CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

The purpose of the literature review was to examine research in the following

areas: importance of the selection interviews, interview characteristics, interviewer

training, interviewer propensity for prejudging the interviewee, demographic

characteristics such as sex, race, and age of interviewers/interviewees and the relationship

between these variables and the interview, elements of effective interviews, elements of

effective teaching, and summary.

Importance of Selection Interviews

While the entire selection process is important, the selection interview itself

provides the best opportunity for assessing the potential match between the individual and

the needs of the institution (Watts, 1993). Selection or employment interviews are the

second most frequently used applicant screening device (Ash, 1981). Resume reviews and

employment application materials are the most common (McDaniel, Schmidt, & Hunter,

1988). Often interviews are used because of their intuitive appeal for those responsible for

hiring, which makes them one of the most frequently used selection procedures

(McDaniel, Whetzel, Schmidt, & Maurer, 1994). Ulrich and Trumbo (1965) surveyed 852

organizations and found that 99% of them used interviews as a selection tool. Neely

(1993) stressed the importance of good selections:

The objective of the selection process is to employ individuals who will be

successful on the job. The potential cost of selecting an applicant who will not be

successful is enormous. These are often incalculable due to inadequate performance, expenses connected with a plan of improvement, the termination process, and because of the expense involved with hiring new employees. (p. 4)

Indeed, the selection process (this includes the interview) is important for many reasons. According to Castetter (1981):

The selection process presents a propitious opportunity to correct problems that exist in the organization relating to affirmative action and to staff balance. The selection process is the means by which requirement for affirmative action plans can be implemented. The process is also a useful device for correcting staff imbalance in experience, in talent, in staff adequacy, in units lacking expertise in selected areas, and in staffing competency. (p. 223)

Importance of the Interview in Selecting Teachers

An important administrative task in any school district is staffing or selecting new employees to fill vacant teaching positions (Vann, 1994). Staffing can be defined as the process involved in identifying, assessing, placing, evaluating, and developing individuals at work (Schneider, 1976). Castetter (1992) described the staffing process as including recruitment, selection, induction, and development. Two parts of the staffing process, recruitment and selection, are identified in the literature as the most important tasks performed not only by school systems but also by other organizations (Anderson, 1992; Castetter, 1992; Jensen, 1987; Phillips, 1987).

As those responsible for staffing their building with quality teachers, principals are faced with a formidable challenge. This challenge can also have serious ramifications, and for this reason the selection interview should not be handled lightly. Jensen (1987) stated in her research that "three conditions make the hiring of qualified teachers a challenge: complexity of the teaching function, insufficient attention to hiring, and inadequate selection techniques" (p. 14).

Castetter (1981) lends support to the above and is cited below:

The primary aim of selection is to fill existing vacancies with personnel who meet established qualifications, who appear likely to succeed on the job, who will find sufficient position satisfaction to remain in the system, who will be effective contributors to unit and system goals, and who will be sufficiently motivated to achieve a high level of self-development. When the selection process is properly planned, additional benefits are derived. The system is able to exercise an important responsibility on behalf of the community and the profession: elimination of candidates unlikely to succeed. Proper selection helps also to minimize dissipation of time, effort, and funds that must be invested in developing a sound staff. Moreover, a rational and uniform basis is provided for personnel selection, which, when consistently applied, provides the applicant, the community, and the school staff with assurance that competency is the key factor determining acceptance or rejection. (pp. 221-222)

According to Rosenholtz (1985) the importance of careful selection procedures cannot be overemphasized. "If principals fail in their efforts to attract good teachers and keep them, they become trapped in a cycle of high turnover and low school productivity" (p. 362). The interview can then serve as a valuable tool in uncovering personnel who will positively serve the needs of their schools and communities.

Empirical Research on the Interview

Researchers have concerned themselves with research on both the validity and the objectivity of the selection or employment interview. The widespread organizational acceptance of the interview as an integral part of the selection and recruiting process almost guarantees that research will continue in this area (Harris, 1989). According to Parsons and Liden's (1984) meta-analysis of research on the interview, the trend is now to move away from research which solely examines the interview as a selection tool and to focus on the factors that influence interviewer's decisions about applicants.

As stated before in this paper, the purpose of this study was to analyze the interview questions and some practices of middle school principals in this suburban school district. Before beginning the analysis of the interview questions and some practices that were explored in this study, it was necessary to investigate the utility of the interview as a valid tool to be used in making personnel selections. Therefore, a brief study into the validity of the interview was warranted. While this was not the focus of this study, it was important to establish empirically that the interview is both valid and reliable as a predictive measure of future performance. Is there validity associated with the interview as a selection tool? Do

interviewers' biases affect or confound the interview? Is there still support for use of the

selection interview even though some factors that might invalidate its utility? Are the

questions asked during the interview valid? Reliable? The following empirical studies will

address the utility of predictive validity of the selection interview.

