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Introduction

- The Entry-Level Applicant Job Skills Survey sought to better understand the skills most commonly assessed in the hiring/selection process of entry-level job candidates, especially “soft skills” such as communication, dependability and reliability, integrity, and adaptability.

- According to the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, there were 15 million job openings in the U.S. in December of 2015, while the unemployment rate was 4.9%. Many of those jobs continue to be left unfilled. Much has been published about the gap between the skills/competencies employers are looking for and the skills job applicants possess.

- The results of this survey provide a better understanding of what skills are being assessed by employers, and how they are being assessed, in order to guide educators in preparing individuals for entering the workforce, especially those who have historically encountered obstacles to entry-level employment.
Skills

• The Entry-Level Applicant Job Skills Survey assessed 15 skills employers commonly look for in entry-level applicants. For the purposes of this study, the term “skill” is used to refer to skills, competencies and attributes.

• The skills assessed include the following:
  » Integrity
  » Initiative
  » Dependability and reliability
  » Adaptability
  » Professionalism
  » Customer focus
  » Teamwork
  » Oral communication
  » Written communication
  » Reading comprehension
  » Respect
  » Critical thinking
  » Mathematics (computation)
  » Planning and organization
  » Creativity/innovation
• More than four-fifths of HR professionals indicated that dependability and reliability (97%), integrity (87%), respect (84%) and teamwork (83%) were very or extremely important when determining whether an applicant possessed the necessary qualifications to be hired into an entry-level position. About one-fifth indicated creativity/innovation (19%) and mathematics (computation) (22%) were not at all or only slightly important for entry-level positions; few (0%-9%) indicated the remaining 13 skills assessed were not at all or only slightly valuable.

• One-half to three-fifths of HR professionals indicated that adaptability (62%), initiative (49%) and critical thinking (49%) would become more important for entry-level job candidates to possess in the next three to five years. Nine percent indicated mathematics (computation) would become less important in the next three to five years; 5% or less indicated the other 14 skills assessed would become less important in the next three to five years.

• More than three-fourths (78%) of HR professionals indicated that dependability/reliability was one of the three most important skills for entry-level positions. About one-half (49%) indicated integrity was one of the three most important skills, and more than one-third said the same about teamwork (36%).
The vast majority (95% to 100%) of HR professionals indicated the general definitions for entry-level job skills provided in the survey were consistent with their organization’s definitions, except for initiative (85%) and customer focus (67%).

- Oral communication – 100%
- Teamwork – 100%
- Respect – 99%
- Integrity – 97%
- Critical thinking – 97%
- Adaptability – 96%
- Professionalism – 96%
- Dependability and reliability – 95%
- Initiative – 85%
- Customer focus – 67%

On average, about three-quarters of HR professionals indicated that entry-level job applicants possessed the desired level of integrity (75%) and teamwork (73%) skills. About two-thirds reported entry-level job applicants possessed the desired level of respect (69%), dependability and reliability (68%), professionalism (67%), customer focus (67%), initiative (65%), and adaptability (64%); 55% possessed the desired level of critical thinking skills.

The majority of HR professionals indicated their organizations used in-person interviews (95%), applications (87%) and resumes (86%) throughout the hiring/selection process of entry-level job applicants. Few said that their organizations used personality tests (13%), cognitive ability tests (10%), online interviews (4%), references (3%) or online simulation (2%).

It is noteworthy that even though applications and resumes are two of the most commonly used methods in the hiring/selection process of entry-level job applicants, few HR professionals indicated they were very or extremely confident in these methods to accurately assess various skills (4%-12% and 4%-13%, respectively).
Key Findings (continued)

- Overall, one-fifth (20%) of HR professionals were very or extremely confident in their organization’s ability to effectively assess the skills of entry-level applicants; 11% were not at all confident or only slightly confident.

- Not knowing enough about the applicant was the most commonly reported concern in assessing the following skills during the job application selection process: integrity (48%), respect (45%), dependability and reliability (44%), initiative (40%), and adaptability (39%). Being able to easily fake a particular skill was also a common concern for assessing several skills: respect (49%), teamwork (46%), customer focus (44%), dependability and reliability (38%), integrity (36%), and initiative (34%).

- About one-half (47%) of HR professionals indicated that a completion of a career-related internship by an entry-level applicant was very or extremely valuable in demonstrating that the applicant was a strong candidate; about two-fifths (39%) indicated the same for holding or having held a job outside of the school system.

- The majority of HR professionals indicated their organizations used employee referrals (87%) and their organization’s web/career site (72%) to identify potential entry-level job applicants; about one-half used job fairs (53%), school recruiting (49%) and LinkedIn (49%). Few used Twitter (8%), Google+ (4%), YouTube (1%), Pinterest (0%) and FourSquare (0%) to identify potential entry-level job applicants.
• **About three-fifths of HR professionals indicated their organizations did not use selection tests in the hiring process of entry-level applicants.** Among HR professionals who worked for organizations that did use selection tests, the vast majority (84%) reported using the results of selection tests as one piece of data in the hiring decision; 29% used them for developmental purposes once the candidate began the job. Less than one-quarter indicated using them for other reasons.

