

February 2012

Employer and Student Characteristics that Predict Disagreement About College Graduates' Skill Improvement Needs

Lawrence Roth
St. Cloud State University

Richard J. Sebastian
St. Cloud State University

Sohel Ahmed
St. Cloud State University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://thekeep.eiu.edu/jnams>

Recommended Citation

Roth, Lawrence; Sebastian, Richard J.; and Ahmed, Sohel (2012) "Employer and Student Characteristics that Predict Disagreement About College Graduates' Skill Improvement Needs," *Journal of the North American Management Society*. Vol. 6: No. 1, Article 3.

Available at: <https://thekeep.eiu.edu/jnams/vol6/iss1/3>

This Research Article is brought to you for free and open access by The Keep. It has been accepted for inclusion in *Journal of the North American Management Society* by an authorized editor of The Keep. For more information, please contact tabruns@eiu.edu.

JOURNAL OF THE NORTH AMERICAN MANAGEMENT SOCIETY

NAMMS

NORTH AMERICAN MANAGEMENT SOCIETY

EDITORIAL STAFF

JOURNAL & PROCEEDINGS EDITOR

Julia Teahen, Baker College

JOURNAL BOARD OF EDITORS

Bob Ballenger, Washington and Lee University
 Richard Barker, Consultant
 Amanda Baugous, Augustana College
 Jeff Fahrenwald, Rockford College
 John Farlin, Ohio Dominican University
 Ronald Faust, University of Evansville
 Gideon Falk, Purdue University-Calumet
 Michele Govekar, Ohio Northern University
 Paul Govekar, Ohio Northern University
 Regina Greenwood, Kettering University
 Brian Hinrichs, Saint Xavier University
 Peggy Houghton, Baker College
 John Humphreys, Texas A & M University
 Lynn Isvik, Upper Iowa University
 Richard Leake, Luther College
 Bill Livingston, Baker College
 Jim Maddox, Friends University
 Terry Maris, Ohio Northern University
 C. R. Marshall, U. of Wisconsin-Stevens Point
 Joseph Martelli, The University of Findlay
 Edward Murphy, Embry Riddle Aeronautical Univ.
 Richard Sebastian, St. Cloud State University
 John Vinton, Baker College
 Carolyn Wiley, Roosevelt University

COPYRIGHT AND PERMISSION TO COPY

The Journal of the North American Management Society owns the copyright of all content published within it. Permission to copy JNAMS content is subject to the fair use principles of U.S. copyright law. For permission to copy JNAMS materials, contact the Journal Editor by e-mail at julia@baker.edu.

Team Performance Study: Determining the Factors that Influence High Performance in Teams	2
<i>David S. Hoyte, Regina A. Greenwood, & Baiyun Gong</i>	
Social Network Mapping and Analysis of the Southern California Aerospace Industry	7
<i>Kristie Ogilvie</i>	
Employer and Student Characteristics that Predict Disagreement about College Graduates' Skill Improvement Needs	17
<i>Lawrence Roth, Richard J. Sebastian, & Sohel Ahmad</i>	
Three Contributing Factors to Effective Utilization of Technology in Management Education and Practice: Personhood, Mindfulness, and Meditation	29
<i>Georgia Lee Eshelman, Maria Lai-Ling Lam, & Martha J.B. Cook</i>	
A Portrait of HR: The Personality Traits of Human Resources Professionals	40
<i>E. Anne Christo-Baker & Cristina de-Mello-e-Souza Wildermuth</i>	
Against the Wall-Mart: Does Market Power Condone Bad Behavior?	56
<i>Michaeline Skiba & Roy Nersesian</i>	
Guidelines for Contributors	64

Employer and Student Characteristics that Predict Disagreement About College Graduates' Skill Improvement Needs

Lawrence Roth, Richard J. Sebastian, and Sohel Ahmad

Abstract: College of business students and representatives of employers likely to recruit them rated the skills "new college graduates most need to improve upon." Although there were high levels of agreement for most of the skills, students' and employers' ratings differed dramatically for "interviewing skills," "lose [the] sense of entitlement," and "realistic expectations." We coded individual differences from the student survey and recruiting strategy and industry differences from the employer survey and then used regression to explore how these variables influenced student and employer ratings. Essentially nothing that occurs on the college campus improved students' ability to identify the problems reported by employers. Rather, students' misconceptions (as defined by employers) were reduced only by getting older, getting real-world experience (from full time jobs and internships), and by having more highly educated parents. The implication is that an important blind spot has developed in the business curriculum.