<u>Utility of Predictive Validity of the Interview</u>

Ghiselli (1966) was one of the first researchers to focus on a person's past

experiences to predict the person's subsequent work behavior. During a seventeen-year

period, Ghiselli, posing as someone from the personnel department, interviewed 507 men

for the position of stockbroker. Of this number, 275 or 54% were eventually hired by

management. (None of the men interviewed knew that Ghiselli was actually a researcher.)

His interview questions covered the applicant's college history and any military

employment history. No information was gathered about experiences encountered during

childhood or adolescence. Only the applicant's college life and what followed were

explored. The findings indicated that those men who obtained the highest interview ratings

were hired. It might be noted that all these men were very similar in their responses, as

indicated in the standard deviation of .77 for those hired. Ghiselli also correlated the criteria

success on the job (predictive validity) and the interview ratings of the men hired and found

it to be .35, which is of moderate substantial validity (Ghiselli, 1966).

Latham and Saari's (1984) studies attempted to ascertain if there is a correlation

between what employees (n=29) say they would do in hypothetical situations and what

supervisors and peers observe them doing on the job. To illustrate the predictive validity

of situational interview questions, Latham et al. (1984) developed twenty situational

interview questions, along with five questions on past behavior, to correlate with job

performance as indicated by ratings given to workers by supervisors and peers. The 29

clerical office personnel in the study were women who had worked for the company an

average of six years. The internal consistencies (Cronbach's alpha) of the interview

questions and the criteria were as follows: situational questions (.73), past experience

questions (.55), behavioral observation scales (BOS) completed by supervisors (.96), and

BOS completed by peers (.96). Clearly, the questions asked during the interview were

highly representative of actual job behaviors as determined by job analysis. There was also

found to be significant correlation between situational questions and supervisor ratings of

workers according to BOS ($r = .39$) and peer ratings ($r = .42$). Again, the questions asked

of a situational nature during the interview were highly representative and predictive of

actual job behavior as indicated by supervisors and peers. This study did not find a high

correlation between questions of past behaviors and the ratings of supervisors and peers

($r = .14$ and .15, respectively). In another study Latham, Saari, Pursell, and Campion

(1980), examined the reliability and validity of the situational interview in which interview

questions are written based on critical incidents derived from a job analysis. Specifically,

hypothetical interview questions are asked and responses are scored according to behavior

benchmarks provided by job experts. Results of Latham et al.'s study of 49 unionized

workers interviewed using this approach found that the internal consistency of the

questions used in a situational interview was .71 and the interobserver reliability among

interviews was .76. This high correlation between what is asked during the job interview and what is actually done on the job attests to the need to address actual job requirements/behaviors during the interview.

<div align="center">Interview Characteristics</div>

The interview remains one of the most common and influential selection techniques for securing information and impressions about applicants; yet, if used incorrectly, it is neither valid nor reliable (Jensen, 1987). Despite its limitations, the interview can yield data and observations about candidates that other methods are incapable of providing (Watts, 1993; Castetter; 1981). Fear (1984) defined, and in doing so, showed the importance assigned to the interview by stating: ". . . [the] interview is the most critical aspect of the selection program since it is here that all information obtained from the preliminary interview, the application form, the aptitude tests, and reference check is integrated with other factors of the individual's background and a final decision is made" (p.85). According to Castetter (1981), "The interview has three major purposes: (1) securing sufficient information from the candidate that…will enhance the possibility of making the correct choice from among the candidates, (2) providing the candidate with the information needed to accept or reject the position if offered, [and] (3) creating a favorable impression about the organization and the environment in which the work will be performed" (pp. 243-244).

Interviews between the candidate and the official under whose jurisdiction the candidate will serve is a decentralized [this means the interview is conducted in a location

other than the organization's main or administrative office] interview and may be categorized as being either structured or unstructured. The patterned or structured interview utilizes a standard list of questions prepared in advance and could be based, for example, on behavior description interviewing (Janz, 1986) and from which the interviewer does not deviate (Castetter, 1981; Watts, 1993). In his book, Janz (1986) defined behavior description interviewing as involving questions that ask the candidates to describe their behaviors in past situations related to the job expectations of the current position. The unstructured interview may or may not be based on a list of predetermined questions. The difference between the unstructured and structured interview lies in the freedom the former method allows the interviewer in eliciting information from different types of applicants. Research findings indicate that structured interviews result in greater interviewer reliability than interviews conducted without a guide (Campion, Pursell, & Brown, 1988). According to Hammons (1992b), the advantages of a structured interview include the assurance to the candidate of a fair and impartial interview, assistance in monitoring and controlling the amount of time devoted to each topic, and the avoidance of legal issues. Further, if all candidates are asked the same questions, there is assurance that there is a common base upon which to evaluate applicants (Ferguson, 1983). According to Jensen (1987), the interview should be structured so as to gather indicators of social competence, commitment, pragmatic problem-solving skills, thought processes, and elements of subject-matter knowledge.