• **Fifteen percent of HR professionals were familiar with the use of “big data” and machine learning algorithms to screen/hire job applicants; 30% were somewhat familiar.** Just 4% were currently using this kind of approach to screen/hire job applicants; 15% were considering using this approach.

  » When asked what factored into their organization’s decision to use, or consider using, a “big data” or machine algorithm approach to screen/hire job applicants, about one-third (34%) indicated their organizations needed a better way to screen large volumes of job applicants or had a desire to be innovative and create a more job-applicant-friendly experience (32%).

• **Twelve percent of HR professionals were familiar with the use of gamification to screen/hire job applicants; 23% were somewhat familiar.** Just 1% were currently using this kind of approach to screen/hire job applicants; 11% were considering using this approach.
What Do These Findings Mean for the HR Profession?

- **HR professionals have an important insight into the skill levels of the labor market due to their central role in the recruiting process—and a growing number report skills gaps across industries.** Recent SHRM research published in the New Talent Landscape report shows HR professionals are finding it increasingly difficult to fill open positions. Shortages are being reported across the labor market in soft skills and applied skills, such as critical thinking and problem solving. Lack of experience on the job may make it harder for the newest entrants to the labor market to acquire such skills without training and development opportunities on the job or targeted educational efforts.

- **HR’s organizational culture building efforts may need to be increasingly focused on the issues of respect and integrity.** Building a respectful culture is reflected in the focus HR professionals place on dependability and reliability, integrity, respect, and teamwork when seeking to fill entry-level positions. SHRM research on employee job satisfaction has found that respectful treatment of all employees at all levels is the top employee job satisfaction factor. Trust between employees and senior leaders is also among the top contributors to job satisfaction.

- **Innovative HR professionals will continue to look for more reliable and unbiased methods of assessing entry-level job applicants, especially in relation to personal qualities such as integrity, teamwork and respect.** Although many HR professionals report that entry-level job applicants possess these skills, there will be a continued drive to improve hiring processes that further enhance new-hire job performance.
• **Dissatisfaction with current assessment methods leaves the door open for new approaches to take hold—but only if they are found to be effective.** Although applications and resumes are two of the most commonly used methods in the hiring/selection process of entry-level job applicants, few HR professionals endorsed each as very or extremely effective for assessing various skills. In addition, only one-fifth of HR professionals were very or extremely confident in their organization’s ability to effectively assess the skills of entry-level applicants. This indicates a need for new and more effective approaches.

• **Improvements in the use of predictive data modeling and assessment technologies could influence the methods HR professionals use to evaluate candidates for entry-level and other jobs.** Although few HR professionals indicated that their organizations currently used data-based assessment methods such as personality and cognitive tests or simulations, the use of these tools may grow in the future.

• **The growing use of data analysis across business functions is likely to generate an expectation among C-suite leaders that HR can and should also harness data to improve decision-making.** Although only 15% of HR professionals were familiar with the use of “big data” and machine learning algorithms to screen/hire job applicants and only 12% were familiar with the use of gamification to screen/hire job applicants, the need for better ways of screening large volumes of job applicants and creating a more job-applicant-friendly experience is encouraging more organizations to consider the use of such technologies. Other factors that could drive this trend are reduced costs and improvements in service-providers’ ability to demonstrate the predictive capacity and a strong return on investment of such technologies.
What Do These Findings Mean for the HR Profession? (continued)

- **Although technology, especially social media, is increasing the availability of publicly accessible information about entry-level candidates, legal concerns will continue to inhibit the use of such sources in assessing candidates.** Even though not knowing enough about an applicant was the most commonly reported concern in assessing a range of candidate qualities/skills such as integrity, respect, and dependability and reliability, seeking out additional information from other sources beyond in-person interviews, applications and resumes may continue to be discouraged in many organizations.

- **Career-related internships will continue to be important gateways to employment for entry-level job applicants.** The strong advantages enjoyed by those who can secure such opportunities will lend further weight to concerns around advantage gaps. New entrants to the labor force who lack the financial safety net needed to take on unpaid or low-paid internships may find it more difficult to secure many entry-level positions. Strong reliance on employee referrals is another factor that could play into this debate, which has implications for diversity and equal opportunity.
Entry-Level Job Skills
Importance of Skills for Entry-Level Positions

- Dependability and reliability: 97% (Very or extremely important), 3% (Moderately important or important), 0% (Not at all or slightly important)
- Integrity: 87% (Very or extremely important), 13% (Moderately important or important), 0% (Not at all or slightly important)
- Respect: 84% (Very or extremely important), 16% (Moderately important or important), 0% (Not at all or slightly important)
- Teamwork: 83% (Very or extremely important), 16% (Moderately important or important), 1% (Not at all or slightly important)
- Customer focus: 78% (Very or extremely important), 20% (Moderately important or important), 3% (Not at all or slightly important)
- Initiative: 73% (Very or extremely important), 26% (Moderately important or important), 1% (Not at all or slightly important)
- Adaptability: 71% (Very or extremely important), 29% (Moderately important or important), 1% (Not at all or slightly important)
- Professionalism: 64% (Very or extremely important), 33% (Moderately important or important), 3% (Not at all or slightly important)

