings and closings.

Method

Subjects

Subjects were 123 graduate students enrolled in three evening and two day sections of organizational behavior and management and one evening section of legal issues in personnel at the University of Houston Graduate School of Business. Subjects participated during regularly scheduled class sessions. Participation was voluntary and no students declined to participate. One student who began the experiment did not complete the entire questionnaire and was deleted from the analysis.

Sixty percent of the subjects were employed full time, and another 16 percent part time. About half (47.5%) reported managerial/supervisory responsibilities, and twenty-six percent had interviewing responsibilities for professional-level applicants. Twenty-one percent had screening

responsibilities, that is they decided which applicants will be interviewed. Forty-five percent were female, and the average age of the subjects was 28 years (range 21 to 40). For those currently employed, the last job search outside of the company was an average of 2.9 years ago (range 0 to 12) and for those not currently employed 2.6 years ago (range 0 to 9). Eighty-seven percent of the subjects used a resume during their last job search.

Resumes

The resumes used in this research described actual job seekers looking for the position of training and development specialist. One was located through a newspaper advertisement requesting volunteers for a university research project, and two were referred by the placement service of the local society of training professionals. Three resumes were prepared for each job seeker: the traditional style, in which descriptions emphasized job duties and responsibilities, and included personal information such as birth date, marital status, etc. (Style 1); the personal attributes style derived from Lathrop (1977), in which descriptions emphasized skills, attributes, quality of work, and characteristic work style (Style

2); and the impression management style, which was identical to the second style except for expanded "Objective" and "Personal" sections at the beginning and end of the resume, respectively, which restated the applicant's personal strengths in terms of the employer's needs (Style 3).

The format and appearance of the resumes were held as constant as possible. The same typeface was used, the same conventions regarding margins, capitalization, underlining, etc. were maintained for all three resumes of the same person, etc. The third resume was slightly longer than the second due to the addition of the extended Objective and Personal sections.

Every attempt was made to assure accuracy, and all information was real except for the names, addresses and telephone numbers of the applicants. All three volunteers met three times each with the experimenter in order to develop the resumes.

Manipulation of relevancy. Because the resumes described real people, relevancy of applicant qualifications could not be explicitly controlled. However, the actual differences in backgrounds and personal characteristics among the three job seekers represented three levels of relevance.

Applicant 1 had five years of experience as a trainer in industry, which was reflected through job titles and dates of employment in all three resumes. This person's traditional resume described this experience in terms of hours of training conducted per week, titles of courses taught, etc. The personal attributes resume, on the other hand, described his quality of work (a record of success as the United Way chairman for his employer), his characteristic work style (use of a self-disclosing teaching style), and his philosophy of adult education (a process of sharing in which everyone has something to contribute). Applicant 1, therefore, had relevant work experience, which was reflected in the traditional resume. For him, the personal attributes resume elaborated on this experience by including personal characteristics that were related to the position sought.

Applicant 2 had taught health and physical education in the local public school system for five years, and thus did not have work experience directly relevant to industrial training. This applicant had, however, recently earned her MA in Human Resource Management, so had relevant educational experience. The work information was reflected in all three resumes

attributes resume highlighted these training responsibilities in terms of her teaching abilities ("Because of my teaching skills...") and her quality of work ("In light of its success, given additional responsibilities for several other technical and safety programs."). For Applicant 3, this information about training experiences, skills and quality of work was more relevant to the position sought than the information about engineering duties.

To summarize the impact on relevance of these three backgrounds, Applicant 1's background was directly relevant to the position and this was reflected in both the traditional resume and the personal attributes resume. Applicant 2's background was partially relevant to the position, with relevant educational and non-relevant work experience. Both traditional and personal attributes resumes provided this information. However, the personal attributes resume highlighted information about leadership abilities that were not relevant to the position. Applicant 3's background was partially relevant to the position as reflected in both styles, but the personal attributes resume increased the amount of relevant

through job titles, employer's name, and dates of employment, and the educational background was similarly reflected in all three resumes. For Applicant 2, however, the personal attributes resume made her strong leadership abilities, clearly evident as demonstrated through an impressive record of college offices held and in management of special school projects, clearly evident. However, these leadership abilities, while positive, were probably irrelevant to the position of training specialist, which was explicitly described as non-managerial in the materials given to the subjects.