Empirical Research on the Structure of the Interview

Wiesner and Cronshaw (1988) found that the structure of the interview was an important moderator (with regard to validity): unstructured interviews (i.e., without a predetermined set of questions and/or without specific rating scales) had an average corrected validity coefficient of .31 while structured interviews had an average validity coefficient of .62. Both were corrected at the 90% confidence level as opposed to the 95% confidence interval first reported. Wiesner and Cronshaw (1988) also found that studies using a formal job analysis produced higher validities than did studies using informal job analyses. They also agreed with Arvey and J. Campion (1982) that board interviews had somewhat higher validities than did individual interviews, but only for unstructured interviews.

McDaniel et al. (1987) utilized a set of validity coefficients from the U.S. Office of Personnel Management and obtained data from references found in earlier reviews of the employment interviews. Like the findings of Wiesner and Cronshaw (1988), McDaniel et al. (1987) found the nature of the interview to be a moderator of validity. Specifically, this study found that job-related interviews (i.e., interviews conducted to examine past job experiences, training, and interests) had a mean corrected validity coefficient of .43. McDaniel et al. (1987) also found that structured interviews produced a higher validity coefficient (.45) than did unstructured interviews (.36). In addition, other types of structured interviews (i.e., Behavior Description Interview [BDI] Janz et al., 1986; and Comprehensive Structured Interview [CSI] Pursell et al., 1980) appeared to be more valid than unstructured interviews.

In summary, these studies indicate that validity exists across different types of interviews and that the selection or employment interview appears to be predictive of job performance.

Interviewer Questioning

William Goldstein (1977) offers a format designed to draw explicit answers from candidates. Good interviewing is like good teaching because it should move from the known to the unknown, from the simple to the complex. Specifically he wrote:

Interviews should allow the candidate opening familiarity--easy responses, perhaps about themselves—and move quickly to more rugged terrain. Regrettably, many interviews never leave easily traversed meadows for the more challenging mountains of intellectual questioning that stretches the candidate. Opening questions at interviews tend to deal with biographical information and the candidate's aspirations. Such questions have lubrication value; they ease strangers into familiarity. But once a firm footing is in place, such questions should be abandoned quickly. (p. 22)

In his book Ober (1992) discussed two types of interview questions: open-ended and closed, and what types of responses one could expect from questions asked of each type. Open-ended questions are phrased so that they cannot be answered "yes" or "no," whereas closed questions are phrased so that the opposite is true. Examples of words that begin open-ended questions are What, When, How, Who, Where, or Which. Questions that solicit closed responses begin with words such as Is, Do, Has, Can, Will, or Shall. Both

types are examined in this study. Interviewers should be cognizant of how their questions

are being asked since this often determines the type of response received.

<u>Development of Questions for Interviewing Teachers</u>

With regard to developing questions, Zahorik (1980) suggests that attention might

be given to four elements of education: students (e.g., what are students' needs?);

knowledge (e.g., what substance or affective learning is essential for all students?); teacher

(e.g., what role should the teacher assume in the classroom? Should s/he be a knowledge

source? facilitator of learning? diagnostic technician?); and aims (e.g., what should the aim

of education be? academic growth in basic skills? development of healthy self-concepts of

students?). Pawlas (1995) suggested that questions be grouped into the following five major

categories: teacher relationships with students, teacher relationships with colleagues,

teacher relationships with parents, instructional techniques, and a potpourri of topics and

background information.

Good development of questions gives the interviewer solid evidence on which to

base a hiring decision and should focus on four areas: the teacher as a person, what the

teacher has done in the past, what the teacher will do for the school in the future, and how

the teacher will fit in the school (Castetter, 1981; Pawlas, 1995). This view that past

behavior can be used to predict future behavior has already been supported empirically by

Ghiselli (1966) and Latham and Saari (1984). Toward this end, the interview questions

themselves become the vehicle for selection. The questions asked, therefore, are critical, for

they provide the means toward that end.

Interviewer Training

An important element of the interview process which might often be overlooked is interviewer training. Indeed, Jensen (1987) found that "untrained interviewers tend to ask unchallenging questions and to use the interview as an opportunity to talk about their own accomplishments or philosophy" (p. 18).

Drake (1975) supported this view by stating, "The interview is the most convenient vehicle for evaluating others. However, until recently, much of the research concerning the effectiveness of the interview for predicting job behavior has shown disappointing results, possibly because the researchers did not concern themselves with the skills of the interviewers. More recent research indicates that predictive accuracy improves sharply when managers are trained in interviewing techniques . . ." (p. 10).

