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ABSTRACT

A computer search revealed that very little has been written about the selection interview in social work. This exploratory study was undertaken to compare and contrast the selection interview in social work with a theoretical model developed from the literature. As a result, information and knowledge on interviewing methods, procedures and role behaviour of interviewers and interviewees was provided.

The sample for the study consisted of 42 social service workers, drawn from three Children's Aid Societies in Southwestern Ontario--Essex County Children's Aid Society, Roman Catholic Essex County Children's Aid Society and Hamilton-Wentworth Children's Aid Society. The study participants consisted of two groups: 7 interviewers and 35 interviewees. The questionnaires were administered to the participants as a group. The interviewer questionnaire requested information on the interviewer's preparation, format, content and interviewing style. Six indexes were developed from the interviewer questionnaire. The interviewee questionnaire requested information on the interviewee's preparation, participation, satisfaction and perception of the interview format, content and interviewer style. Eight indexes were developed from the interviewee
The results indicated that the interviewer and interviewee index scores were similar in direction and intensity. In terms of the research question posed, the respondents reflected the same variability on the interview's content, methods and objectives as discussed in the literature review. The respondents differed from the theoretical model in the interview preparation and interview format.

In general, the interviews were performed adequately, and in most indexes the interview fell within the mid-range. There are, however, areas for improvement. Perhaps, if interviewers and interviewees prepared and organized an outline for the interview, a better match could be obtained between the agency and worker. If greater attention were paid to these matters, the selection process could be more effective. Thereby improving service to clients.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

This chapter provides the context of the study in terms of its historical background, perspective and problem formulation. Briefly outlined is the pattern of employment interviewing from the 1940's to the present. The writer's personal experience with the selection interview, which led to an interest in the topic, is also described. The focus of the study is identified and its formulation is outlined.

Background

This research problem initially developed from the observations and experiences that were made from the writer's personal work background. The writer has been interviewed and has participated in social work selection interviews. Throughout this experience, what was most noticeable was the lack of structure and unsystematic manner in which these selection interviews were performed. Little use was made of job specifications, position descriptions or organizational charts, reference forms, or selection evaluation forms. The goal, purpose and methodology of selection interviews were often vague and imprecisely stated and there seemed to be little planning on the part of the interviewer.

Perhaps the very commonness of interviewing and communication has led to the assumption that anyone can interview without any preparation or special skills. The writer's experience suggests that social
work selection interviews are not clear and precise about recruitment goals, methods and skills. It is the writer's belief that if social work interviewers are to be successful recruiters, they must be: (1) knowledgeable of the communication process, (2) precise and clear in the planning of the interview, (3) able to conduct the interview in accordance with their plan, (4) able to interpret the data received and (5) able to gauge their overall effectiveness throughout the recruitment process so that each step in the procedure is valid and reliable.

While reviewing the literature for this study, the writer found little material on the selection interview in social work. The structure, content and method of selection interviewing in social work was not described in the literature reviewed for this study. It is the writer's purpose to describe and examine the selection interview in social work.

The research question: "Is the social work employment interview as perceived by the interviewer and interviewee in three Children's Aid Societies different or similar to a theoretical employment interview model that has been developed from the literature and, finally, what are the implications?"

This research question focuses on describing what occurs in actual social work administrative practices. Further, the research question compares the similarities and differences between a theoretical model and actual practices. The comparison may point out suggestions for improvement, weaknesses and possibly raise new questions for future research.

The writer is not concerned with finding an association between variables or determining causality. Instead, the writer will describe
the selection interviewing process. A review of the literature on selection interviewing formed the basis of the theoretical employment interview model and provided the material for the questionnaires that were administered to the respondents. The findings obtained will be described in terms of their similarities or deviations from the theoretical model. This comparison may reveal similarities and differences; point out weaknesses and suggest methods for improving procedures; and raise new questions which can be explored through further research.

Purpose of Research

The intent of this exploratory research is to compare a description of the selection interview in three Children's Aid Societies with a theoretical model of selection interviewing derived from the literature. Similarities and differences between the data from the agency's recruitment practices and the theoretical model will be explored. Should there be a discrepancy between the model and the data collected, recommendations will be made which may improve the effectiveness of the selection interview.

