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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION AND RELEVANT LITERATURE

Suggestions and recommendations for the training of employment interviewers are available in great quantity. Unfortunately, few of these have been subjected to evaluative analysis. This section reviews the relevant literature on employment interviewer training.

Scott (1915) astonished the business world by reporting a study in which six sales managers attempted to rate 36 applicants with such conflicting results that agreement on the best and the worst candidates was not possible. Although the sales managers were working without benefit of job descriptions or interview training, the belief that the interview could select with some accuracy was shaken and has never quite recovered. Snow (1924) had a psychologist and six sales managers interview twelve applicants for work as truck drivers. Here the interviewers managed only to achieve some agreement on the two best and the two worst drivers. Hollingworth (1929) had twelve sales managers interview 57 applicants. The managers could not agree on their ratings and the best and worst candidates were mixed, he said, as if
by chance. In none of these early experiments were the sales managers trained for interviewing.

Bingham (1948) asked the inevitable question: If more objective selection procedures, such as application blanks validated item by item for the prediction of the most successful long term employees, as well as psychological and trade tests which have been shown to be reasonably valid for prediction of success on various jobs are now available, why bother with the selection and training of proficient interviewers? Why not save the salaries of the interviewers and hire by the objective techniques? In answering his own question, Bingham cited four reasons for needing the interviewer, none of which dealt with evaluation. The four duties that cannot be delegated to objective methods are, according to Bingham, that the interviewer must answer the applicant's questions, he must convince the man he is interviewing that the company is a good place to work, he must serve the role of counselor of steering the applicant toward a job for which he might be better suited if that is the case, and he should leave the prospect with the feeling that he has made a personal friend. The lack of an evaluative role for the interviewer is painfully obvious. Of course, if the interviewer is not capable of making accurate decisions regarding suitability for employment it may be equally doubtful that he be capable of these alternative tasks. Bingham may be taken to task for assuming that the
interviewer can serve the role of a counselor accurately but also assume the superiority of the actuarial methods for employment decisions. There would appear to be a contradiction here.

The issue of the interviewer versus the validity coefficient is not pertinent in most situations. When compared in the realm where the actuarial methods are at home, the actuarial methods are always superior both for gathering data and weighting it. But, we don't have cross validated validity coefficients for all jobs in all settings. So it is likely that the job of employment interviewing will not go out of style for a very long time. The interviewer's evaluation is most valuable where the actuarial methods have failed to demonstrate utility, such as in measuring interpersonal relations and motivation for the job. It is in the assessment of this information where the interviewer and the rating form he uses needs to concentrate his attention (cf., Ulrich & Trumbo, 1965).

Definitive research on the effects of different systematic approaches on the training of interviewers is lacking. Perhaps this is because most interviewers are trained as professional workers with a wide variety of duties. Clinical and counseling psychologists must acquire skills in psychometric procedures as well as interviewing. Market research and public opinion pollers must learn techniques of sampling. Personnel
interviewers frequently must know other aspects of selection, training, and labor relations programs. In these professions, training in interviewing constitutes but a part of a total program.

There has been some discussion, in clinical and counseling work especially, about the technique of interviewing. It was felt that there were right and wrong strategies, right and wrong ways to meet certain kinds of situations, that there were, in short, formulas for the interview. The work by Fiedler (1950) has shown that this is not necessarily so. Fiedler found that whatever their theoretical position, experienced interviewers tend to describe the interview relationship in essentially similar ways. They are more like each other in this respect than they are like novices of their own schools.

Rogers (1942) has perhaps more than anyone else worked to dispel the notion that technique and strategy were the major concerns of the interviewer. Rogers' thinking is that the relationship between the client and counselor is all important, that unless the interviewer really accepts and respects the interviewee, little in terms of the goals of the counseling interview can be accomplished. This is to say that one interviewer may use a technique successfully while another fails with the same technique. It should be recalled that Rogers' concern is to help a troubled client
in a counseling relationship and as such is at variance with the intent of the employment interview. Nevertheless, the point is well taken that one interviewer may use a technique successfully while another fail with the same technique.

Uhrbrock (1948) has made recommendations regarding the training of interviewers. He has recommended that the beginning interviewer be broken in by having him conduct different kinds of interviews. First, advises Uhrbrock, he should be assigned to exit interviewing, then to surveys of employees' attitudes by means of conversational interviews, then to employment interviewing. This order places employment interviewing in the most important position and utilizes the others as a preparation. By interviewing those who are leaving their work, the learning interviewer finds out some of the reasons for failure and dissatisfaction. In attitude surveys he will discover the importance of attitudes and the differences between good and bad ones. He will then know some particular attitudes that should be watched for in prospective employees.

Bellows and Estep (1954) wrote their text with interviewer self training in mind and established the four requirements they thought necessary for interviewer self training: Interviewers must be aware of the human fallacies and errors that seem ever present in the appraisal of men, they must realize the necessity of maintaining an objective point
of view, they must be familiar with the results of scientific investigations in this area, and they must develop, evaluate, and apply objective methods such as item analysis techniques for specific interview situations.

Unfortunately, in the heart of their text they can only report that it is probable that the trained interviewer tends to produce more effective results than the untrained interviewer (Bellows & Estep, 1954, pg. 89). They go on to state that the training of interviewers should include not only the acquisition of job information and job knowledge, training in company policy, and training in how to talk, and the use of language in questioning, it should also emphasize the importance of the objective attitude, the use of techniques for verification and validation of interview information, and the common pitfalls to which interviewers are subject.

Kahn & Cannell (1957) state that the purpose of their interview training is to promote the trainees' probability of being perceived as within the communication range. The components of this behavior are identified as permissiveness, receptivity, and empathy. An interviewer is successful because of his personality traits and because he has somehow learned to create a psychological atmosphere in which respondent communication flourishes. As with the other advocates of training, other textbook writers included, these assertions are made without evidence.
Training can be formalized or it can occur by being assigned to interviewing duties and allowing on the job experience to accumulate. The effect of experience as a personnel officer and its relationship to the accuracy of decisions made in screening privates for the Canadian Army was studied by Rowe (1960). Rowe utilized two accuracy measures (a) The agreement between the responses of each personnel officer and the group's ranking of the applicant. The applicant who is ranked as most suitable by the group should be the candidate most frequently accepted for the Army by the individual personnel officers, and (b) The agreement between the responses by each officer and the applicant ranking obtained by adding up the check-mark values of the characteristics included in his description. The two measures are described as being closely related.

In the Canadian Militia, Rowe found that the rank of the officers making the decisions (an indication of his experience) was significantly related to the accuracy of the decisions. These results did not hold for the regular Army personnel officers. In the regular Army, Rowe found that the personnel officers acquire experience much more rapidly in their duties and attributed the greater number of more accurate decisions made by the regular Army personnel officers and the lack of a significant relationship with rank as an indication that a relatively short period of full-time employment in personnel
selection results in accuracy reaching a level which shows little subsequent change. This is the only study in the Webster (1964) program that addressed the issue of interviewer training or experience on decision making in the interview.

The effect of formal training or on the job experience on the quality of decisions made may not be in the direction intended by the researcher. There is some evidence (Crow, 1957) that training programs devoted to increasing the accuracy of interpersonal perception run the risk of decreasing accuracy when they increase the trainee's responsiveness to individual differences. The experience may lead the trainee to differentiate among people far beyond his capacity to do so accurately.

Without proper training in employment interviewing techniques there are a number of errors that untrained interviewers may make. The term halo effect was first coined by Thorndike (1920) to describe the fact that trait-ratings tended to intercorrelate more highly than would be expected by chance. This was thought to result from an overall general impression which the interviewer had of the applicant. Hollingworth (1922) discussed the error of central tendency in which high scorers are underestimated and low scorers are overestimated. Also discussed was the error of basing a judgment on one outstanding trait. Burtt (1926) discussed errors based on unwarranted inferences from personal appearance.
Other errors have also received attention. Bingham and Moore (1931) noted that the applicant may misunderstand what the interviewer wants and he may improperly prepare for the interview. Also discussed was the tendency of the interviewer to judge from stereotypes.

Errors in the interview, as in all measurement theory, can be either constant or variable. Constant errors may be specific to a single interviewer or characteristic of all interviewers and could be due to invalid information. Constant errors can be thought of as correctable by proper training. Interviewers may differ in their judgments because they look for different things. The reason interviewers may differ in their judgments is that they give undue weight to irrelevant information and use different weighting procedures on the same information. If interviewers are restricted to a narrow range of information, trained to give that information certain weights, and told what information to disregard, and what unwarranted assumptions to avoid (which is what the "objective" procedures do) there should be higher agreement among these judges than among a group of judges not given such training. Training for agreement has certain important merits and could be used as a criterion of employment interviewer behavior. Whether the consensus would be "correct" or not may be an issue but at least agreement indicates that the technique utilized in the evaluation process is not dependent upon who
conducted the interview.

By taking away the interviewer's options to select the questions, it might be possible to minimize the tendency well supported in the Webster (1964) report that early impressions have extremely high agreement with later suitability ratings. In other words, by the use of a structured interview format, the series of questions might be such as to prevent the interviewer from leading the applicant to information that the interviewer thinks will continue to confirm or refute information gathered early in the interview. This follows directly from Bruner's theory of gating (Bruner, 1957). If left to their own resources, interviewers would be expected to display a tendency to seek information that would confirm their initial hypothesis as to the applicant's suitability. The notion of gating consists of the elimination of non-congruent information simply because the perceiver may reduce the amount of such information by the type of question he asks. If this option is taken away from the interviewer, as in a board interview where other interviewers ask the questions, or in a structured interview where one predetermined question follows another and leads to another, there should be more uniform agreement among the judges.

Although the dyad is the usual arrangement for the employment interview studied in the research literature this setting is not the only form of interview setting. The board interview
is actually quite common in practice, especially with higher level professional and managerial talent.

In the board interview a small group of interviewers, usually from 2 to 5, collectively interview a single job applicant and make ratings on each of the various qualities or traits of the interviewee selected for study. Thus, each interviewer may get part of the time to question the applicant, but the majority of the time is spent in listening to what questions others have asked and to the responses of the applicant to those other questions. Those others eliciting the information may be very good or very poor in their style of getting information. Nevertheless, all of the interviewers present hear the questions asked and the applicant's responses, whether the questions themselves are poorly or correctly worded and the procedures are good or poor.