Castetter (1981) found that criticisms of the interview as a selection device include untrained interviewers, variability of employment interview content, question variability, uneven interpretation, premature decision, negative approach, halo effect, interviewer biases, failure of interviewer to listen, and interviewer tendency to focus on negative information.

According to Yate (1987), a bad hire [in any business] can be traced to one of the following reasons:

- Poor analysis of job function

- Poor analysis of necessary personality-skill

- Inadequate initial screening

● Inadequate interviewing techniques

● Inadequate questioning techniques

● Poor utilization of "second opinions"

● Company and career/money expectations inappropriately sold

● References not checked (p. 19).

More specifically, Yate (1987) found that during the interview, the manager failed to ask either himself or the interviewee the right questions at the right time; and perhaps even failed to interpret the answers given to his questions adequately.

The need for interviewer training is emphasized in Drake's (1975) research involving business managers. In an analysis of more than 500 taped recordings of employment interviews by both amateurs and professional interviewers, Drake identified the following most frequently observed mistakes: (1) talking too much, (2) jumping to conclusions, (3) "telegraphing" the desired responses to interviewer's questions, and (4) failing to translate data about past behavior to on-the-job performance.

Goldstein (1977) reported that interviewees are sometimes disappointed because of the behavior of the interviewer when the following occur:

● The interview begins late because the interviewer got "tied up."

● Questions asked are ephemeral, strictly procedural, and unchallenging.

● The interviewer spends the greater part of the session lecturing on his/her philosophy of education with no opportunity for rebuttal or exchange.

● The interviewer fails to read the candidate's application and supporting

credentials prior to the interview, and then asks needless questions clearly answered in the

paperwork submitted.

● The interviewer is bored with the whole process and shows it.

● Having been asked a basic question about the nature of the teaching assignment,

the interviewer apologizes for not knowing exactly what the job entails.

● The interviewer fails to inform the candidate on details of how and when the

position will be filled and method by which successful and unsuccessful candidates will be

notified.

● The interview ends on an abrasive "Don't-call-us-we'll-call-you" note, poisoning

what might have been a reciprocally pleasant experience. (pp. 21-22)

Empirical Studies on Interviewer Training

Several studies have addressed the issue of interview validity. According to Harris'

(1989) meta-analytic review of interview validity (based on research from 1982 and before),

reviews have been more positive in attesting to its validity. According to Campion, Pursell,

and Brown (1988), there are several reasons why the more recent data have been more

promising: the structured nature of recent interviews, the use of questions based on a job

analysis, the use of panels of interviewers, the training of raters, the practice of note taking

during the interview, and the use of behaviorally anchored rating scales to evaluate the

interviewee's answers all may play a role in the improvement of interview validity.

Pulakos et al. (1996) agreed with the above findings but state they have found very little research on the impact of the interviewer on validity. Graves and Karren (1992) cited literature to support the view that interviewer background variables (e.g., personality, experience, demographic status, cognitive structure, and affect) as well as the interview context and conduct of the interview all serve to influence the interviewer's information processing capabilities and, in turn, their judgments and effectiveness.

Evidence supporting the existence of interviewer rating errors was reported by Zedeck, Tziner, and Middlestadt (1983). These researchers found that interviewers differed in the way in which they utilized information and in their overall assessments of interviewees. Upon finding significant differences in the overall assessments of dimension ratings of the interviewees provided by different interviewers, the authors concluded that the results were likely due to the types of interviewer biases referred to as leniency or severity effects.

Drake (1982) conducted a study to determine the accuracy of the interview as an assessment/selection tool before and after interviewer training. In the study, two adult classes were exposed to the same resume and tape recordings of an actual job applicant. Each class was asked to review the resume and rate the recording on a 7-point scale where 1 = poor and 7 = superior. Before the treatment, both classes were rather equal in how they evaluated the candidate (Class 1 mean = 4.6; Class 2 mean = 4.8; SD = 3.1 and 2.8, respectively). The treatment in this study was a 6-week class on interviewer techniques

provided to class 1. Class 2 continued in its regular studies in personnel administration, not including interviewing.

At the end of the six weeks following the first evaluation, the same resume and tape were presented for a second time to both classes. This time the standard deviation for class 1 (the group provided the training) decreased from 3.1 to 1.2. This showed a marked increase in the interrater consistency between the first and second interview ratings. The other class, however, showed a slight increase in variability with a standard deviation of 2.9. The standard deviation of class 1's second evaluation clearly showed that there was more consistency among raters during the second review than in their first. Class 2 showed no positive change.