Effective recruitment procedures have a positive influence on the staff, agency and clients. Well chosen staff should use and enjoy their talents in fulfilling the position description. This will produce satisfied employees who will assist the agency in meeting its objectives. The quality of an organization's staff is one of the major factors which determines whether an agency will be successful in reaching its goals. The worker, position description and organization must all fit together in order for the organization to meet its objectives and for the worker
to experience job satisfaction.

With the increased public awareness of the social worker's role in Child Welfare brought about by media coverage, human rights and the increasing use of litigation, it is important at this time to carefully select social work personnel. Careful screening and selection procedures should ensure that the most qualified candidates are chosen on the basis of their qualifications and the position requirements. Recruiters cannot afford to be imprecise and unclear as to what their goals and methods are. The consequences of ill-prepared recruiting are lawsuits, loss of time and money, poor morale and inadequate service to clients.

The aim of this study is to add to what little knowledge currently exists on recruitment in social work. This study also has the objective of contributing to the refinement and development of variables which may be related and tested for significance in further research.

Historical Perspective

Employers in the 1940's filled vacancies with "our kind of people" which meant, those people who thought, looked and acted the same as the recruiter. The recruiters were unsophisticated and naively made decisions based on the firmness of an applicant's handshake, (Stewart & Cash, 1978). In the 1950's, psychological and intelligence tests were very popular for recruitment in general. Their reliability and validity were not questioned at the time.

Since the 1960's there have been a number of influences on the recruitment process: Human Rights Code, research into employment inter-
viewing, training employers and applicants to participate in interviews, and agency accountability, (Stewart and Cash 1978). These influences have forced attention on the selection of personnel and challenged what is appropriate for a selection interview. Recruiters must now prepare, plan and implement the interview, and interpret the data according to well thought out guidelines in order to select the most desirable candidate.

In the last few decades, attention has been given to the recruitment process in industry and commerce. This same attention has not been given to the selection procedures in the social service profession; therefore, it may be said that this study is designed to fill a gap and shed some light on this important area.

**Definition of the Recruitment Process**

The recruitment process consists of searching, screening and selecting a candidate to fill a vacancy. Conducting the recruitment search requires that the employer advertise the requirements of the position by a position description and organization description so that potential applicants can decide if they have the qualifications and are interested in applying for the position.

Screening consists of assessing candidates in order to determine if they have the skills, knowledge and abilities to do the job and have an employment record which indicates whether or not the applicants are motivated to adequately fulfill the position description. Three further questions must be answered at this time: How will the applicant fit in with the agency and other employees?, Will his interpersonal needs
be met? Finally, will the agency and candidate agree on their values, goals and aspirations? The personnel selection literature used for this study was unanimous on these points, (Moffatt, 1979; Stanton, 1977).

The employer's tools used for screening are: background information from application forms, opinions from past employers, resumes, references, psychological tests, grade records and interviewing, all being valuable sources of information. The interview appears to meet a need for both interviewer and interviewee; a need which may be difficult to achieve through other means. The interviewer can assess communication skills, appearance, personality factors, thinking patterns and level of motivation. The interviewee is also able to receive information and a flavour for the agency. The interviewee may get a sense of the working atmosphere and a feel for the interpersonal functioning in the agency.

Selection, the last step in the recruitment process, requires that the recruiter interpret the data collected on the candidate so that the best applicant may be chosen. The recruiter can use two criteria for selection: the job applicant with the best record or the individual who shows the most potential.

Selection procedures vary widely from agency to agency. Their complexity depends on the type of position applied for, the labour market and organizational requirements. Nevertheless, some kind of selection interview - prescreening or in-depth - seems to be a key component in the recruitment process. A 1957 survey revealed that 99% of the 872 firms surveyed required that job applicants be interviewed; (Spriegal & James, 1958, p. 42). More recently, a report in 1977 found that over 96% of
the companies surveyed indicated either an interview or an applicant's previous experience were the most important factors when it came to selecting employees, ("Survey Finds...", 1977, p. 3). Although these studies relate to industry, there appears to be every reason to extrapolate the findings to the human service professions. Since the selection interview plays a key role in the recruitment process and few studies have been done on recruiting social service workers, this researcher has chosen to study the selection interview in social work.