Applicant 3 had changed careers twice, beginning as an elementary school teacher, returning to school for an undergraduate degree in engineering, and working as a civil engineer for six years and a training specialist for one year. All three resumes reflected this work and educational experience. While employed as an engineer, she had been assigned a variety of responsibilities for training operating personnel in addition to her engineering duties. The traditional resume described her engineering experience in terms of engineering projects handled and mentioned the training responsibilities as additional duties. The personal

information provided by describing her training experiences in terms of relevant abilities.

Manipulation check As a manipulation check, subjects responded to the question "The information in the resume was relevant." Responses were analyzed as a planned comparison of Styles 1 and 2 within a 3 (applicant) X 3 (resume style) analysis of variance, with applicant a within subjects factor and resume style a between subjects factor. An effective manipulation of relevance would result in a significant applicant by style interaction, followed by significant contrasts of Styles 1 and 2 by applicant.

Procedure

Subjects within each administration were randomly assigned to one of the three resume style conditions. Each subject was given a booklet which contained a cover letter, three resumes of one style and three facing pages of questions about them, and a final page which contained 15 questions about the importance of various elements of the resume in general and some demographic items. The order of the resumes within the booklets was randomly determined and was the same for all three conditions, and subjects were asked to skim

all three resumes before answering any of the questions in order to reduce possible contrast effects.

Dependent Variables

The effectiveness of the resume was measured three ways. First, to measure the employment decision, subjects were provided with an abbreviated job description and asked how they would respond to the candidate assuming the resume had been received in answer to an advertisement for an opening at their firm and that they were responsible for a decision about the next step. These free responses were rated by two trained raters into three categories (interview (1), intermediate category (2), no interview (3)) for a measure of offer of an interview. Second, to measure the impression made by the candidate, subjects were asked to describe the person as a job applicant. These free responses were rated by two other trained raters as to favorability on a five point scale (1 = Very Unfavorable to 5 = Very Favorable). Third, subjects evaluated the qualifications of the applicants by indicating their agreement on a five point scale (1 = Strongly Disagree to 5 = Strongly Agree) to the question "Based on the resume, the applicant is qualified for a position as a training specialist."

Analysis

Data were analyzed as follows. Two planned comparisons within a 3 (resume style) X 3 (applicant) multivariate analysis of variance design were developed to test the two hypotheses. Resume style was a between-subjects factor; applicant was a within-subject factor. To test Hypothesis 1, a contrast compared Style 1 (the traditional style) to Style 2 (the personal attributes style). As style was hypothesized to operate differently for different applicants because of differences in relevance, the style by applicant interaction was first tested for significance with follow up tests of simple effects of style within each applicant.

To test Hypothesis 2, an a priori contrast compared Style 2 to Style 3. As this hypothesis dealt only with issues of form within the personal attributes style, no interaction was expected.

The analytical design decision about which resume styles to compare was made on the basis of the hypotheses, and it should be noted the planned comparisons in this design are non-orthogonal.

Results

Manipulation Check

Testing for relevance, the a priori comparison of the Applicant X Style interaction for Styles 1 and 2 was significant (Wilks' approximate $F(2, 117) = 4.295$, $p = .016$). Results by applicant are shown on Table 1. There were no differences in relevance for Applicant 1,

Insert Table 1 about here

there was a significant reduction in relevance for Applicant 2 and a significant increase in relevance for Applicant 3 between the traditional and personal attributes resume styles, confirming the manipulation of relevance.

Interrater Reliability

Interrater reliability for the measure of the offer of an interview was .93, measured as a Pearson product moment correlation between the ratings for each of the non-missing responses. Reliability for the impression measure was .69, calculated the same way.