The board interview is sometimes called an oral examination. Whether it is more properly an examination or an interview seems to be a moot question. One way of making the distinction could be that if predetermined standards are used and an emphasis is placed on questioning, it is a test. If there is more informality with a greater emphasis on the applicant being allowed a good deal of time to talk of things as he sees fit, thus displaying himself in his own way, it is an interview. Universities have made great use of the technique in examining candidates for advanced degrees. There is hardly
anyone in the United States who holds a Ph. D. degree who did not have to pass an oral examination in the process of getting it.

A series of experiments on the reliability and validity of the oral graduate examination was conducted by Pressey and reported in two papers (Barnes & Pressey, 1929; Pressey, Pressey, & Barnes, 1932). In the first of these studies the indication was that the oral examination was a highly unreliable method of examination with no such validity as might be hoped. In a replication and extension Pressey reported in the second study that when each examination was conducted by a different faculty committee marked inconsistencies were noted in the ratings and in the decisions to pass or fail the applicant for the higher degree. The point of this comparison is that the original investigation was conducted with graduate students but the same disappointing results were confirmed when faculty members were used, even though the faculty members could be assumed to have greater experience and training to draw upon in forming impressions and making their decisions.

Overall, this review of the relevant research literature indicates that insufficient interest has been shown in the area of employment interviewer training. This is unfortunate since innumerable workshops and seminars have been and are being conducted across the country for the purpose of...
training interviewers. This training comes at a cost both in the time invested by the participants and in the financial outlays by their companies. There have been no real attempts to find out whether the money invested in these programs has been well spent.

Part of the difficulty in measuring training outcomes is the lack of a suitable criterion measure. What steps do interviewers go through when they make "correct" decisions? What do interviewers who consistently make "good" decisions do that other interviewers don't do? Since we lack a suitable criterion measure we have no way of evaluating whether the participants in an interviewer training course really benefited from the training in the sense of being more like the good interviewers than they were before training. But, do we need a criterion of good decision quality? Might not there be ways of approaching the issue which would avoid a frontal assault on an apparently insurmountable issue yet accomplish a related goal? The issue need not be whether trained interviewers make better decisions, it may be suitable to demonstrate that they make at least different decisions than interviewers who lack the training.

The purpose of this dissertation is to explore the issue of employment interviewing training. Rational for the experimental setting will be presented in light of the literature review and the hypotheses to be tested will be
specified. The details of the experiment will be developed and the results presented and discussed in light of current thinking on the issues. The report will close with a summary of the hypotheses, conclusions, and recommendations.
CHAPTER II

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

A number of issues were considered in planning the present research. The rationale for the research setting is presented in view of the literature review. This section closes with a statement of the hypotheses.

In exploring the topic of training of employment interviewers one immediately sees that two all encompassing questions demand attention: "What is the effect of training on an interviewer's knowledge of what he should do and know about interviewing?" and "What is the effect on the interviewer's evaluation of applicants as a result of training?". If the overall evaluation of a job applicant is no different before than after training, in what we think are proper question asking technique and behavioral procedures, then the training has little practical implication aside from being an expensive exercise and interesting drill and can be dispensed with.

It is assumed that exposure to a training course on employment interviewing should result in higher scores on a criterion of knowledge of the selection process, employment interviewing, and question asking procedure for those receiving
the training in comparison to those who do not get the training. To evaluate for this difference a multiple choice objective test containing correct behaviors and errors as alternatives should be utilized. Through the use of an objective multiple choice format it could be possible to evaluate the criterion for an internal consistency estimate of the test's reliability.

Although a training course may be standardized for presentation if it is presented each time by the live lecture method, a question is bound to arise as to whether a live lecture is ever exactly the same for each audience of learners. As an improvement in procedure it might be considered that standardization across groups can only be insured by a video tape recorded presentation of the course to be shown to all groups of subjects to be trained. There are costs that may be incurred such as lack of rapport between the video taped lecturer and the learners but the benefit of such a training program would be its standardization. It would be worthwhile to evaluate the relative utility of a video tape recorded presentation of the training course to attempt a replication of the results from the live lecture stage. If the same results could be shown from the video tape recorded standardized course, great savings would be evident in instructor preparation, cost of presentation, and the number of people who take training on a demand schedule, whenever and wherever desired.
The main focus of attention should be on whether the trained interviewers develop different impressions about a job applicant and whether they make different decisions about the same job applicant than do not-trained interviewers. For a proper quantitative evaluation of training outcomes, standardization of the applicant to be judged is required. Also the rating form should be standardized for use by the trainees whether trained or not-trained to determine the effect of training independent of the form used. Through proper standardization of the rating form, and the applicant to be perceived, a decision regarding differences in perception of the applicant should be possible.

It is considered desirable to have the applicant standardized for presentation to the trained and not trained interviewers. It might also be considered desirable to present only the job applicant's voice on a tape recording. Sound recordings by means of a tape recorded presentation captures only the oral part of the interview and so allows emphasis on the primary means of communication. As the visual perception of the participants are eliminated, such factors as voice, enunciation, rapidity of speaking, courtesy, picking up cues dropped by the interviewee and interviewer, awkward pauses, and general organization of the interview are highlighted. Such tape recorded interviews have another special advantage over live interviews in that they are available for demonstration on demand.
A question might arise as to the artificiality of the job applicant tape, especially presenting only the audio portion. It should be recalled that appearance is not one of the salient issues for assessment in the interview. Further, focusing the trainees' attention on the audio sound track will put their attention on the primary means of communication.

A question might arise as to the artificiality of having trainees rate an applicant where they cannot select the questions and respond to applicant behaviors with their own probes. It should be recalled that there are benefits to standardization of the job applicant. Part of the benefit is in insuring control of what information is evaluated by all trainees exposed to the tape. Also, for higher level professional and managerial level positions, as well as in academic settlings, extensive use is made of board interviews. It should be recalled that most of the time in these interviews is spent listening to questions that others pose. It is believed that the setting of the experiment is very realistic rather than artificial and there is much to be gained by approaching the issue in this manner.

Standardization of the rating form is also essential. Ulrich & Trumbo (1965) state that the interview is the best instrument the personnel specialist has for evaluating the job applicant's motivation for the job and his interpersonal relations. In addition, Hakel & Schuh (1971) report that
across seven diverse occupations the interpersonal relations and boyscoutishness of the applicant were judged as highly important for making the employment decision by actual practicing employment interviewers. It is believed that a rating form designed to focus the interviewer's attention on the items that reflect motivation for the job, interpersonal relations skills, and boyscoutishness, will assess the most important information from the interview.

Experimental Hypotheses

Three major hypotheses were investigated in the present study.

Hypothesis 1: Subjects participating in a training course in employment interviewing which focuses on question asking procedures, important job applicant characteristics, attention to errors than can occur in rating, and on overall selection procedures will demonstrate knowledge of correct interviewing behaviors (i.e., score higher) on an achievement test built upon the content of the course than not trained subjects.

Hypothesis 2: The effects of training will be evident whether the course content is presented by live lecture or video tape recorded methods of instruction.

Hypothesis 3: Subjects participating in the employment interviewing training course will develop a different perception of the applicant than subjects not trained. Trained subjects should form different impressions and make different decisions than not trained subjects.
CHAPTER III

GENERAL PROCEDURE AND DESIGN OF THE EXPERIMENT

The subjects were drawn from the introductory psychology subject pool at the Ohio State University during the Winter Quarter, 1971, for the live lecture instruction portion of the experiment (N=33) and during the Spring Quarter, 1971 for the video tape recorded instruction portion of the experiment (N=106). Subjects in the introductory psychology subject pool volunteered for the experiment through normal procedures and were granted experiment time credit for their participation. All subjects did not appear at the designated time, causing unequal cell frequencies in the design of the experiment.

Subjects who did report on the date, time, and at the place designated for the experiment were greeted by the experimenter who dressed in a manner he judged suitable for a training director assigned to teach professional and managerial level personnel how to conduct the first selection interview.

When the experimenter greeted the subjects he told them that he was developing a course to train professional and
managerial level personnel to be employment interviewers. They were instructed that they would be given an opportunity to rate a real job applicant for a life insurance sales position as part of their training. They were also instructed that they would be tested on employment interviewing. The order of training, testing, and rating was not announced. Regardless of which combination of elements of the four hours the subjects were exposed to, they were given brief (5-minute) breaks between the sections.

Subjects were instructed that the exact nature of the position was not important and no information regarding the specifications of the life insurance sales position was provided during their rating of the job applicant. The full job applicant tape recorded interview lasted over 60 minutes but only the first 30 minutes of the tape was played for the subjects. All subjects were exposed to this same taped presentation. While subjects listened to the tape they were allowed to take notes freely and to examine their copy of the personal history resume for the applicant. Subjects who had received the training course and its accompanying materials were also allowed access to these. An additional 10 minutes was allowed for subjects to complete their ratings.

Subjects were told that the audio tape following the lecture (whether live or video tape recorded) had actually been used to train life insurance managers in the 1960's
and was being used because it was still the best taped lecture of its kind around.

Upon entering the class room and being seated, the subjects were told that there are many professional and managerial level people who do not do employment interviewing except on an occasional basis. They were told that the usual part time interviewer is someone who is temporarily taken off of his job and allowed to do the first selection interview as a reward for long and faithful service. But, although these people want to do the interviewing, they don't know what to do. They may lack an overall picture of the employment process and special knowledge of fair employment practices. To meet the needs of these interviewers, the training departments conduct short training courses that prepare them to do the first selection interview. The training course acquaints the interviewers with what they should do and the why's behind the doing.

The experimenter was aware that many of the volunteers were eager to learn information that they could use to their own good advantage in seeking summer, part time, and career positions. The subjects were encouraged to ask any questions they wished but were requested to keep their questions relevant to the course until the 4 hour program was completed.

This research was conducted in three stages. During the first stage the achievement test was written, administered,
and scored. Item difficulties were examined and the Kuder-Richardson Number 8 estimate of reliability was computed.

The second stage of the experiment consisted of running the six combinations of the three elements of the 4 hour course each with a separate group of subjects. The elements were: Train, Rate, and Test. Training consisted of the two and one-half hours of lecture and tape recorded presentation of the course content. Rate consisted of hearing the job applicant tape and completing the rating form. Test consisted of taking the 48 item achievement test based on the course's content. Group 1 received the schedule train-rate-test; Group 2: Train-test-rate; 3: Test-train-rate; 4: Rate-train-test; 5: Test-rate-train; and 6: Rate-test-train. The number of subjects scheduled was to be a minimum of 5 in each cell of the design.