Ghiselli's (1966) study was conducted to determine how accurate interviewers might be for predicting on-the-job performance. Ghiselli found that just three days of interviewer training improved the predictive accuracy of raters. Specifically, in this study, two groups interviewed employees of a technology company that was being acquired by a major chemical company. Two teams of five members each were to interview employees of the acquired company in an attempt to merge manpower. The ratings of each team were correlated with the acquired company's performance ratings from the prior three years. Unfortunately, the correlation of the interview teams' ratings with prior job-related performance was low ($r = .25$ and $.22$, respectively). Because it had been anticipated that a much higher correlation would be found, training was sought for one of the two groups in order to test the trained-interview theory. After three days of training, Team A interviewed

and evaluated 54 people (31 were interviewed and evaluated the first time) with a correlation of .64 between ratings and prior job performance ratings. The untrained Team B evaluated 50 people (35 first time) but the correlation between the second rating and prior job performance rating remained a low .26.

The findings of both studies provide support for the theory that a greater consistency and validity can occur when interviewers are trained in interview techniques. Furthermore, these findings also show that in a relatively short period of time managers can learn to predict, with reasonable accuracy, on-the-job performance.

More recent studies have produced inconsistent results. For example, Fay and Latham (1982) found that training upper-level business students in the area of rating decreased a number of these rating errors. Also, Dougherty et al. (1986) trained actual interviewers in eliciting useful information and using this information to rate interview dimensions. The training included mock interviews. Results indicated large increases in the validity of interviewer judgment. On the other hand, Maurer and Fay (1988) conducted an experiment with managers and supervisors from a public health agency that examined interviewer training as well as interview format. The training included eight hours devoted to general skills (e.g., note-taking, questioning methods), as well as rating errors (e.g., halo, contrast). The training manipulation in this study did not affect interrater agreement.

Finally, two studies by Pulakos et al. (1995) and Pulakos. (1996) both attributed interview training as having a positive effect on the validity of the interview ratings. In the first study, Pulakos et al. (1995) compared the validity of two different types of structured

interviews (i.e., experienced-based and situational). In the second study, Pulakos et al.

(1996) investigated issues regarding the validity of individual interviewer's ratings

collected after a structured interview. In both studies, it was found that interviewer training

impacted greatly on the validity of the interview ratings. More studies found there to be

validity associated with the interview when interviewer training has occurred.

Interviewer Training and Selection of Teachers

As the people responsible for selecting personnel for their buildings, principals have

a major responsibility. It is, therefore, important that they have training on how to choose

the right person. Interviewer training is one way to help principals staff their buildings with

highly effective employees.

School districts can improve interviews by improving the skills of interviewers

(Jensen, 1987). Furthermore, Jensen (1987) advises districts to select interviewers who

have these qualifications: alertness to cues, ability to make immediate and accurate records;

willingness to use criteria established by the organization, and ability to suppress biases.

Interviewer Propensity for Prejudging Interviewees

The selection interview remains the most frequently used selection tool despite the

many possible sources of bias inherent because of its subjective nature (Arvey, 1979; Arvey

& Campion, 1982; Ryan & Sackett; 1987; Schneider & Schmitt, 1986). Attention has been

turned toward attempting to discern if, and to what degree, bias exists in questions and

ratings given during the selection interview (Mayfield, 1964; Kinicki & Lockwood, 1985).

While the interviewer may strive to be objective and unbiased in rating the interviewee,

there may be situations wherein stereotyping occurs. This involves making decisions about people based simply upon one's initial reactions (Dipboye, 1982, Macan & Dipboye, 1990). According to Fear (1984) for some interviewers, if the initial reaction to an interviewee is favorable, then there is a natural tendency to look for only those clues that will confirm the original impression. The interview, therefore, results in nothing unfavorable being revealed and is inescapably a poor interview. In other words, interviewers ask questions that only serve to confirm that first impression—whether good or bad (Snyder & Swann, 1978). Sackett (1982) and McDonald (1985), however, did not find that interviewers engaged in impression-confirming or information-seeking strategies.

According to Half (1993), "We all operate from a set of preconceived biases, many of them extremely subtle and deep rooted" (p. 14). For instance, in his job as founder of a financial and data processing recruitment firm, Half (1993) has found executives who chose not to hire candidates for the following reasons: one salted his food before tasting it (an indication to the executive that the person has preconceived notions); another had a mustache; and still another was short.

Several studies have examined applicant characteristics and their influences on interviewer ratings. Physical attractiveness, for example, as well as applicant dress and candidate scent have been researched. Gilmore et al. (1986) found that physical attractiveness did influence recruiter and college student interview decisions in laboratory setting. Similar results were reported by Riggio and Throckmorton (1988). However, Beehr and Gilmore (1982) found that the effect of attractiveness was dependent on job

type (i.e., whether attractiveness was relevant for the job or not). Raza and Carpenter (1987) also found this variable to be related to overall ratings.

