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ABSTRACT

Recruiters make many inferences about applicants' abilities and interpersonal attributes on the basis of applicants' resumes. For example, every once in a while, a good resume leaves a strong positive impression and the recruiter creates a high expectation for the selection interview. What if a disappointing interview follows? Will the great resume help or hurt the candidate? The purpose of this study is to assess the impact of a good resume on the recruiter’s evaluation of a candidate when a non-enthusiastic interview follows as well as the interacting role of gender. The results of two online experiments (n=454) where participants played the role of the recruiter, showed that, on average, a very good resume (vs. no resume) before a non-enthusiastic interview did not affect the recruiter’s evaluation of the candidate. However, when the recruiter’s and the candidate’s gender were taken into consideration, a different picture emerged. While no effect was found for male recruiters, the candidate’s resume had a clear significant impact on female recruiter’s evaluations: when the candidate was also a female, the good resume shown before the non-enthusiastic interview performance tended to help, whereas when the candidate was a male, the good resume had a significant negative effect on female recruiters’ evaluation of the candidate.

In sum, in situations where the resume had a strong impact on the recruiter’s evaluation (female recruiters), the direction of the effect was moderated by the candidate’s gender. Gender differences in information processing as well as in-group/out-group biases due to gender matching are used to hypothesize and explain the main findings.
I. INTRODUCTION

In recruitment, it is not atypical for an organization to review thousands of resumes in a year’s time (Useem, 1999) and the evaluation of applicants’ resumes continues to be an important pre-employment screening device. They are commonly used as an initial applicant screening tool because they provide an opportunity to appraise applicants’ qualifications in areas such as education, work experience, and special skills (Knouse, 1989).

Research suggests that recruiters make many inferences about applicants' abilities and interpersonal attributes on the basis of applicants’ resumes (Ash, Johnson, Levine, & McDaniel, 1989; Brown & Campion, 1994), and establish a first impression of applicants’ employability. These impressions, in turn, are used to make pre-hire decisions (Ash et al., 1989; Dipboye, Fontenelle, & Garner, 1984).

Every once in a while, a resume leaves a very strong positive impression and the recruiter creates a high expectation for the selection interview. These expectations are proposed to affect evaluations of applicants (Schmitt, 1976). In particular, recruiters might be influenced by expectancy-confirmation processes, sometimes called “self-fulfilling prophecies” (Darley & Fazio, 1980; Jones, 1977).

Dipboye (1982)’s model of self-fulfilling prophecy in the employment interview suggests that recruiters' pre interview impressions of job applicants can influence their post interview evaluations in a way that matches the original impression. This can happen either
because of behavioral biases: recruiters' initial impressions influence their behavior, their communication style and their rapport with applicants during the interview (Dougherty, Turban, & Callender., 1994), or due to cognitive biases: recruiters notice, recall, and interpret events in a manner consistent with their initial impressions (Phillips & Dipboye, 1989); two biases that occur because of people’s tendency to confirm preheld beliefs (Snyder & Swann, 1978).

These self-fulfilling prophecies are largely supported in the field of recruitment (Blau & Ryan, 1997; Cable & Gilovich, 1998; Dipboye et al., 1984; Dougherty et al., 1994; Latham, Wexley, & Pursell, 1975; Macan & Dipboye, 1990). However, in other fields, mainly in psychology and marketing, another theory, called “the assimilation and contrast theory” (Hovland, Harvey, & Sherif, 1957) has shown that contrast is another possible direction for the impact of prior expectations on subsequent evaluation. Both assimilation and contrast effects refer to the amount of displacement in current judgment that is attributable to prior impressions (Kravitz & Balzer, 1990). While assimilation occurs when judgments are biased towards the prior impression, contrast occurs when judgments are biased away from the prior impression.

According to this theory, pre interview impressions do not necessarily get confirmed post interview, but its confirmation depends on the disparity between the initial impression and the actual performance during the interview. As such, when a disappointing interview follows a resume that created a high expectation, the recruiter’s evaluation of the candidate could go in two very different directions:

Even though some studies have analyzed a possible contrast effect in interviews, the effect was only observed across candidates; where the first interviews of job candidates provided an anchor or frame of reference and a following disappointing candidate provided
the basis for a possible contrast effect (Hakel, Ohnesorge, & Dunnette, 1970; Landy & Bates, 1973; Rowe, 1967).

However, when analyzing the effect of a candidate’s resume on recruiter’s evaluations, literature in recruiting has largely focused on assimilation (Cable & Gilovich, 1998; Dipboye, 1982; Dipboye et al., 1984; Dougherty et al., 1994; Latham et al., 1975; Macan & Dipboye, 1990), while, to our knowledge, no study has investigated possible contrast effects. For this reason, one of this study’s main contributions is to analyze whether a negative disconfirmation is possible when expectations based on a great resume are disconfirmed by a low interview performance.

There are many characteristics that may also affect how resume information is incorporated in the recruiting process. For example, Powell, Butterfield, & Parent (2002) concluded that applicants’ demographics explained additional variance in selection decisions beyond what is already explained by applicants’ qualifications. Further, several studies propose that gender is one of the most influential of these demographic characteristics (Glick, Zion, & Nelson, 1988; Pratto & Bargh, 1991; Zikmund, Hitt, & Pickens, 1978).

However, the effects of gender on recruiter’s responses to applicants have yielded inconsistent results. Ferris & Gilmore (1977), for example, found that males evaluated applicants more positively; Rose & Andiappan (1978) and Muchinsky & Harris (1977) found that female gave more positive evaluations and several other studies found no significant effect at all (Heilman & Saruwatari, 1979; Heilman, 1984; Heneman, 1977; Taylor & Ilgen, 1981).
Because of these inconsistent results, Powell (1987) highlights the necessity of further research to determine the conditions under which different explanations of the effect of gender apply.

Some studies have shown that there is a significant gender difference in information processing. This gender difference may lead female recruiters, who are said to be comprehensive rather than selective information processors and who engage in more creative, associative, imagery-laced interpretation (Wood, 1966) to be more prone to create a strong prior upon seeing a candidate’s resume and, in turn, be more affected by the resume’s effect than are male recruiters. Therefore, one of our goals will be to investigate the interaction of the recruiter’s gender and the expectation set by the resume on the recruiter’s evaluation of the candidate.

In addition, Byrne (1971)’s similarity-attraction paradigm suggests that demographics, such as gender, can impact recruiter’s evaluation of applicants in a recruitment setting because the more similar one perceives another person to be, the more that other person is liked and thus the more probable it will be receiving more favorable evaluations. Thus, a final contribution of this dissertation will be to investigate the matching role of the recruiter’s and the candidate’s gender.

Even though many studies have researched how gender can impact evaluations, we are not aware of any study that analyzed its impact in a recruitment situation where recruiter’s evaluation arises in the context of negative disconfirmation (i.e., good resume followed by a non-enthusiastic interview).

