

## **Candidate Experience and its Cycle in the Hiring Process: An Analysis of Student Employees**

Marysol Villeda  
*Tarleton State University*

Randy McCamey  
*Tarleton State University*

### **Abstract**

*This study examined the effects of the candidate experience in the hiring process. This paper discusses the effects of customer experience to provide a reference to candidate experience. To add value to the candidate experience, surveys were used to measure the candidate experience of student employees as part of the hiring process at a mid-sized rural institution. The goal was to track their experience through the different stages of the hiring process and understand how that experience affects the institution. Four hypotheses were created to test the correlation of the candidate experience to different variables. It was found that hired candidates report a better experience than those not hired when holding all other variables equal. Those candidates that reported a positive experience were likely to recommend others to apply to the same company. There was a correlation between the candidate experience and the likelihood of posting on social media. Lastly, it was found that the interaction between the interviewer(s) and candidates affect the experience.*

Keywords: Candidate experience, student employees, residential leaders, hiring process

### **1. Introduction**

Access to the Internet and the prominence of social networking sites has decreased the possibility of keeping personal information private. Therefore, candidates' experiences have become public in the internet world. The term "candidate" refers to a job applicant that would bring knowledge, skills, and experiences to an organization if hired (Mothokoa & Martiz, 2018). Candidate experience refers to the observations and reactions of job applicants related to the overall hiring process of a company; this includes the sourcing, recruiting, interviewing, hiring, and onboarding processes (Roberts, 2017). These experiences not only relate to the way candidates are treated during the hiring process, but also consist of perceptions and unintended realities felt by the applicant. According to the director of Monster.com, candidate experience consists of each candidate's beliefs and perceptions of his or her treatment received by the employer during the hiring process (as cited in Villeda & McCamey, 2019). More than 60% of business candidates use Glassdoor.com to review a company before initiating the job application process (Miles & McCamey, 2018). Furthermore, a study done on 826 job hunters concluded that 60% of the candidates report a negative experience, more than 70% of candidates directly or indirectly shared their bad experience, and those with a negative experience were 3.5 times less likely to reapply to the same company (Tallulah, 2016). Virgin Mobile lost \$5.4 million in 2014 because of unsatisfied job candidates switching to the competition. According to LinkedIn.com,

companies with a negative reputation lost more than \$7 million in 2017(as cited in McCarthy et al., 2018). Therefore, the purpose of this study is to examine candidate experience.

The purpose of this paper is to explain how the candidate experience is affected during the hiring process, and in turn how such experience affects businesses. This paper was organized by first explaining how candidate experience is affected through the various phases of the hiring process, followed by the actual study done on young candidates, and a conclusion. The findings of this study add to available literature concerning customer experience. The customer experience has been widely studied while candidate experience was neglected. Business managers would greatly benefit from the analysis presented in this paper because it shines light into the importance of candidate experience and its effects.

### **1.1 Candidate Experience in the Application Phase**

Candidates get information about potential job opportunities from various sources such as a company's website, (53%), LinkedIn.com (38%), contacts within a company (32%), Glassdoor.com (12%), and Facebook (12%) (Basu, Reilly, Schnidman, & Ignatova, 2017). By having web-based applications, new problems are arising that affect the candidate experience to the level that some applicants will not even complete the first step of the hiring process. For instance, employers can include additional information such as asking for specific experience examples, current job duties, and what talent the candidate is bringing to the company on online applications, which then requires applicants to spend significantly more time and effort completing the application. This can be especially challenging for applicants with disabilities (Novak, 2017). A study by Partnership on Employment and Accessible Technology (PEAT) concluded that applicants with disabilities (46%) had rated web-based applications as difficult and impossible (Novak, 2017). Some common complaints found through the PEAT study included difficult navigation of websites, timeouts, confusing or inconstant instructions, and a lack of assistance (Novak, 2017). Older applicants could have trouble completing the applications if they are unfamiliar with technology. In addition, employers could be asking too much information about candidates at the application phase that could discourage the candidate to apply. Alternatively, the application could give the employer too much information that could encourage them to discriminate at the application phase.

### **1.2 Candidate Experience in Interview Phase**

During interviews, employers, or hiring managers, can analyze a candidate, and see if they will be a good match for the company. According to McLaren (2017), an interview can influence a candidate's perception of a company. In a 2017 study on 14,000 professionals concluded that 65% of candidates with a negative interview experience lost interest in the job offer (McLaren, 2017). Employers create a negative experience by not being on time, not showing interest in the candidate, or showing a lack of knowledge (McLaren, 2017). Important information candidates seek in their interviews include job details (89%), salary range (72%), company overview (69%), and why they fit (54%) (Basu et al., 2017). The average candidate experience lasts two to three months from beginning to end of the hiring process, many candidates undergo three interviews, and 84% of candidates are satisfied with the number of interviews; the most valuable attribute of the interview experience was learning the job responsibilities (70%) (Basu et al., 2017). Therefore, the interviewer must be knowledgeable and inspire trust in candidates. Interviewers provide candidates with a feeling of the company and are therefore influencers of candidate experience.