Forsythe, Drake, and Cox (1985) studied the effect of female applicant dress on ratings by personnel managers in an experimental setting. They found the more masculine the dress, the more positive the interviewer evaluation. However, this was only true to a point: candidates with the most masculine dress were rated lower than candidates with the moderately masculine dress.

In addition to studies based on the interviewer's seeing the interviewee and making judgments, there are also studies in which interviewers make judgments based upon preview of the credentials of the interviewee. Preinterview impressions based upon review of resumes, application, references, and other such information allow interviewers to form a preinterview impression of the applicant. Thus, the amount of verbal interaction and time spent with the interviewee are two aspects of the interviewer's conduct of the interview that can be affected by initial impressions (Macan & Dipboye, 1988; Phillips & Dipboye, 1989; Tullar, 1989; Sydiaha, 1961). Additionally, preinterview impressions may influence cognitive biases that subsequently affect an interviewer's evaluations. Interviewers notice, recall and encode information in a manner consistent with their preinterview impressions. Thus, their ratings may be clouded or biased based upon what they write while interviewing, which may be skewed based upon preinterview impressions.

Demographic Characteristics (sex, race, and age) and the Selection Interview

Many variables have been investigated with regard to their relationship to the selection interview. Studies have examined, for example, demographic characteristics such as sex (Cash, Gillen, & Burns, 1977; Ferris & Gilmore, 1977; Gorman, Clover, & Doherty, 1978; Graves & Powell, 1988; Heilman & Martell, 1986); race (McDonald & Hakel, 1985; Mullins, 1982; Parsons & Liden, 1984); and in laboratory settings, age (Arvey, 1979; Gordon, Rozelle, & Baxter, 1988).

Earlier studies have concluded that females often received lower ratings than males in the interview setting, particularly when there was little or no information about qualifications. More recent evidence indicates that to the contrary, females typically do not receive lower ratings in the employment interview; and, in several instances, females received higher ratings than males (Parsons & Liden, 1984). In fact, with regard to sex, field studies indicate that female applicants were rated much higher than males on three of five interview dimensions (intelligence, attractiveness, and skills) as established in Raza and Carpenter (1987). Graves and Powell (1988) investigated the effect of applicant sex on campus interviews and found that female applicants were rated as more likable than males. Parsons and Liden (1984) examined the relationship between applicant sex, nonverbal cues, and interview outcomes for jobs at a large amusement park. They found that female applicants were rated higher on all nonverbal cues (e.g., poise, clothing, and voice intensity) than males, although applicant sex was not related to overall ratings when nonverbal cues were not included. Arvey, Miller, Gould, and Burch (1987) conducted a validity study for a

job analysis-based interview. They found that females received slightly higher interview scores and had somewhat higher average job performance ratings than males.

Lastly, in a field study of actual applicants in campus interviews, Graves and Powell (1995), found complex effects of sex similarity on recruiter decision processes. Perceived similarity and interpersonal attraction mediate the effect of sex similarity on female recruiters' assessments of applicants' qualifications. Specifically, female recruiters saw male applicants as more similar to themselves and more qualified than female applicants. For male recruiters, interview outcomes were not affected by sex similarity.

The results of sex and interview ratings seem inclusive. Perhaps more studies of actual interviews whereby sex is clearly a moderating factor of selection are needed.

Studies involving applicant's race involved both laboratory and field studies. In their field study Parsons and Liden (1984) found that black applicants were rated lower than white applicants on several nonverbal dimensions. Mullins (1982) found that when applicant quality was low, blacks were rated higher than whites and that interviewers who had scored higher on a scale of racial prejudice were more likely to give higher ratings to black applicants than less prejudiced interviewers. McDonald and Hakel (1985) found that applicant race had a statistically significant effect in certain cases; however, the amount of variance race accounted for was negligible.

Studies examining the effect of applicant age on the interview were also conducted in laboratory settings. Gordon, Rozelle, and Baxter (1988) examined the joint effects of accountability, job level, and age. The researchers found that when the accountable position

of the person making the recommendation for hire was high (person would make

recommendation to someone posing as a representative of the personnel department),

subjects were less likely to recommend hiring the older applicant than a younger applicant.

In their study, Raza and Carpenter (1987) found that older applicants were rated

lower on several interview dimensions, but that the dimensions varied for different

interviewers. Older applicants received lower hiring recommendations, but only from male

interviewees; female interviewers rated older applicants lower on attractiveness.

In another laboratory setting, Singer and Sewell (1989) studied interviewers who

were given detailed information such as stories about successful older workers (with age

indicated) and neutral information about younger, less experienced workers. Subjects were

asked to select one for hire. Using two groups, managers and college students, researchers

found that under age-related, detailed information, managers favored older candidates (48+)

for low status jobs whereas the college students preferred young (25) for low and high

status jobs. Under neutral information, managers favored young applicants for low-status

jobs while students preferred the older candidates for high-status jobs.