In summary, the purpose of this study is to assess (a) the impact of a very good resume followed by a non-enthusiastic interview on the recruiter’s evaluation, (b) the role
of the recruiter’s gender, (c) the role of gender matching (e.g., female candidate and female recruiter).

In the following section, we will first provide a literature review on the self-fulfilling paradigm, on assimilation and contrast theory, as well as on gender differences in information processing and on the gender similarity effect along with a set of hypothesis. Second, we will describe the method used in experiment 1A and 1B and discuss its results and possible explanations. Finally, we will describe potential managerial implications, the main limitations, and a few ideas for future research.

II. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

The first information recruiters have on applicants usually comes before the interview and consists of paper credentials such as a candidate’s resume. An impression is then created upon the applicant’s resume, which typically leads to an expectation or belief about the candidate (Ash et al., 1989; Brown & Campion, 1994). The question has then been “how does this initial impression impact subsequent evaluations?” Two somewhat unrelated bodies of the literature can help address this question: self-fulfilling theory and assimilation and contract theory.

SELF-FULFILLING THEORY

Self-fulfilling theory has argued that assimilation is likely to occur. That is, the recruiters’ pre interview impressions of job applicants will influence their post interview
evaluations in a way that matches their original impression. In other words, the basic proposition of the self-fulfilling model is that, all other things held constant, the more favorable the information on the candidate through his resume, the more favorable the interviewer's evaluation of the candidate after the interview (Dipboye, 1982; Tucker & Rowe, 1979).

These self-fulfilling assimilation effects are mediated by both the tendency of interviewers to convey their opinions of the interviewee in their conduct of the interview and their tendency to notice, recall, and interpret information in a manner that is consistent with pre-interview evaluations (Dipboye, 1982). In order words, assimilation happens either because of behavioral biases (i.e., recruiters' initial impressions influence their behavior, their communication style and their rapport with applicants during the interview; Dougherty et al., 1994), or due to cognitive biases (i.e., recruiters notice, recall, and interpret events in a manner that is consistent with their initial impressions; Phillips & Dipboye, 1989). These two biases occur because of people’s tendency to confirm preheld beliefs (Snyder & Swann, 1978).

The self-fulfilling theory has been supported by several studies that have examined relationship between pre- and post-interview evaluations in both controlled experiments (Dipboye, Stramler, & Fontenelle, 1984; Dipboye et al., 1984) or during actual hiring decisions (Cable & Gilovich, 1998; Dougherty, Ebert, & Callender, 1986; Phillips & Dipboye, 1989).

An example is the study by Dougherty et al. (1994) that examined behavioral styles used by interviewers to confirm their first impressions of job applicants. For this, three interviewers in a corporate setting formed first impressions based on application blank and test score information and then conducted audiotaped interviews. Coders then independently coded 79 interviews and found that first impressions were related to
confirmatory behavior. Results showed that interviewers followed up positive first impressions, for example, by showing positive regard toward applicants, "selling" the company and gathering less information about the applicants, thus showing that interviewers in natural settings do use confirmatory strategies.

In another study, Cable & Gilovich (1998) examined preinterview impressions and post-interview evaluations in the context of prescreening decisions. 158 recruiters from 95 different organizations conducted a total of 1,501 interviews. Following their interviews, recruiters were asked to complete a voluntary survey about each applicant where they rated applicants among six dimensions using a 4-point scale. Fifty percent of the candidates had been prescreened, and the rest obtained interviews through the career office's internal bidding process. Two independent judges then coded applicants' resumes along the six dimensions. Results showed that job applicants who were prescreened into interviews were judged more favorably by recruiters than applicants who were not prescreened. Because many applicants were prescreened by some organizations and not by others, the authors were able to control for applicant qualifications and show that the same individuals were rated more favorably when prescreened than when not prescreened. Finally, the results ruled out the possibility that findings simply reflect accurate preinterview assessments of applicant-job "fit", thus providing evidence that the favorable evaluation was due to the recruiter’s initial impression of the candidate.

Finally, Tucker & Rowe (1979) determined the effect of early expectancies on an interviewer's causal interpretations of an applicant's past performance outcomes. In their experiment, 72 students each read a series of 10 transcripts that they believed had been taken from an actual interview. Each transcript dealt with a single educational or work-related outcome, with 5 of the transcripts dealing with success situations and 5 with failure situations. Prior to reading the transcripts, each participant received a letter of reference,
thus creating an expectancy: 24 received a favorable letter of reference, 24 received an unfavorable letter, and 24 received a neutral letter. Results suggested that an interviewer with an unfavorable expectancy is likely to give the applicant less credit for past successes and to hold the applicant more personally responsible for past failures while a favorable expectancy is likely to yield the opposite effect. Thus, the recruiter’s interpretations of the candidate’s past results were closely related to their initial impression of the candidate.

Those three studies along with others provide considerable evidence that the self-fulfilling processes of behavioral confirmation and cognitive distortion are common in the interview context (Dipboye et al., 1984; Dougherty et al., 1994; Phillips & Dipboye, 1989).

ASSIMILATION AND CONTRAST

Although assimilation, through self-fulfilling mechanisms, does exist, an unrelated research stream has proposed that contrast is another possible direction for the impact of prior expectations on subsequent evaluations. A study by Spector (1956) found that subjects whose expectations were negatively disconfirmed evaluated a reward less favorably than did subjects who expected and received the same reward. In other words, disappointed subjects magnified the difference between the presumably more desirable reward and the one they received.

The early theorists assumed that the effects of the two influences (assimilation and contrast) were mutually exclusive. That is, either individuals were exclusively assimilation-oriented or contrast-oriented. But the recent studies have pointed towards the idea that it is not an either-or situation and a theory including both assimilation and contrast actually exist.
Assimilation and contrast theory (Hovland et al., 1957) posits that both effects are quite likely and essentially depend on how big the disparity between expectations and actual performance of an applicant is. There are zones of acceptance and rejection in individuals’ perceptions.

If the disparity between expectations and actual performance is sufficiently small to fall into the individual’s zone of acceptance, he/she will tend to assimilate the difference by giving an evaluation that is more in line with expectations than its objective performance justifies (Anderson, 1973). This happens because individuals “do not like to be in a state of conflict” and by reinterpreting the performance so as to be consistent with one’s expectations, individuals try to reduce dissonance (Oliver, 1977).

On the opposite side, if the discrepancy between expectations and actual performance is so large that it falls into the zone of rejection, then a contrast effect comes into play and the individual magnifies the perceived disparity (Anderson, 1973). Again, this negative unfavorable evaluation due to a negative disconfirmation of the expectancy happens because of individuals’ need for consistency. This need is usually expressed by attitude change in the direction that eliminates inconsistency (Brown & Roger, 1965).