Note: n = 509-518. Respondents who indicated “Don’t know”/“No opinion” were not included in this analysis. Percentages may not total 100% due to rounding. The scale consisted of six response options from “Not at all important” to “Extremely important”; response options were combined for the purposes of analysis.
Importance of Skills for Entry-Level Positions (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skill</th>
<th>Very or extremely important</th>
<th>Moderately important or important</th>
<th>Not at all or slightly important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oral communication</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading comprehension</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical thinking</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written communication</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and organization</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creativity/innovation</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics (computation)</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: n = 509-518. Respondents who indicated “Don’t know”/“No opinion” were not included in this analysis. The scale consisted of six response options from “Not at all important” to “Extremely important”; response options were combined for the purposes of analysis.
Most Important Skills for Entry-Level Positions

- **Dependability and reliability**: 78%
- **Integrity**: 49%
- **Teamwork**: 36%
- **Customer focus**: 30%
- **Initiative**: 24%
- **Professionalism**: 20%
- **Adaptability**: 15%
- **Respect**: 14%
- **Critical thinking**: 8%
- **Oral communication**: 7%
- **Planning and organization**: 6%
- **Written communication**: 3%
- **Reading comprehension**: 2%
- **Creativity/innovation**: 1%
- **Mathematics (computation)**: 1%

Note: n = 514. Respondents were asked to select the three skills they believed were most important when hiring for an entry-level position.
Change in Importance of Skills for Entry-Level Positions in the Next Three to Five Years

- **Adaptability**: 62% More important, 38% No change, 0% Less important
- **Initiative**: 49% More important, 50% No change, 1% Less important
- **Critical thinking**: 49% More important, 50% No change, 1% Less important
- **Creativity/innovation**: 46% More important, 50% No change, 4% Less important
- **Customer focus**: 45% More important, 53% No change, 2% Less important
- **Respect**: 44% More important, 56% No change, 0% Less important
- **Teamwork**: 43% More important, 56% No change, 1% Less important
- **Dependability and reliability**: 39% More important, 60% No change, 0% Less important
- **Planning and organization**: 38% More important, 60% No change, 3% Less important
- **Integrity**: 34% More important, 65% No change, 1% Less important
- **Oral communication**: 32% More important, 65% No change, 3% Less important
- **Written communication**: 29% More important, 67% No change, 3% Less important
- **Reading comprehension**: 25% More important, 72% No change, 3% Less important
- **Professionalism**: 23% More important, 71% No change, 5% Less important
- **Mathematics (computation)**: 13% More important, 78% No change, 9% Less important

*Note: n = 433-441. Percentages may not total 100% due to rounding.*
HR professionals were asked to rate the accuracy of each definition statement (according to their organization’s definition) for the three skills they identified as the most important when hiring for an entry-level position. The general definition provided in the survey is shown in bold text in the slides that follow.¹

¹Note that the following skills were not reportable (NR) due to few respondents indicating that they were one of the three most important skills when hiring for an entry-level position: written communication, reading comprehension, mathematics (computation), planning & organization, and creativity/innovation.
Integrity: Consistency of Definition Statements With Organizations’ Definitions

- **Treat others with honesty, fairness and respect**
  - Yes: 97%
  - Somewhat: 2%
  - No: 1%

- **Accept responsibility for one’s decisions and actions**
  - Yes: 93%
  - Somewhat: 6%
  - No: 0%

- **Demonstrate respect for the organization’s time and property**
  - Yes: 87%
  - Somewhat: 12%
  - No: 2%

Note: n = 241-242. Respondents who indicated “Not sure” were not included in this analysis. Percentages may not total 100% due to rounding.
Initiative: Consistency of Definition Statements With Organizations’ Definitions

- **Pursue work with energy, drive and effort to accomplish tasks**
  - Yes: 90%
  - Somewhat: 7%
  - No: 3%

- **Demonstrate a willingness to work and seek out new work challenges**
  - Yes: 85%
  - Somewhat: 13%
  - No: 2%

- **Strive to exceed standards and expectations**
  - Yes: 84%
  - Somewhat: 13%
  - No: 3%

- **Take initiative in seeking out new responsibilities and work challenges, increasing the variety and scope of one’s job**
  - Yes: 74%
  - Somewhat: 22%
  - No: 4%

- **Establish and maintain personally challenging but realistic work goals**
  - Yes: 69%
  - Somewhat: 23%
  - No: 9%

Note: n = 108-115. Percentages may not total 100% due to rounding. Respondents who indicated “Not sure” were not included in this analysis.
### Dependability and Reliability: Consistency of Definition Statements With Organizations’ Definitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavior</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate regular and punctual attendance</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Display responsible behaviors at work</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fulfill obligations, complete assignments and meet deadlines</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comply with rules, policies and procedures</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow written and verbal directions</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behave consistently, predictably and reliably</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: n = 375-389. Percentages may not total 100% due to rounding. Respondents who indicated “Not sure” were not included in this analysis.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Yes (%)</th>
<th>Somewhat (%)</th>
<th>No (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Display the capability to adapt to new, different or changing</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>requirements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be open to learning and considering new ways of doing things</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embrace new approaches when appropriate and discard approaches that</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are no longer working</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectively change plans, goals, actions or priorities to deal</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with changing situations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actively seek out and carefully consider the merits of new</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>approaches to work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: n = 73-74. Respondents who indicated “Not sure” were not included in this analysis.*
Maintain a professional appearance and demeanor at work

