11-4-2018

RECRUITING SALES STUDENTS: THE VALUE OF PROFESSIONALS IN THE CLASSROOM

Blake Nielson
Weber State University, blakenielson@weber.edu

Shannon Cummins
University of Nebraska at Omaha, scummins@unomaha.edu

Recruiting Sales Students:
The Value of Professionals in the Classroom

Abstract

Recruiting sales students can be difficult for employers due to the supply/demand gap. This is true despite increases in university sales education programs. This study investigates the impact of a sales organization representative giving an in-class presentation on student intent to pursue employment at the organization. The results indicate that a quality in-class presentation can improve student desire to work for the organization; but an average in-class presentation or shorter extra-curricular presentation had no positive effect. These results imply that an in-class presentation should be taken seriously, and done well, in order to positively impact the recruitment process.

Keywords: Recruitment, Sales, Presentations, Intent to Pursue Employment

A transition is underway within U.S. universities to include comprehensive sales education in the curriculum. In the past decade, the number of sales programs featuring at least three courses, outside accreditation, and university recognition, increased from 27 to 136 (Sales Education Foundation, 2017). These programs have designed creative curricula emphasizing role-playing, shadowing, and live-competitions that help students develop sales skills (Leach, Liu, & Johnston, 2005; Nielson & Border, 2016) and prepare students to succeed in professional sales upon entry into the field (Bolander, Bonney, & Satornino, 2014). The problem for sales organizations is simple: there are not enough of these well-prepared students. Despite the critical nature of sales recruitment to overall organization success (Graham-Leviss, 2012; Mumm, 2013), hiring job-ready sales talent is still a competitive juggernaut because there are far more sales opportunities than students (Waldeck, Pullins, & Houlette, 2010; Nielson, Eichmeier, & Cooper-Larsen, 2017).

The marketing education literature has attempted to address this supply/demand gap by investigating the ways in which university curricula can drive interest in sales careers through changing student perceptions of sales and by improving student preparation for a sales career (Cummins et al. 2013). Collectively, these efforts have shown that sales education has a positive effect on both student perceptions about a career in sales (e.g. Bristow, Gulati, & Amyx, 2006; Karakaya, Quigley, & Bingham, 2011) and student intent to pursue a sales career (Peltier et al., 2015). Specific works have revealed the types of classroom interventions that can best drive student interest in sales (e.g. Cummins et al., 2015).

Unfortunately, current work does not address the next step in narrowing the professional sales supply gap. Simply, current research does not inform our understanding of how university sales programs impact student choice of specific employers after graduation. This is despite calls

for such investigation (Agnihotri et al., 2014). Additionally, current work does not drive understanding of how firm involvement in sales programs impacts sales recruitment despite calls for organizational involvement in sales education (Cespedes & Weinfurther, 2016).

Agnihotri et al. (2014) found that "hyper-competition" for students has created a "noisy" recruiting environment that students must navigate while selecting a post-graduation job. This "noise" makes it harder for many students to select a company that fits their individual needs (Weilbaker & Williams, 2006). Initial employment fit is critical, not only to employee success and career trajectory, but also to the firm as it dictates retention rates, recruiting expenditures, and employee ROI (Fogel et al., 2012).

The combination of growing university sales curricula and organizational shortages of quality sales staff has created an environment where student recruitment is linked to the classroom. Not only do faculty invite firms into the classroom to bring material to life, they often reserve the privilege for paying sponsors. Firms enter classrooms to engage with qualified students prior to job market entry and often as a coveted perk of sales center sponsorship. A review of sales center promotional materials targeted at firms highlights the opportunity to enter classrooms as a benefit often reserved for sponsors. Despite this reality, scholars have yet to explore the impact of this classroom dynamic on student job selection.

In this paper, we introduce *intent to pursue employment* among sales students. We test two previously untested propositions put forth by Agnihotri et al. (2014) related to successful integration of sales professionals in the classroom. We investigate the impact of integrating sales professionals in the classroom on student intent to pursue employment with the professionals' organization.

Literature Review

While the impact of educational exposure on intended career choice (Cummins et al. 2015, Allen et al., 2014) and preparedness (Bolander et al., 2014; Bristow, Gulati, & Amyx, 2006; Karakaya et al., 2011) is well explored in the marketing education literature, the impact of educational exposure on specific job choice post-graduation is not well understood. Despite calls to investigate the intersection of curriculum, faculty, and post-graduation employment (Cummins et al., 2013), little empirical work within the sales domain exists. A broad attempt to remedy this gap developed 16 propositions based on stakeholder theory (Agnihotri et al. 2014). This ambitious work approached the problem of improving student recruitment and placement outcomes from the perspective of student, employer, and university.