### 1.3 Candidate Experience in the Screening Phase

The screening process determines what candidates meet the minimum requirements to continue the hiring process (Mohl, 2013). A key characteristic of the screening processes is the communication applicants receive. Candidate experience can be derived from the extent and quality of communication. According to Miles and McCamey (2018), communication quality becomes the number one factor of influence on candidate experience during the entire hiring process. Effective communication leads to a clear understanding of the situation while ineffective communication causes discrepancies. According to Crispin, those applicants who are unqualified and screened out need notification for closure (as cited in Miles & McCamey, 2018). Additionally, by informing those screened out about the decision, it leaves the door open for them to possibly reapply to a better-suited job opening in the future (Miles & McCamey, 2018). Candidates that had a positive experience but were not hired were 80% more likely to reapply to the same company in the future (Zhang & Feinzing, 2017). According to C&E, communication is key to a candidate-employer relationship; however, responding to all applicants can be challenging when a company receives hundreds of applications (Carpenter, 2013). The communication process should stay consistent throughout the hiring process. However, as candidates are eliminated the remaining candidates should receive more consistent information about the process and timeline.

## 2. Materials & Methods

The hiring process of Residential Leaders at a rural educational institution completed the data collection methodology. The data was collected from mid-November 2019 to the beginning of August 2020. Four surveys were provided to candidates. The first survey was provided at the end of the application phase which had 240 participants. The second survey was provided after a group interview, which had 124 participants. The third survey was provided after a video interview, which had 99 participants. The last survey was provided after the selection phase (hired or not hired) which had 86 participants.

Each survey was created to measure the candidate experience in accordance to the specific hiring process. The goal was to measure how the candidate experience change through the different phases of the hiring process, specifically the difference between candidates hired and those not hired. Since all candidates underwent all phases of the hiring process, the surveys were emailed to 240 applicants. The first survey was included in the application form; therefore, all applicants participated. The second survey was emailed to 240 candidates and had a response rate of 52%. The third survey was emailed to the same candidates and had a response rate of 42%. Following the same method, the last survey had a response rate of 36%. As expected, the response rate decreased after each survey.

The questions in the four surveys were used to gather data about candidate experience and other variables. For the analysis, SPSS Statistics were used for all hypotheses. Correlation statistics, ANOVA test, and Independent Samples Test were used in this study. Correlation statistics measures the relationship between two or more variables (Hayes, 2020). ANOVA is used to test if results have significant difference between variables (Stevens, 2002). Independent Samples Test measures the means of two independent means to statistically show if the means are different (Stevens, 2002). The majority of candidates were 18-20 years old, freshmen, with a GPA of 3.00-3.49, and female. See Table 1 below for demographics.

Table 1  
*Demographics*

Category	Subcategory	N=240	Percentage %
Age	18-20	219	91.25%
	21-24	21	8.75%
	25 and over		
Classification	Freshman	114	47.5%
	Sophomore	81	33.75%
	Junior	37	15.42%
	Senior	8	3.33%
	Graduate		
GPA	4.0	12	5%
	3.99-3.80	18	7.5%
	3.79-3.50	51	21.25%
	3.49-3.00	83	34.58%
	2.99-2.50	62	25.83%
	Less than 2.50	14	5.83%
Gender	Male	59	24.58%
	Female	181	75.42%

## 2.1 Research Hypotheses

Based on the literature review gathered, the researcher hypothesizes that:

Hypothesis 1: The candidate experience has a positive correlation to the results of the hiring process (being hired or not).

Hypothesis 2: The candidate experience has a positive correlation to intentions of candidates to recommend others to apply for the same position.

Hypothesis 3: The candidate experience has a positive correlation to candidates posting on social media about the experience.

Hypothesis 4: The candidates experience has a positive correlation to the interaction with the interviewer(s).

### 2.1.1 Research Hypothesis One

Hypothesis 1: The candidate experience has a positive correlation to the results of the hiring process. The first hypothesis measured how candidates' experience was perceived if hired or not. According to previous research, candidates not hired with a positive experience are likely to reapply in the future, while those candidates that have encountered a negative candidate experience are less likely to reapply (Tallulah, 2016; Zhang & Feinzing, 2017). However, this research neglects to directly answer the question. In this case, this research is trying to determine if those being hired have a higher overall (higher/positive) candidate experience and if those not hired report a lower candidate experience.