- Demonstrate self-control by maintaining composure and keeping emotions in check even in difficult situations
  - Yes: 96%
  - Somewhat: 4%
  - No: 0%

- Use professional language when speaking with supervisors, co-workers and customers
  - Yes: 94%
  - Somewhat: 6%
  - No: 0%

- Take ownership of one's work
  - Yes: 91%
  - Somewhat: 6%
  - No: 3%

- Maintain a positive attitude
  - Yes: 91%
  - Somewhat: 7%
  - No: 2%

- Maintain professional appearance by dressing appropriately for the job and maintaining personal hygiene
  - Yes: 90%
  - Somewhat: 9%
  - No: 1%

Note: n = 96-101. Respondents who indicated “Not sure” were not included in this analysis.
Customer Focus: Consistency of Definition Statements With Organizations’ Definitions

- Be pleasant, courteous and professional when dealing with internal and external customers or clients: 98% Yes, 1% Somewhat, 1% No
- Provide personalized service with prompt and efficient responses to meet the requirements, requests and concern of customers or clients: 97% Yes, 3% Somewhat, 1% No
- Understand and anticipate customer needs: 88% Yes, 11% Somewhat, 1% No
- Actively look for ways to identify market demands and meet customer or client needs: 67% Yes, 20% Somewhat, 13% No
- Evaluate customer or client satisfaction: 65% Yes, 24% Somewhat, 10% No

Note: n = 139-145. Percentages may not total 100% due to rounding. Respondents who indicated “Not sure” were not included in this analysis.
Teamwork: Consistency of Definition Statements With Organizations’ Definitions

Demonstrate the ability to work effectively with others

- Interact professionally and respectfully with supervisors and co-workers: 98% Yes, 2% Somewhat, 1% No
- Develop constructive working relationships and maintain them over time: 95% Yes, 4% Somewhat, 1% No
- Establish a high degree of trust and credibility with others: 94% Yes, 5% Somewhat, 2% No
- Use appropriate strategies and solutions for dealing with conflicts and differences to maintain a smooth workflow: 88% Yes, 8% Somewhat, 4% No

Note: n = 176-179. Percentages may not total 100% due to rounding. Respondents who indicated “Not sure” were not included in this analysis.
Oral Communication: Consistency of Definition Statements With Organizations’ Definitions

- Clearly communicate thoughts, ideas and information orally: 100%
- Speak in a logical, organized and coherent manner: 94%, 6%, 0%
- Provide appropriate level of detail for the situation and audience: 94%, 6%, 0%
- Listen to and consider others' viewpoints: 94%, 6%, 0%

Note: n = 32-33. Respondents who indicated “Not sure” were not included in this analysis.
Respect: Consistency of Definition Statements With Organizations’ Definitions

- Work effectively with those who have diverse backgrounds and/or opinions: 99% Yes, 1% Somewhat, 0% No
- Demonstrate sensitivity and respect for the opinions, perspectives, customs and individual differences of others: 99% Yes, 1% Somewhat, 0% No
- Be flexible and open-minded when dealing with a wide range of people: 96% Yes, 4% Somewhat, 0% No
- Value diversity of approaches and ideas: 91% Yes, 6% Somewhat, 3% No

Note: n = 69. Respondents who indicated “Not sure” were not included in this analysis.
Critical Thinking: Consistency of Definition Statements With Organizations’ Definitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Critically review, analyze, synthesize, compare and interpret information</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use logical thought processes to analyze and draw conclusions</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify inconsistent or missing information</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draw conclusions from relevant and/or missing information</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test possible hypotheses to ensure the problem is correctly diagnosed and the best solution is found</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: n = 38. Respondents who indicated “Not sure” were not included in this analysis.
Percentage of Entry-Level Job Applicants That Possess Desired Level of Most Important Skills

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skill</th>
<th>0%-24%</th>
<th>25%-49%</th>
<th>50%-74%</th>
<th>75%-100%</th>
<th>Weighted Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Integrity</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teamwork</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependability and reliability</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionalism</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer focus</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiative</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaptability</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical thinking</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: n = 36,349. Percentages may not total 100% due to rounding. Respondents who indicated “Don’t know” were not included in this analysis. Data are sorted by weighted average. Note that the following skills were not reportable (NR) due to few respondents indicating that they were one of the three most important skills when hiring for an entry-level position: oral communication, written communication, reading comprehension, mathematics (computation), planning & organization, and creativity/innovation.
Methods Used to Assess Skills
Methods Used Throughout Hiring/Selection Process of Entry-Level Job Applicants

- In-person interview: 95%
- Application: 87%
- Resume: 86%
- Telephone screen: 58%
- Phone interview: 48%
- Panel interview: 42%
- Situational judgement test: 28%
- Personality test: 13%
- Cognitive ability test: 10%
- Online interview: 4%
- References: 3%
- Online simulation: 2%
- Other: 8%

* The response option was developed from open-ended responses.
Note: n = 473. Percentages do not total 100% due to multiple response options.
Confidence in Methods to Accurately Assess Skills of Entry-Level Job Applicants

HR professionals were asked to indicate their confidence in the methods used by their organization to accurately assess the skills of entry-level job applicants during the selection process.¹