The third stage used the video tape recorded lecture method and was intended to cross validate the findings from the live lecture presentation of training. The experimental design was repeated. Because of the higher availability of subjects during the replication, the number of subjects was to be a minimum of 20 in each cell of the design.
CHAPTER IV
DEVELOPMENT OF THE ACHIEVEMENT TEST

A 48-item achievement test was developed for this research. Based on the course's content, it was presented in two parts. Part I consisted of 26 items on procedures for question asking. The items were presented as portions of a transcript of a real employment interview, and the subjects were instructed to determine where the interviewer made an error in the presented passages. Subjects were instructed to indicate the alternative that applied: No error if that was thought to be the case, or the alternative most like the error that they thought had occurred. Errors could consist of what was said or in the way that it was said. Part II of the test was intended to measure the subjects' knowledge of general principles of employment interviewing and selection. It consisted of 22 additional items. See Appendix C for a sample Achievement Test booklet and an answer sheet.

Twenty-one male and female upper division and graduate students enrolled in a course in industrial psychology at the Ohio State University were used as the subjects for the verification of the item difficulties of the achievement test.
Item difficulties were examined and found to range between .095 and .952. Since each item had some variance, the test was used in its entirety. Verifying the item difficulties on this advanced group of subjects was a sufficiently stringent test for the item difficulties. The Kuder-Richardson Number 8 reliability estimate was .868 for the 48 item test. The mean score of the industrial psychology students was 23.9 items correct with a standard deviation of 7.37.
CHAPTER V
PREPARATION OF THE TRAINING COURSE

The training course modeled after that currently used by the Life Insurance Agency Management Association (LIAMA), was intended to acquaint the student with the employment process, the interview's part in the total employment scheme, the interview's goal, what the interview consists of, why it is used, how to prepare for it, and how to hold the first selection interview with an applicant for a professional or managerial level position.

Seven personnel forms were given to the subjects as training aids for their use during the experiment but all were retained by the experimenter at the completion of the training course. See Appendix A for a sample of the contents of the training course materials. Each form is briefly described below.

1. An Outline of the training course was presented as a three page table of contents covering the topics to be studied. This form was constantly referred to during the 90 minutes of lectures.
2. A Checklist for the Selection Procedure consisted of a listing of 15 stages through which the successful applicant progresses. The sequence is orderly, allowing for the less expensive hurdles to be presented first followed by each additional step to putting an applicant on the payroll.

3. A Fair Employment Practices Abstract consisted of excerpts from the Ohio Fair Employment Practices Act. The form was the same as the one provided visiting employment interviewers and students at the Ohio State University's various placement offices. The excerpt covered in briefest form what the employer's representatives and the job applicants must do and not do to conform to the provisions of the act.

4. The Personal History Resume was a basic information source that asked the job applicant his name, employment history, educational history, and whether he had been a member of the armed forces of this country.

5. The Structured Interview Format was a version of the work history format used by LIAMA. The form provided to the subjects consisted of questions numbered A-1 to A-11 which indicated that they covered work history and were to be asked for each job held by the job applicant. On the top of the form was listed the standard probes and comments recommended for use by the trainer.

6. The Master List of Errors consisted of a listing of 18 errors that can occur in interviews. Examples of 11 of the
errors were also covered in the separate training tape.

7. The Interview Summary Evaluation Form consisted of two parts. Part I instructed the subjects to review their notes and at the end of the interview to evaluate the applicant. Five evaluation levels ranging from one extreme position through neutral to the other extreme position were provided for each of the 26 job applicant characteristics. Twenty-two of the job applicant characteristics were included because previous research (Hakel & Schuh, 1971) reported that they were highly important for making employment decisions in occupations ranging from blue collar through general management. Four additional items were included: Personal feelings toward the applicant, motivation for the job, educational experience, and manner of expression. Part II of the rating form required the subjects to review the evaluations they had made, and to draw an overall evaluation of the applicant. Subjects were instructed to indicate their decisions:

- The applicant looks definitely promising on the information obtained to this point. My decision would be to continue further with the applicant.

- My decision would be to terminate further activities with this applicant.

See Appendix B for a sample Interview Summary Evaluation Form.

The video tape recorded lecture was generated from the lecturer's notes, the same notes used during the presentation.
of the live lecture training courses. During the video taping, close up pictures were presented of the forms used as training aids. Thus, the lecturer was not shown at all times on the final taped lecture. The final taped version of the lecture took 90 minutes to present.

The lecture was followed by a 55 minute audio tape recorded lecture and skit demonstrating good and bad interviewing techniques and instructing on job applicant rating techniques. This taped presentation had been used to train Sales Managers for a Life Insurance Company.
CHAPTER VI

THE STANDARDIZED JOB APPLICANT TAPE

The design of the experiment required the presentations of a single job applicant standardized for rating by all of the subjects in the experiment regardless of their treatment combination. This section describes the development of several tapes and the selection of the one used in the experiment.

Six simulated employment interviews between the writer (as the interviewer) and graduate student cohorts (as the job applicants) were conducted and the audio portion was tape-recorded. The job applicants were being considered for a life insurance sales position and the interview was conducted accordingly. Equipment failure caused the elimination of two. Of the remaining four tapes, one was judged not usable because of the strong bias toward an ideal Boy scout image. The bogus job applicant had had so much "desirable" experience that in combination with other high credentials that he was judged by the experimenter to be too obviously a good candidate for the position. One of the remaining three tapes was eliminated because of extensive appearance of church-related
activities. Because a strong emphasis had been placed on fair employment practices in the training course, it was felt that this interview was unsuitable.

The two remaining tapes were very similar in that the two graduate students convinced the experimenter that they were believable applicants for the life insurance sales position. Either tape would have been suitable for use. The choice of the tape finally used was a matter of chance. There was nothing unique about the tape used as the standardized job applicant. During the first 30 minutes the interview progressed from a detailed discussion of work history and experience, through educational background, leisure time activities, plans for the future, and present living arrangements. In the writer's opinion, the bogus applicant did a credible job of masking his college education, and presented a believable case regarding past work experience as a shoe salesman. There were items of information which cast the applicant into a doubtful light. He reported having a physical deferment from military service and of lacking a college education.
CHAPTER VII
ANALYSIS PLAN

The analysis was conducted to test three hypotheses regarding the test, the replicability of the results between the live lecture and video tape recorded presentations of the training content, and the rating of the standardized job applicant.

The achievement test scores for the subjects who received the training prior to being tested were pooled and compared to the scores made by subjects who were tested prior to the training. By pooling, Groups 1, 2, and 4 were combined and compared to Groups 3, 5, and 6. Thus, no differentiation was made between train and test immediately or with training, rate the job applicant, and then test. A point biserial correlation coefficient for the pooled train-test group test scores against the test-train group test scores was calculated.

A one way analysis of variance, eta, and epsilon for the test scores made by each group in the six fixed treatment conditions was calculated. The eta here expresses the relationship between the fixed treatment conditions and the test scores of the subjects in the treatment condition. This eta took into account the uniqueness of the six conditions while the
previously cited point biserial correlation pooled the groups into a trained-tested or tested-trained dichotomy. Analysis was designed to answer the question "Does the training course make a difference in achievement test score?"

The second focus of analysis was on whether the results from the live lecture taught sessions would cross validate to the video tape recorded taught sessions. The test scores for the groups tested in the live lecture portion and the video tape recorded portion of the experiment were cast into a two way analysis of variance design for unweighted means and unequal cell frequencies (Winer, 1962). Factor A consisted of the two conditions of live instruction versus video tape instruction. Factor B consisted of the six treatment combinations arranged as a single factor.

The main focus of analysis was on the question "Does training in employment interviewing result in a different perception of the applicant?". The ratings made on the 26 job applicant characteristics and on the overall evaluation of whether to continue with the applicant were compared between those trained before rating to those rating the applicant before training. This pooling was of Groups 1, 2, and 3 against Groups 4, 5, and 6. Thus, no differentiation was made between train and rate immediately or with the train-test-rate condition.
There are three aspects of the job applicant attribute ratings that might receive attention in the determination of whether differences in ratings did occur. One indication would be that the trained group might rate the applicant higher or lower than the group rating the applicant without benefit of training. The difference in mean ratings would appear as statistically significant point biserial correlation coefficients on the job applicant attributes with the trained-not trained classification. The mean ratings could be the same but the trained group could have either larger or smaller variances about a mean rating. Because of the highly standardized nature of the training it would be anticipated that the ratings should be more similar for those receiving training than for those not trained. A third method of analysis would be attention to the correlation matrix of the trained group in comparison to the not trained group. If the training would be successful in breaking up the halo error, the trait intercorrelations should be lower for the trained group.
CHAPTER VIII
THE EFFECT OF TRAINING ON ACHIEVEMENT TEST SCORES

The first hypothesis, that subjects participating in a training course in employment interviewing would demonstrate higher knowledge of correct interviewing behaviors than subjects not receiving training, was supported. The higher knowledge was reflected in higher test scores on the achievement test based on the course's content. These results cross validated between the Live Lecture and Video Tape Recorded groups.

The point biserial correlation coefficient between trained or not trained and test score for the Live Lecture trained groups was .883 and was significant. A one way analysis of variance was conducted on the six groups' test scores and their treatment categories. The F was 32.03, eta was .925, and epsilon was .911.

The point biserial correlations between trained or not trained and test score for the video tape recorded trained groups was .805 and was significant. This figure was comparable to the correlation of .883 for the live lecture trained groups. A one way analysis of variance was conducted for the six treatment categories. The F was 45.37, eta was .833, and
epsilon was .824. The F was significant and was evidence of the high relationship between the fixed treatment categories and test score.
CHAPTER IX

COMPARATIVE RESULTS OF THE LIVE LECTURE AND
VIDEO TAPE RECORDED METHODS OF TRAINING

The second hypothesis, that increased standardization of
the training course by presenting the lecture material by
Video Tape would not affect the test scores made by the subjects
in the treatment conditions, was supported.

The summary of the analysis of variance of the treatment
combinations for the live lecture and video tape recorded
methods of training is shown in Table 1. The F for methods
of training was 0.0. The F for treatment combinations was
52.551 and is significant beyond the .001 level. The F for
the interaction of 1.391 was not significant. The sample
sizes, means, and standard deviations of the treatment by
condition combinations are shown in Table 2.