INTRODUCTION

Why was there dramatic disagreement about three and only three (of seventeen) skill improvement needs for new college graduates? Roth, Ahmad, and Sebastian (2010) surveyed upper division management students about (1) the skills that are most important for entry-level post-college job candidates to possess and (2) the skills new college graduates most need to improve upon. Then they compared the student results to employer results from a survey specifically developed to identify the needs and concerns of those students' likely employers (Ditlevson, 2009). The students almost perfectly reproduced employer ratings for the skills "most important for [job] candidates to possess." The results of the "most need to improve" survey were more complicated. Agreement was very high for the thirteen skills common to both surveys (although higher for the "important to possess" survey) but there were serious disagreements for three of the four skills unique to the "need to improve" survey. Employers rated "realistic expectations" ($m = 4.31$, 1st of 17; see Table 1) and "lose [the] sense of entitlement" ($m = 4.31$, 2nd of 17) as the skills most in need of improvement while students rated these in the middle and lowest ranges ($m = 3.98$ & 3.45 , 6th & 15th, respectively). In addition, students rated "interviewing skills" ($m = 4.25$) as the skills they most needed to improve while employers rated this in the lower range ($m = 3.51$ or 9th of 17).

The objective of this paper is to explore possible causes of these dramatic employer-student disagreements. To do this, we coded individual differences from the student survey and organizational differences from the employer survey and then regressed each set of variables on ratings for the three skills.

THE LITERATURE IS SUGGESTIVE

There has been surprisingly little research into differences between what students think and what employers actually want in new college hires. Posner (1981) compared student and faculty ratings of characteristics likely to be important to recruiters. Although there were disagreements about many characteristics, all three groups rated communication ability and future potential as the most important applicant characteristics, grades and work experience were of intermediate importance, and extra-curricular activities were least important. Posner observed that recruiters need to be sensitive to the many

misperceptions which students (and possibly faculty) have about their organizations. Hafer and Hoth (1983) also found general agreement as well as considerable disagreement on what was most and least important. They suggested that the students' misconceptions stemmed primarily from their sources of information, namely family members, college placement officers, and sometimes the employers themselves.

Kaplan (1985) was the first to ask about the strengths and weaknesses of recent college graduates. Students had a very limited understanding of what managers considered to be important for college graduates seeking entry-level positions. Kaplan noted that students may have learned to value what their professors value rather than what future employers value. We could find no additional research for the next twenty years. Then, a longitudinal study revealed that high school students had a limited understanding of what employers wanted and experience in college produced little improvement in their understanding (Humphreys & Davenport, 2005). Focus group research revealed that even after graduating from college former students did not place the same priorities on learning outcomes as did employers (Hart, 2006).

There also has been surprisingly little research into the meaning of the "unrealistic expectations" and inappropriate "entitlement beliefs" attributed to students and recent graduates. Employers once were students and now, with greater experience and maturity, hold different views. Some have observed that contemporary students hold views similar to those they recall having abandoned. The #1 employer-identified skill improvement need, "realistic expectations," is closely related to the growing problem of highly ambitious students who choose unrealistic career paths (i.e., career plans or paths with very low chances of success; Reynolds, Steward, MacDonald, & Sischo, 2006). The #2 employer-identified skill improvement need, "lose [the] sense of entitlement," is central to a growing problem that has been explored by Chao and Gardner (2007). Studies suggest that many college students have inappropriate senses of entitlement (or superiority) that can produce counterproductive behaviors in the job search processes and later on the job. The growing narcissism problem of today's youth described by Twenge (2007) may be closely related to the unrealistic expectations and a sense of entitlement problems described by employers. Some employers report that they attempt to avoid these problems by only hiring graduates with internship or substantial full time work experience. The implication is that students learn about entitlements and unrealistic expectations from many sources and their views get "corrected" only by work experience, not by higher education.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

A developmental explanation predicts that older and more experienced students increasingly will rate student skill development needs like employers. Hence younger, less experienced students primarily will be responsible for the student-employer disagreements. A real-world work experience explanation predicts that as students gain internship, full-time work, and perhaps military or even just plain life experience (and the maturity that comes with it), they increasingly will tend to appraise the needs of other students more like employers and less like the typical student. An educational explanation predicts either that student learn their unrealistic expectations in the classroom or conversely that misconceptions are reduced and realistic expectations are learned in the classroom. It is clear that students learned very well in their orientation course about employer needs and expectations for new college hires (Roth et al., 2010). They also could have learned unrealistic expectations and inappropriate entitlement beliefs, or alternately, their pre-existing problems could have been reduced by learning in subsequent classes. Either way, a learning explanation predicts that GPA, years of college, and using Career Services will affect student-employer disagreements. Finally, a social-economic status explanation predicts that students from higher social-economic status (e.g., more highly educated parents) will better understand employer perspectives.