¹Note that results for the following skills were not reportable (NR) due to few respondents indicating that they were one of the three most important skills when hiring for an entry-level position: oral communication, written communication, reading comprehension, mathematics (computation), planning & organization, and creativity/innovation.
Confidence in Methods to Accurately Assess Integrity in Entry-Level Job Applicants

- **Situational judgement test**: 48% Very or extremely confident, 49% Moderately confident or confident, 3% Not at all or slightly confident
- **Panel interview**: 44% Very or extremely confident, 51% Moderately confident or confident, 5% Not at all or slightly confident
- **In-person interview**: 38% Very or extremely confident, 58% Moderately confident or confident, 4% Not at all or slightly confident
- **Phone interview**: 15% Very or extremely confident, 62% Moderately confident or confident, 23% Not at all or slightly confident
- **Telephone screen**: 13% Very or extremely confident, 56% Moderately confident or confident, 31% Not at all or slightly confident
- **Application**: 10% Very or extremely confident, 43% Moderately confident or confident, 47% Not at all or slightly confident
- **Resume**: 7% Very or extremely confident, 44% Moderately confident or confident, 49% Not at all or slightly confident

**Note**: n = 67-209. Respondents who indicated “Don’t know” or “No opinion” were not included in this analysis. Only respondents who indicated integrity was on of the top three most important skills when hiring for an entry-level position were asked this question. Online interview, personality test, cognitive ability test, online simulation and “other” were not reportable due a low response count (n < 30). The scale consisted of six response options from “Not at all confident” to “Extremely confident”; response options were combined for the purposes of analysis.
## Confidence in Methods to Accurately Assess Initiative in Entry-Level Job Applicants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Very or extremely confident</th>
<th>Moderately confident or confident</th>
<th>Not at all or slightly confident</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Panel interview</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-person interview</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone interview</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone screen</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resume</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: n = 37-102. Percentages may not total 100% due to rounding. Respondents who indicated “Don’t know” / “No opinion” were not included in this analysis. Only respondents who indicated initiative was one of the top three most important skills when hiring for an entry-level position were asked this question. Online interview, personality test, situational judgement test, cognitive ability test, online simulation and “other” were not reportable due a low response count (n < 30). The scale consisted of six response options from “Not at all confident” to “Extremely confident”; response options were combined for the purposes of analysis.*
Confidence in Methods to Accurately Assess Dependability and Reliability in Entry-Level Job Applicants

- Panel interview: 39% Very or extremely confident, 51% Moderately confident or confident, 10% Not at all or slightly confident
- Personality test: 37% Very or extremely confident, 51% Moderately confident or confident, 12% Not at all or slightly confident
- In-person interview: 32% Very or extremely confident, 56% Moderately confident or confident, 11% Not at all or slightly confident
- Situational judgment test: 26% Very or extremely confident, 63% Moderately confident or confident, 11% Not at all or slightly confident
- Phone interview: 19% Very or extremely confident, 62% Moderately confident or confident, 19% Not at all or slightly confident
- Telephone screen: 14% Very or extremely confident, 59% Moderately confident or confident, 27% Not at all or slightly confident
- Resume: 9% Very or extremely confident, 44% Moderately confident or confident, 46% Not at all or slightly confident
- Online simulation test: 9% Very or extremely confident, 63% Moderately confident or confident, 29% Not at all or slightly confident
- Application: 8% Very or extremely confident, 46% Moderately confident or confident, 47% Not at all or slightly confident

Note: n = 352. Percentages may not total 100% due to rounding. Respondents who indicated “Don’t know” / “No opinion” were not included in this analysis. Only respondents who indicated dependability and reliability were one of the top three most important skills when hiring for an entry-level position were asked this question. Online interview, personality test, situational judgement test, cognitive ability test, online simulation and “other” were not reportable due a low response count (n < 30). The scale consisted of six response options from “Not at all confident” to “Extremely confident”; response options were combined for the purposes of analysis.
Confidence in Methods to Accurately Assess Adaptability in Entry-Level Job Applicants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Very or extremely confident</th>
<th>Moderately confident or confident</th>
<th>Not at all or slightly confident</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In-person interview</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone interview</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone screen</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resume</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: n = 31-65. Percentages may not total 100% due to rounding. Respondents who indicated “Don’t know” / “No opinion” were not included in this analysis. Only respondents who indicated adaptability was one of the top three most important skills when hiring for an entry-level position were asked this question. Online interview, telephone screen, personality test, situational judgement test, cognitive ability test, online simulation and “other” were not reportable due a low response count (n < 30). The scale consisted of six response options from “Not at all confident” to “Extremely confident”; response options were combined for the purposes of analysis.
Confidence in Methods to Accurately Assess Professionalism in Entry-Level Job Applicants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Very or extremely confident</th>
<th>Moderately confident or confident</th>
<th>Not at all or slightly confident</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Panel interview</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-person interview</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situational judgement test</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone interview</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone screen</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resume</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: n = 30-90. Respondents who indicated “Don’t know”/“No opinion” were not included in this analysis. Only respondents who indicated professionalism was one of the top three most important skills when hiring for an entry-level position were asked this question. Online interview, personality test, cognitive ability test, online simulation and “other” were not reportable due a low response count (n < 30). The scale consisted of six response options from “Not at all confident” to “Extremely confident”; response options were combined for the purposes of analysis.
Confidence in Methods to Accurately Assess Customer Focus in Entry-Level Job Applicants