To research this hypothesis, 86 candidates answered the survey; 52 were hired and 34 were not hired. The survey asked about the candidate experience before the RL hiring process, during, and after. The results were analyzed during those three phases for those candidates hired and those not hired. An example of how questions were asked is "Please rate your overall experience of the employment process." In addition, the answer options were "Extremely Positive, Moderately Positive, Slightly Positive, Neither, Slightly Negative, Moderately Negative, and Extremely Negative." The survey had thirteen questions.

When asked about the candidate experience before the hiring process, the candidates that

were hired reported a mean of 6.08 while those not hired reported a mean of 6.38. This was based on a scale of 1 through 7 of negative to positive. The candidates hired had more positive experiences with the majority either having an extremely positive or moderately positive experience. Those not hired also gave similar responses in which the majority stated having an extremely positive or moderately positive experience. Those not hired had a slightly higher candidate experience before the process which could be due to expectations. It is important to note that when the RL hiring process began, COVID-19 was not an issue. Another reason for those not hired having a higher experience before the hiring process could deal with expectations of being hired and the confidence in the skills possessed.

At this point, the “before” candidate experience of those hired and those not hired was analyzed to determine the relationship. The first step was to measure the variance among the two variables using a 95% confidence (Stevens, 2002). Using One-Way ANOVA on SPSS, there was a .148 significance value for the candidate experience before the hiring process. The result ( $p = .148$ ) which is above  $p = .05$  which means there was no statistically significant difference between those hired candidates and those not hired (Stevens, 2002). The second step was to run an Independent Sample Test using SPSS (Stevens, 2002). Using Levene’s Test for Equality of Variance provides a significance value or p-value of .333. The result was assessed using  $p > .05$  (Stevens, 2002). Based on the results, .333 is greater than .05 resulting in the conclusion that the p-value for the variable of the candidate experience before the hiring process between hired and not hired is homogeneous. The Sig. (2-tailed) result was  $p = .148$  using Shapiro-Wilk test of  $p > .05$  which confirms the lack of significance in difference in candidate experience between those hired and not hired before the hiring process. After an ANOVA test and an Independent Sample Test, the p-values showed that there was a level of similarity between the two variables (hired candidates and not hired candidates).

The candidate experience was measured during the hiring process. Based on the group statistics, those hired had a mean of 5.90 while the candidates not hired had a mean of 5.76. The results were based on a scale of one (extremely negative) through seven (extremely positive). The average of candidates stated their candidate experience was lower during the process compared to before the process. There are many variables that could have influenced such results such as the application phase and the interviewers. However, the most important variable was the effects caused by COVID-19 that delayed results for candidates.

Based on ANOVA and an Independent Sample Test, the p-values were analyzed to determine if there was a difference in candidate experience between those hired and those not hired. The p-values (significance values) were measured against p value of .05 below using a 95% confidence level (Stevens, 2002). Based on the ANOVA, the result was a  $p = .541$  significance. Reviewing the Independent Sample Test (Levene’s Test of Variance), the result was a significance of  $p = .367$  which again shows a lack of significant difference because it was greater than p-value .05. Lastly, the t-test for Equality of Means Sig. (2-tailed) showed a  $p = .541$ , proving a lack of difference significance between the two variables (hired and not hired candidates) in candidate experience during the hiring process. Therefore, using the three p-values examined, the candidates hired and those not hired had homogeneous results in terms of candidate experience during the hiring process.

Lastly, the candidate experience was measured after the results (after selection) were given to candidates. The group statistics state that those candidates hired had a candidate experience mean of 6.37 and those not hired had a mean of 4.71. The results were based on a scale of one through seven as discussed above. Using the scale discussed, the average of

candidates hired stated they had a moderately positive experience while those not hired stated having neither a positive nor negative experience. The results were expected considering those hired would feel more positive than those not hired.

To determine a difference between the two variables, an ANOVA test and an Independent Sample Test were performed. The results were examined using a 95% confidence in which the significance had to be below .05 to show a difference (Stevens, 2002). Using the ANOVA results, the significance or p-value was  $p < .001$  which was below .05 stating a statistical significance in candidate experience between those hired and those not hired. When using the Independent Sample Test, Leven's Test of Equality of Variance, the Sig. (or  $p =$  value) was .001 which is below .05 and resulting in a significance between the two variables measured (hired and not hired) at the end of the hiring process. To show this, the Sig. (2-tailed) was examined which provided a  $p < .001$ , which again is lower than  $p = .05$ . Therefore, the candidate experience of the candidates hired and not hired lacked homogeneity resulting in statistical significant difference between the two means.