Employer characteristics also might affect the disagreements. Entitlement and unrealistic expectation problems might depend on industry, occupation, or recruiting practices. Employers that require higher grade point averages or specific majors might have fewer (or more) problems than employers that interview a wider range of applicants. Employers who recruit primarily on campus might have different experience than those recruiting primarily off campus. Finally, the experiences of employers who have internship programs or who hire interns might be different.

To explore these alternatives, we coded the organizational and individual difference responses from the two surveys in order to extract as much relevant information as possible.

EMPLOYER SURVEY

Since the early 1990s the National Association of Colleges and Employers (NACE, formerly the College Placement Council) has conducted an annual survey of what employers and job candidates want from each other. The SCSU College Job Outlook survey was started in 2004 to overcome several shortcomings of the NACE survey. Whereas NACE sampled fewer than ten Minnesota employers, the SCSU College Job Outlook survey sample includes only organizations that participate in Minnesota's three primary college job fairs. Although the two surveys retain many similarities, the SCSU survey has evolved somewhat differently as it increasingly focused on issues its participants identified as important.

We used the 2010 SCSU College Job Outlook Survey (conducted in August 2009, Ditlevson, 2009). Its 87 respondents (32% response rate) were HR professionals (mostly recruiters) from a diverse assortment of public and private sector organizations. Only the 81 respondents who provided complete data were used in the analyses. Note that while the response rate in 2009 was unusually low because of depressed economic conditions, with the exception of items related to hiring plans, survey results were very similar to previous years when response rates ranged from 50%-60%. The participants rated each "most important to possess" and "most need to improve upon" skill on a not-at-all important (1) to extremely important (5) scale.

VARIABLES FOR EMPLOYERS

Similar to the results of previous College Job Outlook Surveys, 19.5% of respondents indicated their industry to be accounting or finance, 14.9% government, 12.6% technology, 11.5% manufacturing, 10.3% nonprofit, and 8.0% health care (29.9% indicated other). Because too much statistical power would be lost if a variable was created for each option, we created four variables (coded 1/0 for yes/no) to identify potential outliers and special cases (i.e., accounting and finance [*AcctFire*; $n = 17$], government [*Govt*; 13], health care [*Health*; 7], and nonprofit [*NonProf*; 9]). The variables used in the analyses are described in Table 2.

Although 20.7% of the organizations intended to increase number of new college hires, 63% expected no changes and 16.1% expected a decrease (*NewHires*; coded as 0, +1, and -1 respectively). The majority (69.0%) of employers were planning to again recruit on campus (*OnCampus*; 44.8% had firm plans and 24.2% had tentative plans, both were coded 1, no plans were coded 0). Employers often indicated that they expected to use multiple methods to find their new college (graduate) hires. 94.3% expected to use campus-sponsored programs such as job fairs (85.1%) and on-campus interviews (34.5%; *HireUniv*; coded 1 if either method was used, 0 otherwise), 54.0% of employers expected to use employee referrals (*HireRefe*; coded 1/0 for yes/no), and 52.9% of employers expected to hire from an intern program (*HireInrn*). 31.4% of employers required new hires to have specific majors (*MjrOnly*; coded 1/0) and 24.4% required job candidates to have GPAs of 3.0 or higher (*GPA3Only*; 1 if yes, 0 if preferred [50%] or not a factor [25.6%] was indicated). Only 6.9% of employers required an internship (*InrnOnly*; coded 1/0) but 75.6% of employers offered internships to students (*HaveInrn*; coded 1/0). Finally, employers

estimated how many of *their* new hires will have had an internship in *their* organization. 57.4% of employers indicated 0%-24% (*PctIntrn*; coded 1), 14.9% indicated 25%-49% (coded 2), 16.1% indicated 50%-99% (coded 3), and 2.9% (coded 4) indicated that *all* of their new college graduate hires would have interned in *their* organization.

RESULTS FOR EMPLOYERS

Table 3 presents the correlation matrix for employers. Improvement need ratings for "realistic expectations" and "sense of entitlement" were highly correlated ($r = .432, p < .01$). Ratings for "interviewing skills" were correlated with both "entitlement" ($r = .284, p < .05$) and "realistic expectations" ($r = .336, p < .01$) ratings.

The need to improve "interviewing skills" decreased as firms increasingly filled positions with interns (*PctIntrn*; $r = -.226, p < .05$). Employers who had plans to hire using campus interviews and job fairs (*HireUniv*) rated the need to "lose [the] sense of entitlement" ($r = .223, p < .05$) and develop "realistic expectations" ($r = .274, p < .05$) higher than did other employers.