The Study of the Selection Interview

Why study the selection interview? The very commonness of the selection interview suggests that it may be carried out in a superficial and naive manner and used as a panacea. Like most procedures, the selection interview has strengths and weaknesses. It can appropriately fulfill some functions but it is inadequate for other purposes.

As stated earlier, recruitment of social service personnel is an important matter. The cost of failing in selecting a competent worker may mean litigation, inefficiency and failure to reach agency objectives. It is necessary for the recruiter to be as precise and clear as possible in defining goals and the means by which these goals are accomplished. Comprehensive knowledge of the objectives, goals and strategies of the recruitment interview will assist the recruiter in efficiently and effectively performing his duties. The interviewer must be aware of what the selection interview is capable of: (1) what its strengths and limitations are; (2) how it compares to other selection procedures - tests, resumes, school records - in terms of validity and reliability; (3) what
are the different approaches to selection interviewing and the advantages and disadvantages of each; and (4) how an interview is conducted.

Research into selection interviewing has very practical ramifications. A gain in the effectiveness of the recruitment interview could possibly have positive repercussions on staff performance, agency operations and service to clients.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The purpose of this chapter is to describe the components of the interview. The selection interview will be defined, its objectives outlined and the present state of research on the topic described. The role of the interviewee and recruiter will be explored.

Definition of an Interview

There are many definitions of interviewing: Stewart and Cash define an interview as a "process of dyadic communication with a predetermined and serious purpose designed to interchange behaviour involving the asking and answering of questions", (1978, p. 5). Downs, Sheyak and Martin define the interview as, "a specialized form of oral; face to face communication between people in an interpersonal relationship that is entered into for a specific task and related purpose associated with a particular object matter", (1980, p. 5). Schubert writes that an interview is "at least two people talking together with some common purpose in mind", (1971, p. 1). Kadushin states that an interview "is a conversation with a deliberate purpose, a purpose mutually accepted by the participants", (1972, p. 8). Kahn and Cannell define an interview as "a specialized pattern of verbal interaction - initiated for a specific purpose and focused on some specific content area, with consequent elimination of extraneous material", (1963, p. 16).

A common word in all the above five definitions of interviewing is
purpose. Other key components in the definition are interpersonal relationship and verbal, face to face exchange. The interview differs from ordinary conversation in that there is a specific purpose, goal or objective to the interview rather than just pleasure. One or both parties came to the interview in order to focus on a particular subject matter. The information exchanged is evaluated in terms of its reliability, validity and relevance to the interview purpose. The effectiveness of the interview is gauged by meeting the interview goals or objectives. Effectiveness is not a simple matter to determine when dealing with human subjects, since the quantity and quality of the information exchanged is dependent on the rapport developed between the interviewer and interviewee.

There are two levels in an interview, "content and relationship", (Downs et al., 1980, p. 19). To be an effective interview in most settings, interrogations and debates excluded, both levels must be respected and addressed. An interviewer who focuses on content only may offend the interviewee which in turn affects the reliability and validity of the information received. Conversely, exclusive focus on relationship aspects may create a favourable rapport with the interviewee and interviewer, but produce inadequate, incomplete and irrelevant information.

It is the writer's view that the relationship between interviewer and interviewee is as important as the content. The very concept or format of some interviews, such as the selection or appraisal interview may be threatening for some individuals. An interviewer who intentionally induces stress may only increase the interviewee's insecurity which may lead to anxiety and defensiveness, thus creating a barrier to communication,
(Gibb, 1961; Rogers, 1962).

An interview takes place between at least two people or two parties, an interviewer and an interviewee. There may be more than two people, but there are never more than two parties to the interview. Both parties form a relationship and interact in the interview. Parties bring to the interview their personal interpretations and expectations of behaviour associated with each role in the interview. The depth and quality of the interchange between the parties depends on their respective perception, past experience and self concept.