The results indicate that positive experience matters in the hiring process. With employers having a difficult time hiring new employees, positive candidate experience needs to become a priority. While those hired report a higher experience, those not hired could still be candidates for future positions. According to Rivera (2012), hiring is more than seeking skilled employees; it is a process of mutual responsibility to give the best self-presentation. According to Miles and McCamey (2018), candidate experience is important for an organization seeking to hire the best employees while competing with other organizations for talent. The candidate experience of all candidates (hired or not hired) is important because more than 60% of possible applicants seek previous reviews on websites such as Glassdoor.com before making a decision to apply to a company (Miles & McCamey, 2018). This hypothesis was supported when using Broaden-and-Build theory because positive events did increase the emotions felt by candidates hired (Fredrickson, 2004). According to Taylor (1991) when an individual undergoes a negative event, negative reactions follow. This explains why those not hired rated their candidate experience lower than those hired. Even though, participants from both groups reported a positive experience, those hired reported a higher positive experience. Such finding was expected given the human emotions involved when good news are versus negative news are received.

### *2.1.2 Research Hypothesis Two*

Hypothesis 2: The candidate experience has a positive correlation to intentions of candidates to recommend others to apply for the same position. Hypothesis 2 seeks to explain if those with a positive experience would recommend others to apply to the same company. Therefore, this study seeks to understand if the same effects that brands and perceptions of products and service have on customers' intention to recommend others apply to candidates recommending others to apply to the same institution. This hypothesis was analyzed using Cohen's (1977) guidelines of effect size and the correlation between two variables. Effect size provides a quantitative measurement of the degree of relationship (Cohen, 1977).

After the application phase (based on 240 candidates), the candidate experience had a mean of 6.36, meaning a large portion of the population stated a highly positive experience. The likelihood to recommend others to apply had a mean of 6.55. Both variables had extremely positive results. After correlating the results for both variables, the result was .565. Based on Cohen's (1977) chart, the relationship between candidate experience and the likelihood to recommend others to apply has a large relationship.

The results of the candidate experience and likelihood to recommend others to apply

were influenced by several aspects of the application phase. For instance, when asked to rate the length of the application, 203 candidates stated the length was adequate. When asked if the application was easy to complete, 237 candidates stated yes. Lastly, when asked if enough information was provided to successfully complete the application phase, 169 candidates stated all the information needed was provided, 60 stated information was provided to some extent, and 11 stated that no information was provided. The positive answers reflected the resulting positive candidate experience, which in turn led to a clear majority of candidates stating their likelihood to recommend others to apply.

After the group interview, 124 candidates decided to participate in the second study. The candidate experience after this phase had a mean of 6.40; in this case, the candidate experience was extremely positive for most of the candidates. Analyzing the likelihood to recommend others to apply the variable had a 6.48 mean. Most candidates (77) stated being extremely likely to recommend others to apply, 35 moderately likely, 8 slightly likely, 2 neither likely nor unlikely, and 2 slightly unlikely. The correlation of both variables yielded a .625 relationship. This result has a large effect size since the results were higher than .50 (Cohen, 1977).

The likelihood to recommend others to apply was slightly higher after the group interview than in the application phase. A possible reason for this result could include personal interaction with the interviewers and other aspects of the interview. Most candidates also stated the interview setting was professional. The correlation results were .625, which resulted in a large effect size when using Cohen's (1977) guidelines.

The last phase of the hiring process was done during the crisis of COVID-19. This pandemic affected the process by delaying the hiring decisions. Furthermore, due to budget cuts and the uncertainty of the pandemic, the number of hired candidates was reduced. The selection phase encountered limitations that could have influenced the perceptions of the students/candidates that participated in this study. One key limitation was the reduction of candidate participation. In the application phase, there were 240 applicants; however, the number of participants in this study was reduced to 86 by the selection phase. In the selection phase, the average candidate experience was 5.59.

While in the past phases of the hiring process most candidates stated having an extremely positive experience, the majority stated having a moderately positive experience during this phase. The mean for the likelihood to recommend others to apply was 5.88. When correlating the two variables (candidate experience and likelihood to recommend others), the results were .735, leading to a large size effect when using Cohen's (1977) guidelines. These results were also analyzed by separating those hired and those not hired. The results were .725, a large size effect for those hired, and .597 for those not hired. Both results had a large size effect when using Cohen's (1977) guidelines; however, those hired had a slightly higher likelihood of recommending others to apply compared to those not hired.

According to Zhang and Feinzig (2017), those with a positive experience are more inclined to recommend the organization. A study found that 62% of those with a satisfactory experience are likely to recommend others to apply (Zhang & Feinzig, 2017). The finding from Zhang and Feinzig's (2017) study correlates with the findings of this study that found that the majority of candidates that had a positive experience were also inclined to recommend others to apply.

### *2.1.3 Research Hypothesis Three*

Hypothesis 3: The candidate experience has a positive correlation to candidates posting on social media about the experience. Hypothesis 3 is dedicated to social media. The younger generations,

like the ones used in this study, are comfortable with social media and use several platforms to find job opportunities (Villeda & McCamey, 2019). In addition, candidates are influenced by information posted on social media about a company and will actively seek such information (Carpenter, 2013; Roberts, 2017).