If organizations required new hires to have internships (*ItrnOnly*), then they also tended to require them to have specific majors (*MjrOnly*; $r = .219, p < .05$). If they preferred to hire interns (*HireInrn*), then they tended to offer internships (*HaveIntr*; $r = .629, p < .01$) and to fill a larger portion of vacancies with interns (*PctIntrn*; $r = .549, p < .01$). Consistent with the timing of the survey, the more firms relied on interns to fill entry-level positions (*PctIntrn*), the more they were cutting back on new hires (*NewHires*; $r = -.310, p < .01$). The outliers were that healthcare recruiters rated campus interviews and job fairs as less effective methods for recruiting workers (*Health*; $r = -.286, p < .01$) whereas nonprofit organizations rated internships as a less effective method for recruiting workers (*NonProf*; $r = -.297, p < .01$).

To identify the effects of each variable while controlling for the others, the ten recruiting strategy variables were regressed on each dependent variable. Then the analyses were repeated with the addition of the four industry variables. For "interviewing skills," not one of the ten recruiting strategy variables was significant (all $p > .172$) and the addition of the four industry variables did not change these results. Likewise for "lose [the] sense of entitlement," not one of the recruiting strategy variables was significant (all $p > .099$) but when industry was added "accounting and finance" approached significance ($\mathbf{B} = .577; p = .066$; all other $p > .13$). Finally, only one recruiting strategy variable was significant for "realistic expectations" (*HireUniv*; $\mathbf{B} = .903, p = .029$; all others including industry $p > .1$). Employers that expected to get most of their new hires from campus-sponsored sources (job fairs and campus interviews) rated students as having a greater need to develop realistic expectations.

STUDENT SURVEY

We converted the online employer survey into paper-and-pencil format and distributed it in eleven sections of four different junior- and senior-level management classes several weeks before the end of the 2009 fall semester. The employer characteristics items were replaced by individual characteristics items. The survey was presented to students as part of ongoing efforts to improve curricula and student services. Participation was voluntary and anonymous.

VARIABLES FOR STUDENTS

Surveys were returned by 258 students (94% participation rate). Only the 198 students (76.7%) who provided complete data were used in the analyses. 81% were business majors and the rest had allied or related majors (3% were blank). Students could select multiple identity categories. 84% selected Caucasian, 5.8% Asian, 3.1% Black, 1.9% Hispanic, .8% American Indian, and 1.6% selected "Other." Ages ranged from 20 to 48 years (*Age*; $m = 22.8$, $sd = 3.62$, eight were older than 30 years) and 53% were female (*Gender*, coded 1 for female, 2 for male).

Self-reported GPAs ranged from 2.0 to 4.0 (C to A) with a mean of 3.15. Class standing was 1.6% freshmen, 1.6% sophomore, 31.0% junior, and 63.2% seniors (*Cstand*, coded 1 to 4 respectively). 12% had internship experience (*Internyn*) and 4% were military veterans (*Vetnyn*, both coded 1/0 for yes/no). 81% of the students reported that they were currently working (*Cwyn*, coded 1/0) and those working reported an average of 2 to 50 hours per week ($m = 24.33$, $sd = 2.50$). These responses were combined into a single variable (*CWavgHrs*) coded zero if the student was not working and the average number of hours working per work if employed. 52% percent of the students had visited the Career Services Center (*CrsVyn*, coded 1/0). Finally, students reported each parent's education level on a 1-to-6 scale indicating some high school, high school graduate, some college, B.A./B.S., M.A./M.S., and M.D./J.D./Ph.D. The responses (mother $m = 3.11$, $sd = 1.01$, father $m = 3.18$, $sd = 1.15$) were highly correlated ($r = .426$, $p < .001$) and so were added to produce a single variable (*momdad*).

RESULTS FOR STUDENTS

Table 4 presents the correlation matrix for students. Similar to employers, ratings of skill improvement needs for "realistic expectations" and "entitlements" were highly correlated ($r = .421$, $p < .01$) and "interviewing skills" were correlated (but less strongly than for employers) with both "entitlement" ($r = .197$, $p < .01$) and "realistic expectations" ($r = .166$, $p < .05$). Age (*Age*) was strongly correlated with years of full time work experience (*FullWExp*; $r = .787$, $p < .01$) and veteran status (*Vetnyn*; $r = .322$, $p < .01$). Full time work experience (*FullWExp*) was correlated with hours currently working (*CWavgHrs*; $r = .272$, $p < .05$) and veteran status ($r = .272$, $p < .05$). GPA was higher for women ($r = -.215$, $p < .01$) and predicted visiting Career Services (*CrsVyn*; $r = .178$, $p < .05$). Parental education (*momdad*) was negatively correlated with age ($r = -.173$, $p > .05$), years of full time work experience (*FullWExp*, $r = -.187$, $p < .01$), and military veteran status (*Vetnyn*, $r = -.196$, $p < .01$).