The role chosen or perceived between interviewer and interviewee—interviewer superior to interviewee; interviewee equal to interviewer; interviewer subordinate to interviewee—has effects on the information exchanged. All status positions may offer unique advantages appropriate for a particular situation. If the interviewer is in a superior position to the interviewee, this situation may allow the interviewer to control the interviewee, motivate the interviewee and observe the interviewee under stress. An equal status between interviewee and interviewer may lead to a favourable rapport, increase empathy and lessen communication barriers. The interviewer being in a subordinate position to the interviewee, facilitates interviewee expression. The criteria for choosing each position depends on the objectives of the interview. The goal is to maximize information between the interviewer and interviewee while still maintaining an optimum interpersonal relationship, (Gordon, 1969).

A mutual sharing between participants can only occur if there is trust. If an individual feels she can risk exposing herself in the
Interview, it can add to the quality of the interchange. Trust cannot thrive in the interview if the participants are psychologically threatened, exposed to negative attitudes and are judged by their behaviour. A number of researchers, (Jourard & Jaffe, 1970; Pope & Siegman, 1968), indicate that if the interviewer is empathetic, supportive and self-disclosing, the interviewee reciprocates with similar behaviour. This empathic approach may be appropriate to the counseling, performance and research interview. It is unlikely that there will be a high degree of trust and empathy in selection and persuasive interviews.

Egan and Cowan (1979) have formulated an integrative model which describes how individuals process reality. The perception, attention, transformation and action cycles are divided into four stages.

In phase I, stimuli from the environment are taken in via the sense organs. In phase II, a portion of the sensory data is selected for attention; this is, figures emerge from the background. In phase II, the individual transforms the salient stimulus so that it has a particular meaning. In phase IV, the individual acts, based on the meaning of the situation as constructed in the third phase. (1979, p. 24).

Sensory, cognitive motor and cybernetic capacities of human beings play a key role in this model.

The transformation cycle is a unique cycle. No two individuals have the same interrelationships between perception, attention and transformation. Nor do people respond equally to their world from a cognitive, emotional or attitudinal mode. Individuals may have a preference and routinely respond to their world in a cognitive or emotional manner or some combination of the two, (Bandura, 1969; Buss & Plomin, 1975). The Egan and Cowan model portrays some of the processes involved in inter-
personal relationships.

The third common element in these definitions is that the interview is a face to face interaction. The participants are in one another's presence. The asking and answering of questions is vocalized and allows each participant to observe the other's response. Each party may also observe the nonverbal behaviour, such as tone of voice, gestures and facial expressions which accompanies the verbal interaction.

The Interview as an Interpersonal Process

The interview takes place within a social-psychological context. There may be influences operating on the interviewee during the interview which tend to make the individual either unable or unwilling to give relevant, reliable and valid information. Whether communication becomes inhibited or whether free expression takes place, depends on the personalities involved, their background and the situational factors.

The overt characteristics of the interviewer, such as sex, age, race, ethnicity, social class, manner of dress and speech, create an immediate impression which may influence the interviewee's response. (Benny, Riesman & Star, 1956; Birdman, 1965; Katz, 1942).

Basic personality traits of the interviewer may help or hinder the interviewing process. Gordon (1969) claims that an interviewer should be able to adapt to an active or passive role and be intelligent and emotionally secure.

A deficiency in any of these three traits may seriously affect the reliability and validity of the information obtained from the interviewee. According to Gordon (1969) an inflexible interviewer is
motivated by fear, manifesting itself by either dominating the interview
or giving up control to the interviewee. Cognitive theorists would ex-
plain this same rigid behaviour as a possible result of "mindlessness",
that much of human behaviour is mindless. "... in which attention is
not paid precisely to those substantive elements that are relevant for
the successful resolution of the situation." (p. 40). This automatic
response could be induced by repeating the same behaviour many times.
Abelson (1976) believes that people who engage in mindless behaviour
are engaging in scripted behaviour. Abelson defines a script as a,
"... a highly stylized sequence of typical events that is well understood
... a coherent sequence of events expected by the individual involving
him either as a participant or an observer." (p. 33). A person engaged
in scripted behaviour requires minimal cognitive processes to carry out
the behaviour. Langer describes the process:

Philosophers and cognitive psychologists have been concerned with
the process of shifting attention from something to something else. How-
ever, it may also be the case that in many waking instances, we
shift attention from something to nothing else. At those times,
we process a minimal amount of information to get us through
whatever activity engages us. But, by and large our "minds" are

A third tentative explanation for rigid or dogmatic interviewing
may be explained by Egan and Cowan's transformation cycle as mentioned
previously. A dogmatic interviewer may have a preference or pattern of
responding in an emotional or emotional-cognitive (values, attitudes)
manner. In such a situation, the individual would respond in a stereo-
typed manner. Regardless of the cause of the rigid behaviour, the end
result is the same: incomplete and inaccurate information is received.