Hypothesis 1

Testing the interaction first, the multivariate Applicant by Style interaction for the planned

comparison of Styles 1 and 2 which tested Hypothesis 1 was significant (Wilks' approximate $F(6, 354) = 3.230$, $p = .004$). As well, the univariate F-tests of the Applicant by Style interaction were significant for each measure (Offer of an Interview: $F(2, 178) = 5.814$, $p = .004$; Pre-interview impression measure: $F(2, 178) = 7.220$, $p = .001$; Evaluation of qualifications: $F(2, 178) = 7.147$, $p = .001$).

Results of the comparisons of the two resume styles by applicant for each measure are shown in Tables 2, 3, and 4. For the measure of offer of an

Insert Tables 2, 3, and 4 about here

interview, all results support the hypothesis, that is there was no difference for Applicant 1, there were significantly fewer offers for Applicant 2, and there were significantly more offers for Applicant 3. It should be noted that results for Applicant 1 were very close to significance at the traditional probability level, and were in the direction of fewer offers of an interview for the personal attributes resume.

Similarly, for the pre-interview impression measure, all results support the hypothesis, that is

there was no difference between the traditional and personal attributes resumes for Applicant 1, the impression made was significantly less favorable for Applicant 2, and was significantly more favorable for Applicant 3 with the personal attributes style.

There were no differences in evaluations of qualifications for Applicants 1 and 2, and there was a significant improvement in evaluations for Applicant 3 using the personal attributes resume. Again, it should be noted that results for Applicant 1 were very close to significance at the traditional level and were in the direction of a less favorable evaluation. Results for Applicant 2 were also very close to significance at the traditional level, and were in the direction of a less favorable evaluation, which would support the hypothesis.

These results indicate the first part of Hypothesis 1, that personal attributes resumes will be more effective for all applicants, was not supported.

Hypothesis 2

Testing Hypotheses 2, the multivariate planned comparison of Styles 2 and 3 was not significant (Wilks' approximate $F(3, 87) = .39331$, $p = .758$). The use of strongly worded opening and closing paragraphs

in personal attributes resumes resumes did not make a difference in interview outcomes.

Discussion

That portion of the first hypothesis which states that personal attributes resumes will be more effective for those who have qualifications relevant to the position not reflected in previous job duties was clearly supported. However, personal attributes resumes are not more effective for all candidates. For applicants with traditional qualifications, that is, whose work experience is relevant to the position, this research suggests personal attributes resumes may be less effective than traditional resumes. Also, when personal attributes resumes emphasize skills and abilities which are not relevant to the position, they may be less effective than traditional resumes. The way in which qualifications are described in a resume makes a difference in employment outcomes.

The second hypothesis was clearly not supported. Strongly worded opening and concluding statements in a personal attributes resume do not make a difference. A full one-third of the subjects were devoted to testing this hypothesis, and in light of this statistical power and the significant results found with the other

hypothesis, this resounding non-significance is important. This result should help to lay to rest attempts to create a positive mind set in the interviewer by expressing job objective in terms of the employer's needs and to manipulate the final impression through a paragraph which recapitulates the applicant's personal strengths.

However, other elements of the resume, particularly overall appearance, may be involved in creating a good first impression. It should be noted that formatting issues were not tested in this research, and indeed an explicit attempt was made to hold them constant. This research demonstrates that content is important in the resume, and that efforts to create good first or last impressions through objectives and personal statements are not effective. Future research is needed to determine the impact of format, and to determine the relative importance of content and format.