Student ratings for "interviewing skills" improvement needs were not significantly correlated with any individual difference variable except "not working" (*Cwyn*, $r = -.169$, $p < .05$). Students rated the need to "lose [the] sense of entitlement" higher if they were older (*Age*; $r = .220$, $p < .01$) or had more full time work experience (*FullWExp*; $r = .164$, $p < .05$). Finally, students rated "realistic expectations" improvement needs higher if they had internships (*Internyn*; $r = .165$, $p < .05$) or were working while attending college (*Cwyn*; $r = .161$, $p < .05$).

Multiple regression produced no significant results for "interviewing skills" (all $p > .092$). Older students ($\mathbf{B} = .086$, $p = .011$) rated other students higher on the need to "lose [the] sense of entitlement" and the results for working students approached significance—especially as the number of hours worked increased (*CWavgHrs*, $\mathbf{B} = .010$, $p = .079$; all other $p > .155$). Just as for employers, the results for "realistic expectations" were more complicated. Students with internships (*Internyn*, $\mathbf{B} = .483$, $p = .020$) and more educated parents (*momdad*, $\mathbf{B} = .073$, $p = .046$; all other $p > .14$) were increasingly likely to agree with employers (and to disagree with other students) that "realistic expectations" skills were the most important improvement need.

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

"Interviewing skills" were rated as the #1 improvement need by students and as #9 by employers. The only significant results were that employers rated these needs lower if they filled more positions with interns and students rated these needs lower if they were not currently working. Students appear still to have a poor understanding of organizational life and the hiring process (Kaplan, 1985; Posner, 1981). Research has shown that college students expect to learn how to appear to have mastered complex skills (that they don't really understand) well enough to fool even experienced and qualified interviewers (Knefelkamp & Slepitz, 1976). To students, the interview may represent just another hurdle to be surmounted using skills they expect easily to master in campus-sponsored programs. Perhaps students are right. While recruiters noticed students' lack of polish, they did not find students' interviewing skills to be a serious problem. Ironically, focusing on improving students' interviewing skills might serve primarily to make unrealistic expectations and entitlement problems more obvious to recruiters!

"Lose [the] sense of entitlement" was rated as the #2 skill improvement need by employers' and #15 by students. Employers planning to recruit on campus rated this higher and perhaps so too did some accounting and finance employers. Older students rated this need higher and perhaps so too did many students working while in college. These results are easy to explain. Recruiters encounter the "sense of entitlement" problem primarily when recruiting on campus. Older students, who are closer in age and experience to recruiters, tend to agree with them. What is remarkable is that nothing else affected "entitlement" ratings.

"Realistic expectations" problems were rated higher by employers using campus-based recruiting sources (job fairs and campus interviews). Students who were currently working or who had internship experience tended to rate other students as having more serious problems. When the effects of other variables were controlled, only students with internship experience and more highly educated parents rated "realistic expectations" improvement needs higher. The implications are straightforward. "Realistic expectations" problems are much greater when recruiting on-campus but can be reduced by screening for students with higher social-economic status or internship experience.

The bottom line was that nothing in our students' college experience had significant impact on employer-identified "realistic expectations" and "sense of entitlement" problems or on students' tendency to mis-identify their primary development need as "interviewing skills." Rather, everything that reduced (or even affected) these problems was independent of what happens on-campus (i.e., age, internship, work experience, and social-economic status). Perhaps we should be relieved that nothing that happens in college increased these problems! Recent research suggests these problems are widespread because students increasingly do not understand the fundamentals necessary for career success (Render, 2010). What is disturbing is that students matriculate primarily to improve their occupational prospects yet employers increasingly claim that students are not mastering what they need to accomplish their career goals (Humphreys & Davenport, 2005). The most parsimonious explanation for our results is that unrealistic expectations and entitlement beliefs are not being effectively addressed by anything that happens on the college campus itself. It seems that a blind spot may have evolved for which no part of the institution is specifically accountable and this, in turn, has created fertile ground for problems caused by contemporary social changes.