A one way analysis of variance was conducted across the
six experimental groups. F was 1.351 and was not significant.
The implication of the not significant F was that the methods
of training did not differ in their ability to produce a high
criterion score whether the training was by live lecture or
video tape recorded lecture.
Table 1
Analysis of Variance of the Treatment Combinations for the Live Lecture and Video Tape Recorded

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Method of Training (A)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment Combination(B)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1024.979</td>
<td>52.551</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB Interaction</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>27.133</td>
<td>1.391</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Cell</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>19.505</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2
Sample Sizes, Means and Standard Deviations for the Treatment by Condition Combinations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Live Lecture</th>
<th></th>
<th>Video Tape</th>
<th></th>
<th>Recorded</th>
<th></th>
<th>Totals</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Train-Rate-Test</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33.250</td>
<td>5.117</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>35.435</td>
<td>4.500</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>35.111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Train-Test-Rate</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>38.667</td>
<td>2.494</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>34.727</td>
<td>4.464</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>35.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test-Train-Rate</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19.000</td>
<td>1.673</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22.182</td>
<td>4.438</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>21.593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate-Train-Test</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>38.000</td>
<td>2.966</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>36.944</td>
<td>3.719</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>37.174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test-Rate-Train</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24.125</td>
<td>3.100</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25.500</td>
<td>6.103</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24.950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate-Test-Train</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20.000</td>
<td>2.958</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18.222</td>
<td>3.583</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19.059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>26.879</td>
<td>8.304</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>30.208</td>
<td>8.138</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>29.417</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Sample Size
b Mean
c Standard Deviation
A one way analysis of variance was conducted across the six control groups. F was 3.943 and was significant. Examination of the scatter plots of test scores by each control group revealed that the control group that was exposed to the structured interview of the standardized job applicant and who used the rating form before being tested made fewer errors on the test than, the control groups who took the examination prior to the exposure to the rating exercise. It is possible that the exposure allowed some learning to take place which was then evident in the higher criterion scores. A 2 by 3 way analysis of variance was conducted on the test first control groups versus rate-test control groups to evaluate the significance of this difference in test scores. The F was found to be 7.63 and was significant. The interaction was not significant. The test first control groups from the live lecture and video tape recorded methods of training were then combined and a point biserial correlation was calculated on test scores between the test before rating group in comparison to the test after rating group. The correlation of .406 was significant, indicating a moderate relationship between achieving higher achievement test scores and simple exposure to the rating form and hearing the tape of the applicant being interviewed.

Two additional checks on the equivalence of the methods of training were made. In the live lecture and video tape recorded groups separately, the correlation between membership
in the train-test condition in comparison to the train-rate-test condition and achievement test scores was calculated. The question addressed was whether interjecting a task between training and testing would decrease criterion scores for that group. For the live lecture group the correlation was .533 and was significant with a one tailed test but on cross validation the correlation was .024 and was not significant. A comparison was made between the test scores for the treatment conditions of rate-train-test and train-rate-test. The correlation of .502 was not significant for the live lecture trained groups. The cross validated correlation of .174 also was not significant. Clearly, the evidence pointed to the comparability of the training programs. The same high criterion scores were achieved regardless of the arrangement of treatments and regardless of the method of training.
CHAPTER X

EFFECTS OF TRAINING ON IMPRESSIONS AND DECISIONS

The third hypothesis, that subjects participating in the employment interviewing training course will develop a different perception of the applicant than subjects not trained, was partially supported. While an analysis of mean ratings and variance spread did not show differences, the correlation matrices indicated a reduction in halo error for the trained group.

On the overall decision to continue with the applicant, the phi coefficient of .048 was not significant for the live lecture trained group. The cross validated phi coefficient for the video tape recorded trained group was .076 and also was not significant.

Impressions were formed by the subjects about the standardized job applicant. Ratings on only two of the job applicant characteristics were correlated significantly with training for the live lecture taught group. They were the applicant's perceived trustworthiness and the perception of how the people he works with feel toward him. The correlations were .424 and .410, respectively, indicating that those subjects
who received training were more lenient in their ratings. Of further interest is the observation that only four of the 26 characteristics were negatively correlated with membership in the trained group. By chance, one would expect a split of 13 positive and 13 negative correlations. The 22 to 4 split was statistically different from 13 to 13 by a binomial test and supports the hypotheses that if anything, the trained subjects were more lenient in their judgments, a result both unintended and unexpected by the course architect.

Ratings on only three of the 26 job applicant attributes were significantly correlated with training for the video tape recorded taught group. They were the evaluation of the applicant's motivation for the job, the applicant's level of satisfaction toward his coworkers, and the reason he left his last job (whether he left of his own volition). The correlations were -.214, -.200, and -.216, respectively, indicating that those subjects who received training were not as lenient in their ratings. These three items were not significantly correlated with training for the live lecture trained groups. The two items significantly correlated with training in the live lecture groups did not cross validate to the video tape recorded trained groups. A reevaluation of the observation that only four of the 26 job applicant characteristics were negatively correlated with membership in the trained group resulted in the opposite finding of
19 of the 26 characteristics now having negative signs. Both results are statistically significant but in the opposite direction. No explanation is offered for the divergent results. The conclusion drawn is that there are no systematic, cross validated effects of training on leniency of ratings.

An analysis was conducted on the standard deviations of the trait ratings. Since the trained group was informed of the high importance of the structured interview format and the high importance of the trait ratings in comparison to the characteristics not included in the rating form, it would be suggested that greater attention would be paid to the characteristics, and that attention to this highly salient information would result in more uniform agreement among the judges in the trained before rating condition. A matched comparison was made for each item's standard deviation between the train-rate groups and the rate-train groups. Fifteen of the 26 items had smaller standard deviations for the group who was trained. A 13 to 13 split would be expected by chance. The 15 to 11 split was not significantly different from 13 to 13 by a binomial test. The conclusion is that there are no systematic effects of training on the spread of ratings given to a job applicant.

An analysis was conducted on the intercorrelation matrices of the trait ratings. It would be anticipated that the training program's attention to errors of rating, such as the
halo effect, might be detected as having an effect on the intercorrelation matrix of the trait ratings for the group of subjects who received training. If the rate before training intercorrelation matrix is essentially the same as the trait rating intercorrelations of the groups who were trained prior to the rating exercise, it would be implied that even this elementary task did not show a transfer between knowing what to do and translating that knowledge into the behavior of having lower intercorrelations among the traits. Ideally, one should conduct matched t tests between all combinations of trait ratings taken two at a time (McNemar, 1962). However, an alternative procedure may be better with considerable savings in man-hours and expense. It was suggested that the results of a Wherry hierarchical factor analysis (Wherry, 1959) of the correlation matrix of the rate-train group could be compared to the results of the same analysis on the correlation matrix of the train-rate group. It would be anticipated that a general factor would result from each analysis.

The analyses were conducted and the factor coefficients of the items on the general factor were compared. If the training was successful in producing behavior change, that change should be evident in lower factor loadings for the general factor in the train-rate sequence. The factor coefficient for each item on the general factor was transformed into a Z. The Zs were compared and the standard error of the
difference between the Zs for the two groups was obtained according to procedures outlined in McNemar (1962). If the Zs are significantly different, their factor coefficients are significantly different. A one tail t test was conducted because it was hypothesized that the train-rate group should have lower factor coefficients on the general factor. It was found that 20 of the 26 differences between the factor coefficients were significantly different with the one tail test. The higher and primary loadings for the train-rate and rate-train groups are shown in Tables 3 and 4. It should be noted that only this comparison of correlation matrices was in support of the hypothesis that subjects could translate knowledge learned in training to performance in evaluating the standardized job applicant.

In the factor analyses themselves, the same number of factors were extracted for both groups. The first factor from the two analyses was an interpersonal relations factor dealing with the applicant's level of satisfaction toward his coworkers and his ability to get along with the people he works with.