The subjects of this research were graduate business students, which bears on the issue of external validity of this research. The issue of generalizability from college students to professional interviewers has been addressed by two studies and two

reviews recently. Dipboye, Fromkin, and Wiback (1975) tested this directly, using two different subject populations--male undergraduate industrial management students and male professional interviewers. Students rated the applicants more favorably than professional interviewers, but there were no significant differences in rankings of applicants. McGovern, Jones, and Morris (1979) replicated an earlier study by asking male undergraduate students from the introductory psychology research pool and three upper-level psychology courses to rate video-taped interviewee behavior that had earlier been rated by professional personnel representatives. Results closely paralleled the professional interviewers, although again student subjects showed more leniency. Bernstein, Hakel, and Harlan (1975) reviewed six additional studies specifically to answer the question of the threat to generalizability of the college students as interviewer. This review concluded: "No important findings that would limit generalizability have been discovered, except that students are lenient relative to interviewers." (p. 267). They further concluded there is a "clear case for the acceptability of using students in such research, at least in studies similar

to those reviewed here." (p. 267) Arvey and Campion (1982), reviewing the research presented above, suggest the threat to generalizability using students as interviewers seems "minimal," and not as "critical as previously believed." (p. 294) It should be noted that the research discussed above compared undergraduate students to professional interviewers. In the present research, a majority of the subjects were night students with several years of business experience, many in managerial/supervisory positions. Thus, it seems appropriate to generalize to the professional interviewer population.

One implication of the use of students as subjects is that the interview decision and other responses were known by the subjects to be simulated, rather than believed to be real. This has been an issue in research investigating discrimination (see, for example, Newman and Kryzstofiah (1979), reported in Arvey and Campion (1982)), where subjects who were unaware they were in a research study were more likely to make decisions based on race than those who were aware. This effect seems less likely in the present research, but cannot be ruled out.

This research used resumes of actual job seekers instead of constructed resumes, which also bears on the issue of external validity, and which represents both strengths and limitations of this research. The research design decision to use actual job seekers with actual employment and educational histories and actual personal skills and attributes was made in order to reduce possible experimenter bias in the creation of combinations of work history and personal attributes, that is, in order to permit more confidence in generalizability. This represents a strength of the research in that after the relevance of the information was confirmed through the manipulation check, it is possible to eliminate the explanation that the results are due to the experimenter's idiosyncratic notions of how to combine work histories and personal attributes.

However, a limitation of this research strategy is the inability to control for extraneous factors. Only one applicant was described for each of the three relevance conditions. There is no way to rule out the possibility that results were due to some factor in the specific applicant's background, rather than to the degree of relevance of the information supplied by each style.

The possible importance of extraneous factors is clearly illustrated by the results of the impression formed by Applicant 1. Recall that Applicant 1 was considered to have the most traditionally appropriate background for the position and that the two styles were not seen to be significantly different in relevance of information provided. There were clearly no differences in the impression formed, while the results for the offer of an interview and evaluation of qualifications were close to statistical significance. The possible extraneous factor for Applicant 1 is that he graduated from Harvard University. Informal content analysis of the responses to the impression measure indicate that this fact, in and of itself and for inferences the subjects indicated they drew regarding intelligence, was of considerable importance to them. A possible explanation for Applicant 1's results is that in forming an impression about this candidate the fact of Harvard was of overwhelming importance so that the manipulation (description of work experience) contributed little additional to the impression. Since information about undergraduate university was provided in exactly the same form on all

resumes, it is not possible to determine the amount of variance this one fact may have accounted for.

The possibility that one piece of information about an experience 11 years earlier may exert this kind of influence raises the impression formation and person perception questions of the field of social cognition. Applicant 1's resume may have activated a "Harvard" schema which effectively overwhelmed the other information provided when subjects were asked to form an impression. These results suggest that the subjects may have distinguished between the instruction to form an impression of the applicant and the instructions for the other two measures, that is, that forming impressions of other people is somehow different from deciding whether to interview them or evaluating their qualifications. This possibility is important, as the relationship between cognitive representations and actions is only beginning to be researched (Lingle, Altom, & Medin, 1984), and more research testing this link is needed. Social cognitive psychologists have been criticized for using "paper people", and the use of resumes, a real life and important instance of "paper people," may represent a fruitful way not only to research impression formation,

but also to use the results of this line of research in a practical way.