Hypothesis 3 states that the use of social media to post about the candidate experience is related to extreme experiences; it was researched using four surveys that measured the candidate experience to the intention of posting on social media. The first survey was provided during the interview phase and generated 240 responses. The average candidate experience during the application phase was 6.36 in range of 1 through 7. The use of social media to post about the experience had a mean of 4.89 in a range of 1 through 7. The correlation results were evaluated using Cohen's guidelines, which determine the size effect depending on the magnitude of the relationship between two variables (Cohen, 1977).

The result from the two questions was a correlation of .386, meaning there was a medium-size effect because of the comparison with Cohen's (1977) guidelines. While the number of extremely positive experience was 128, only 61 stated they were extremely likely to post on social media. While zero candidates stated an extremely negative experience, 17 stated they were extremely unlikely to post on social media. Most candidates (66) stated they were neither likely nor unlikely to post on social media. Those results for the social media question were expected since people are unlikely to take time to post on social media unless something extreme were to occur during the process. However, candidates are likely to rate their experience as extremely positive, unless something extremely negative occurred during the process. The results do not state an absolute correlation nor a negative correlation. A .386 correlation was not high enough to support an absolute relationship during the application phase however it was significant enough when using Cohen's (1977) guidelines.

The question "after the completion of the group interview process, how likely are candidates to post about their experience on social media" was asked after the group interview process. This survey had 124 responses. Based on the same range discussed above, the mean for the candidate experience was 6.40 and the social media's mean was 4.25. The correlation between the two questions was .424, again resulting in a medium-size effect when using Cohen's (1977) guidelines. The candidate experience results for the group interview had similar results from the application phase in which the majority had an extremely positive experience. However, the results for posting on social media had a lower number for "extremely likely to post on social media," and a vast majority (45) stated they were neither likely nor unlikely to post. Only 14 out of 68 candidates that reported an extremely positive experience also reported being extremely likely to post on social media. At the group interview phase, the correlation was higher compared to the application phase.

The likelihood of candidates posting on social media after the video interview was analyzed. With 99 participants during the video interview, the mean for the candidate experience as 6.16 and the mean for posting on social media was 3.98. The correlation for the two variables was .393, a medium-size effect (Cohen, 1977). The results were like the group interview in which most candidates stated an extremely positive experience as their candidate experience but were neither likely nor unlikely to post on social media. This suggests that most candidates will refrain from posting on social media, at least when undergoing a normal hiring process. During the video interview, only 16 of the 46 candidates that reported an extremely positive experience stated they were extremely likely to post on social media.

As stated previously, the selection phase was affected by the pandemic caused by



COVID-19. This could have caused limitations such as increasing anxiety that could translate into candidates being more inclined to post on social media or more reluctant to post. During the final phase, the average candidate experience was 5.59. When asked about the likelihood to post on social media, the average was 4.17. When correlating the candidate experience and the likelihood to post, the result was .534.

Using Cohen's (1977) guidelines when comparing the likelihood to use social media and the candidate experience, there was a large size effect. However, when comparing the correlation of the candidate experience and the likelihood of posting on social media, it had a large variance between those candidates hired and those not hired. Those hired had a candidate experience with a mean of 6.21 and mean of 5.17 for likelihood to post on social media. Those candidates had a large correlation when using Cohen's (1977) guidelines with a .603, while those not hired had a small correlation according to Cohen's (1977) guidelines of .010. The mean for those not hired, in which the candidate experience was 4.65 and the likelihood to post on social media was 2.65. It is expected that those hired would be proud to post on social media about their accomplishment while those not hired would rather not inform their friends through such a public platform.

An explanation as to why candidates would not post their hiring experience on social media could be the lack of interest. For instance, social media sites such as Facebook, Instagram, and Twitter are less likely to be used to post content (Dooley, 2017). Facebook, for instance, had a 21% decline in users' updates (Dooley, 2017). While younger generations continue to share content, they are doing so on more private platforms such as WhatsApp, Facebook Messenger, and GroupMe (Dooley, 2017). According to Hao (2017), some social media users do not post to respect their own privacy, to avoid online drama, and a lack of motivation.

#### *2.1.4 Research Hypothesis Four*

Hypothesis 4: The candidates experience has a positive correlation to the interaction with the interviewer(s).

Hypothesis 4 deals with the interactions between the company's employees and the candidate experience. For instance, candidates that do not undergo an adequate interview process have stated their interest decreased in continuing the process (McLaren, 2017). A study done by Olson and Peytchev (2007) determined that long interviews could negatively affect the hiring process. The interview phase helps build the relationship between a candidate and interviewer; therefore, various factors can affect this process including the length, the interviewer, and the environment. This hypothesis seeks to find a correlation between the interaction between candidate and interviewer with the candidate experience. The second survey provided to the RL candidates was used to collect data for Hypothesis 4.