It would appear that the factor structure for the group that received training before rating the applicant was able to demarcate its factors better once the general factor was rotated out. The train-rate group scattered five items into factors where they look as though they belong while the same
Table 3
Higher and Primary Factor Loadings for the Rate-Train Condition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Feelings</td>
<td>.447</td>
<td>-.303</td>
<td>.424</td>
<td>.224</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>.046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Motivation</td>
<td>.700</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>.325</td>
<td>-.078</td>
<td>.198</td>
<td>-.066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Education</td>
<td>.322</td>
<td>-.135</td>
<td>.560</td>
<td>-.117</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Expression</td>
<td>.512</td>
<td>-.306</td>
<td>.585</td>
<td>-.091</td>
<td>.227</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Coworkers</td>
<td>.529</td>
<td>.491</td>
<td>.174</td>
<td>.286</td>
<td>.091</td>
<td>-.363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Length</td>
<td>.493</td>
<td>-.299</td>
<td>-.005</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>-.033</td>
<td>.332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Last job</td>
<td>.446</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>.121</td>
<td>.464</td>
<td>-.179</td>
<td>.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Dependable</td>
<td>.735</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.093</td>
<td>.218</td>
<td>.211</td>
<td>-.049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Trustworthy</td>
<td>.660</td>
<td>-.166</td>
<td>.109</td>
<td>.336</td>
<td>.217</td>
<td>-.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Lazy</td>
<td>.767</td>
<td>.190</td>
<td>.158</td>
<td>.142</td>
<td>-.167</td>
<td>.133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Supervisor</td>
<td>.300</td>
<td>.179</td>
<td>-.028</td>
<td>.640</td>
<td>-.149</td>
<td>-.140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. People</td>
<td>.455</td>
<td>.257</td>
<td>.253</td>
<td>.201</td>
<td>.228</td>
<td>-.344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Assigned task</td>
<td>.517</td>
<td>.334</td>
<td>-.070</td>
<td>.082</td>
<td>-.009</td>
<td>-.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Other's opinions</td>
<td>.447</td>
<td>.189</td>
<td>.410</td>
<td>.170</td>
<td>-.351</td>
<td>.075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Cooperative</td>
<td>.682</td>
<td>.249</td>
<td>-.088</td>
<td>.082</td>
<td>.214</td>
<td>-.098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Reference</td>
<td>.613</td>
<td>.125</td>
<td>.125</td>
<td>.088</td>
<td>-.098</td>
<td>.107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. People</td>
<td>.600</td>
<td>.383</td>
<td>.246</td>
<td>.076</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>-.175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Effective</td>
<td>.670</td>
<td>.143</td>
<td>.225</td>
<td>-.048</td>
<td>.089</td>
<td>-.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Factor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Stable</td>
<td>.663</td>
<td>-.014</td>
<td>.378</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>-.175</td>
<td>.204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Responsibility</td>
<td>.627</td>
<td>-.011</td>
<td>.321</td>
<td>.172</td>
<td>-.031</td>
<td>.044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Answers</td>
<td>.793</td>
<td>.230</td>
<td>-.012</td>
<td>.150</td>
<td>-.119</td>
<td>.137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Number</td>
<td>.554</td>
<td>-.073</td>
<td>.093</td>
<td>.402</td>
<td>-.015</td>
<td>.037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Conscientious</td>
<td>.736</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>.187</td>
<td>.122</td>
<td>-.064</td>
<td>.148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Responsible</td>
<td>.835</td>
<td>.125</td>
<td>-.030</td>
<td>.127</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>.106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Answers</td>
<td>.809</td>
<td>-.057</td>
<td>.100</td>
<td>-.063</td>
<td>.213</td>
<td>.111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Provoke</td>
<td>.292</td>
<td>-.203</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>.485</td>
<td>.101</td>
<td>-.071</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4
Higher and Primary Factor Loadings for the Train-Rate Condition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Feelings</td>
<td></td>
<td>.640</td>
<td>-.038</td>
<td>-.109</td>
<td>.234</td>
<td>.155</td>
<td>.113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Motivation</td>
<td></td>
<td>.547</td>
<td>-.101</td>
<td>-.097</td>
<td>.126</td>
<td>.567</td>
<td>-.194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Education</td>
<td></td>
<td>.369</td>
<td>-.112</td>
<td>-.508</td>
<td>-.134</td>
<td>.512</td>
<td>.202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Expression</td>
<td></td>
<td>.457</td>
<td>-.048</td>
<td>-.274</td>
<td>.098</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>.321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Coworkers</td>
<td></td>
<td>.307</td>
<td>-.421</td>
<td>.248</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>.368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Length</td>
<td></td>
<td>.240</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>.248</td>
<td>.098</td>
<td>-.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Last job</td>
<td></td>
<td>.310</td>
<td>-.076</td>
<td>.331</td>
<td>-.103</td>
<td>.261</td>
<td>-.073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Dependable</td>
<td></td>
<td>.584</td>
<td>-.125</td>
<td>-.027</td>
<td>.527</td>
<td>-.026</td>
<td>.039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Trustworthy</td>
<td></td>
<td>.486</td>
<td>-.094</td>
<td>.216</td>
<td>.462</td>
<td>-.267</td>
<td>.122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Lazy</td>
<td></td>
<td>.611</td>
<td>-.171</td>
<td>-.033</td>
<td>.242</td>
<td>.251</td>
<td>.086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Supervisor</td>
<td></td>
<td>.379</td>
<td>.094</td>
<td>.436</td>
<td>-.138</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. People</td>
<td></td>
<td>.397</td>
<td>-.243</td>
<td>.562</td>
<td>-.184</td>
<td>.098</td>
<td>.256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Assigned task</td>
<td></td>
<td>.463</td>
<td>-.213</td>
<td>.201</td>
<td>.210</td>
<td>-.084</td>
<td>.275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Other's opinions</td>
<td></td>
<td>.493</td>
<td>-.090</td>
<td>.220</td>
<td>-.116</td>
<td>-.032</td>
<td>.401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Cooperative</td>
<td></td>
<td>.601</td>
<td>.134</td>
<td>-.023</td>
<td>-.046</td>
<td>.144</td>
<td>.135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Reference</td>
<td></td>
<td>.552</td>
<td>.132</td>
<td>.329</td>
<td>-.066</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. People</td>
<td></td>
<td>.423</td>
<td>-.329</td>
<td>.659</td>
<td>-.016</td>
<td>.278</td>
<td>-.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Effective</td>
<td></td>
<td>.556</td>
<td>-.116</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>.244</td>
<td>.163</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4, continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19. Stable</td>
<td>.621</td>
<td>-.097</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>.352</td>
<td>.104</td>
<td>.035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Responsibility</td>
<td>.682</td>
<td>-.001</td>
<td>-.174</td>
<td>.201</td>
<td>.284</td>
<td>.037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Answers</td>
<td>.707</td>
<td>.229</td>
<td>-.083</td>
<td>-.099</td>
<td>.141</td>
<td>.185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Number</td>
<td>.512</td>
<td>.206</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td>-.106</td>
<td>.088</td>
<td>.070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Conscientious</td>
<td>.687</td>
<td>.179</td>
<td>-.063</td>
<td>.392</td>
<td>-.009</td>
<td>-.076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Responsible</td>
<td>.819</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>.242</td>
<td>.164</td>
<td>.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Answers</td>
<td>.723</td>
<td>.237</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>-.048</td>
<td>-.144</td>
<td>.368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Provoke</td>
<td>.553</td>
<td>.299</td>
<td>-.145</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>.119</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
five items were pumped into the second factor for the rate-train group. It can be seen in Tables 3 and 4 that the five items of motivation for the job, educational experience, expression, other people's opinions, and stable are all in Factor 2 for the rate-train group but are scattered into three factors in the train-rate group.

For the train-rate group, the third factor appears to be a Boy scout dimension with loadings on stable, dependable, trustworthy, and conscientious. The fourth factor is represented by motivation for the job and evaluation of educational experience. The fifth factor combines expression and other people's opinions to form an interpersonal relations dimension. The second factor was also an interpersonal relations dimension dealing with supervisory relations, the people he works with, and his most recent employer. The third factor for the rate-train group resembles the second factor from the train-rate group.

Factor four for the rate-train group is almost nonexistent once the general factor is rotated out. Item 14 dealing with other people's opinions seems to belong more properly on factor 2 where it also loads.

In general, it would appear that the rate-train group was not only more prone to the halo error, as evidenced by the higher factor coefficients on the general factor, but once the general factor is rotated out the remaining factors are more
demarcated and interpretable as a result of training.

On the overall decision to continue with the job applicant, 8 of the 12 trained subjects and 13 of the 21 not trained subjects indicated they would continue with the applicant, for the live lecture trained group. For the video tape trained group the frequencies were 48 of the 67 trained subjects and 28 of the 49 not trained subjects indicated they would continue with the applicant.
CHAPTER XI

DISCUSSION

The training program succeeded in getting across to the trainees the essential knowledge about employment interviewing and the selection process in general. It also succeeded somewhat in breaking up the halo error. But, the trainees were no more harsh or lenient in their ratings, nor did their ratings have smaller variances about the mean ratings. Further, the same proportion of trainees as non-trained subjects indicated they would continue contact with the applicant.

In sum, it took considerable scheming and the use of very sophisticated statistical techniques to demonstrate a benefit of the training in terms of performance. The evidence for transfer of the training into performance rests solely on the comparison of the factor coefficients on the general factor from the intercorrelation table of trait ratings. How much more effort would it take to find out if the trained group makes better decisions. The issue of validity of decisions never even arose. It is possible that the brevity of the course was not up to producing more impact on the trainees'
behaviors. But, the course was designed to be typical. And a typical course in employment interviewing today frequently lasts as short as four hours. The total time spent by subjects in this research was four hours. How could we expect major changes in behaviors to have occurred in such a short period of time? Fiedler's (1950) finding of experienced interviewers being highly similar, more similar than to members of their own theoretical orientations, should have warned us that it may take years to develop a skillful behavior repertoire for conducting interviews. But then, one wonders if Fiedler's experienced interviewers made more accurate decisions than the novices.

The Rowe (1960) research would lead us to believe that more experienced interviewers do make more accurate decisions. The results of the research on the Canadian militia did not cross validate to the regular Army though. Rowe attributed the difference to the amount of experience the personnel officers received per unit of time and she concluded that after a short period of selection interviewing experience there was no improvement in accuracy. Could other uncontrolled factors have accounted for the difference? It is difficult to draw clear conclusions based on the Rowe data alone.

Also, Crow (1957) reported a finding that would give any training director pause. Crow found that senior medical students given special instruction in client-physician relations
actually became poorer judges of people during their senior year in medical school than the students not given the training. When training people to make judgments about other people, the training director takes a chance that he may succeed in getting the learners to pay far more attention to the individual differences in the other persons than they can classify accurately. This entire area of interpersonal perception requires considerably more attention.

The situation in which the applicants' materials were presented were artificial. The personal history resume contained only name, occupational experience, education, and military service. There is a great deal to be said for this limited presentation of information. Webster (1964) recommended that the situation and circumstances in which the applicant is seen contain enough uncertainty to maintain the interviewer's interest so that relevant material brought out late in the interview could be evaluated properly.

The interview utilized in this research lasted one-half hour. The actual interview went over an hour but only the first half hour was played for the subjects because of the time constraints. Whether a shorter or longer period of time might have shown a difference between trained and non-trained subjects in their evaluation of the job applicant is doubtful. Springbett (1954) reported that the early impressions were so pervasive as to agree with final judgments in a high
proportion of cases even though these early impressions were formed on less than five minutes worth of interaction between the participants.

There can be merit in telling novice interviewers what techniques previous interviewers have used and in informing them of the overall goals, and limitations, of a brief course in employment interviewing. Certainly, it may be possible to collapse several days on-the-job experience into a four hour (one afternoon) session presented in highly compact form. It is hoped that the training materials and course content developed for this research would be used to good advantage in this way. If an organization has the video tape recorded material and can support facilities for its use, it is possible that interviewers could subject themselves to this information on a demand schedule. Repetitions in whatever number, and in whatever sequence would be possible thereby adapting the use of the equipment to the individual needs of the novice interviewer.

When tested about question asking procedures and the procedures involved in the conduct of the interview, trained interviewers demonstrated significantly higher criterion scores on a test which was shown to have high internal consistency. If our goal is to develop the knowledge of how to do interviews, then clearly the training is beneficial and can be conducted by either the live lecture of video tape recorded methods, and
according to several different schedules of any combination of train, rate, and test, that suits the training director's fancy.
CHAPTER XII
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Three major hypotheses were investigated in the present study.

Hypothesis 1: Subjects participating in a training course in employment interviewing which focuses on question asking procedures, important job applicant characteristics, attention to errors that can occur in rating, and on overall selection procedures will demonstrate higher knowledge of correct interviewing behaviors (i.e., score higher) on an achievement test built upon the content of the course than not trained subjects. This hypothesis was supported. The relationship between training, regardless of treatment combination, and test score was highly statistically significant.

Hypothesis 2: The effects of training will be evident whether the course content is presented by live lecture or video tape recorded methods of instruction. The hypothesis was supported. The live lecture and video tape recorded methods produced equally high criterion scores.