For the student stakeholder, the benefit of improving job placement may seem simple: more students with jobs equals success. Luckily, for sales students, this is an overly simplistic reading of a complex job market. Students graduating from sales programs are in demand and have the luxury of searching for offerings that meet their perceived needs and wants in a first employer. These students are confronted with many employment options, but often have difficulty differentiating among job offerings (Turban & Dougherty, 1992) and identifying a position with strong "person-job fit" (Werbel & Gilliland, 1999). According to Dipboye (1992) and Rynes (1990), this stems mostly from a lack of information. Simply, students have too little contact with potential employers and are unable to ascertain role and organizational characteristics. This lack of familiarity means students are often unable to determine if there is "fit," or congruence between their own needs, goals, and values and the organizations' norms, values, and reward systems. And even when prospective employees have opinions about a given organization, this "employer knowledge" may be lacking or based on superficial sources (Cable & Turban 2001; Ehrhart 2006). Problems stemming from poor person-job fit are severe for

4

students as research shows that poor fit can result in lower levels of early career success and may even push individuals out of a chosen career path (Kristof-Brown, Zimmerman, & Johnson, 2005; Singh & Greenhaus, 2004).

Organizations also have difficulty determining person-job fit, and suffer from poor fit effects. Sales attrition is a persistent problem within sales organizations. Attrition is often attributed to the competitive landscape, where demand for sales professionals far outstrips supply and salespeople are able to negotiate for more competitive compensation packages. But, attrition can also stem from the organization's poor recruitment and candidate selection. A benchmark estimate of cost stemming from the departure of a sales professional in their first year of employment is three to four times the employee's salary (Van Clief, 1991). Despite spending an average of $6,275 per collegiate hire (National Association of Colleges and Employers, 2017), many first-time salespeople do not stay with the company or with the career.

One strategy for decreasing market and financial costs of salesperson attrition is to target collegians educated through university sales programs. Students graduating from sales programs, on average, stay employed with the firm longer and generate enough sales to equal their salaries faster than other collegians (Fogel et al., 2012). Despite the growth in collegiate sales programs, employers still find it difficult to differentiate themselves among a "noisy" field of competing employment offers (Weilbaker & Williams, 2006).

The university stakeholder may be the most interesting, and crucial, in improving placement outcomes for both students and organizations. A recent study put forth a sales course outline where students learned and practiced the sales process through a multi-part job hunting exercise. The outcome was improved person-job fit (Allen et al., 2017). For administrators, improving placement rates and student placement perceptions can drive enrollment numbers

through higher institutional rankings (Morgeson & Nahrgang, 2008). Post graduation, improved job placement and job success can drive alumni perceptions about their alma-mater (Kristof-Brown, Zimmerman, & Johnson, 2005; Singh & Greenhaus, 2004). While faculty have long been understood to be vital in driving student interest in, and preparedness for, the sales career path (Peltier et al., 2014, Cummins et al., 2013, Bristow, Gulati, & Amyx, 2006; Karakaya et al., 2011), it is largely uninvestigated how faculty can assist sales students (see noted exception of Allen et al., 2017) and organizations in obtaining optimal person-job fit.

Hypotheses

Sales center personnel are tasked with developing a model that gives company donors a presence on campus that is ultimately seen by students and drives the recruitment pipeline. A common sales center benefit that sponsor companies are given is the opportunity to help teach and present in sales courses. The authors observed that the opportunity to come into sales center classes was viewed differently among firms despite its positioning as a core benefit of sponsorship. The research question of student's intent to pursue employment arose after partner firms asked how well this common technique of a classroom presentation was working. This research question is connected to two of Agnihotri et al.'s (2014) propositions related to student intent to pursue a sales position. Agnihotri and colleagues (2014) developed a stakeholder model in which balanced participation of employers, students, and educators results in higher student interest through 1) improved student awareness of job offerings and characteristics; and 2) active recruitment of individuals by employers. The tested propositions are described below and focus on the ability of curriculum-based employer–student interaction to positively impact intent to pursue employment with the representative's organization.

Contact Strategy Impact

Previous work has investigated the mode of communication preferred by students when investigating employment opportunities (i.e. Swanson and Tomkovick 2012). In total, the research suggests that students' preferences for modes of communication for social purposes were not necessarily those preferred for school/work activities. Thus, it is important for recruiters and faculty to question recent trends showing rising reliance on social media and internet resources to recruit collegians (Collegiate Employment Research Institute, 2013). In fact, research focusing on coveted sales student's shows this group holds strong communication mode preferences when investigating job opportunities and employment offers. Specifically, sales students prefer individualized, in-person communication over social media when discussing initial employment with recruiters (Swanson and Tomkovick, 2012). This was opposite employers' prediction of a preference for e-mail and social media communications.