- Situational judgement test: 46% Very or extremely confident, 46% Moderately confident or confident, 8% Not at all or slightly confident
- Panel interview: 47% Very or extremely confident, 42% Moderately confident or confident, 11% Not at all or slightly confident
- In-person interview: 38% Very or extremely confident, 56% Moderately confident or confident, 6% Not at all or slightly confident
- Phone interview: 33% Very or extremely confident, 53% Moderately confident or confident, 14% Not at all or slightly confident
- Telephone screen: 20% Very or extremely confident, 60% Moderately confident or confident, 21% Not at all or slightly confident
- Resume: 9% Very or extremely confident, 50% Moderately confident or confident, 41% Not at all or slightly confident
- Application: 10% Very or extremely confident, 41% Moderately confident or confident, 49% Not at all or slightly confident

Note: n = 39-126. Percentages may not total 100% due to rounding. Respondents who indicated “Don’t know” / “No opinion” were not included in this analysis. Only respondents who indicated customer focus was one of the top three most important skills when hiring for an entry-level position were asked this question. Online interview, personality test, cognitive ability test, online simulation and “other” were not reportable due a low response count (n < 30). The scale consisted of six response options from “Not at all confident” to “Extremely confident”; response options were combined for the purposes of analysis.
Confidence in Methods to Accurately Assess Teamwork in Entry-Level Job Applicants

- **Panel interview**: 42% Very or extremely confident, 51% Moderately confident or confident, 7% Not at all or slightly confident
- **Situational judgement test**: 36% Very or extremely confident, 58% Moderately confident or confident, 7% Not at all or slightly confident
- **In-person interview**: 34% Very or extremely confident, 55% Moderately confident or confident, 11% Not at all or slightly confident
- **Phone interview**: 23% Very or extremely confident, 53% Moderately confident or confident, 24% Not at all or slightly confident
- **Telephone screen**: 13% Very or extremely confident, 54% Moderately confident or confident, 34% Not at all or slightly confident
- **Application**: 8% Very or extremely confident, 37% Moderately confident or confident, 55% Not at all or slightly confident
- **Resume**: 5% Very or extremely confident, 46% Moderately confident or confident, 49% Not at all or slightly confident

*Note: n = 45-158. Percentages may not total 100% due to rounding. Respondents who indicated “Don’t know” / “No opinion” were not included in this analysis. Only respondents who indicated teamwork was one of the top three most important skills when hiring for an entry-level position were asked this question. Online interview, personality test, cognitive ability test, online simulation and “other” were not reportable due a low response count (n < 30). The scale consisted of six response options from “Not at all confident” to “Extremely confident”; response options were combined for the purposes of analysis.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Very or extremely confident</th>
<th>Moderately confident or confident</th>
<th>Not at all or slightly confident</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In-person interview</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone screen</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone interview</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resume</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: n = 32-68. Percentages may not total 100% due to rounding. Respondents who indicated “Don’t know” / “No opinion” were not included in this analysis. Only respondents who indicated respect was one of the top three most important skills when hiring for an entry-level position were asked this question. Online interview, panel interview, personality test, situational judgement test, cognitive ability test, online simulation and “other” were not reportable due a low response count (n < 30). The scale consisted of six response options from “Not at all confident” to “Extremely confident”; response options were combined for the purposes of analysis.
Confidence in Methods to Accurately Assess Critical Thinking in Entry-Level Job Applicants

Note: n = 30-31. Respondents who indicated “Don’t know”/“No opinion” were not included in this analysis. Only respondents who indicated critical thinking was one of the top three most important skills when hiring for an entry-level position were asked this question. Application, telephone screen, online interview, phone interview, panel interview, personality test, situational judgement test, cognitive ability test, online simulation and “other” were not reportable due a low response count (n < 30). The scale consisted of six response options from “Not at all confident” to “Extremely confident”; response options were combined for the purposes of analysis.
Overall Confidence in the Company’s Ability to Effectively Assess the Skills of Entry-Level Applicants

- Not at all or slightly confident: 11%
- Moderately confident or confident: 69%
- Very or extremely confident: 20%

Note: n = 458 The scale consisted of six response options from “Not at all confident” to “Extremely confident”; response options were combined for the purposes of analysis.
Concerns About the Company’s Ability to Assess Skills During the Entry-Level Job Applicant Selection Process

HR professionals were also asked to indicate concerns they have with their organization’s ability to assess the skills of entry-level job applicants during the selection process.¹

¹Note that results for the following skills were not reportable (NR) due to few respondents indicating that they are one of the three most important skills when hiring for an entry-level position: oral communication, written communication, reading comprehension, critical thinking, mathematics (computation), planning & organization, and creativity/innovation.
Top Three Concerns About Company’s Ability to Assess Skills During the Entry-Level Job Applicant Selection Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Integrity</th>
<th>Initiative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Usually, not enough is known about applicant to assess skill</td>
<td>Usually, not enough is known about applicant to assess skill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too easy for applicants to fake</td>
<td>Too easy for applicants to fake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills is difficult to assess</td>
<td>People in organization are not sufficiently trained to assess skill</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- \( n = 176 \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependability and Reliability</th>
<th>Adaptability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Usually, not enough is known about applicant to assess skill</td>
<td>Usually, not enough is known about applicant to assess skill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too easy for applicants to fake</td>
<td>Skills is difficult to assess</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills is difficult to assess</td>
<td>Don’t have tools to help assess skill</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- \( n = 296 \)
- \( n = 88 \)