Hypothesis 3: Subjects participating in the employment
interviewing training course will develop a different perception of the applicant than subjects not trained. Trained subjects should form different impressions and make different decisions than not trained subjects. This hypothesis is rejected in the case of comparing mean rating, and variances about the mean ratings. It is also rejected if we compare the proportion of trained and non-trained groups who decide to continue further with the job applicant. However, if we look to a characteristic of the intercorrelation matrices it is seen that the trained group was less prone to the halo error. Also, the factor structure for the trained group was more demarcated than for the non-trained group. It is concluded that this hypothesis is partially accepted.

It is recommended that the training course be presented to learners via the video tape recorded method of training. The desirability of having access to the material on a demand schedule, the ease of presentation, and the standardization of the presentation, plus its lower cost, all point to the higher utility of the video tape recorded over live presentation of the training course.

It is also recommended that considerably more attention will be given to area of training employment interviews. Attention should be given to the possible benefits of the many techniques and methods of training that have been advocated. The merits of discussions, role playing, and lectures on
issues other than those covered in this research all need equally detailed attention. Hopefully, greater benefits to the interviewer training may be realized and improved decision quality be the result.
CHAPTER XIII

SUMMARY

All of the major textbooks on employment interviewing have suggested that the skill of interviewing is trainable. Along with the explicit assumption that interviewing is an acquired skill is the implicit assumption that training will produce a different result in a sample of interviewer trainees than would occur for a sample of similar people who are exposed to similar testing situations but who lack the training in employment interviewing. It is also assumed that the result will not only be different for the trained group but also the result should be better to justify the cost of the training. Surprisingly, there are no well controlled validation studies to justify the assumption of the beneficial effects of employment interviewer training. This dissertation set out to explore three aspects of the problem. The first focus of analysis was on the achievement test developed on the content of the training course. The analysis was designed to answer the question of whether the training course made a difference in the test scores made by trained versus non-trained subjects. In the live lecture group compared to their
control, the point biserial correlation was .883 (N=33) and eta was .925, the F for the eta was a significant 32.05 indicating that training did effect the test scores made by the subjects.

The second focus of analysis was on whether the results from the live lecture taught interviewers would cross validate to a group of subjects taught by a video tape recorded lecture of the material covered in the live lecture presentations. The video tape recorded trained groups' point biserial correlation between test scores and trained-tested or tested-trained sequence was .805 (N=106), eta was .833, and F for the eta was a significant 45.37. An analysis of variance for unweighted means and unequal cell frequencies for the two methods of training by the six treatment conditions was performed (N=139). The F for methods of training was 0.0. The F for treatment combinations was 52.551 and was significant. The interaction was not significant. The implication of no significant difference between the live lecture and video tape recorded conditions was that either method could be used to train subjects with equivalent results. Attention was then focused on the schedule of training. A one way analysis of variance for the experimental group was performed (N=75). F was not significant indicating that the three schedules of training produced the same result.

The main focus of analysis was on the question of whether
training in employment interviewing produced different impressions and different decisions about a standardized job applicant. There were four aspects of the issue investigated. The first comparison was on the overall decision of whether to continue with the job applicant. The correlation between training and the decision was .048 for the live lecture group and -.076 for the video tape trained group. In neither case did the correlation differ significantly from zero. The next comparison was on mean trait ratings as reflected in the point biserial correlations of the trait ratings and trained-net trained grouping. Some differences in rating did appear but none of the trait ratings cross validated. An analysis was conducted on the standard deviations about the mean trait ratings. Fifteen of the 26 trait ratings had lower variances for the trained group than for the non-trained group but this did not differ significantly from being a chance result. Attention was then directed toward factor analyses of the intercorrelation matrices of the trait ratings for the train-rate and rate-train groups separately. The loadings on the general factor were compared statistically. It was found that 20 of the 26 factor loadings were significantly smaller for the trained group indicating that the training was partially effective in breaking up the halo error. Although five factors were extracted from each matrix, the factor structure for the trained group appeared somewhat better demarcated after the general factor was rotated out. The
overall implication was that the training course was partially successful.
Appendix A

A Sample Contents of the Training Course Materials
TRAINING COURSE IN EMPLOYMENT INTERVIEWING

Need for the course: Introduction

Purpose of the training
  a. Acquaint the student with
     1. The employment process and the interview
     2. The Structured Interview Format
     3. The Personal History Resume as a basic information source
     4. The Interview Summary (Evaluation Form) containing the essentials required for sound decision making
  b. Teach the beginning interviewer
     1. How to ask questions: The way the question is asked can influence the applicant's answer and in turn your perception of the applicant.
     2. How to take notes during the interview
     3. How to avoid the most common errors in asking questions

Audio-Visual Aids
  Tape recorder
  Training Tapes
    1. Questions and Rating hints
    2. Actual job applicant interview

Materials
  The Handout
  Checklist for Selection Procedure
  Fair Employment Practices abstract
  Personal History Resume
  Structured Interview Format
  List of Common Errors
  Interview Summary (Evaluation) Form
    1. Motivation for the job
    2. Interpersonal Relations
    3. Boyscoutishness
The employment process may consist of several different steps depending on the occupation.

Testing

Interviewing and its marginal utility

The selection interview: For minimum acceptability to the firm
Technical competence assessment: How fast could the applicant contribute to the team (different people judge)
Familiarization: getting settled, education and recreation (different people handle)

Goals of the selection interview: An organized conversation with a purpose: To evaluate the applicant by asking questions that are:
- Relevant
- Elicit accurate information
- Presented in the same way for all applicants
- Maintaining flexibility for followup and probing

The structured interview and evaluation forms are used because they have every advantage
- Saves time: no need to invent your own questions, get right down to business
- Keeps evaluation close to the facts because questions and rating are relevant
- Insures the coverage of all of the information
The applicant doesn't present an organized picture of himself

Preparing for the interview

Review the Structured Interview Format: what question comes next and familiarization with probes: There are no "nosey" questions.
Review the contents of the Interview Summary Form: essential information that needs to be derived in the selection interview: note what isn't asked.
Review the Personal History Resume for at least 15 minutes: read and think. Your evaluation is built upon this information: note what isn't asked.
Study the list of common errors.
Review the strategies for taking notes: You may depend upon your notes to complete the Interview Summary Form.
- How: Use of key words
- When: To record information: positive and negative
- When: To complete the write up: immediately after the interview

Errors that can occur in procedure unless forewarned
- Spending too much time before starting the interview
- Selling the man on the job before deciding if you want him
- Giving the applicant all of the answers
- Giving rather than getting information
Holding the interview

The usual interview covers work experience and education. The full interview may last several days and cover in addition:
- Military Service
- Financial situation
- Present social situation
- Plans for the future

The interview is oriented toward evaluating what the applicant has done (it is not a clinical interview). What the man has done in the past is the single best predictor of his future performance.

Be neutral during the interview.
Tell the applicant what happens next.

If negotiations are terminated:
- a. Express appreciation for time spent
- b. Wish the applicant success
- c. Leave a favorable impression of the company and yourself

Present the training tape: Concentrate on the interviewer and his errors, not on the applicant or his qualifications. Have in front of you: The Master List of Errors.

Review the Interview Summary (Evaluation) Form.
Focus attention on the items and on the key decision regarding the applicant's acceptability.

Present the second training tape.
Have in front of you: The Structural Interview Format, the Personal History Resume, and the Interview Summary Form.
CHECKLIST FOR SELECTION PROCEDURE

Complete this form for each applicant contacted.

Applicant's name
Street Address
City and State

Telephone Number
Social Security Number
Zip Code

1. Made appointment for first visit with applicant.
2. Administered test battery.
3. Discussed test results with applicant.
4. Gave applicant PERSONAL HISTORY RESUME form.
5. Conducted first session of the selection interview
6. Evaluated applicant on the INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM.
7. Had applicant visit with other members of the company.
   a.
   b.
   c.
8. Obtained permission to check references.
10. Made reference check with the following people
    a.
    b.
    c.
    d.
11. Arranged for physical examination.
14. Applicant response
    a. accepted
    b. rejected: reason
EXCERPTS FROM THE OHIO FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES ACT

"Section 4112.02 UNLAWFUL DISCRIMINATORY PRACTICES.

"It shall be unlawful discriminatory practice:

"(A) For any employer, because of the race, color, religion, national origin or ancestry of any person, to refuse to hire or otherwise to discriminate against him with respect to hire, tenure, terms, conditions, or privileges of employment, or any matter directly or indirectly related to employment.

"(B) For an employment agency*, because of race, color, religion, national origin or ancestry to:

"(1) Refuse or fail to accept, register, classify properly, or refer for employment, or otherwise to discriminate against any person;

"(2) Comply with a request from an employer for referral of applicants for employment, if the request indicates directly or indirectly that the employer fails to comply with the provisions of sections 4112.01 or 4112.07, inclusive, of the Revised Code.

"(E) Except where based on a bona fide occupational qualification certified in advance by the commission, for any employer, employment agency or labor organization prior to employment or admission to membership to:

"(1) Elicit or attempt to elicit any information concerning the race, color, religion, national origin, or ancestry of an applicant for employment or membership;

"(2) Make or keep a record of the race, color, religion, national origin, or ancestry of any applicant for employment or
membership;

"(3) Use any form of application for employment or personnel or membership blank seeking to elicit information regarding race, color, religion, national origin, or ancestry;

"(4) Print or publish or cause to be printed or published any notice or advertisement relating to employment or membership indicating any preference, limitation, specification, or discrimination, based upon race, color, religion, national origin, or ancestry;

"(5) Announce or follow a policy of denying, or limiting, through a quota system or otherwise, employment or membership opportunities of any group because of the race, color, religion, national origin, or ancestry of such group;

"(6) Utilize in the recruitment or hiring of persons any employment agency, placement service, training school or center, labor organization, or any other employee-referring source known to discriminate against persons because of their race, color, religion, national origin, or ancestry.

"(F) For any person seeking employment to publish or cause to be published any advertisement ** which specifies or in any manner indicates his race, color, religion, national origin, or ancestry, or expresses a limitation or preference as to the race, color, religion, national origin, or ancestry of any prospective employer."

*College placement or employment offices are included in this definition.