Students may believe in the validity of actual person-to-person contact and this could be a big reason they prefer that personal touch in the recruitment and placement process. It may give them assurance of actual firm interest and hiring intent versus communicating through non-personal approaches. The preference for synchronous communication by students is apparent, but the question for recruiters is if time spent on campus will drive a measurable change in student's desires to work for their organization. Previous work has found that effective classroom visits by experienced sales professionals can drive intent to pursue a sales career of non-sales students (Cummins et al., 2015). We posit that a sales professional's classroom visit can influence sales students' intent to pursue employment with that professionals' organization.

Emergent from this discussion is Agnihotri et al.'s (2014) proposition that students will more highly rate the attractiveness of a sales position with companies that use in-person

7

communication during the sales-student recruitment process. In this paper, we test the ability of organizations to impact student intent to pursue employment with a given organization through in-person classroom contact. Specifically: *H₁: Sales student intent to pursue employment will be higher for organizations that employ in-person communication during the sales recruitment process.*

Impact of Recruiter Relationships

It is well established that student evaluations of faculty trend with demonstrated characteristics of enthusiasm and perceived interest in students (e.g. Radmacher and Martin, 2001). We expect this relationship to hold for students' evaluation of recruiters; and in addition, we argue that a positive evaluation of firm personnel will translate to a more positive evaluation of the recruiter's employment opportunity. As established, sales students prefer personal face-to-face contact with recruiters (Dixon & Adamson, 2012). This first personal interaction can generate a positive first impression of the organization and its opportunities. But what content should be included in a personal interaction? Emphasizing the unique aspects of a sales position, aspects that students may not necessarily associate with sales, such as a creative job environment, task variety, interactions with different types of people, and travel opportunities, can improve an organizations' position with prospects (Pettijohn & Pettijohn, 2009). But beyond characteristics of the role, recruiters can deliver a "positive candidate experience" (Graham-Leviss, 2012; Wiles & Spiro, 2004) by using relationship selling skills to build relationships and show genuine interest in student welfare, while maintaining professional interactions (Agnihotri et al.'s 2014). The recruiter's personal interest in the sales student offers a compelling motivation

to keep a company in the student's consideration set of possible employers (Wiles & Spiro, 2004).

Emergent from this discussion is Agnihotri et al.'s (2014) proposition that students will more highly rate the attractiveness of a sales position with companies that have shown (a) a genuine interest in sales students and (b) a professional and positive attitude. In this paper, we test the ability of sales organization representatives to impact student intent to pursue employment through classroom presentations. More specifically, we investigate if presentations that are viewed as genuine, professional, and positive are more likely to drive intent to pursue employment as compared to more generic presentations. Is it time or quality that matters when visiting a classroom for recruitment? Specifically, we hypothesize: *H_2: A sales organization that has a better class presentation, according to the students, will more positively impact student intent to pursue employment.*

Methodology

An quasi-experiment was conducted with students from a western and midwestern university. Both schools have established sales centers and are full members of the University Sales Center Alliance. These sales centers partner with companies that are provided the opportunity to attend sales courses to aid instructors in lesson presentation while also discussing their company and employment opportunities. Not all sponsors attend all classes; rather, specific partners are assigned to attend and help teach specific class meetings each semester. In these courses, the representatives share insights from industry, while conveying opportunities at their company. Additional opportunities to present at other events outside of scheduled classes

including panel and single-presenter topic presentations, job fairs, networking events, and competition judging are extended to sponsor firms.

The students in the sample took a pre-test before the interventions measuring their desire to work for the organizations that were coming to present. All students were professional sales majors, enrolled in a sales minor/certificate, or interested in sales positions. All students included in the analysis were present for the pre-test, the company presentation, and the post-test. The intervention was conducted in seven regularly scheduled 75 minute classes across the two universities. One university also hosted an extra-curricular event outside of normal class meeting times where three employers presented for twenty-five minutes rather than the hour allocated during class. All representatives were invited to present on a pre-determined sales topic, either as part of the course curriculum during class, or at an extra-curricular sales center informational event. All representatives had freedom to discuss their company and opportunities for employment.

The pre- and post-tests were administered immediately before and after the presentations respectively. The survey was adapted from the ITPSC scale that was developed by Peltier et al (2014). The ITPSC scale was built to measure a student's intent to pursue a sales career. A summated score for the four variables was utilized, with higher scores indicating an increased intent to pursue. The intent to pursue measures were altered to include the focal organization so that students' intention to pursue a sales job with the given organization were assessed. See the Appendix for the amended measures. The total student sample size was 322.