1Respondents who indicated each respective skill was one of the top three most important skills when hiring for an entry-level position were asked about their concerns about their company’s ability to assess each of the three skills.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professionalism</th>
<th>Customer Focus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable; no concerns</td>
<td>Too easy for applicants to fake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usually, not enough is known about applicant to</td>
<td>Not applicable; no concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assess skill</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26%</td>
<td>Don’t have tools to help assess skill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too easy for applicants to fake</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ n = 69 \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teamwork</th>
<th>Respect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Too easy for applicants to fake</td>
<td>Too easy for applicants to fake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t have tools to help assess skill</td>
<td>Usually, not enough is known about applicant to assess skill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usually, not enough is known about applicant to</td>
<td>Skill is difficult to assess</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assess skill</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ n = 134 \]

\[ n = 49 \]

---

\(^1\)Respondents who indicated each respective skill was one of the top three most important skills when hiring for an entry-level position were asked about their concerns about their company’s ability to assess each of the three skills.
Experience and Academic or Extracurricular Activities
The Value of Experience and Academic or Extracurricular Activities in Demonstrating the Job Applicant Is a Strong Candidate

- **Completion of a career-related internship:**
  - Very or extremely valuable: 47%
  - Moderately valuable or valuable: 42%
  - Not at all or slightly valuable: 11%

- **Job outside of school system:**
  - Very or extremely valuable: 39%
  - Moderately valuable or valuable: 48%
  - Not at all or slightly valuable: 12%

- **Leadership role in student government:**
  - Very or extremely valuable: 30%
  - Moderately valuable or valuable: 45%
  - Not at all or slightly valuable: 24%

- **Chair or co-chair of an extracurricular club:**
  - Very or extremely valuable: 21%
  - Moderately valuable or valuable: 48%
  - Not at all or slightly valuable: 31%

- **Chair or co-chair of more than one extracurricular club:**
  - Very or extremely valuable: 21%
  - Moderately valuable or valuable: 46%
  - Not at all or slightly valuable: 33%

- **Job within school system:**
  - Very or extremely valuable: 20%
  - Moderately valuable or valuable: 53%
  - Not at all or slightly valuable: 27%

- **Participation in an academic team project:**
  - Very or extremely valuable: 20%
  - Moderately valuable or valuable: 52%
  - Not at all or slightly valuable: 28%

---

Note: n = 424-433. Percentages may not total 100% due to rounding. Respondents who indicated “Don’t know”/“No opinion” were not included in this analysis. The scale consisted of six response options from “Not at all valuable” to “Extremely valuable”; response options were combined for the purposes of analysis.
The Value of Experience and Academic or Extracurricular Activities in Demonstrating the Job Applicant Is a Strong Candidate (continued)

- **Independent study project with academic advisor**: 20% Very or extremely valuable, 48% Moderately valuable or valuable, 32% Not at all or slightly valuable
- **Captain or co-captain of an athletic team**: 19% Very or extremely valuable, 43% Moderately valuable or valuable, 39% Not at all or slightly valuable
- **Involvement in student government**: 18% Very or extremely valuable, 49% Moderately valuable or valuable, 33% Not at all or slightly valuable
- **Participation in one extracurricular club in school**: 14% Very or extremely valuable, 50% Moderately valuable or valuable, 35% Not at all or slightly valuable
- **Participation in two or more extracurricular clubs in school**: 12% Very or extremely valuable, 47% Moderately valuable or valuable, 40% Not at all or slightly valuable
- **Member of a school athletic team**: 11% Very or extremely valuable, 44% Moderately valuable or valuable, 45% Not at all or slightly valuable
- **Member of more than one school athletic team**: 8% Very or extremely valuable, 41% Moderately valuable or valuable, 51% Not at all or slightly valuable

Note: n = 424-433. Percentages may not total 100% due to rounding. Respondents who indicated “Don’t know”/"No opinion" were not included in this analysis. The scale consisted of six response options from “Not at all valuable” to “ Extremely valuable”; response options were combined for the purposes of analysis.
Job Applicant Sources
## Sources Used to Identify Potential Entry-Level Job Applicants and the Usefulness of Such Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources Used</th>
<th>Most Useful Source</th>
<th>Sources Used</th>
<th>Most Useful Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employee referrals</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>Facebook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization’s web/career site</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>Outside agency referrals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job fairs</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>Twitter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School recruiting</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>Google+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LinkedIn</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>YouTube</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional or association social networking site</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>Pinterest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous employees</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>FourSquare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment agency</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Print media advertising(^2)</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note for Sources Used: \(n = 444\). Percentages do not total 100% due to multiple response options.