Unrealistic expectations and entitlement problems appear to be very closely related to the problems of "Generation Me" (Gen Me; Twenge, 2006). Having been told throughout their childhood years that they are special and can achieve anything by following their dreams, Gen Me students now expect to get high-paying, high-prestige jobs and to advance rapidly in companies that value their expertise, insights, and opinions. Eventually, Gen Me will encounter the realities of the workplace and, like other generations, abandon its youthful idealism and basically grow up. In the process they will cause many unnecessary

problems as they learn how occupational and career goals are actually achieved, that there are fewer opportunities and much more competition than they thought, and that realistic goals and timelines are very different from their unrealistic expectations. Twenge (2006) recommends better career counseling to help Gen Me overcome these problems before they enter the workplace.

Our results raise many interesting questions. Because our sample was limited to upper division business students at one institution, we wonder whether the findings generalize to other academic disciplines and degrees or to other institutions. It seems unreasonable to conclude that nothing on campus affects these problems. This suggests that we need to cast a much wider net in order to identify all the campus-based experiences and programs that help reduce the problems (if they exist!). Finally, is it not completely clear who has what "unrealistic expectations" and what inappropriate "entitlement" beliefs. Much evidence suggests that both employers and students may be out-of-touch on different issues and that, as a result, both parties increasingly find contemporary campus recruiting practices unsatisfactory (Gardner, 2010). Thus it might be interesting to learn more about the features of ongoing and potential programs that could better serve both parties mutual *and* conflicting interests.

REFERENCES

- Chao, G. T., & Gardner, P. D. (Winter, 2007). Today's young adults: Surfing for the right job. White Paper prepared for MonsterTRAK.com by the Collegiate Employment Research Institute (CERI), Michigan State University, <http://ceri.msu.edu>, accessed March 2008.
- Ditlevson, A. (2009). Minnesota College Job Outlook, surveys conducted every year since 2004, available from the St. Cloud State University Career Services Center.
- Gardner, P. (2010). Recruiting Trends 2010-2011. Michigan State University and The Collegiate Employment Research Institute (CERI), Michigan State University, <http://ceri.msu.edu>, accessed April 2011
- Hafer, J. C. & Hoth, C. C. (1983). Selection characteristics: Your priorities and how students perceive them. *The Personnel Administrator*, 28(3), 25-29.
- Hart, P. D. (2006a). How should colleges prepare student to success in today's global economy? Surveys among employers and recent college graduates conduced on behalf of The Association of American Colleges and Universities (AACU) by Peter D. Hart Research Associates, Inc. Accessed online January 2007 at <http://www.aacu.org/leap/documents/Re8097abcombined.pdf>
- Humphreys, D., & Davenport, A. (2005). What really matters in college. *Liberal Education America's Promise*, 91(3), 36-43.
- Kaplan, E. (1985). College recruitment: The view from both sides. *Personnel*, 62(11), 44-49.
- Knefelkamp, L.L. & Slepitz, R. (1976). A cognitive-developmental model of career development—An adaptation of the Perry scheme. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 6, 53-58. NACE (2010). Job Outlook 2010, National Association of Colleges and Employers, accessed from the NACE press release Web page on February 15, 2009 (www.naceweb.org).
- Posner, B. Z. (1981). Comparing recruiter, students, and faculty perceptions of important applicant and job characteristics. *Personnel Psychology*, 34, 329-339.
- Render, I. (2010). It's the Basics, Really! What Trips up College Seniors in the Job Search and Early Career? The Collegiate Employment Research Institute (CERI), Michigan State University, <http://ceri.msu.edu>, accessed April 2011
- Reynolds, J., Stewart, M., MacDonald, R., & Sischo, L. (2006). Have adolescents become too ambitious? High school seniors' educational and occupational plans, 1976-2000. *Social Problems*, 53, 186-206.
- Roth, L., Ahmad, S., & Sebastian, R.J. (2010). Student versus employer perceptions of college graduate skills. *Journal of the North American Management Society*, 5(1-2), 47-56.
- Twenge, J. M. (2007). *Generation Me: Why today's young Americans are more confident, assertive, and entitled—and more miserable than ever before*. New York: Simon & Schuster Adult Publishing Group.

TABLE 1: WHAT SKILLS DO YOU THINK EMPLOYERS FEEL NEW COLLEGE GRADUATES MOST NEED TO IMPROVE UPON?