The survey had 124 responses where the candidate experience was correlated to the interview experience, perception of the interview(s). Using a simple correlation through SPSS Statistics software, the following results were found. The correlation results were compared to Cohen's Effect size. Effect size measures the relationship between variables as it relates to the size in which R stands for the magnitude ranging from -1 to 1 (Cohen, 1977).

Based on the correlation analysis a -1 result indicates a negative relationship, zero indicates no correlation, and +1 indicates a positive relationship. The candidate experience had a mean of 6.40, the perception of the interviewer(s) a mean of 6.25. The correlation between the candidate experience and the interaction with the interviewer(s) was .383. The results of the correlation between the interviewer(s) and the candidate experience have a medium-size effect when using Cohen's guidelines.

As explained by the Role Theory there is a relationship between customers' satisfaction and the interaction with employees (Solomon et al., 1985). There was a correlation between the candidate experience and the interaction with the interviewers. However, there were limitations to this hypothesis. For instance, the survey was done on candidates that underwent a group interview. Group interviews neglect to provide for a one-on-one personal relationship. Group interviews have become common in organizations hiring many employees where the hiring process is slower (Chamberlain, 2015). However, group interviews have limitations for the candidates; for instance, extroverts will react differently from introvert candidates in a group interview (Alexander, 2019).

### **3. Conclusion**

After an analysis of previous research done on both the topic of candidate experience and customer experience, all hypotheses tested were supported. The hypotheses were tested considering previous theories about customer/human behavior including Broaden-And-Build Theory, Asymmetrical Effects, Affective Events Theory, Consumer Perception Theory, and Role Theory (Fredrickson, 2004; Sanchez-Fernandez & Iniesta-Bonillo, 2006; Solomon et al., 1985; Taylor, 1991; Weiss & Corpanzano, 1996). This paper opens the way for future research concerning candidate experience in the hiring process.

The goal of this paper was to prove the importance of the candidate experience. While candidate experience has not been studied in the past years, taking into account the importance of experience sharing through different channels, it is a topic worth analyzing. One objective was to prove a correlation between the reported candidate experience and the hiring results. After testing this hypothesis, statistical significance was found between the experience of those hired and those not hired. Proving this was important since it demonstrates that those hired will be more satisfied with the hiring experience than those not hired even after being treated the same during the hiring process. These results are difficult to change due to the emotional aspect involved in the results. However, employers should treat all candidates with respect regardless of the hiring decision.

The second objective was to prove the importance candidate experience has to the company's reputation. For instance, those candidates that have a positive experience are more likely to recommend others to apply compared to those that had a neutral or negative experience. This was proven with statistical significance during the application phase, group interview phase, and selection phase.

The third objective was to test how likely candidates were to post on social media based on their experience. It was hypothesized that there was a correlation between the two variables. Tested during the application phase, group interview phases, video interview, and selection phase, a correlation was found. Proving this hypothesis is critical for companies. With the availability to posting on social media, candidates will not shy away from sharing their experiences especially on sites such as Glassdoor.com.

The last objective was to prove that the interaction with the interviewer(s) affects the candidate's experience. This was tested by asking candidates about their experience and how positive the interaction was with the interviewers. This hypothesis was supported with statistical significance. Just as employees shape the customer experience, interviewers affect the candidate experience.

Table 2  
*Results of Tested Hypotheses*

Hypotheses Tested	Supported	Results
<b>Hypothesis 1:</b> The candidate experience has a positive correlation to the results of the hiring process.	<b>Yes</b>	<p>Statistically significance was found between the candidate experience of those hired and not hired candidates at the end of the process.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <math>p = .000</math> (ANOVA)</li> <li>▪ <math>p = .001</math> (Sample Test, Leven's Test of Equality of Variance)</li> <li>▪ <math>p = .000</math> (Sig. (2-tailed))</li> </ul>
<b>Hypothesis 2:</b> The candidate experience has a positive correlation to intentions of candidates to recommend others to apply for the same position.	<b>Yes</b>	<p>A statistically significant correlation was found between candidate experience and likelihood to recommend others to apply.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <math>Corr(CandE, recommend) = .565</math> after application phase</li> <li>▪ <math>Corr(CcandE, recommend) = .625</math> after group interview</li> <li>▪ <math>Corr(CandE, recommend) = 7.35</math> after selection phase</li> </ul>
<b>Hypothesis 3:</b> The candidate experience has a positive correlation to candidates posting on social media about the experience.	<b>Yes</b>	<p>A statistically significant correlation was found between candidate experience and likelihood to post on social media.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <math>Corr(CandE, social media) = .386</math> after application phase</li> <li>▪ <math>Corr(CandE, social media) = .424</math> after group interview</li> <li>▪ <math>Corr(CandE, social media) = .393</math> after video interview</li> <li>▪ <math>Corr(CandE, social media) = .538</math> after selection phase</li> </ul>
<b>Hypothesis 4:</b> The candidates experience has a positive correlation to the interaction with the interviewer(s).	<b>Yes</b>	<p>A statistically significant correlation was found between candidate experience and interaction with interviewer(s).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <math>Corr(CandE, perception of interviewer) = .383</math> after group interview</li> </ul>