In marketing, for instance, the assimilation and contrast theory (Hovland et al., 1957) has widely been supported regarding consumer’s evaluation of products (Anderson, 1973; Khurana, 2011; Klein, 1999; Oliver, 1977).

In a study by Anderson (1973) for example, participants were randomly assigned to one of five levels of persuasive product information: substantially/slightly understating the product’s features, describing the product accurately, slightly/substantially overstating the product’s features, or no product information. The study showed that participants responded with significant differences in their evaluations of the product depending upon their level of expectations. The results best fit assimilation-contrast theory, since product
ratings were assimilated toward expectations until the "very high" condition when contrast effect began, causing a downturn away from expectations in evaluations of the product.

Khurana (2011) came to the same conclusion. In her experiment, the evaluation was over service in either a restaurant or a café. Pre and Post type of questionnaires were used, where the pre questionnaire helped in determining participant's prior expectations and the post questionnaire was used for understanding the actual performance of the service. The result was that when disconfirmation size was small, the customer response was assimilated towards the initial impression, and when disconfirmation size was large, the customer response was contrasted away from the initial impression.

These studies showed that when expectations are not matched by actual product performance, the surprise effect or contrast between expectations and outcome may cause the consumer to exaggerate or magnify the disparity rather than assimilate. The experiments revealed that a negative disconfirmation of an expectancy (that is, results were poorer than anticipated) produced an unfavorable product evaluation and that there is a point beyond which consumers will not accept increasing disparity between product claims and actual performance.

Following this logic, the assimilation and contrast theory (Hovland et al., 1957) leads us to expect that the recruiter’s expectation created upon seeing a candidate’s resume doesn’t always result in assimilation. As with product evaluation, if the gap between the prior expectation and the actual performance is narrow (wide) enough to fall under the zone of acceptance (rejection), an assimilation (contrast) effect will occur.

Of course, it is an empirical question whether expectations of an applicant, created upon seeing his good resume, and his actual non-enthusiastic performance during the interview will fall under the zones of acceptance or rejection. That is, both assimilation and
contrast effects are theoretically possible. Two competing hypothesis are therefore described:

**Hypothesis 1A**: A good resume followed by a non-enthusiastic interview is going to impact the recruiter’s evaluation positively (assimilation).

**Hypothesis 1B**: A good resume followed by a non-enthusiastic interview is going to impact the recruiter’s evaluation negatively (contrast).

It is worth noting that contrast effects have been investigated in the recruitment literature, but only across candidates, where interviewer evaluations of job applicant’s resumes were a function of the qualifications of the immediately preceding applicants. In those studies, participants viewed several interviews of job candidates after another. The first two or three interviews provided a frame of reference while ratings of the following interview were evaluated for contrast effects. Those research projects found that if the applicants are seen singly, they will be given lenient evaluations; if seen as couplets, the contrast effect may be dramatic (Hakel et al., 1970; Landy & Bates, 1973; Rowe, 1967). However, a contrast effect has, to our knowledge, never been investigated as a possible effect of a disconfirmed expectation for a single candidate.

In addition to initial impressions and expectations, gender has also been proposed to affect how resume information is incorporated in the recruiter process by several studies (Glick et al., 1988; Pratto & Bargh, 1991; Zikmund et al., 1978). We propose that gender differences in information processing and the gender similarity-effect help explain how
gender interacts with the resume’s impact on recruiter’s evaluation and will therefore be discussed next.

**Gender Differences in Information Processing**

For decades, scientific studies have tried to delineate the fundamental similarities and differences between genders (Deaux & Kite, 1987). Many past empirical studies have been able to demonstrate significant gender differences across a variety of tasks and traits. Holbrook (1986) suggests that gender may be a key variable in moderating evaluative judgments. Indeed, a variety of research indicates that males and females may use significantly different processing strategies when doing evaluations.

According to the “selectivity model”, males are selective information processors while females are comprehensive information processors. This means that males have a tendency not to process all available information as a basis for judgment. Instead, they tend to use heuristics processing, miss subtle cues and rely more on their own opinions (Meyers-Levy, 1988). As a result, males usually make decisions more quickly than females, relying on only highly available information.

In contrast, females rely on multiple sources of information before making a decision. They process information in a more exhaustive and interpretive way, relying on a broad variety of information. They tend to use a "comprehensive strategy" where they try to integrate all available cues and attempt to engage in effortful, comprehensive analysis of all available information. When forming judgments, females have been found to exhibit greater sensitivity to the particulars of relevant information (Meyers-Levy & Maheswaran, 1991).
In addition, Holbrook (1978) shows that women tend to be more subjective and resort to more individual interpretations. They are also said to engage in more creative, associative, imagery-laced interpretation (Wood, 1966) and to provide greater interpretation of stimuli in terms of feeling and motivation (Gleser, Gottschalk, & John, 1959). This lets us believe that females will be more likely to project an image of the candidate upon seeing his or her resume than will males.

As previously described, people must form and rely on strong priors for assimilation or contrast to take place. Because females process information in a more exhaustive and interpretive way and because their interpretations are usually more subjective, creative and imagery-laced, it is possible that female recruiters are more likely to form/rely on a strong prior upon seeing the good resume and that the resume will significantly impact their evaluation of the candidate.

Because males process the information in a more objective way and because their interpretation are rarely left to imagination, male recruiters may be less likely to form a strong prior upon seeing the good resume and that the resume will have little or no impact on their evaluation of the candidate.

In a nutshell, our second Hypothesis will be as followed:

Hypothesis 2: The good resume is going to have a stronger (positive or negative) effect on a female than on a male recruiter’s evaluation of the non-enthusiastic candidate.

**Gender Similarity Effect**
Individuals show an unconscious, automatic tendency to favor “in-groups” (i.e., people similar to oneself) over “out-groups” (i.e., people different to oneself) (Brewer & Brown, 1998; Reskin, 2001). In particular, people feel more comfortable with in-group members and more readily offer them trust and cooperation. Therefore, similar individuals often receive more favorable evaluations from decision makers than dissimilar ones do.

In the same line, Byrne (1971)’s similarity-attraction paradigm suggests that the more similar one perceives another person to be, the more that other person is liked, and the more likely they will be evaluated more favorably by others.

This paradigm is one of the most robust phenomena. A meta-analysis of over 300 similarity studies observed that similarity produces a positive, moderately sized effect in attraction (Montoya, Horton, & Kirchner, 2008) and the paradigm has been observed across a multitude of different attributes. More importantly, even though Byrne (1971)’s original research referred to similarity in attitudes, more recent research has extended these findings to include similarity in demographic characteristics like gender (Tsui & O’reilly, 1989; Zenger & Lawrence, 1989).

Byrne (1971) argues that similar attitudes serve as reinforcers. According to this perspective, individuals have a fundamental need for logic and consistency and therefore favor stimuli that reinforce this need. For instance, when people are similar to us or validate our ideas and attitudes, they reinforce the logic and consistency of our world. For this reason, we perceive similar people as reinforcing and thus associate them with positive feelings, which in turn lead to attraction and positive evaluations.