In addition to collecting pre- and post-measures for the presenting firms, surveys collected intent to pursue employment data on firms that were not presenting. These firms were also sales center partner firms and similarly known to the students as the presenting firms. This

allowed for a type of control group of firms who actively recruit the students surveyed and attend sales program events, but did not participate in the studied in-person intervention. Participants in two classes (70 total) scored five non-presenting partner companies on the pre- and post-test in addition to the company presenting.

H$_1$, which states sales student intent to pursue employment will be higher for organizations that employ in-person communication during the sales recruitment process was tested by utilizing the Paired Samples T-Test for each company with the results of the pre-test and post-test. The firms who presented in either format (shorter, extra-curricular or longer, in-class) were compared to firms who did not present in-person.

H$_2$ stated that a sales organization that has a better presentation, according to the students, will more positively impact student intent to pursue employment. In order to analyze the quality of the communication, the presentations were rated by students on a five-point scale (see the Appendix). The authors recorded three presentations and enlisted four individuals to access quality to ensure that the question was measuring the quality of the presentation given, and not the branding or desirability of the firm to a student audience. Three of the four had no meaningful knowledge of the companies and no interest in employment. All agreed with the rating means given by the students. Additionally, three individuals reviewed the presentation videos and ranked: 1) perceived interest in students; and 2) professional and positive attitude (Agnihotri et al. 2014) on a five-point scale. The average ratings across these two dimensions matched the rank order of the reviewers using a single quality metric. The mean scores of each set of video rankings were similar to the student ratings, suggesting that a lone measure of presentation quality reflected the dual concept of recruiter interest and attitude proposed by Agnihotri et al (2014).

ANOVA analysis and Tukey post hoc tests were used to analyze if the presentations'

quality ratings were significantly different. These results, and the results from H_1, helped

determine if the firm's presentation is important in driving employment intent.

The final sample size for the study was 322 students. Of this sample, 190 (59.01%) of the

participants were male, and 132 (40.99%) of the participants were female. The sample included

121 (37.58%) seniors, 131 (40.68%) juniors, 55 (17.08%) sophomores, and 15 (4.66%)

freshman. The descriptive statistics for all responses are presented in the Appendix, which

includes the descriptive statistics for the pre-test and post-test for the ten companies that made

presentations as well as the presentation scores.

Results

Key to this quasi-experiment was clear student opinion on the quality of the

presentations. There was a breakpoint in the group means distribution with respect to these

ratings. The quality presentations group consisted of companies 1, 3, 4 and 6. The average

presentation scores for these companies ranged from 4.42 to 4.81. The non-quality presentation

group included the other six companies that had a range of average presentation scores from 2.51

to 3.75. The final sample size for the quality presentation group was 99 and the non-quality

presentation was 223. ANOVA analysis additionally tested if there was a significant difference

in the quality of the presentations. Table 1 below shows clear differences.

(Put Table 1 here.)

The first hypotheses asked if there would be a difference in student intent to pursue

employment after in-person communication. The results show partial support for H_1. The Paired

Samples T-Test for the control companies indicated there was no change of intent to purse with

these non-presenting partner firms. This was as expected since there was no interaction with these non-presenting companies during the quasi-experiment; however, not all presenting firms improved student intent to pursue employment post-presentation. See Table 2 below.

(Put Table 2 here.)

These results leads to H_2, that organizations providing a quality in-class presentation, according to the students, would have a significant improvement in intent to pursue employment. The results indicate firms with presentation scores landing them in the quality group showed improved student intent to pursue employment. The non-quality group showed no significant change in student intent to pursue employment. These results revealed that just showing up for class would not guarantee a change in student employment interest. Table 1 shows the impact of presentation quality on student intent to pursue firm employment for each group (quality and non-quality) and each presenting firm. The results from Table 1 strongly support H_2, that organizations providing a quality in-class presentation, according to the students, would have a significant improvement in intent to pursue employment.

It is interesting to note that the three companies (8, 9, and 10) with less time to present, and in an extra-curricular format, did not have positive significant results on student intent to pursue. One of these firms (10) showed a significant change, but in the wrong direction, where students declared decreased intent to pursue employment after the presentation. With respect to the seven in-class (and longer) presentations, the organization's with mean presentation scores less than or equal to 3.75 did not have strong effect sizes according to Cohen D. Those that had mean presentation scores of 4.4 or higher did have significant effect sizes. The Tukey post hoc test indicated that the high-quality presentation of company 6, which had a Cohen D value of .75, was significantly different from company 2 ($P < .01$), company 5 ($P < .01$), and company 7 ($P <$

.01). These three companies are the companies that presented in an hour-long classroom setting and did not have a significant change in intent to pursue employment. Company 1, which had the next best presentation (Cohen D of .51), had the same significant differences ($p < .01$) from those three companies with no change of intent to pursue and lower quality presentations.