An additional limitation of using actual job seekers concerns the population of job seekers over which results can be generalized. These job seekers were volunteers from a larger, but still restricted pool and appeared typical of non-managerial, white collar professionals looking for a position that does not require a specific educational background or licensing. Care is appropriate in generalization to other populations.

One concern that has been raised about personal attributes resumes is that information about skills, attributes, characteristic work style, and quality of work may "crowd out" information about specific job competencies. To obtain some additional insight into reactions to personal attributes resumes, subjects responded to questions about provision of information about technical competencies and information sufficient to make a decision, and about perceived accuracy in the resume. Results are shown in Tables 5, 6 and 7.

Insert Tables 5, 6 and 7 about here

Where the traditional resume was more effective (that is, for the first and second applicants), there were no differences between the traditional style resume and the personal attributes resume regarding provision of information about technical competencies, or provision of information sufficient to make a decision, that is, the reason for the effectiveness of the traditional resume was not in providing information. Another concern that is frequently raised about the use of personal attributes resumes is the extent to which non-objectively verifiable information (about skills, work style) influences perceptions of accuracy of the resume. There were no differences for any of the applicants in perceptions of accuracy of information. Choice of descriptive style did not lead to concerns about accuracy.

One of the important applications of this research is to career changers. This research used resumes of two career changers. For one, the personal attributes resume made it clear the applicant's strengths were in other areas, that is the applicant was not qualified. For the second, however, the personal attributes resume demonstrated her qualifications through other experiences and personal qualities. Thus, in situations

where other experiences and personal characteristics are relevant to the new career, the personal attributes resume would seem to be more effective. Future research might focus on what information potential employers consider relevant in career changing situations.

This research has shown that differential description of qualifications leads to significantly different pre-interview impressions, decisions about whether to interview, and evaluation of qualifications. Dipboye (1982) has presented a model that proposes that interviewers' pre-interview evaluations of applicants may tend to be self-fulfilling because interviewers cue the interviewee through their own verbal and non-verbal conduct of the interview and because of their cognitive tendency to notice, recall and interpret information consistent with pre-interview evaluations. If so, and his preliminary research points to the continuing influence of pre-interview impressions on interview outcomes, the one or two pieces of paper that constitute the resume are important indeed, and well worth future research time and resources. What makes this element of the job search/recruitment process

particularly interesting is that it is entirely under the control of the job seeker.

The basic proposition of this paper is that how an applicant described is important, and the results show that clearly. Different ways of describing the same applicant and experience significantly change the effectiveness of a resume. Relevance of information to the position is the primary criterion upon which a decision about how to describe information should be made. Attempts to create a good first and last impression by beginning and ending on a positive note made no difference in this study.

References

- Arvey, R. D. (1979). Unfair discrimination in the employment interview: Legal and psychological aspects. Psychological Bulletin, 86, 736-765.
- Arvey, R. D., & Campion, J. E. (1982). The employment interview: A summary and review of recent research. Personnel Psychology, 35, 281-322.
- Bernstein, V., Hakel, M. D., & Harlan, A. (1975). The college student as interviewer: A threat to generalizability? Journal of Applied Psychology, 60, 266-268.
- Dipboye, R. L., Fromkin, H. L., & Wiback, K. (1975). Relative importance of applicant sex, attractiveness, and scholastic standing in evaluation of job applicant resumes. Journal of Applied Psychology, 60, 39-43.
- Feild, H. S., & Holley, W. H. (1976). Resume preparation: An empirical study of personal managers' perceptions. The Vocational Guidance Quarterly, 24, 229-237.

