

INDEPENDENT STUDY / Source observation: 27 July 2026

Finding the information gaps before they become decisions.

A seven-field completeness audit with evidence, corrective actions and a practical publication checklist.

24

job advertisements reviewed

7

information fields per record

40%

overall field completeness,
rounded

The short version

Across 168 possible field observations, the stored sample contained 67 positive checks. The main gaps concerned pay, closing dates and eligibility information. The output was a focused checklist and correction plan.

The challenge

Applicants need enough information to assess a role before applying. This independent study tested the completeness of the same 24-record sample used in the job-market study. It is a second analysis of that dataset, not a separate client engagement.

The audit method

The checklist covered responsibilities, experience, education, named tools, work arrangement, salary and an application deadline or visible closing status.

Each field received one point when visible in the reviewed source and zero when absent. Overall completeness equals 67 divided by 168, or 39.9%, rounded to 40%. The measure reflects field presence, not the quality of the employer or role.

Findings and likely causes

Responsibilities were visible in 23 of 24 records. Named tools appeared in 16, experience and work arrangement in 10 each, education in five, deadlines in two and salary in one.

Possible explanations include different publishing templates, source truncation, policy choices and fragmented ownership. These are hypotheses from desk review; no employer interviews established causation.

Seven-field completeness

Field	Present	Share
Responsibilities	23 / 24	96%
Tools or technical methods	16 / 24	67%
Experience	10 / 24	42%
Work arrangement	10 / 24	42%
Education	5 / 24	21%
Application deadline	2 / 24	8%
Salary	1 / 24	4%

Corrective and preventive actions

Use a standard template with explicit fields for essential experience, education or equivalent experience, tools, location and work arrangement, compensation information and closing status.

Assign a reviewer before publication. Resolve missing fields or record why a field is not applicable. Run a periodic sample audit to identify recurring omissions and update the template.

Suggested future checks include at least 90% completeness of agreed mandatory fields and a visible closing date or open-until-filled statement. These are proposed targets, not improvements measured in this study.

What was delivered

A record-level audit, field-level counts, a defect and risk register, likely-cause notes and corrective/preventive recommendations. The workbook keeps these connected to the original coded sample.

This method is transferable to prospect lists, CRM records and research reports: define the standard, inspect consistently, quantify the gaps, and make the next correction clear.

Limits

Some sources were search listings or summarized job text. Information absent from that source may have existed elsewhere in an application process.

The sample is small and deliberately balanced by role family. The study did not test recruiter response, hiring fairness or the effects of the recommended changes.

Sources & scope

Source: Job Sample, Data Quality Audit and QA Findings & CAPA tabs in the downloadable workbook. Arithmetic checked 15 October 2026 against the stored rows.

Discuss a research or outreach project

thisisfurqanahmad@gmail.com | [Read this case study online](#)

[Download the source workbook](#)