**Data sheets and resumes have been interpreted as "advertisements" under this law.
PERSONAL HISTORY RESUME

1. Name (Last-First-Middle)

2. Occupational Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Employer</th>
<th>Job Title</th>
<th>Month and Year from to</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Level</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Year Graduated</th>
<th>Degree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>_________________________</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>_________________________</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Military Service

Have you served in the Armed Forces of this Country________
   How?  I understand.  
   What?  
   Anything else?  

WORK HISTORY  
A-1. Is the job with ______ the first full time job you have had?  
A-2. How did you happen to go with ______?  
A-3. When was this exactly?  
A-4. Did you consider any other jobs at that time?  
   YES: What were they?  
      Why did you take the one you did?  
   NO: Any particular reason why you did not consider any other jobs?  
A-5. How do you feel about your experiences with the _____ company?  
A-6. Was it a good move?  
      In what way?  
A-7. Why did you leave?  
A-8. How did you leave?  
      What was the sequence of events?  
      Who did what?  
A-9. When was that exactly?  
A-10. What happened between this and the next job?  
A-11. How did you happen to go with the next company?  
CYCLE ITEMS A-3 through A-11 until each job has been covered.  
* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *  
A-12. What are you looking for in your next job?  
      What do you believe you have to offer a new job?
Master List of Errors

Failure to use silence; not giving the applicant enough time to provide a complete and accurate answer (interrupting).

Failure to keep your own talking to a minimum; your talk ratio should not exceed 1:7.

Failure to probe with terms such as "why", "how", and "what" (why he believes something and how he did something).

Asking too many questions at one time.

Using complicated unfamiliar technical phrases.

Leading questions that beg the "right" answer.

Failure to have the applicant define his terms (worked "hard") or Failure to probe for specifics when general terms have been used.

Summarizing for the applicant (interpreting).

Indicating acceptability, favorability, or approval.

Using "what else" (should be "anything else").

Failure to control the interview (giving not getting information).

Failure to get an answer to the question.

Revealing the purpose of a question.

Repeating a question already asked and answered.

Skipping questions from the guide.

Avoiding a potentially negative (sensitive) area: financial, criminal record, health.

"Assuming"

Asking a question that can be answered in one word (yes/no).
Appendix B

A Sample Interview Summary Evaluation Form
Interview Summary Form

Part I

At the end of the interview, review your notes and evaluate the applicant. Note that there are five evaluation levels ranging from one extreme position through neutral to the other extreme position. Please checkmark (✓) on the line to indicate your evaluation of the applicant.

Your personal feelings toward this applicant

Like: __________: __________: __________: __________: __________: Dislike
neutral

Your evaluation of this applicant's motivation for the job

Very much: __________: __________: __________: __________: __________: Not motivated
neutral

wants this: __________: __________: __________: __________: __________: for this
neutral
job

Your evaluation of the applicant's educational experience

Good: __________: __________: __________: __________: __________: Bad
neutral
student: __________: __________: __________: __________: __________: student

The applicant's manner of expression (vocabulary and grammar)

Good: __________: __________: __________: __________: __________: Poor
neutral
expression: __________: __________: __________: __________: __________: expression

The applicant's level of satisfaction toward his coworkers

Satisfied: __________: __________: __________: __________: __________: Dissatisfied
neutral

How long does the applicant usually hold a job

Short time: __________: __________: __________: __________: __________: Long time
neutral

He left his last job because

He was: __________: __________: __________: __________: __________: voluntarily
neutral

fired: __________: __________: __________: __________: __________:

How dependable is the applicant

Very: __________: __________: __________: __________: __________: Not
neutral
dependable: __________: __________: __________: __________: __________: dependable

How trustworthy is the applicant

Very: __________: __________: __________: __________: __________: Not
neutral
trustworthy: __________: __________: __________: __________: __________: trustworthy
How lazy is the applicant
Very lazy:______:______:______:______: lazy
neutral

He and his supervisor
Don't get along:______:______:______:______:along
neutral

How do the people he works with feel toward him
Like him:______:______:______:______:him
neutral

How long would he put off an assigned task
Would do it immediately:______:______:______:immediately
neutral

He thinks other people's opinions are
Rational and valuable:______:______:______:______:valuable
neutral

How cooperative is he
Very cooperative:______:______:______:______:cooperative
neutral

His most recent employer gave him a reference that was
Good:______:______:______:______:Bad
neutral

How well does he get along with the people he works with
Can't get along:______:______:______:______:along
neutral

How effective (gets things done correctly) is the applicant
Very effective:______:______:______:______:effective
neutral
How stable is the applicant
Very stable: __________:________:________: ______: ______: ______: ______: ______: stable
neutral

Will he accept responsibility for his work
He would accept full responsibility: ______: ______: ______: ______: ______: ______: ______: No responsibility for his work
neutral

What kind of answer did he give when asked why he left his last job
Evasive and vague: ______: ______: ______: ______: ______: ______: ______: direct and factual
neutral

How many people can he get along with
Everybody: ______: ______: ______: ______: ______: ______: Nobody
neutral

How conscientious is the applicant
Very conscientious: ______: ______: ______: ______: ______: ______: ______: conscientious
neutral

How responsible is the applicant
Very: ______: ______: ______: ______: ______: ______: ______: Not neutral

When asked straight questions, he gave Crooked answers: ______: ______: ______: ______: ______: ______: ______: Straight answers
neutral

When others try to provoke him he would maintain self control: ______: ______: ______: ______: ______: ______: ______: Lose his temper and fight back
neutral
Part II

Carefully review the evaluations you have made. What is your overall evaluation of this applicant? Are the areas in which the applicant is low critical areas? This is the time to be critical of the applicant and of the evaluations you have made. This is a key decision point in the selection process.

Indicate your decision

_____ The applicant looks definitely promising on information obtained to this point. My decision would be to continue further with the applicant.

_____ My decision would be to terminate further activities with this applicant.

Your name ____________________________
Your age __________
Your sex ____________
Your group ________
Today's date _________
Appendix C

A Sample National Competitive Examination for Employment Interviewers Achievement

Test Booklet and Answer Sheet
INSTRUCTIONS:

Please place all of your answers on the answer sheet. Do not make any marks on the test booklet.

Part I

The following statements were taken from actual employment interviews. Your instructions are to read and evaluate each statement or set of statements. Consider carefully for each item whether, in your opinion, the employment interviewer makes an error. Indicate the alternative that applies: No error if you think that is the case; or the alternative present that is most like the error you think occurred. Errors can exist in what is said or in the way that it is said.

In all cases you are to evaluate the employment interviewer's behavior and not that of the applicant. Your total score is the number of items you get correct. There is no penalty for guessing. Please answer every item. Please mark only one alternative for each item.

Turn the page and begin. You have approximately one-half hour to complete this test.
1. Employment interviewer: "I see on your resume here that you listed your job with the Doan Company as your first job. How did you happen to go with them?"

   a. Assumed it was the applicant's first job.
   b. Asking too many questions at one time
   c. Failure to keep talking to a minimum
   d. Summarized for the applicant
   e. No error.

2. Employment interviewer: "When was this exactly?"

   a. Revealed the purpose of the question
   b. Assumed.
   c. Indicated acceptability or approval.
   d. No error.
   e. No purpose to the question.

3. Employment interviewer: "Did you consider any other jobs at that time? I'm trying to see how much of a choice you really had open to you."

   a. No error
   b. Asking a question that can be answered in one word.
   c. Revealing the purpose of the question
   d. Repeating a question already asked and answered.
   e. Assuming

4. Employment interviewer: "How do you feel about the experience with the Doan Company? I suppose that you enjoyed the contact with people?"

   Applicant: "Yes. That is what I liked most about the job."

   a. Assuming and leading.
   b. Avoiding a potentially negative area
   c. Revealing the purpose of the question
   d. No error
   e. Asking a question that can be answered in one word

5. Employment interviewer: "You left that job in September, 1970, is that right?"

   a. No error.
   b. Assuming and leading
   c. Failure to control the interview
   d. Repeated a question already asked
   e. Asked a question that could be answered in one word
6. Employment interviewer: "I see. So you took a summer job with Doan. You think the experience as a whole was worthwhile and you feel that you learned a lot, in fact, a great deal from it. Not to mention the extra money you earned. Is that right?"

   a. Summarized and interpreted for the applicant
   b. Leading question that begged the right answer
   c. Failure to control the interview
   d. Asking a question that can be answered in one word
   e. No error

7. Employment interviewer: "What happened between this and the next job?"

   Applicant: "Well, I went back to school..."

   Employment interviewer: "I understand that you went back to school. Specifically, I want to know what other jobs you held during the school year."

   a. No error
   b. Revealed the purpose of the question
   c. Interrupted the applicant
   d. Repeated a question already asked and answered
   e. Asking too many questions at one time

8. Employment interviewer: "What are you looking for in your next job?"

   Applicant: "I'm especially looking forward to your sales training program. Could you tell me a little about it? When would I start? How long is the program? How much field guidance am I given?"

   Employment interviewer: "Sure. We have a three month course in salesmanship. You can start immediately upon graduation. During the early development you will study exclusively in our home office facilities which we call our START program. Then a manager will accompany you into the field to help you get started. I'm sure you will enjoy it. As you've said, it is the best program in the field and our competition even acknowledges it."

   a. Failure to keep own talking to a minimum
   b. Using complicated unfamiliar technical phrases
   c. Failure to control the interview
   d. Failure to get an answer to your question
   e. No error
9. Employment interviewer: "Tell me. What were the hours, working conditions, and pay in this job with Lykes Brothers?"

   a. Asking too many questions at one time
   b. Asking questions that can be answered in one word
   c. Too direct an approach to question asking
   d. No error
   e. Assuming and leading

10. Employment interviewer: "To whom did you report? What did you report? How often did you report?

    a. Avoiding potentially sensitive (negative) areas
    b. Asking questions that can be answered in one word
    c. No error
    d. Too direct an approach to question asking
    e. Asking too many questions at one time

11. Employment interviewer: "How good were you at this job?"

    Applicant: "Above average I guess. I worked pretty hard. I found that I had to be aggressive and persistent to do well. And I found I could play that role quite well."

    Employment interviewer: "I see. What ideas did you have about how that job could be changed?"

    a. No error
    b. Failed to have the applicant define his terms
    c. Indicated acceptability or approval
    d. Revealed the purpose of the question
    e. Asked a leading question that begged the right answer

12. Employment interviewer: "How do you feel about the person who was your immediately preceding supervisor?"

    Applicant: "He was all O.K. I guess. But, he really used to bug me about occasional absences. I guess I got on his nerves as much as he got on mine."