- Hakel, M. D., Dobmeyer, T. W., & Dunnette, M. D. (1970). Relative importance of three content dimensions in overall suitability ratings of job applicants' resumes. Journal of Applied Psychology, 54, 65-71.
- Hastie, R., & Carston, D. (1980). Theoretical issues in person memory. In R. Hastie, T. M. Ostrom, E. B. Ebbesen, R. S. Wyer, Jr., D. L. Hamilton, & D. E. Carlson, (Eds.), Person memory: The cognitive basis of social perception (pp. 1-53). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Helwig, A. A. (1985). Corporate recruiter preferences for three resume styles. The Vocational Guidance Quarterly, 34, 99-105.
- Lathrop, R. (1977). Who's Hiring Who. Berkeley, CA: Ten Speed Press.
- McGovern, T. V., Jones, B. W., & Morris, S. E. (1979). Comparison of professional versus student ratings of job interviewee behavior. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 26, 176-179.

- Newman, J. M., & Kryzstofiah, F. (1979). Self-reports versus unobtrusive measures: Balancing method variability and ethical concerns in employment discrimination research. Journal of Applied Psychology, 64, 82-85.
- Oliphant, V. N., & Alexander, E. R. (1982). Reactions to resumes as a function of resume determinateness, applicant characteristics, and sex of raters. Personnel Psychology, 35, 829-842.
- Pearlman, K. (1980). Job families: A review and discussion of their implications for personnel selection. Psychological Bulletin, 87, 1-28.
- What businessmen look for in the resume. (1975, October). Personnel Journal, p. 516.
- Porter, L. W., Lawler, E. E., III, & Hackman, J. R. (1975). Behavior in organizations. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Ruck, H. W. (1980). Across-company study of decision policies of manager resume evaluations. Dissertation Abstracts International, 41, 3222B-3223B.

Stephens, D. B., Watt, J. T., & Hobbs, W. S. (1979).

Getting through the resume preparation maze: Some empirically based guidelines for resume format.

The Vocational Guidance Quarterly, 28, 25-34.

Table 1

Perceptions of Relevance of Information

Applicant	Resume Style		t value	df	p
	1	2			
	Trad	P/Attr			

1	4.00	3.69	-1.6	71.9	.112
2	3.39	2.68	-3.4	78.1	.001***
3	3.98	4.63	4.7	73.7	.001***

***p < .001

Table 2

Ratings of Offer of Interview (a)

Applicant	Resume Style		t value	df	p
	1	2			
	Trad	P/Attr			

1	1.23	1.56	2.0	63.6	.053
2	1.96	2.39	2.3	71.7	.026*
3	1.54	1.00	-3.9	37.0	.001**

(a) 1 = Offer interview; 2 = Intermediate category;

3 = No interview, reject

* $p < .01$. ** $p < .001$.

Table 3

Ratings of Pre-Interview Impressions

Applicant	Resume Style		t value	df	p
	1	2			
	Trad	P/Attr			

1	3.14	3.01	-0.6	74.3	.545
2	2.83	2.32	-2.5	70.2	.014*
3	3.14	4.04	4.3	61.4	.001**

* $p < .05$.** $p < .001$

Table 4

Evaluations of Qualifications

Applicant	Resume Style		t value	df	p
	1	2			
	Trad	P/Attr			

1	4.10	3.76	-2.0	70.3	.053
2	2.71	2.32	-1.8	76.6	.080
3	3.70	4.68	5.4	54.5	.001*

*p < .001.

Table 5

Provision of Information About Technical Competencies

Applicant	Resume Style		t value	df	p
	1	2			
	Trad	P/Attr			

1	3.59	3.78	.9	79.0	.377
2	2.98	2.61	-1.7	78.9	.095
3	3.76	4.51	4.3	67.6	.001*

* $p < .001$.

Table 6

Provision of Information Sufficient to Make Decision

Applicant	Resume Style		t value	df	p
	1	2			
	Trad	P/Attr			

1	4.31	4.05	-1.6	60.9	.118
2	3.71	3.65	-0.3	77.5	.775
3	4.15	4.71	4.7	74.1	.001*

*p < .001.

Table 7

Perceptions of Accuracy

Applicant	Resume Style		t value	df	p
	1	2			
	Trad	P/Attr			

1	3.80	3.86	.3	65.5	.736
2	3.86	3.89	.2	73.0	.829
3	3.87	4.05	1.2	72.3	.230