These results support H_2; the quality of the presentation does matter if an organization wants to change sales student intent to pursue employment in the classroom. These results also indicate that time and/or setting can be important while attempting to change a sales student's intent to pursue. The only well-received presentations took place during a regularly scheduled class meeting. The shorter, extra-curricular presentations, despite being single-presenter format, did not result in favorable student ratings.

Discussion

There is much argument in higher education regarding the treatment, or acceptance, of students as consumers (Bok, 2003; Matulich, Papp, & Haytko 2008). Some argue they are consumers—consuming a product in the form of classes and employment potential and we must cater to, if not at least acknowledge the impact of, their consumerism on higher education (e.g. Singleton-Jackson et al., 2010; Feiertag and Berge, 2008; Stewart, 2009). Others feel higher education is separate from the marketplace and should be a place where the concerns of hiring firms are secondary (Mills, 2012). This broader discussion about the place and value of education is outside the purview of this paper; yet, we understand that sales centers do wade into the discussion through their partnerships with market players.

Nowhere is this more evident than in the recruitment of sales students. Many sales programs are permitted to begin because they are self-funded. Simply, administration gives the

green light because the extra man-hours, the cost of running competitions and trainings, and the travel for students and faculty, is off-set by sponsor dollars. These sponsors, while happy to have a better trained population entering the workforce, are not wholly benevolent. Their sponsorship pays off when they hire (and retain) sales students. The opportunity to recruit directly from the sales program student population is the driving rationale behind their investment (Weilbaker & Williams, 2006).

This paper shows that connecting recruitment and learning within the classroom can impact student intent to pursue employment. While it is debatable if this model is what higher education institutions should be, the reality is clear. Sales programs are in a position to integrate post-graduation job reality into the classroom; with the potential to benefit students, the program, and outside employers. As the liaisons between students and employers, faculty are knowledge brokers (Weeks et al., 2014) in training students and brokering successful job placements; both of which are central to the university's academic mission (Peltier et al., 2014). Research has shown that university sales education is a significant contributor to sales person performance (Bolander et al., 2014); but how much of that success is due to student adoption of specific behaviors, and how much is due to connecting students with the right jobs?

As educators, we must approach the role of broker with the student in mind. As shown, students who are able to improve person-job fit have better outcomes personally and professionally (Kristof-Brown, Zimmerman, & Johnson, 2005; Singh & Greenhaus, 2004). The results are similarly better for sponsors benefiting from decreased turnover costs and stronger performance (Klewer, Shaffer, & Binnig, 1995). Academia is not wholly altruistic either in this calculation, as improved student job placement drives institutional ratings and alumni satisfaction; and hopefully, donations and involvement (Morgeson & Nahrgang, 2008).

While it is common in sales programs across the U.S. to invite sponsors into the classroom, this paper demonstrates that recruiting sales organizations must take the opportunity seriously. One large university sales center even offers coaching, outlines, talk points, and slide templates to enhance classroom presentations. Sales faculty and students can get frustrated when these are not taken seriously or even a scheduling conflict put a new presenter in the classroom last minute with little to no preparation. Mere exposure effect is not the name of the game when recruiting sales students. Instead, the student-perceived quality of the recruiters' presentation is vital to positively impacting student intent to pursue employment.

Sales faculty and sales programs should select partner firms carefully; much as firms with good hiring processes select employees. The selection of sales program partners should be approached as a long-term partnership where each party gives and gains. With the rapid growth of sales centers, it is tempting to view sponsor dollars as handouts—money with few strings attached. Similarly, for sponsors, it is easy to hope that a few hours in the classroom and a sponsorship check to a sales program will result in a magical fix to sales function staffing woes.

The reality is that good sponsors are those who understand recruitment is still driven by "deepening connections" with students (Backhaus & Tikoo, 2004; Berthon, Ewing, & Hah, 2005). This process is not easy; but rather time-consuming and labor-intensive. For prospective employers, it is also critical to realize they are competing with other sponsors for these coveted sales students (Waldeck, Pullins, & Houlette, 2010); and thus, must choose wisely when sending personnel to talk with students and crafting site-visits and follow-up encounters. While taking top salespeople and leadership away from customers and other tasks may seem too great a cost, a missed opportunity to hire a future star salesperson may be the bigger loss.