Student Rank	Student Mean	Skill			
		Students (If different)	Employer (If different)	Employer Mean	Employer Rank
1	4.25	Interviewing skills ^{1**}	Realistic expectations ^{1*}	4.31	1
			Lose sense of entitlement ^{1**}	4.11	2
			Work ethic	3.99	3
2	4.25	Communication (verbal and written) ~		3.94	4
			Motivation/initiative	3.87	5
3	4.21	Knowledge of company/environment ^{1~}		3.87	6
			Flexibility/adaptability [*]	3.84	7
4	4.11	Professionalism/etiquette ^{**}		3.71	8
5	3.99	Work ethic			
6	3.98	Realistic expectations ^{1*}	Interviewing Skills ^{1**}	3.51	9
			Interpersonal skills (relates well to others) ~	3.40	10
7	3.88	Leadership skills ^{**}		3.38	11
8	3.81	Teamwork skills ^{**} (works well with others)		3.28	12
9	3.77	Interpersonal skills (relates well to others) ~			
10	3.71	Motivation/initiative	Organizational skills ^{**}	3.26	13
11	3.67	Honesty/integrity ^{**}		3.26	14
12	3.66	Organizational skills ^{**}			
13	3.58	Think analytically ^{**}		3.15	15
14	3.48	Flexibility/adaptability [*]			
15	3.45	Lose sense of entitlement ^{1**}			
16	3.18	Ability to acquire learning ~		2.89	16
17	3.05	Utilize technology ~		2.64	17

Reproduced from Roth et al., 2010. ¹ Not included in the "most important to possess" survey.

* $p < .06$ and ** $p < .05$ using the conservative Bonferroni procedure to compensate for repeating the T-test multiple times on the same survey (e.g., a table-wise $p < .05$ was maintained by using $p < .05/17$ for statistical test).

~ $p < .05$ if the Bonferroni correction is not used.

TABLE 2: ORGANIZATION AND INDIVIDUAL DIFFERENCE ITEMS IN THE SURVEYS.

Employer survey items

Set 1: Recruiting strategy

1. *NewHires* Plan to decrease (-1), no change (0), or increase (+1) the number of new college hires.
2. *OnCampus* Have plans to recruit on campus next year (yes = 1, no = 0).
3. *HireUniv* Expected to use campus job fairs and campus interviews (yes = 1, no = 0).
4. *HireInrn* Expect to get most new hires from interns (yes = 1, no = 0).
5. *HireRefe* Expect to get most new hires from employee referrals (yes = 1, no = 0).
6. *ItrnOnly* Internship is required for new hires (yes = 1, no = 0).
7. *MjrOnly* Specific major is require for new hires (yes = 1, no = 0).
8. *GPA3Only* A 3.0 GPA or higher is require for new hires (yes = 1, no = 0).
9. *HaveIntr* My organization offers internships to students (yes = 1, no = 0).
10. *PctIntrn* What percentage of new hires are interns? < 25% = 1, 25-49% = 2, 50-99% = 3, 100% = 4.

Set 2: Industry

11. *AcctFire* Industry is accounting or finance related (yes = 1, no = 0).
12. *Govt* Governmental employer (yes = 1, no = 0).
13. *Health* Healthcare employer (yes = 1, no = 0).
14. *NonProf* Nonprofit employer (yes = 1, no = 0).

Note: Industry was selected from the following options but only the four indicated above were coded and analyses (number selecting): *Business services (6), communications (1), education (6), employment agency (1), financial services (13), government (7), healthcare (7), military (0), manufacturing (4), non-profit/human services (9), restaurant/hospitality (1), retail (7), technology (7), other (18)*

Student survey items (paper-and-pencil)

1. *Age* Age (write in, in years)
2. *Gender* Gender (select Female [1] or Male [2])
3. *GPA* Overall grade point average (write in)
4. *Cstand* Class standing (Freshman [1], Sophomore [2], Junior [3], or Senior [4])
5. *Internyn* Internship (select Yes [1] or No [0])
6. *Vetnyn* Veteran (select Yes [1] or No [0])
7. *FullWExp* Years of full time work experience (write in years)
8. *Cwyn* Currently working (select Yes [1] or No [0]; see *CWavgHrs*, next)
9. *CWavgHrs* Average number of hours worked weekly (write in, zero if *Cwyn* is "no").
10. *CrsVyn* Have you used Career Services? (select Yes [1] or No [0])
11. *momdad* (Select one for each of Mother's education and for Father's education: Some high school, High school diploma, Some college, College degree, Master's degree, MD, JD, or PhD. These were coded 1 to 6 and both responses were summed.)