In summary, this part of the literature review has examined the research pertaining

to demographic variables of both interviewer and interviewee and the relationship of both to

the selection interview. Many of the studies have been conducted in laboratory settings with

college students as interviewers, which makes the results somewhat questionable since an

actual interview cannot be captured in a laboratory situation. Nevertheless, the study of

these variables raises the awareness level of those involved in personnel selection of the importance of being mindful of biases that can occur.

<div align="center">Elements of Effective Interviews</div>

Numbers of people in business and education have written about what constitutes an effective interview. While there is not agreement on the importance of each element, there is agreement that some elements are necessary in order for the interview to occur. The following paragraphs reflect the elements of an effective interview as expounded by experts in the fields of business (personnel management/consultative) and educational administration.

For purposes of this study, seven sources were consulted as a means of identifying some practices or components of an interview which may contribute to its effectiveness. For example, of the seven experts, six wrote that the interviewer should have received formal training in interview techniques (i.e., Castallo, 1992; Drake, 1982; Fear, 1984; Jones/Walters, 1994; Rebore, 1991; Seyfarth, 1991). Following the brief biographical sketches of these writers is a list of practices where at least four authors listed a particular practice as an important one for interviewers to follow. A table of the completed results of the analysis follows this section. Included in the table are all practices listed by at least two authors.

These seven experts represent both private business and education and are well known in both fields. Included for their knowledge, expertise, and widespread recognition are the following authors:

(<u>Education</u>)

      1. Richard Castallo, editor—State University of New York at Cortland

      2. William Castetter—Professor Emeritus, Graduate School of Education, University of Pennsylvania

      3. James Jones/Donald Walters—(Jones) Professor Emeritus, Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies, Temple University; (Walters) Professor and Chairman, Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies, Temple University

      4. Ronald Rebore—Professor, St. Louis University

      5. John Seyfarth—Professor, Virginia Commonwealth University

(<u>Business</u>)

      1. John Drake—co-founder of Duke, Beam, Morin Management Consultants, specializing in human resources

      2. Richard Fear—personnel consultant; past vice president of The Psychological Corporation; has trained several thousand interviewers in this country and abroad

<u>Summary of Effective Interview Practices of Experts</u>

      During the interview, the interviewer:

      1. Uses a set of standard questions that are asked of all applicants (Castallo, 1992; Castetter, 1981; Drake, 1982; Fear, 1984; Jones/Walters, 1994; Rebore, 1991).

      2. Determines the relevance of an applicant's experiences and training in terms of the demands of a specific job (Castallo, 1992; Castetter, 1981; Drake, 1982; Fear, 1984; Jones/Walters, 1994; Seyfarth, 1991).

3. States the purpose and format of the interview (Castallo, 1992; Drake, 1982; Fear, 1984; Jones/Walters, 1994; Rebore, 1991; Seyfarth, 1991).

4. Conducts the interview in a set time period (Castallo, 1992; Castetter, 1981; Drake, 1982; Fear, 1984; Jones/Walters, 1994).

5. Probes for clues to behavior to develop a picture of strengths and shortcomings (Castallo, 1992; Drake, 1982; Fear, 1984; Rebore, 1991; Seyfarth, 1991).

6. Appraises the applicant's personality, motivation, and character (Castetter, 1992; Drake, 1982; Fear, 1984; Rebore, 1991; Seyfarth, 1991).

7. Is mindful of EEO considerations (Castallo, 1992; Fear, 1984; Rebore, 1991; Seyfarth, 1991).

8. Takes notes or records the interview (Castallo, 1992; Drake, 1982; Fear, 1984; Rebore, 1991).

9. Conducts interviews in a pleasant environment (Drake, 1982; Jones/Walters, 1994; Rebore, 1991; Seyfarth, 1991).

10. Develops rapport with the interviewer by use of (a) small talk (Castallo, 1992; Fear, 1984, Seyfarth, 1991); (b) calculated pause (Drake, 1982; Fear, 1984; Rebore, 1991); (c) facial expressions (Drake, 1982; Fear, 1984; Rebore, 1991; Seyfarth, 1991); (d) reinforcement (Castallo, 1992; Drake, 1982; Fear, 1984; Seyfarth, 1991); and (e) playing down unfavorable information (Drake, 1982; Fear, 1984).