In addition, similarity judgments allow us to simplify our world by organizing information, classifying people and objects, and more quickly making generalizations when we encounter something new and previously uncategorized (Medin, Goldstone, & Gentner, 1993; Tversky, 1977).
The similarity–attraction paradigm is complemented by social identity (Tajfel & Turner, 1986) and self-categorization theory (Turner, Hogg, Oakes, Reicher, & Wetherell, 1987), which propose that our self-concepts are in part formed by the groups to which we think we belong.

That is, because it is necessary to maintain a positive self-regard, seeing others that are similar to oneself in a positive light is psychologically beneficial. Although different factors may influence how people categorize themselves and others into groups in different situations, research indicates that demographic variables, including gender, are important in this regard.

If recruiters will perceive candidates of the same gender as more similar as candidates from the opposite gender, it is possible that, everything else being equal, the assessment of a candidate of opposite gender will fall under the zone of rejection, whereas the assessment of a candidate of same gender will fall under the zone of acceptance. Following the same logic, contrast should be more likely to occur between opposite-gender pairs (e.g., female recruiter-male candidate) whereas assimilation should more likely to occur for same-gender pairs (e.g., female candidate-female-recruiter).

Hypothesis 3: Contrast will prevail when the recruiter’s and candidate’s gender do not match whereas assimilation will prevail when the recruiter’s and candidate’s gender match.

Of course, given that female recruiters are expected to form and rely more strongly on their priors that male recruiters (i.e., hypothesis 2), the directional impact of gender similarity on recruiter’s evaluation is logically more likely to occur among female recruiters.
Two experiments have been conducted to assess these 3 main hypotheses.

III. EXPERIMENT 1A AND 1B

In experiment 1A and 1B we asked participants to take the role of a recruiter and evaluate one candidate, a male candidate in experiment 1A and a female candidate in experiment 1B. Participants were either presented or not with a good resume followed by a video in which the applicant performs non-enthusiastically in an interview. Then participants provided a general evaluation and hiring assessment of the candidate. The experiments allowed us to assess the impact of the resume along with the moderating roles of the recruiter’s (participants) gender as well as the matching between recruiter’s and applicant’s gender.

METHOD

Four hundred and forty five individuals participated voluntarily in an internet-based experiment about recruitment: two hundred and forty two in experiment 1A and two hundred and three in experiment 2B. Participants were recruited on the Amazon’s Mechanical Turk platform and were given a small monetary incentive as compensation for completing the survey. The two experiments were conducted at two different points in time: the first on was completed in November 2013 and the second one in March 2014.
The main difference between experiments 1A and 1B was the candidate’s gender. In both experiments, all other key aspects of the procedure remained constant—that is, same resume and same questions and answers during the interview.

Out of the four hundred and forty two participants, 61.12% are men and 38.88% are women. The mean age of the sample is 33.07 years (SD=11.21). Also, 55.3% are residents of the United States of America, 42% of India and 2.7% of other countries.

Each experiment had a 2 (Male candidate vs. Female Candidate) by 2 (Resume vs. No Resume) by 2 (video replicate: video 1 vs. video 2) between-subject design.

Stimuli

*Resume.* The resume of a fictitious candidate was created for the experiment. All the information on it was made up but referred to existing universities and companies. The goal was to create a resume that would be perceived by the participants as being impressive, so that either an assimilation or a contrast effect could possibly occur once they see the candidate’s non-enthusiastic performance during the interview. To reach this goal, the resume stated that the candidate had acquired extensive experience in big companies like Samsung or Allianz and had attended well-known international schools like New York University or London Metropolitan University. In addition, the resume showed that the candidate speaks four languages fluently, has had several achievements in his career and has significant international experience. The resume had the following categories: “Work experience”, “Achievements”, “Education and Training”, “Languages and IT”, and “Other Interests”. The only difference between the resume in experiment 1A and in experiment 1B was the name of the candidate: the candidate in experiment 1A had a male name while the candidate in experiment 1B had a female name.
Video Interview. Two actors, a man and a woman, were asked to play the male and female job candidates for the experiments 1A and 1B, respectively. The video showed participants a short clip of the candidate during his or her interview process. For this, an office at Fundação Getúlio Vargas was used as the location and the actors were wearing professional clothing to make the scenery of the video realistic. The participants saw only the candidate but could clearly hear the interviewer’s questions as well as the candidate’s answers. The goal was for the video to be perceived as non-enthusiastic, such that a negative disconfirmation (i.e., performance worse than expected) could result from seeing the video right after having read the candidate’s good resume. To present a non-enthusiastic performance, the actors played a very annoyed, uninterested candidate with a very negative attitude.

In order to increase robustness, four different videos were used in the experiments, two with the male (experiment 1A) and two with the female (experiment 1B) candidate. All of them had a length of around two minutes.

Procedure

Participants typically needed between 5 and 12 minutes to complete the survey. The survey was all in English language. Before participants started the survey, the purpose of the experiment and what it consisted of was briefly explained to them and they were asked to agree to a statement of informed consent.

At the beginning of the experiment, participants were asked to imagine the following scenario: “You work as a recruiter in the Human Resources department of a medium-sized telecommunication company in São Paulo, Brazil. Your company needs to hire new Sales Representatives to join the existing sales team, and you are in charge of the
The company wants to hire Sales Representatives that have great people skills, are motivated, passionate, and that are team-players. They should have experience in Sales and any language besides English is considered an advantage.

After this short introduction, participants were randomly assigned to either the “Resume” or the “No Resume” condition (i.e., main independent variable). In the “No Resume” condition, all they saw was the name, the age and the nationality of the candidate. They then proceeded immediately to the short interview clip. In the “Resume” condition, participants had as much time as they wanted to go through the resume of the candidate. In order to control to a certain degree whether participants would actually read the resume, the survey page was blocked so that they could not continue to the next page for two minutes. In addition, in experiment 1B, they were asked to read carefully as they would be asked a few test questions about the resume later on.

Participants then saw a short video of the interview process of the candidate. In experiment 1A, the candidate was a man while in experiment 1B, the candidate was a woman. They could press play at any time and repeat the video several times if they wanted. English subtitles were included in the video to make it more understandable as the candidates were from Brazil and English was not their native language. For each experiment, there were two different videos of the candidate; in one the candidate’s attitude is slightly worse than in the other one. In each of the two experiments, participants were randomly assigned to either “Video 1” or “Video 2” (i.e., replicates). The content of all the videos was the same; the questions and answers were almost completely identical. The video lasted around 2 minutes. Again, in order for participants to watch the video carefully, they were warned that follow-up questions would be asked later on and the page was blocked for the length of the video.
After this brief clip, we asked participants if they had been able to watch the entire video and if they experienced any problems with it. A box was available for them to write their answers.