Sales programs need to develop sponsors by introducing clear expectations prior to accepting sponsor checks. Based on this research, sales programs need to craft in-class and extracurricular activities that improve person-job fit and allow students to explore the reality of a job both during work hours and in work-life balance. This research suggests that spending time in the classroom is not enough for recruiting top talent. Just as well designed lessons drive student learning, quality classroom visits by recruiters can drive students to pursue employment. This work also suggests that longer exposures within normally scheduled classes are the most beneficial to recruiting organizations.

If the chronic shortage of sales professionals in the workforce is to be addressed, more research and a renewed commitment by both academics and businesses is needed. We must understand what drives students to not only pursue a sales career, but also to pursue a specific sales job. By understanding what drives employment choices, firms can better design their roles to meet future sales professionals' demands. By connecting recruiters and students to improve the flow of information about specific employment opportunities, faculty can drive person-job fit and answer calls for research to expand our understanding of how to align the career development needs of students with the needs of employer recruiters (Gray, Peltier, and Schibrowsky, 2012). Only when students' first sales jobs are successful, and they choose to stay in the profession, will we begin chipping away at the larger sales supply-demand gap.

Limitations

This study is but a first attempt at testing some of the propositions put forth by Agnihotri et al. (2014); and understanding how sales organizations can better drive intent to pursue employment among collegians. Future work should explore the different factors that help

companies achieve a better classroom presentation rating. Similarly, our study's single-item measure of presentation quality does not directly test Angihorti et al's (2014) proposition that refers to companies that have a "genuine interest in sales students and professional and positive attitude". This research was conducted at universities in the Midwest and West, and results may vary in other locations.

Conclusion

This study investigates one aspect of the sales recruitment process by discussing the importance of firm presentations. The results indicate that an organization can impact student intent to pursue employment with a quality classroom presentation; however, an average presentation does not drive intent to pursue employment. Additionally, only presentations during regularly scheduled classes were viewed favorably by students. The shorter extra-curricular presentations were not only viewed as poor, but one reduced student intent to pursue employment. These results should encourage recruiting organizations to prepare for classroom sales presentations and understand the impact these encounters can have on the recruitment process.

References

Agnihotri, R., Bonney, L., Dixon, A. L., Erffmeyer, R., Pullins, E. B., Sojka, J. Z., & West, V. (2014). Developing a stakeholder approach for recruiting top-level sales students. *Journal of Marketing Education, 36*(1), 75-86.

Allen, C. K., Dugan, R. G., Popa, E. M., & Tarasi, C. O. (2017). Helping students find their sweet spot: A teaching approach using the sales process to find jobs that fit. *Marketing Education Review*, *27*(3), 187-201.

Allen, C.K, Kumar, P., Tarasi, C., & Wilson, H. (2014). Selling sales: Factors influencing undergraduate business students' decision to pursue sales education. *Journal of Marketing Education*, *36*(2), 94-104.

Backhaus, K., & Tikoo, S. (2004). Conceptualizing and researching employer branding. *Career Development International, 9*, 501-517.

Berthon, P., Ewing, M., & Hah, L. L. (2005). Captivating company: Dimensions of attractiveness in employer branding. *International Journal of Advertising, 24*, 151-172.

Bolander, W., Bonney, L., & Satornino, C. (2014). Sales education efficacy: Examining the relationship between sales education and sales success. *Journal of Marketing Education*, *36*(2), 75-86.

Bok, D. (2003). Universities in the marketplace: The commercialization of higher education. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Bristow, D. N., Gulati, R., & Amyx, D. (2006). A look at professional selling from the students' perspective: A replication and extension. *Marketing Management Journal, 16*, 88-103.

Cable, D.M., & Turban, D.B. (2001). Establishing the dimensions, sources and value of job seekers' employer knowledge during recruitment. In *Research in personnel and human resource management*, edited by G. R. Ferris. New York: Elsevier Science.

Cespedes, F.V., & Weinfurther, D. (2016, April 26). More Universities Need to Teach Sales. *Harvard Business Review. Retrieved from https://hbr.org/2016/04/more-universities-need-to-teach-sales*

The Collegiate Employment Research Institute & Michigan State University Career Services Network. (2013). *Recruiting trends 2012-2013* (42nd ed.). Retrieved from http://www.ceri.msu.edu/wp-content/uploads/2012/11/FRecruiting-Trends-2012-2013.pdf.

Cummins, S., Peltier, J. W., Erffmeyer, R., & Whalen, J. (2013). A critical review of the literature for sales educators. *Journal of Marketing Education*, *35*(1), 68-78.