11. Searches for unfavorable information (Castetter, 1981; Drake, 1982; Fear, 1984; Seyfarth, 1991).

Table 2 (<u>continued</u>) 41

Table 2

<u>Summary of Experts' Effective Interview Practices</u>

	Richard Castallo	William Castetter	John Drake	Richard Fear	Jones/ Walker	Ronald Rebore	John Seyfarth
1. has received formal training in interviewing	X	X	X		X	X	X
2. uses a set of standard questions that are asked of all applicants	X	X	X	X	X	X	
3. determines the relevance of an applicant's experience and training in terms of the demands of a specific job	X	X	X	X	X		X
4. states the purpose and format of the interview	X		X	X	X	X	X
5. conducts the interview in a set time period	X	X	X	X	X		
6. probes for clues to behavior to develop a picture of strengths and shortcomings	X		X	X		X	X
7. appraises the applicant's personality, motivation, and character	X		X	X		X	X
8. is mindful of EEO considerations	X			X	X	X	
9. takes notes or records the interview	X		X	X		X	
10. conducts interviews in a pleasant environment			X		X	X	X
11. develops rapport with the interviewer by using small talk, calculated pause, facial expressions, reinforcement, or playing down unfavorable information	X		X	X		X	X
12. searches for unfavorable information		X	X	X			X
13. evaluates applicant's mental ability in the absence of aptitude tests			X	X		X	

	Richard Castallo	William Castetter	John Drake	Richard Fear	Jones/ Walker	Ronald Rebore	John Seyfarth
14. includes on the interview panel both the department head and another teacher from the same discipline as interviewee					X	X	X
15. does only 15% of the talking; allows interviewee to do the majority of the talking			X	X			
16. presents a favorable image of the school district				X		X	
17. uses techniques of control of interview (e.g., through use of an interview guide or interruptions)				X		X	
18. uses a rating sheet	X				X		
20. puts interviewees at ease; sees this as an important skill						X	
21. asks the interviewee to demonstrate a lesson	X						
22. uses probes or follow-up questions to pre-planned questions	X						

Selection criteria should be explicit enough to identify ideal characteristics needed for optimal job performance. While the preceding list is certainly not exhaustive of what should occur during the interview process, it does reflect those elements deemed to be representative of effective practices by those recognized in their respective fields.

Elements of Effective Teaching

The purpose of the building-level interview conducted by principals should have as its main objective the selection of teachers who can assist students with educational attainment. At the core of this search is the need for principals to find those persons most

capable of maximizing student achievement. To accomplish this task, principals must first establish the essential qualities that teachers should possess to enable them to help students meet their goals. Teachers play a significant role in schools, particularly in the way they contribute to the school's effectiveness. The relationship between teacher effectiveness and school effectiveness has been established in the literature. Cox (1981) cited 75 years of research that indicates the key role that teachers play in providing effective schooling. Effective teaching should have as its ultimate goal student achievement. According to Langlois and Zales (1991), effective teachers seek to make the most of the time available for instruction and involve students in that instruction.

Over the years, researchers have conducted thousands of studies to identify and analyze effective and ineffective teaching—in other words, they have attempted to define teaching competencies or skills. Some researchers have defined effective teaching as a complex art and a science that involves the cognitive perception, and decision-making strategies that teachers use as they plan, teach, analyze, evaluate, (reflect), and apply improvements to their own teaching (Ornstein, 1993; Stanley & Popham, 1988). Other researchers have defined effective teaching in the way teachers manage their classrooms and provide appropriate instructional tasks (Fisher et al., 1978). Good and Brophy (1984) described the effective teacher as a manager. According to their research, effective teachers strive to provide a classroom organization that fosters student learning in which teachers use simple and familiar lesson formats and assignments when they introduce students to classroom routines. Ornstein and Levine (1981) concluded their study by

stating, "Teaching is a very complicated activity; what works in some situations with some students may not work in other settings with different students and goals" (p. 592).

While researchers have not always agreed on what constitutes effective teaching, research findings suggest that student achievement is linked to teacher competence (Anderson, Evertson, & Brophy, 1979; Emmer, Evertson, & Anderson, 1980; Good, 1990; lesson presentation and review (Rosenshine, 1986; Tobias, 1982); skill practice (Gagne, 1985); teacher questioning techniques (Rosenshine, 1979; Good, 1979); and discipline (Emmer, Evertson, & Anderson, 1980; Kounin, 1970).

With the knowledge that effective teaching is possible, principals are faced with a difficult task: finding those teachers most capable of performing at a level whereby all children can be successful.

<div align="center">Summary</div>

Several topics have been explored in this extensive literature review. First, empirical research, along with journal articles and books, was used to explicate the validity of the interview as a selection tool. Secondly, the biases associated with its use have been examined. Lastly, information on effective teaching has been included to show the possible relationship between questions asked and the quality of teacher sought via these questions. While the interview is not the only factor to be considered when making hiring decisions, it is often the only selection tool employed by principals. For this reason, interview questions should be constructed with the utmost regard to outcomes, namely, finding teachers who share the vision to ensure the school's quality.