Next, we asked participants to evaluate the candidate by answering the following two questions on an 11-point scale: “How do you evaluate the candidate?” and “How likely are you to hire the candidate?” (-5=“S/he is terrible/Very unlikely to 5=“S/he is excellent/Very likely”). Those two questions formed our main dependent variable—that is the evaluation of the candidate by the recruiter, here, the participants.

In addition, we asked the following open-ended question: “Please explain the reasons for your answers”. At this point, participant had a big box where they were free to write anything they wanted without having a limit of characters. With this question, we hoped to gather some qualitative data that would possibly help us gain some deeper insight regarding what participants thought of the candidate. In addition, this question served as a control question that allowed us to see that participants in fact perceived the resume as being very good, that they had created some expectations from it and that the interview really was perceived as non-enthusiastic. All the comments regarding the resume were very positive, which was mostly described as “outstanding” or “awesome” and the candidate in the interview was often described as having a bad attitude, having no motivation, no enthusiasm or no charisma. Also, many participants in the Resume condition wrote that the resume was great but that the interview was very disappointing, thus letting us think that they had created a high expectation upon seeing the resume.

All those questions were blocked, so that the candidate could not continue without answering all of them.

On a subsequent page, we double-checked, like announced previously, if participants paid careful attention to the video. For this, we asked two questions with two
possible answers for each one. The questions were about what the candidate answered during the interview. We told the participants that for each question, there is one correct and one incorrect answer. Again, the questions were blocked and participants had to respond before being able to move on with the survey.

In experiment 1B only, we decided to add four questions about the resume for participants in the “Resume” condition. They had been told before reading the candidate’s resume that questions about it would be asked later on. The goal was to see how carefully they read it but also to assess how salient it was to them. All four questions had two possible responses, a correct and an incorrect one. In addition, we asked participants to evaluate on a scale from 0 to 100 how important each source of information is to them: the resume and the Interview.

At the end, we asked participants if they experienced any problems during the survey and left a box in which they could respond in length. Finally, beyond gender (i.e., the other critical independent variable), we asked them to answer a few demographic questions like, age, nationality and occupation.

Replication Material

The two surveys of experiment 1A and 1B are presented in the Appendix. The 4 video clips with the interviews can be watched on Qualtrics (links given in the appendix).

SPSS version 20 was used to conduct all the statistical analyses. The databases are available upon request.

RESULTS
Dependent Variable and Manipulation Check

As already pointed out, the dependent variable was the participant’s evaluation of the candidate, measured on a scale from -5 to 5 by having participants respond the following two questions: “How likely are you to hire the candidate?” and “How do you evaluate the candidate?”. After checking for reliability ($\alpha = 0.99$), an evaluation index was created.

As a reminder, we asked participants to answer two test questions about the video and four test questions about the resume to control for whether they had watched the video and read the resume carefully or not.

Six individuals were excluded from the dataset because they clearly did not follow the instructions and responded all six test questions wrong. The results were not affected by this exclusion.

The video replicates did not significantly impact the described results. Therefore, they were collapsed in all subsequent analysis. Given that experiment 1A and 1B were virtually identical to one another, we integrated both experiments in the subsequent analyses whenever possible. That said, we are aware that no random assignment occurred for this variable (i.e., male vs. female candidate). We will discuss the limitation in the general discussion.

Main Findings

On average, a good resume before a non-enthusiastic interview did not affect the recruiter’s evaluation of the candidate neither did it interact with the candidate’s gender. That is, there was no significant difference between the “No Resume” (M=0.38, SD=3.15; n=236) and the “Resume” Condition (M=0.35, SD=3.15; n=209; F(1,145)=0.01, p=0.93) and the null effect emerged independent of whether the candidate was male (experiment
1A) or female (experiment 1B). That is, the interaction term was also non-significant (F(1,445)=2.52, p=0.11). Thus, at first sight, neither **Hypothesis 1A**, that predicted a positive effect of the resume on the evaluation, nor **Hypothesis 1B**, that predicted a negative effect of the resume on the evaluation, was supported.

This result is somewhat surprising as this would mean that participants did not create any expectations upon seeing the good resume as no assimilation nor contrast effect occurred. However, when the recruiter’s gender (that is, the gender of the participant who has been asked to play the role of a recruiter) and the candidate’s gender are taken into consideration, a different picture emerges.

Figure 1 summarizes the main findings by Resume (present vs. absent prior to the interview), recruiter’s gender (male vs. female) and candidate’s gender (male/experiment 1A vs. female/experiment 1B).

*Figure 1. Candidate’s Evaluation as a Function of Resume and Recruiter’s and Candidate’s Gender*
For male recruiters, there was a clear no effect of the resume on evaluation, independent of whether the candidate was male (experiment 1A) or female (experiment 1B). The mean for the “No Resume” condition was slightly lower than for the “Resume” condition, though not significant for both the male candidate (M=1.47, SD=2.84; n=80 vs. M=1.76, SD=2.82; n=67; F(1, 146)=0.39, p=0.53) and the female candidate (M=-1.56, SD=2.59; n=69 vs. M=-1.30, SD=2.62; n=56; F(1, 125)=0.29, p=0.59). The two-way interaction was also non-significant (F(1, 271)=0.00; p=0.95).

For female recruiters, however, the candidate’s resume had a clear significant impact on recruiter’s evaluations. Further, the direction of the effect was moderated by the candidate’s gender. When the candidate was also a female, the good resume (M=-0.93, SD=2.97; n=39) tended to help relative to the No Resume (M=-1.58, SD=2.66; n=39) although it did not reach significance (F(1, 78)=1.01, p=0.32). When the candidate was a male, however, the good resume shown before the non-enthusiastic interview performance had a significant negative effect on female recruiters. The difference between the “No Resume” (M=2.94, SD=1.78; n=48) and the “Resume” conditions (M=1.39, SD=3.05; n=47) was significant (F(1, 95)=9.11, p < 0.01), thereby providing evidence of a contrast effect. The two-way interaction was also significant (F(1,172)=7.30, p<0.01).

Finally, the above effects were qualified by a three-way interaction between the candidate’s gender, the recruiter’s gender, and the Resume/No Resume on the recruiter’s evaluation of the candidate (F(1, 445)=4.43, p=0.04).

Thus, the results above provide partial support for Hypothesis 1B. That is, at least under certain circumstances (i.e., male candidate-female recruiter), a good resume followed
by a non-enthusiastic interview negatively impacted the recruiter’s evaluation of the candidate – that it, a contrast effect was observed.

The results also provide support for Hypothesis 2, which states that the impact of the good resume (and the priors it sets) should be bigger for females than for males, because females process information in a more exhaustive, interpretive way than males, thus being likely to create a stronger prior upon seeing the resume. As figure 1 demonstrates and the statistical analyses described above confirm, the resume has a significant impact among female recruiters but no impact among male recruiters.