Note for Most Useful Source: \(n = 437\). Percentages may not total 100% due to rounding.  
\(^1\)Online application  \(^2\)e.g., newspaper
Selection Tests and Screening Tools
### Timing of Administration of Selection Tests in the Hiring Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We do not use selection tests</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When a candidate is interviewing</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After a candidate is interviewed, but before a job offer</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After a candidate applies but before any job interviews</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At the time a candidate applies (part of the application process)</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After a contingent job offer</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before a candidate applies</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### How the Results of Selection Tests Are Used in the Hiring Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use of Results</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As one piece of data in the hiring decision (combined with interview, resume, etc.)</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For developmental purposes once the candidate begins the job</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To determine or influence interview questions</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a “pass/fail”—knocking a candidate out of the process if he or she fails the test</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a follow-up to a test given earlier in the hiring process</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: $n = 442$. Percentages do not total 100% due to multiple response options.

Note: $n = 183$. Percentages do not total 100% due to multiple response options.
Use of “Big Data” and Machine Learning Algorithms to Screen/Hire Job Applicants

Are you familiar with this approach to screening/hiring job applicants?

- Yes: 15%
- Somewhat: 30%
- No: 55%

Is your organization using, or considering using, a “big data” or machine algorithm approach to screening/hiring job applicants?

- Yes, currently using this kind of approach: 4%
- Yes, considering using this approach in the future: 15%
- No: 81%

Note: \( n = 198 \). Respondents who indicated their organization is currently using or considering using this kind of approach were asked this question.
Factors in the Decision to Use, or Consider Using, a “Big Data” or Machine Algorithm Approach to Screening/Hiring Job Applicants

- Need/needed a better way to screen large volumes of job applicants: 34%
- Want/wanted to be innovative and have a more job-applicant-friendly experience: 32%
- Current methods are/were prone to human biases: 26%
- Current methods are/were not helping us select the right job applicants: 24%
- Do/did not know what skills or attributes should be assessed: 18%
- Current methods are/were not passing enough quality job applicants: 18%
- Other: 5%

Note: n = 38. Respondents who indicated they were using or considering using a “big data” or machine algorithm approach to screening/hiring job applicants were asked this question. Percentages do not total 100% due to multiple response options. Effectiveness of big data or a machine algorithm approach not reportable (NR) due to a low response count (n < 30).
Use of Gamification to Screen/Hire Job Applicants

Are you familiar with this approach to screening/hiring job applicants?

- Yes: 12%
- Somewhat: 23%
- No: 65%

Is your organization using, or considering using, a game-based approach to screening/hiring job applicants?

- Yes, currently using this kind of approach: 1%
- Yes, considering using this kind of approach in the future: 11%
- No: 88%

Note: n = 152. Respondents who indicated their organizations were currently using or considering using this kind of approach were asked this question.

n = 437

Note: Factors in decision to use, or consider using, a game-based approach to screening/hiring job applicants and effectiveness of the same are not reportable (NR) due to low response counts (n < 30).

1An approach to collecting job applicant information via assessments. This method delivers an assessment in the form of a game or simulation, with the objective of providing an enhanced applicant experience, and to reduce applicant “drop outs.”
Demographics
## Demographics: Organization Industry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health care and social assistance</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional, scientific and technical services</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance and insurance</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational services</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government agencies</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious, grant-making, civic, professional and similar organizations</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail trade</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation and warehousing</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation and food services</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(n = 519\)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale trade</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts, entertainment and recreation</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real estate and rental and leasing</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture, forestry, fishing and hunting</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative and support, and waste management and</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>remediation services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repair and maintenance</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining, quarrying, and oil and gas extraction</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal and laundry services</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*n = 519*
Demographics: Organization Sector

- Privately owned for-profit: 50%
- Nonprofit/not-for-profit: 24%
- Publicly owned for-profit: 17%
- Government: 9%

Note: \( n = 517 \). Percentages may not total 100% due to rounding.

† Government includes the federal government, state governments, local governments, tribal governments and school districts.
Demographics: Organization Staff Size

- 1 to 99 employees: 28%
- 100 to 499 employees: 34%
- 500 to 2,499 employees: 18%
- 2,500 to 9,999 employees: 15%
- 10,000 or more employees: 5%

n = 471
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- 521 HR professionals from a randomly selected sample of SHRM’s membership participated in this survey
- Margin of error +/- 4%
- Survey fielded May 2016
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Additional SHRM Resources

- For more survey/poll findings, visit [www.shrm.org/surveys](http://www.shrm.org/surveys)

- For more information about SHRM’s Research Services:
  - Customized Research Service, visit [www.shrm.org/customizedresearch](http://www.shrm.org/customizedresearch)
  - Engagement Survey Service, visit [www.shrm.org/peopleinsight](http://www.shrm.org/peopleinsight)
  - Customized Benchmarking Service, visit [www.shrm.org/benchmarks](http://www.shrm.org/benchmarks)

- Follow us on Twitter [@SHRM_Research](http://twitter.com/@SHRM_Research)
About SHRM

The Society for Human Resource Management (SHRM) is the world’s largest HR professional society, representing 285,000 members in more than 165 countries. For nearly seven decades, the Society has been the leading provider of resources serving the needs of HR professionals and advancing the practice of human resource management. SHRM has more than 575 affiliated chapters within the United States and subsidiary offices in China, India and United Arab Emirates. Visit us at shrm.org.