Table 3. Correlation Matrix for Employers

	a	b	c	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
	Inter- view- ing skills	Lose sense of Entitle- ment	Realistic Expect- ations	<i>New Hires</i>	<i>On Campus</i>	<i>Hire Univ</i>	<i>Hire Inrn</i>	<i>Hire Refe</i>	<i>Itrn Only</i>	<i>Mjr Only</i>	<i>GPA3 Only</i>	<i>Have Intr</i>	<i>Pct Intrn</i>	<i>Acct Fire</i>	<i>Govt</i>	<i>Health</i>	<i>Non Prof</i>
b	<u>0.284</u>																
c	<u>0.336</u>	<u>0.432</u>															
1	-0.033	0.137	0.077														
2	0.130	-0.101	-0.051	-0.048													
3	-0.025	<u>0.223</u>	<u>0.274</u>	0.016	-0.060												
4	-0.097	0.128	0.008	-0.190	<u>0.282</u>	0.170											
5	-0.007	0.029	0.117	0.098	0.085	0.177	<u>0.231</u>										
6	-0.100	-0.024	0.181	0.140	-0.015	0.073	0.077	0.165									
7	0.038	0.048	0.051	-0.086	0.041	0.060	0.146	-0.085	<u>0.219</u>								
8	0.158	0.005	-0.041	-0.178	0.029	0.035	0.105	-0.136	-0.060	0.093							
9	-0.187	-0.060	-0.060	-0.105	<u>0.276</u>	-0.035	<u>0.629</u>	0.193	0.060	0.090	0.029						
10	<u>-0.226</u>	-0.061	0.097	<u>-0.310</u>	0.184	0.032	<u>0.549</u>	0.171	0.177	0.092	0.053	<u>0.634</u>					
11	-0.053	0.209	0.097	0.130	0.181	-0.010	0.130	0.182	0.108	-0.112	0.081	0.137	0.119				
12	-0.091	-0.070	-0.195	-0.083	-0.145	-0.167	-0.128	-0.207	0.005	0.145	0.125	0.028	-0.074	-0.208			
13	-0.025	-0.112	-0.161	-0.019	-0.080	<u>0.286</u>	0.025	0.017	-0.087	0.175	0.019	-0.019	-0.055	-0.147	-0.134		
14	0.059	-0.145	-0.031	0.044	-0.019	0.091	<u>-0.297</u>	<u>-0.228</u>	-0.100	-0.066	-0.209	<u>-0.239</u>	<u>-0.258</u>	-0.169	-0.155	-0.190	
Min	1	1	1	-1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Max	5	5	5	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	4	1	1	1	1
Mean	3.506	4.107	4.313	0.046	0.690	0.943	0.529	0.540	0.069	0.310	0.241	0.747	1.322	0.195	0.149	0.080	0.10
SD	0.963	1.018	0.840	0.608	0.465	0.234	0.502	0.501	0.255	0.465	0.430	0.437	1.062	0.399	0.359	0.274	0.30
																	6

< .01, two-tailed

< .05, two-tailed

Note: Results for the 81 recruiters/organizations providing complete data.

Table 4. Correlation matrix for students

	a	b	c	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
	Inter-viewing Skills	Lose sense of Entitlement	Realistic Expectations	Age	Gender	GPA	Cstand	Internyn	Vetnyn	FullWExp	Cwyn	CWavgHrs	CrsVyn	momdad
b	<u>0.197</u>													
c	<u>0.166</u>	<u>0.421</u>												
1	-0.078	<u>0.220</u>	0.123											
2	-0.102	0.098	-0.072	0.121										
3	-0.017	-0.071	0.105	0.013	<u>-0.215</u>									
4	-0.037	-0.081	0.038	0.020	0.056	0.013								
5	0.003	0.034	<u>0.165</u>	-0.100	0.057	0.127	0.054							
6	-0.109	0.118	0.074	<u>0.322</u>	0.125	0.086	-0.029	-0.069						
7	-0.071	<u>0.164</u>	0.131	<u>0.787</u>	<u>0.153</u>	0.014	-0.071	-0.072	<u>0.272</u>					
8	<u>-0.169</u>	0.055	<u>0.161</u>	-0.116	-0.114	-0.009	0.007	-0.069	-0.049	0.002				
9	0.094	0.108	0.104	0.058	-0.038	0.015	-0.012	-0.075	0.064	<u>0.272</u>	<u>0.695</u>			
10	0.053	-0.036	0.113	-0.056	<u>-0.175</u>	<u>0.178</u>	0.098	0.127	0.074	-0.100	-0.020	<u>-0.140</u>		
11	0.069	-0.008	0.094	<u>-0.173</u>	0.077	-0.019	0.003	0.090	<u>-0.196</u>	<u>-0.187</u>	-0.038	-0.092	-0.070	
Min	1	1	1	20	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Max	5	5	5	48	2	4	4	1	1	29	1	50	1	12
Mean	4.25	3.38	3.93	22.78	1.53	3.15	3.66	0.12	0.04	2.28	0.81	19.44	0.52	6.29
SD	0.95	1.00	0.92	3.62	0.50	0.35	0.56	0.32	0.19	3.84	0.39	13.45	0.50	1.82

< .05, two-tailed

< .01, two-tailed

Note: Results for the 198 students with complete data.