This rationale finds support also on female recruiter’s report with respect to the importance of the resume and the interview.

Remember that in experiment 1B, we asked participants to indicate on a 101-point scale how important both the resume and the interview were to them. While there was no significant difference between male recruiters (M=85.37, SD=16.21; n=38) and female recruiters (M=79.93, SD=16.85; n=55) with respect to the interview (F(1,93)=2.42, p=0.12), the results showed that the resume is significantly more important to female recruiters than to male recruiters (M=76.66, SD=16.99; n=38 vs. M=64.71, SD=23.14; n=55; F(1,93)=7.37; p<0.01).

Finally, there was also some support for Hypothesis 3, which states that the direction of the effect should be moderated by matching between the recruiter’s and candidate’s gender. Precisely, contrast is more likely to occur when the recruiter and candidate’s gender do not match whereas assimilation is more likely occur when the recruiter and candidate’s genders match. This phenomenon is observed in the data in situations where the resume has a strong impact on the recruiter’s evaluation (female recruiters). For female recruiters, a contrast effect was observed when they evaluated a male candidate (gender mismatch). However, this effect tended to reverse once they were
evaluating a female candidate (gender match), although, as already reported, it did not reach significance.

These results fit into the similarity-effect literature. According to this effect, women perceive the female candidate as more similar to themselves than the male candidate, thus are more likely to give the female candidate a more favorable evaluation. When evaluating the male candidate, female recruiters that had seen the resume before the poor interview performance gave a much less favorable evaluation to the candidate than did female participants that had seen only the poor performance during the interview. Thus, the resume had a very negative effect on the evaluation of the candidate. Though, when the candidate was a female, the resume’s negative effect disappeared. Thus, we assume that the fact that women identify the female candidate as an “in-group”, with whom they have more similarity, makes up for the disappointment felt upon seeing the bad interview and thus does not result in a worse evaluation than when no expectation was created.

IV. GENERAL DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to assess (a) the impact of a very good resume followed by a non-enthusiastic interview on the recruiter’s evaluation, (b) the role of the recruiter’s gender, (c) the role of gender matching (e.g., female candidate and female recruiter).

Three key findings emerge from this research.

First, in this study, a very good resume before a non-enthusiastic interview, on average, did not affect the recruiter’s evaluation of the candidate neither did it interact with the candidate’s gender.
Second, women process information in a much more exhaustive way and put more importance on the resume than do men, thus are more prone to have their judgment affected by the candidate’s resume. As a result, when the recruiter’s gender was taken into account, an effect of the resume was observed. For male recruiters, there was a clear no effect of the resume on evaluation, independent of whether the candidate was male or female. For female recruiters, however, the candidate’s resume had a clear significant impact on recruiter’s evaluations. When the candidate was also female, the good resume tended to help relative to the No Resume. On the contrary, when the candidate was a male, the good resume had a large negative effect on female recruiters, thereby providing evidence of a contrast effect. Those results support our hypothesis that the impact of the resume is bigger for female than for male recruiters and showed that, at least under certain circumstances (i.e., male candidate-female recruiter), a good resume followed by a non-enthusiastic interview negatively impacted the recruiter’s evaluation of the candidate.

Third and last, in situations where the resume has a strong impact on the recruiter’s evaluation (female recruiters), the direction of the effect was moderated by the candidate’s gender. The similarity effect literature explains that women perceive the female candidate as more similar to themselves than the male candidate, thus are more likely to give the female candidate a more favorable evaluation. Indeed, for female recruiters, a contrast effect was observed when they evaluated a male candidate. However, this effect tended to reverse once they were evaluating a female candidate.

**Managerial Implications**

Some important managerial implications can be drawn from this study.
First, this study shows that the female and male recruiters are impacted differently by a good resume followed by a non-enthusiastic interview, which in turn can have a big impact on the recruiting decisions of a company.

According to the results of this study, a good resume seen before a non-enthusiastic performance interview will bias less a male recruiter’s decision but may have an important impact on female recruiters’ evaluation. Also, while the resume impacted negatively female recruiter’s evaluation when the candidate was male, it tended to have a positive impact when the candidate was female. Thus, in one situation, the resume hurt while in the other, it seemed to help. As such, the outcome, which is of high importance for the company, can turn out very different, depending on the recruiter’s gender and its matching with the candidate’s gender.

In a situation of a good resume followed by a non-enthusiastic interview, both assimilation and contrast biases can potentially have a negative impact for the company.

When assimilation occurs, the recruiter runs the risk of hiring a candidate that is not the best choice for the company because he/she maintains his/her initial good impression even though the candidate had a bad performance during the selection interview, which can be an indicative of how well he or she will perform if hired. In this case, the assimilation bias might lead the recruiter to put aside the poor interview performance and focus solely on the good resume, thus ignoring important information when making his/her hiring decision.

When contrast occurs, the recruiter might turn down a very good candidate with a good resume that could potentially have been a real asset to the company, just because of the non-enthusiastic interview, which might just have been the result of a bad day. Again, this bias then leads the recruiter to magnify the importance of the interview while disconsidering the good resume, which is valuable information.
To remedy this problem, we propose a few solutions:

As expectations created upon seeing a resume can lead to an assimilation or contrast bias, a first possible solution would be to have two recruiters involved in the selection process. A first person could go over the resumes to identify the candidates that fit the requirements of the company, while a second person could then interview the candidates that have been pre-selected. As such, this second recruiter would go in the interview without having any priors or expectation of the candidate.

While this solution might be effective, a company might not always have the necessary human or financial resources to have two recruiters, or might not find it to be in its best interest. Therefore, we believe that a second and better solution would be to make recruiters aware of the biases through training sessions in order for them to be able to avoid wrong decision-making. By clearly explaining the biases and their effects, recruiters can learn to detect them and to avoid them in the future.

A third solution we propose to reduce assimilation and contrast biases is to take into consideration additional information about the candidate when making a hiring decision. In fact, when there is a big discrepancy between a candidate’s resume and his/her interview performance, additional data can help the recruiter determine whether the bad interview performance is the result of a bad day or if it realistically reflects the candidate’s personality and skills. An example of additional data could be a candidate’s references or test scores.

For example, a contrast bias might be less likely to occur if in addition to a very good resume, a candidate also presents good references or good tests scores, thus making it harder for the recruiter to magnify the importance of the bad interview performance and disregard the resume. In the same lines, it would be harder for the recruiter to maintain its
first good impression of the candidate through his/her resume if in addition of a bad interview performance, the candidate also has bad test scores.