## References

- Alexander, L. (2019, June 6). The pros and cons of group interviews. *SEEK*. Retrieved from [www.seek.com.au/employer/hiring-advice/pros-cons-group-interviews](http://www.seek.com.au/employer/hiring-advice/pros-cons-group-interviews).
- Autry, A. (2019, January 7). Employee Engagement & Loyalty Statistics: The Ultimate Collection. Retrieved October 14, 2020, from <https://blog.accessperks.com/employee-engagement-loyalty-statistics-the-ultimate-collection>
- Avram, E. M. (2016). The relationship between the university image and students' willingness to recommend it. *Cross-Cultural Management Journal*, 18(2), 115-123.
- Bacik, R., Fedorko, R., Nastisin, L., & Gavurova, B. (2018). Factors of communication mix on social media and their role in forming customer experience and brand image. *Management Is Marketing*, (3), 1108-1118.
- Basu, N., Reilly, K., Schnidman, A., & Ignatova, M. (2017). Inside the mind of today's candidate: 13 insights that will make you a smarter recruiter. Retrieved from <https://business.linkedin.com/content/dam/me/business/en-us/talent-solutions/resources/pdfs/inside-the-mind-of-todays-candidate1.pdf>
- Carpenter, L. (2013). Improving the candidate experience. *Strategic HR Review*, 4, 203.
- Chamberlain, A. (2015). Why is hiring taking longer? New insights from Glassdoor data. Retrieved from [https://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=&ved=2ahUKEwj57fO0z-vrAhUplXIEHaTHB4EQFjABegQICxAD&url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.glassdoor.com%2Fresearch%2Fapp%2Fuploads%2Fsites%2F2%2F2015%2F06%2FGD\\_Report\\_3.pdf&usq=AOvVaw1ID6eZr7VwWDnxIybAb730](https://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=&ved=2ahUKEwj57fO0z-vrAhUplXIEHaTHB4EQFjABegQICxAD&url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.glassdoor.com%2Fresearch%2Fapp%2Fuploads%2Fsites%2F2%2F2015%2F06%2FGD_Report_3.pdf&usq=AOvVaw1ID6eZr7VwWDnxIybAb730)
- Cohen, J. (1977). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences: Jacob Cohen*. New York: Academic Press.
- Dooley, M. (2017, February 01). A new era in social media? Why Millennials aren't sharing anymore. Retrieved from <https://medium.com/@dooleymr/a-new-era-in-social-media-why-millennials-arent-sharing-anymore-15ffe99b9165>
- Doucette, M. (2016, August 30). Why candidate experience matters more than ever. Retrieved from <https://hiring.monster.com/employer-resources/recruiting-strategies/talent-acquisition/candidate-experience-best-practices/>
- Fatma, S. (2014). Antecedents and consequences of customer experience management - a literature review and research agenda. *International Journal of Business and Commerce*, 3(6), 32-49.
- Fredrickson, B. L. (2001). The Role of Positive Emotions in Positive Psychology The Broaden-and-Build Theory of Positive Emotions. *American Psychologist*, 56(3), 218-226.
- Gavurova, B., Bacik, R., Fedorko, R., & Nastisin, L. (2018). The customer's brand experience in the light of selected performance indicators in the social media environment. *Journal of Competitiveness*, 10(1), 72-84.
- Hao, T. (2017, January 06). Why we should STOP posting and sharing in social media. Retrieved from <https://medium.com/@jeevakanow/why-we-should-stop-posting-and-sharing-in-social-media-c2150ce6bad2>
- Hayes, A. (2020, September 16). Correlation. Retrieved from <https://www.investopedia.com/terms/c/correlation.asp>
- Johnson, B. (2018). Candidate experience: The interview. *Agri Marketing*, 56(8), 23.