Cummins, S., Peltier, J. W., Pomirleanu, N., Cross, J., & Simon, R. (2015). Evaluating educational practices for positively affecting student perceptions of a sales career. *Journal of Marketing Education, 37*(1), 25-35.

Dipboye, R. L. (1992). Selection interviews: Process perspectives. Cincinnati, OH: South Western.

Dixon, A., & Adamson, A. (2012, December 4). *Reaching the next generation of sales professionals* [Webinar].

Ehrhart, K. H. (2006). Job characteristic beliefs and personality as antecedents of subjective person-job fit. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 21(2): 193–226.

Fogel, S., Hoffmeister, D., Rocco, R., & Strunk, D. P. (2012). Teaching sales. *Harvard Business Review*, *90*(7/8): 94-99.

Feiertag, J., & Berge, Z. L. (2008). Training generation N: How educators should approach the net generation. *Education + Training*, 50(6), 457–464.

Graham-Leviss, K. (2012). A targeted hiring methodology can hit the bull's-eye in recruiting sales professionals. *Employment Relations Today, 38*(4), 9-17.

Gray, D. M., Peltier, J. W., & Schibrowsky, J. A. (2012). The Journal of Marketing Education: Past, present, and future. *Journal of Marketing Education*, 34, 217-237.

Karakaya, F., Quigley, C., & Bingham, F. (2011). A cross-national investigation of student intentions to pursue a sales career. *Journal of Marketing Education, 13*(1), 47-55.

Kristof-Brown, A. L., Zimmerman, R. D., & Johnson, E. C. (2005). *Consequences of Individual's fit at work: A meta-analysis of person–job, person–organization, person–group, and person–supervisor fit*. Personnel Psychology, 58, 281-342.

Leach, M. P., Liu, A. H., & Johnston, W. J. (2005). The role of self-regulation training in developing the motivation management capabilities of salespeople. *Journal of Personal Selling & Sales Management*, *25*(3), 269-281.

Matulich, E., Papp, R., & Haytko, D.L. (2008). Continuous improvement through teaching innovations: a requirement for today's learners. *Marketing Education Review*, 18(1), 1-7.

Mills, N. (2012). "The Corporatization of Higher Education." *Dissent*, 59(4), 6-9.

Morgeson, F. P., & Nahrgang, J. D. (2008). Same as it ever was: Recognizing stability in the Business Week rankings. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 7 (1), 26-41.

Mumm, J. (2013). Hiring top sales performers is certainly no accident. *BusinessWest*, *30*(3), 14-52.

National Association of Colleges and Employers. (2017). *2017 Recruiting Benchmarks Survey Report* (Whitepaper). Bethlehem, PA: Author.

Nielson, B., Eichmeier, S., & Cooper-Larsen, D. (2017). Organizational compensation limitations inhibiting recruitment of top-tier qualified sales graduates. *International Journal of Sales, Retailing & Marketing, 6*(1), 40-47.

Nielson, B. E., & Border, T. (2016). Teaching and training future sales professionals how to negotiate with real world experience. *Journal for Advancement of Marketing Education*, *24*8-15.

Peltier, J. W., Cummins, S., Pomirleanu, N., Cross, J., & Simon, R. (2014). A parsimonious instrument for predicting students' intent to pursue a sales career: Scale development and validation, *Journal of Marketing Education, 36*(1), 62-74.

Pettijohn, C. E., & Pettijohn, L. S. (2009). An exploratory analysis of sales career desirability: An MBA perspective. *Academy of Educational Leadership Journal*, 13(4), 35-47.

Radmacher, S. A., & Martin, D. J. (2001). Identifying significant predictors of student evaluations of faculty through hierarchical regression analysis. *The Journal of psychology*, *135*(3), 259-268.

Rynes, S. L., & Barber, A. E. (1990). Applicant attraction strategies: An organizational perspective. *Academy of Management Review*, 15, 286-310.

Sales Education Foundation. (2017). A History of the SEF ANNUAL Magazine – Representing Growth in University Sales Programs. *Retrieved from https://salesfoundation.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/10/History-of-the-ANNUAL-Growth-in-SEF-Recognized-Sales-Programs.pdf*

Singh, R., & Greenhaus, J. H. (2004). The relation between career decision-making strategies and person–job fit: A study of job changers. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 64. , 198-221.

Singleton-Jackson, J.A., Jackson, D.L., & Reinhardt, J. (2010). Students as sonsumers of knowledge: Are they buying what we're selling?. *Innovative Higher Education*, 35(5), 343-358.

Stewart, K. (2009). Lessons from teaching millennials. *College Teaching*, 57(2), 111–117.