LIMITATIONS

The study trades off external validity for internal validity, thus making it hard to generalize the obtained results to similar situations in real interview contexts. Even though we did attempt to create a relatively realistic, and hence, generalizable set of stimuli (e.g., video clips), a study with experienced interviewers evaluating actual applicants in a business setting makes us wonder whether the observed effects would stand up in a real interview context where the stakes are higher and motivations more intense (Sackett, 1982). Although this study permits causal inferences to be drawn, it is uncertain whether the effects are strong enough to influence professional interviewers that are less likely to be biased.

In addition, a few other limitations are worth noting on the methodological front:

First, the recruiters were not randomly assigned to male and female candidates. In fact, all participants in experiment 1A evaluated the male candidate while all participants in experiment 1B evaluated the female candidate. Although, all participants come from the same pool, proper random assignment did not take place. As a result, we incur the risk that the observed effect between treatment groups is due to a characteristic of the individuals in the group rather than linked to the treatment effect.

Second, we observe a big discrepancy between the average evaluation of the male candidate and the average evaluation of the female candidate, for both the “No Resume” and the “Resume” condition. This discrepancy could be caused by gender, but it could also
be caused by the fact that the actress playing the female candidate in the video was less enthusiastic in the videos than actor playing the male candidate or that the participants just liked one candidate better than the other one. Therefore, it is possible that the observed three way interaction might be at least in part driven by differences in the performance of the candidates rather than their gender.

Along the same lines, for the male candidate in the “No Resume” condition, female recruiters rated the candidate on average higher than did male recruiters. When the resume was added, the female recruiter’s evaluation dropped and came closer to the average of male recruiter’s evaluation. The question is then whether this contrast effect would also be observed if the evaluation in the “No Resume” condition had been lower (more similar to the male recruiter’s evaluation), thus leaving less room for the evaluation to drop dramatically.

Finally, although the main properties of the procedure remained unchanged, the questions about the importance of the resume and of the interview were asked only in experiment 1B. Thus, this feedback is not available for experiment 1A, which could have been helpful in explaining differences between the two experiment results.

**FUTURE RESEARCH**

As a final step, we propose some ideas for future research.

First, it would be interesting to replicate the experiments in the real world setting to (a) see if the results hold once we eliminate this study’s lack of consequences for recruiter’s evaluation and hiring decisions and (b) provide a more realistic setting.
Second, a similar experiment with an inverted situation could be an interesting next step: a very mediocre resume could be presented to the recruiters before seeing a great performance during the selection interview. In fact, it happens in recruitment that a candidate is at the limit to pass for the second round but then performs surprisingly well during the selection interview. It would be interesting to observe the effect of such a mediocre resume on recruiter’s evaluation when a great interview follows and see how gender interacts with it.

Finally, two future experiments could help us determine whether the solutions provided in the managerial implication section are valid and potentially could help reduce assimilation and contrast biases.

The first solution proposed in the managerial implications section was to provide recruiters with training to help them identify and avoid biases. An experiment in the lab or in a real setting could be done to test this hypothesis. While in one condition, participants would be provided with the same procedure as this current study, a five minute lecture explaining how the biases occur and how they can be avoided could be added before the interview in the other condition. It would then be possible to analyze whether the lecture, representing the training, reduced assimilation and contrast biases. The same experiment could be done in a real work setting with real training, to see if the results hold. If training effects can be demonstrated, it would be interesting to have a longitudinal study to see if the effects hold over time or are merely ephemeral.

The second solution proposed to reduce assimilation and contrast biases was to analyze additional data when making hiring decisions. To test for this, we could have an experiment where in one condition participants are provided with the same procedure as this current study, while in the other conditions, participants would be provided with an additional information about the candidate, like the result of a test score or a reference
letter. We could then analyze if this additional piece of information manages to reduce the bias or not.
APPENDIX

SURVEY LINKS:

Experiment 1: https://fgvsocial.co1.qualtrics.com/SE/?SID=SV_6xQ6wXyUKCKNH1z

Experiment 2: https://fgvsocial.co1.qualtrics.com/SE/?SID=SV_6LtMdZqh851UqlIR
EXPERIMENT 1:

STATEMENT OF INFORMED CONSENT

Study about Recruitment

The main purpose of this study is to better understand recruitment processes.

Your participation in this research consists of responding to some questions about a candidate who is applying to a job.

The study will take about 10 to 15 minutes and you will receive $0.40 for your participation.

Your answers will be treated anonymously and will be kept confidential, that is, in no time your name will be published at any stage of the study. The data collected will be used exclusively for this research and for the results published in events and/or scientific journals.

Your participation is voluntary and you can give up and withdraw your consent to participate at any time.

There are no significant risks of any kind related to your participation in this study.

Aurélie Schleich
aurelie.schleich@fgvmail.br
MSc & PhD Program
FGV/EBAPE

By clicking on the next button, you declare to be aware of the full content of this CONSENT AGREEMENT and agree to participate in the proposed study, knowing that you can give up at any time.
Imagine the following scenario:

“You work as a recruiter in the Human Resources department of a medium-sized telecommunication company in São Paulo, Brazil. Your company needs to hire new Sales Representatives to join the existing sales team, and you are in charge of the selection process.”

The company wants to hire Sales Representatives that have great people skills, are motivated, passionate, and that are team-players. They should have experience in Sales and any language besides English is considered an advantage.

On the next page, you will see a short part of the selection interview of a candidate that applied for the Sales Representative position. This candidate’s name is Paulo Carvalho Sousa, he is Brazilian and 31 years old.

The CV of the candidate is available to you below. Please read it carefully before moving on to the video of his selection interview.
Paulo CARVALHO SOUSA
Brazilian, 31 years old, from São Paulo

WORK EXPERIENCE

2013-2013 Inside Sales Representative – Samsung Electronics – São Paulo, Brazil
• Built and managed account base for medium and large businesses in Latin America and Western Europe
• Predicted future market trends and implemented strategies accordingly
• Maintained contact strategy that ensured good customer follow-up

2006 – 2010 Sales Representative – Allianz – Munich, Germany
• Managed territory for more than 450 clients and 100 CPA firms
• Built long-term business relationships and charged of customer support
• Identified and maximized revenues from existing customer accounts
• Monitored Competition and analyzed competitor activity

ACHIEVEMENTS

+ Consistently exceeded sales by 35% from 2010 to 2013, earning recognition as one of the top 3 representatives (out of 250).
+ Account opener of the year in 2009 (92 new accounts both domestically and internationally).
+ Served as integral member of team that delivered single-year sales increase of 18%, benchmarking year-end revenues of $5.25M in 2007.

EDUCATION AND TRAINING

2012-2013 New York University: Executive MBA
2009 4 months training in Sales and Leadership in Tokyo
2008 6 months training in Sales and Customer Service in Toronto and Indiana
2001-2004 London Metropolitan University: BA in Sales and Marketing

LANGUAGES AND IT

Languages: Portuguese (Native), English (Fluent), French (Fluent), Spanish (Fluent)
IT: Microsoft Pack, Outlook, AS400, SAP - Sales and Marketing Module

OTHER INTERESTS

Participation in Associations, Travels, Literature Ancient History, Politics, Cinema, Judo, Tennis
Click on play to watch the short part of the selection interview of the candidate. We will ask some questions about the video below to make sure you understood it. Also, you will be able to continue to the next page only after 2 minutes.