- Kuffo, L., Vaca, C., Izquierdo, E., & Bustamante, J. C. (2018). Know your customer: detection of customer experience (CX) in social platforms using text categorization. *2018 IEEE International Conference on Big Data (Big Data)*, 4086-4094.
- Lauby, S. (2018, August 16). *Four ways to improve the candidate experience*. SHRM. Retrieved from <https://www.shrm.org/resourcesandtools/hr-topics/talent-acquisition/pages/four-ways-to-improve-the-candidate-experience.aspx>
- McCarthy, J. M., Bauer, T. N., Truxillo, D. M., Campion, M. C., Iddekinge, C. H., & Campion, M. A. (2018). Improving the candidate experience. *Organizational Dynamics*, 47(3), 147-154.
- McKinney, L. N. (2004). Creating a satisfying Internet shopping experience via atmospheric variables. *International Journal of Consumer Studies*, 28(3), 268-283.
- McLaren, S. (2017, October 17). Candidates share 5 things that will make your interview process stand out. Retrieved from <https://business.linkedin.com/talent-solutions/blog/candidate-experience/2017/candidates-share-5-things-that-will-make-your-interview-process-stand-out>
- Miles, S. J., & McCamey, R. (2018). The candidate experience: Is it damaging your employer brand? *Business Horizons*, 61(5), 755-764.
- Miller, R., Parsons, K., & Lifer, D. (2010). Students and social networking sites: The posting paradox. *Behaviour & Information Technology*, 29(4), 377-382.
- Mohl, A. G. (2013). Building the best team: Hiring tips. *Veterinary Team Brief*, 25.
- Mothokoa, N. B., & Maritz, J. (2018). *Health SA Gesondheid*, 23(1), 1-7.
- Novak, J. (2017). Making the cut when applying for jobs online. *Journal of Vocational Rehabilitation*, 46(3), 293-299.
- Olson, K., & Peytchev, A. (2007). Effect of interviewer experience on interview pace and interviewer attitudes. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 71(2), 273-286.
- Pappano, L. (2020, February 20). On college campuses, social media provides private spaces for thousands. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from <https://www.nytimes.com/2020/02/20/education/learning/social-media-college.html>
- Pempek, T. A., Yermolayeva, Y. A., & Calvert, S. L. (2009). College students' social networking experiences on Facebook. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, 30(3), 227-238.
- Rivera, L. A. (2012). Hiring as cultural matching: The case of elite professional service firms. *American Sociological Review*, 77(6), 999-1022.
- Roberts, M. (2017, February 07). What is candidate experience? How to define, improve and optimize it. Retrieved from <https://www.jibe.com/candidate-experience/>
- Ruth, M. (2018). Customer satisfaction. *Salem Press Encyclopedia*.
- Sanchez-Fernandez, R., & Iniesta-Bonillo, M. A. (2006). Consumer perception of value: literature review and a new conceptual framework. *Journal of Consumer Satisfaction, Dissatisfaction and Complaining Behavior*, 19, 40-58.
- Shamma, H. M., & Hassan, S. S. (2009). Customer and non-customer perspectives for examining corporate reputation. *Journal of Product & Brand Management*, 18(5), 326-337.
- Simpson, J. (2017, August 24). Council post: How the perception of a good brand helps your company's effectiveness. *Forbes*. Retrieved from <https://www.forbes.com/sites/forbesagencycouncil/2017/05/05/how-the-perception-of-a-good-brand-helps-your-companys-effectiveness/>
- Solomon, M. R., Surprenant, C., Czepiel, J. A., & Gutman, E. G. (1985). A Role Theory

- Perspective on Dyadic Interactions: The Service Encounter. *Journal of Marketing*, 49(1), 99-111.
- Stevens, J. P. (2002). *Applied Multivariate Statistics for the Social Sciences* (Vol. 4). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Sullivan, J. (2017, April 13). Facing a shortage of applicants? – losing applicants explained with 5 ugly numbers. Retrieved from <https://www.ere.net/facing-a-shortage-of-applicants-losing-applicants-explained-with-5-ugly-numbers/>
- Tallulah, D. (2016, June 14). 23 Surprising stats on candidate experience - infographic. Retrieved from <https://www.careerarc.com/blog/2016/06/candidate-experience-study-infographic/>
- Taylor, S. E. (1991). Asymmetrical effects of positive and negative events: The mobilization-minimization hypothesis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 110(1), 67-85.
- Villeda, M., & McCamey, R. (2019). Use of social networking sites for recruiting and selecting in the hiring process. *International Business Research*, 12(3), 66-78.
- Weiss, H. M., & Cropanzano, R. (1996). Affective events theory: A theoretical discussion of the structure, causes and consequences of affective experiences at work. *An Annual Series of Analytical Essays and Critical Review*, 18, 1-74.
- Zhang, H., & Feinzing, S. (2017, February). *The far-reaching impact of candidate experience - ibm.com* [White paper]. IBM. Retrieved from <https://www.ibm.com/downloads/cas/YMOARJJG>
- Zielinski, D. (2018, April 11). *Study: Most job seekers abandon online job applications*. SHRM. Retrieved from <https://www.shrm.org/resourcesandtools/hr-topics/technology/pages/study-most-job-seekers-abandon-online-job-applications.aspx>