Swanson, S. R., & Tomkovick, C. (2012, Fall). Marketing internships: How values and search strategies differ across the student-employer dyad. *Marketing Education Review*, 22, 251-262.

Turban, D. B., & Dougherty, T. W. (1992). Influences of campus recruiting on applicant

attraction to firms. *Academy of Management Journal*, 35, 739-765.

Waldeck, N. E., Pullins, E. B., & Houlette, M. (2010). Media as factor in student perceptions for sales jobs: A Framework for Research. *Journal of Personal Selling & Sales Management*, *30*(4), 343-354.

Weilbaker, D. C., & Williams, M. (2006). Recruiting new salespeople from Universities: University sales centers offer a better alternative. *Journal of Selling & Major Account Management, 6*(3), 30-38.

Wiles, M. A., & Spiro, R. L. (2004, Winter). Attracting graduates to sales positions and the role of recruiter knowledge: A reexamination. *Journal of Personal Selling and Sales Management*, 24, 39-48.

Table 1: ANOVA

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	188.32	9	20.95	22.07	.00
Residual	295.72	312	.948		
Total	484.04	321			

Table 2: Impact of Presentation on Student Intent to Pursue Firm Employment
Cohen's D and *p*-value for Paired Samples T-Test

Groups	Effect Size Cohen's D	*p* value
Quality Presentations	.48	**.00***
Company 1 (In-Class)	.51	**.00***
Company 3 (In-Class)	.33	**.00***
Company 4 (In-Class)	.38	**.00***
Company 6 (In-Class)	.75	**.00***
Non-Quality Presentations	.00	.48
Company 2 (In-Class)	.00	.77
Company 5 (In-Class)	.04	.26
Company 7 (In-Class)	.00	.53
Company 8 (Extra-Curricular/Shorter)	.00	.72
Company 9 (Extra-Curricular/Shorter)	.00	.77
Company 10 (Extra-Curricular/Shorter)	-.17	**.00***

* *p* < .01

Appendix

Instrument

Intent to Pursue Employment *(adapted from Peltier, et al. 2014)*

I am interested in pursuing a sales position with *[with focal company]* when I graduate

Obtaining a position *[with focal company]* in sales is a priority for me after graduation

Obtaining a sales support position *[with focal company]* would interest me

At some time during my career, I will probably *[work for focal company]* in sales

Quality of Presentation

How would you rank the presentation that was made by this company today (please circle)?

Very Poor   Poor   Neutral   Good   Very Good

Descriptive Statistics of Sample

	Sample Size	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Company 1 Pre-Test Employment Intent	35	2.86	1.21	.20
Company 1 Post-Test Employment Intent	35	3.89	.93	.15
Company 2 Pre-Test Employment Intent	35	3.29	1.01	.17
Company 2 Post-Test Employment Intent	35	3.23	.91	.15
Company 3 Pre-Test Employment Intent	30	2.58	1.01	.18
Company 3 Post-Test Employment Intent	30	3.09	.96	.17
Company 4 Pre-Test Employment Intent	22	3.02	1.17	.25
Company 4 Post-Test Employment Intent	22	3.60	.97	.20
Company 5 Pre-Test Employment Intent	28	2.47	.76	.14
Company 5 Post-Test Employment Intent	28	2.64	.85	.16
Company 6 Pre-Test Employment Intent	12	3.35	.48	.13
Company 6 Post-Test Employment Intent	12	4.38	.69	.20
Company 7 Pre-Test Employment Intent	40	2.76	1.19	.18
Company 7 Post-Test Employment Intent	40	2.92	.90	.14
Company 8 Pre-Test Employment Intent	40	2.91	1.05	.16
Company 8 Post-Test Employment Intent	40	2.98	1.31	.20
Company 9 Pre-Test Employment Intent	40	3.04	1.02	.16
Company 9 Post-Test Employment Intent	40	3.00	1.20	.19
Company 10 Pre-Test Employment Intent	40	3.09	.99	.15
Company 10 Post-Test Employment Intent	40	2.51	1.24	.19
Company 1 Presentation Summated Score	35	4.42	.65	.11

Company 2 Presentation Summated Score	35	3.45	.88	.14
Company 3 Presentation Summated Score	30	4.43	.62	.11
Company 4 Presentation Summated Score	22	4.81	.39	.08
Company 5 Presentation Summated Score	28	3.75	1.17	.22
Company 6 Presentation Summated Score	12	4.66	.49	.14
Company 7 Presentation Summated Score	40	3.40	.62	.09
Company 8 Presentation Summated Score	40	2.51	1.20	.19
Company 9 Presentation Summated Score	40	3.0	1.31	.20
Company 10 Presentation Summated Score	40	2.98	1.22	.06