    Employment interviewer: "I understand. Please describe what you sold on that job."

    a. Indicated acceptability or approval
    b. Failed to get an answer to his question
    c. No error
    d. Asked an unnecessarily personal question
    e. Avoided a potentially negative (sensitive) area
13. Employment interviewer: "What kind of hours did you have?"

Applicant: "Oh, it varied on the day of the week and how busy we were."

Employment interviewer: "Was any travel involved?"

a. There is nothing wrong here
b. Failed to get an answer to his question
c. Assumed
d. Leading questions that beg the right answer
e. Revealed the purpose of the question

14. Employment interviewer: "Did you have any ideas on how that job could have been changed?"

Applicant: "Yes, as I said before, I passed all of them up through channels, but they died on my supervisor's desk."

Employment interviewer: "How often did you deal with new customers versus the same customers again?"

a. Repeated a question already asked and answered
b. There is no error here
c. Should have asked "what ideas" rather than "any ideas"
d. Failed to keep his own talking to a minimum
e. Failed to have the applicant define his terms

15. Employment interviewer: "How often did you deal with new customers versus the same customers again?"

a. Revealed the purpose of the question
b. No error
c. Assuming and leading
d. Asked too many questions at one time
e. The question is not necessary
16. Employment interviewer: "Did new customers come to you? Did you find them?"


Employment interviewer: "Well, a great deal of insurance is sold to friends. You want your friends to have the protection, security, and peace of mind that life insurance can offer. And, yes, you are given lists of names that we call referred leads. Do you see? There are many leads you will be given to get you started in the business."

a. Nothing wrong here
b. Avoided potentially negative areas
c. Failed to have the applicant define his terms
d. Failed to control the interview
e. Asked too many questions at one time

17. Employment interviewer: "What product knowledge was required?"

a. Failed to follow the guide
b. Revealed the purpose of the question
c. Nothing wrong here
d. Question is unnecessary
e. Used complicated unfamiliar technical terminology

18. Employment interviewer: "Was there any record keeping?"

Applicant: "Sure. Everybody keeps records. My supervisor kept the records pretty much the way he wanted to."

Employment interviewer: "I see. Tell me. How were you paid on that job?"

a. No error
b. Revealed the purpose of the question
c. Asked a question that is unnecessarily personal
d. Failed to keep his own talking to a minimum
e. Avoided a potentially negative area
19. Employment interviewer: "How did your supervisor know what you were doing?"

Applicant: "Well, he saw me every day..."

Employment interviewer: "I understand that. What I mean is, how closely did he monitor your activities and expect reports from you?"

a. No error
b. Revealed the purpose of the question
c. Failed to probe with terms such as "why" and "how"
d. Interrupted the applicant
e. Failed to control the interview

20. Employment interviewer: "So, you enjoyed the sales work as a whole and even see now that your supervisor had your own interests and best welfare in mind even though he got after you once in a while. Well, fine."

a. Asked a question that could be answered in one word
b. Summarized and interpreted for the applicant
c. Leading questions that beg the right answer
d. No error
e. Indicated acceptability and approval

21. Employment interviewer: "I see you went to college right out of high school. You must have been an above average student."

a. Asked a leading question that begged the right answer
b. Skipped a question from the guide
c. No error
d. Question was unnecessary
e. Asked a question that can be answered in one word

22. Employment interviewer: "Why did you go to college?"

Applicant: "Well, I found studying pretty easy and never had too much trouble keeping up with my class work. Besides there was nothing else to do."

Employment interviewer: "I see. What were your housing arrangements?"

a. Nothing wrong here
b. Failed to get an answer to his question
c. Failed to probe for specifics when general terms were used
d. Revealed the purpose of the question
e. Question is unnecessary
23. Employment interviewer: "Your participation in sports didn't interfere with your studies in any way, did it?"

a. Asked too many questions at once
b. Revealed the purpose of the question
c. No error
d. Leading question that begged the right answer
e. Assuming

24. Employment interviewer: "What did you do with the money you earned in summers?"

a. Asked an unnecessarily personal question
b. No error
c. Assumed
d. Repeated a question already asked
e. Question is unnecessary

25. Employment interviewer: "How did you spend your weekends during the academic year?"

a. Asked an unnecessarily personal question
b. Revealed the purpose of the question
c. Assumed
d. No error
e. Repeated a question already asked and answered

26. Employment interviewer: "Were you in any student activities? Which ones? Did the organizations have a purpose? How did you get into them?"

a. No error
b. Indicated acceptability and approval
c. Asked unnecessary personal questions
d. Question series violates the Civil Rights Act of 1964
e. Asked too many questions at one time

Do not stop. Continue on and do Part II.
Part II

The following multiple choice items test your knowledge of employment interviewing and the selection process. Circle the letter of the alternative you think is correct for each item. Please answer every item. Your score is the number of items you get correct.

1. When interviewed at the university placement center college graduates:
   a. Are usually extended an invitation to visit the plant or home office
   b. Are usually given a battery of psychological tests to supplement the selection interview
   c. Are rarely extended an employment offer on the spot
   d. Are given an offer of employment about 80% of the time
   e. Are given an offer of employment about 60% of the time

2. The usual procedure for large industrial organizations is to:
   a. Get credit and reference checks before the interview
   b. Wait until the reference checks are in before the interview
   c. Get the credit check before the references are checked
   d. Ignore credit and reference checks
   e. Do the credit and reference checks only on applicants who have been out of their degree for a few years

3. The employment interview, if comprehensive, can last:
   a. Up to one full hour
   b. About three hours
   c. Over five hours
   d. About 15 minutes to one-half hour
   e. Between half an hour and forty-five minutes

4. You have to sell the applicant on a career with the company:
   a. Before you can fully evaluate the applicant
   b. With the sandwich technique (sell, evaluate, sell)
   c. Only if he looks disinterested
   d. After you have evaluated him
   e. At the home office but never on campus
5. You should summarize your notes about the applicant:

   a. Immediately after the interview
   b. Only after several hours and an interview or two with other applicants for comparison
   c. Only after waiting at least one-half hour for consolidation
   d. Only after waiting at least a full hour for consolidation
   e. Only after waiting at least a day for proper consolidation of the important facts

6. One acceptable technique of questioning is to:

   a. Lead the applicant only if you want to recruit him
   b. Lead the applicant if you know you are leading
   c. Cross examine on the discrepancies in his testimony
   d. Comment on the suitability of past experience
   e. Summarize your picture of the applicant so he can check your picture of him against the facts

7. After the evaluation stage the applicant:

   a. Should be given a brief overview of the company's training program
   b. Has a right to know what happens next
   c. Has a right to visit the plant or home office
   d. Should be told his chances of getting an offer
   e. Has a right to know the salary offers made to others

8. After you are through with your questions:

   a. Let the applicant cool off gradually, he may let an important remark slip when his guard is down
   b. Let the applicant cool off gradually, it is good for public relations
   c. Ask the applicant if he has any questions
   d. Present the company's career presentation
   e. Summarize your picture of the applicant honestly and frankly for his own feedback

9. One of the most serious errors the interviewer can make in completing his ratings is to:

   a. Assume because the applicant is good at a few things he will be good at everything
   b. Disregard minor errors in presentation
   c. Use multiple ratings
   d. Use forced choice instead of scaled expectations format
   e. Fail to use the man-to-man system of ratings
10. One of the most valuable possessions of the successful employment interviewer is:

a. His memory of significantly good critical incidents by other similar people as the applicant
b. His stereotypes developed through years of progressive business experience
c. An open mind, there are many ways to be successful
d. The ability to block out minor weak points to get a "total picture"
e. An ability to sell his company to any applicant

11. Which of the following is least important as a determinant of getting an employment offer:

a. Interpersonal relations: present supervisor
b. Interpersonal relations: present co-workers
c. Dependability
d. Lazyness
e. Amount of salary requested

12. Which of the following is least important as a determinant of getting an employment offer:

a. His efficiency
b. How long the applicant puts off an assigned task
c. Cooperativeness
d. The reference from his most recent employer
e. The applicant's draft classification

13. Which of the following is least important as a determinant of getting an employment offer:

a. Maintaining self control
b. Sincerity
c. Responsibility
d. Evasiveness
e. Stability

14. When an applicant completes his resume he should include:

a. A list of social and community clubs he belongs to
b. A photograph
c. A list of religious associations he belongs to
d. A list of job demands considered as a minimum for job satisfaction
e. The highest security clearance received by the applicant in government/military work
15. The personnel department will need to:

a. Keep careful records of the applicant's race
b. Keep careful records of the applicant's religious background
c. Ask for the applicant's place of national origin
d. Announce a policy of limiting, through a quota system, employment of any group because of race or color
e. Do none of the above

16. If you only have 30 minutes for the interview:

a. Get right to the career presentation
b. Let the applicant's questions be your guide
c. Cover work history, work experience, and education if there is time
d. Make a fast assessment of the applicant's intelligence and be satisfied with that
e. Ask the applicant to relate past accomplishments to future goals

17. The employment interview has marginal utility as an assessment of the applicant's:

a. Interpersonal relations
b. Motivation for the job
c. Boyscoutishness
d. All of the above
e. None of the above

18. Which of the following is apt to have the most detrimental effect on the selection interview procedure:

a. Interruptions: Telephone call
b. Trying to structure the interview
c. Failure to establish rapport before the interview
d. Summarizing for the applicant and interpreting for him
e. Interruptions: A typewriter in the background

19. Structured interview and evaluation forms are used by some companies because they:

a. Save time
b. Keep the evaluation close to the facts
c. Insure the coverage of all of the information
d. All of the above
e. None of the above
20. In preparing for the interview the interviewer should:

   a. Review a structured interview format
   b. Review the contents of an interview summary form
   c. Review the applicant's resume for at least 15 minutes
   d. All of the above
   e. None of the above is essential

21. If negative information (police record, health problem, etc.) comes up in the interview:

   a. Make sure it has now been fully straightened out
   b. Tactfully but firmly refuse the offer to the applicant
   c. Probe if the applicant doesn't volunteer a complete explanation
   d. Write it down immediately before you forget
   e. None of the above

22. During the interview:

   a. You shouldn't take any notes
   b. You should note everything good and bad as it appears
   c. Do at least one-third of the talking
   d. Get the verbage down word for word in your notes
   e. You should note the "good" as it appears, but wait on the "bad" until another "good" is mentioned
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b. Your age ________ c. Your sex ________ d. Today's date ________

e. Your group __________________
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