Were you able to watch the entire video clip with the interview?

- Yes
- No

Did you experience any problems with the video?
Now, please evaluate the candidate by answering the following questions:

How likely are you to hire the candidate?

[Slider with -5 to 5 scale]

How do you evaluate the candidate?

[Slider with -5 to 5 scale]

Please explain the reasons for your answers:

[Text box]
Now we would like to double-check if you have watched/listened to the interview carefully. So, please answer the two questions below. For each of these two questions, there is one correct and one incorrect answer.

How was the candidate's previous job?
- His job was completely different than the one he is applying to
- His job was very similar to the one he is applying to

Does the candidate consider himself a team player?
- No, he prefers working on his own
- Yes, he never had any major problem in the past when working with teams

Please answer a few more questions below:
How would you evaluate yourself as a recruiter?

- I am/would be a very good recruiter
- I am/would be a good recruiter
- I am/would be an average recruiter
- I am/would be a bad recruiter
- I am/would be a very bad recruiter

How confident do you feel about your evaluation of the candidate?

Not confident at all

-6  -5  -4  -3  -2  -1  0  1  2  3  4  5

Very confident

Did you experience any problems during this survey?
To finish, please answer a few demographic questions:

Gender

- Male
- Female

Age

[Input field]

Nationality

[Input field]

Occupation

[Input field]

Thanks for your participation.

Type the following code on Mechanical Turk to validate your HIT: R_72s12aKMIk6kFw1
EXPERIMENT 2:

STATEMENT OF INFORMED CONSENT

Study about Recruitment

The main purpose of this study is to better understand recruitment processes.

Your participation in this research consists of responding to some questions about a candidate who is applying to a job.

The study will take about 10 to 15 minutes and you will receive $0.50 for your participation.

Your answers will be treated anonymously and will be kept confidential, that is, in no time your name will be published at any stage of the study. The data collected will be used exclusively for this research and for the results published in events and/or scientific journals.

Your participation is voluntary and you can give up and withdraw your consent to participate at any time.

There are no significant risks of any kind related to your participation in this study.

Aurélie Schleich
aurelie.schleich@fgvmail.br
MSc & PhD Program
FGV/EBAPE

By clicking on the next button, you declare to be aware of the full content of this CONSENT AGREEMENT and agree to participate in the proposed study, knowing that you can give up at any time.
Imagine the following scenario:

“You work as a recruiter in the Human Resources department of a medium-sized telecommunication company in São Paulo, Brazil. Your company needs to hire new Sales Representatives to join the existing sales team, and you are in charge of the selection process.”

The company wants to hire Sales Representatives that have great people skills, are motivated, passionate, and that are team players. They should have experience in Sales and any language besides English is considered an advantage.

On the next page, you will see a short part of the selection interview of a candidate that applied for the Sales Representative position.

This candidate's name is Marianna Carvalho Sousa, she is Brazilian and 31 years old.

The CV of the candidate is available to you below.

Please read it carefully. You will be asked questions about it later on.
Marianna CARVALHO SOUSA
Brazilian, 31 years old, from São Paulo

WORK EXPERIENCE

2010-2013  Inside Sales Representative – Samsung Electronics – São Paulo, Brazil
- Built and managed account base for medium and large businesses in Latin America and Western Europe
- Predicted future market trends and implemented strategies accordingly
- Maintained contact strategy that ensured good customer follow-up.

2006 – 2010  Sales Representative – Allianz – Munich, Germany
- Managed territory for more than 450 clients and 100 CPA firms
- Built long-term business relationships and charged of customer support
- Identified and maximized revenues from existing customer accounts
- Monitored Competition and analyzed competitor activity

ACHIEVEMENTS

- Consistently exceeded sales by 35% from 2010 to 2013, earning recognition as one of the top 3 representatives (out of 250).
- Account opener of the year in 2009 (92 new accounts both domestically and internationally).
- Served as integral member of team that delivered single-year sales increase of 18%, benchmarking year-end revenues of $5.25M in 2007.

EDUCATION AND TRAINING

2010-2012  New York University: Executive MBA
2009     4 months training in Sales and Leadership in Tokyo
2008     6 months training in Sales and Customer Service in Toronto and Indiana
2001-2004  London Metropolitan University: BA in Sales and Marketing

LANGUAGES AND IT

Languages:  Portuguese (Native), English (Fluent), French (Fluent), Spanish (Fluent)
IT:  Microsoft Pacak, Outlook, AS400, SAP - Sales and Marketing Module

OTHER INTERESTS

Participation in Associations, Travels, Literature, Ancient History, Politics, Cinema, Judo, Tennis
Click on play to watch the short part of the selection interview of the candidate. We will ask some questions about the video below to make sure you understood it. Also, you will be able to continue to the next page only after 2 minutes.

As I said before, it is pretty similar to my previous job and I had some good results at it.

Were you able to watch the entire video clip with the interview?

- Yes
- No

Did you experience any problems with the video?


Now, please evaluate the candidate by answering the following questions:

How do you evaluate the candidate?

She is terrible She is excellent

-5 -4 -3 -2 -1 0 1 2 3 4 5

How likely are you to hire the candidate?

Very unlikely Very likely

-5 -4 -3 -2 -1 0 1 2 3 4 5

Please explain the reasons for your answers
Now we would like to double-check if you have watched/listened to the interview carefully. So, please answer the two questions below. For each of these two question, there is one correct and one incorrect answer.

How was the candidate's previous job?
- Her job was completely different than the one she is applying to
- Her job was very similar to the one she is applying to

Does the candidate consider herself a team player?
- No, she prefers working on her own
- Yes, she never had any major problem in the past when working with teams

Now we would like to double-check if you have read the CV carefully. Please answer the questions below. For each of the first four questions, there is one correct and one incorrect answer. The last questions is subjective, there is no right or wrong answer.

In what companies did the candidate work in the past?
- Samsung & Allianz
- Google & ING
Where did the candidate complete her MBA?

- Cornell University
- New York University

What is one of the candidate’s achievements listed on her CV?

- She consistently exceeded Sales by 5% in the last 3 years
- She consistently exceeded Sales by 35% in the last 3 years

How many languages does the candidate speak?

- 2
- 4

When evaluating this candidate, how important was each source of information to you?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Not Important at all</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To finish, please answer a few demographic questions:

Gender

- Male
- Female

Age


Nationality


Occupation


Did you experience any problems during this survey?

Thanks for your participation
Type the following code on mechanical Turk to validate your HIT: R_3UDy0b2hTM@5CR
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