Intelligence permits the interviewer to pursue information
which is relevant, evaluate information received, remember what has been
previously stated and probe for completeness and clarification. An
intelligent and self-aware interviewer may be able to analyze his per-
formance and judge its effectiveness.

Studies indicate that individuals vary in their degree of self-
awareness and ability to accurately report their subjective state.
Turner (1978) found that high-private, self-conscious people would be
more self-aware and therefore describe themselves in more precise detail
than low-private, self-conscious people. Turner and Peterson (1977)
found an association between high self-conscious individuals and their
ability to give accurate self-reports.

Smith and Miller (1978) argue that awareness of thoughts and
behaviour depend on the situation. A routine situation evokes automatic
responses as described by Langer (1978) and Abelson (1976).

Duval and Wicklund (1972) offer another explanation for sub-
jective states. They describe people as having two types of conscious-
ness. The first, objective self-awareness, is characterized by the
conscious focus of individuals on their own behaviour. The second
subjective self-awareness, is described as a feeling of being one with
the environment. Each of these states can be produced by manipulating
situational factors. Studies have indicated that if the subject is
given a task to perform, he may attend to the task excluding other
thoughts and stimuli. Yet, if the subject is made aware of their status
as objects in the world, objective self-awareness will occur. One study by Davis and Wicklund (1972) requested subjects to write an essay under three conditions: The first two were under experimental conditions; (1) writing the essay in the presence of a camera that recorded their writing; (2) writing the essay in anticipation of reading their work to a small audience; (3) the control group was asked to write their essay with no mention of an audience and without a camera. The results indicated that individuals presented a higher quality essay under experimental conditions than under control conditions. This study has implications for the interviewer's and interviewee's behaviour during the interview and in evaluating recruiting effectiveness. If interviewers are required to defend their selection to colleagues, they may be in a more objective self-aware state during the interview. Also, a training program may increase the interviewers' awareness of their role. Unless interviewees have prepared for the selection interview and anticipated sending and receiving information, they are very likely to lapse into subjective self-awareness as described by Davis and Wicklund (1972).

A productive interaction between interviewee and interviewer may be dependent on how each individual typically processes reality as described by Egan and Cowan's (1979) four staged cycle: perception, attention, transformation and action. It could be speculated that an interaction between two emotionally-responding individuals may be very volatile and unproductive. Ickes and Barnes (1977) studied communication between people of various levels of self-awareness. Specifically, the study compared communication between high and low self-monitors.
Self-monitors are individuals who observe and control their self-presentation and expressive behaviour, (Snyder, 1974). Dyads composed of high and low self-monitors experienced more silence than did dyads composed of people with a similar level of self-monitoring. Ickes and Barnes (1977) found that high self-monitors reported that they felt more self-conscious communicating with low self-monitors than with a high self-monitor. These researchers found that communication styles were different for high and low self-monitors in that the former were more likely to initiate conversation.

Individual differences in self-awareness are major variables in making decisions to consciously select persuasive techniques. It also influences the conscious state in which the person will be. This could be either objective self-awareness or subjective self-awareness. A third influence of self-awareness is the degree to which people are aware of their mental and behavioural responses when responding to one another.

Rolloff and Barnicott (1978) found that the intention to use compliance-gaining techniques was influenced by personality variables and by their interactions with the situation. The research concerning self-monitoring suggests that individuals vary in the conscious selections of persuasive techniques. High self-monitors have greater sensitivity to environmental cues. This may facilitate the selection of persuasive strategies to a greater extent than low-self-monitors who may be more concerned with accurately portraying their attitudes during communication.

As indicated earlier, self-awareness can be increased by a
number of factors. One factor that may induce self-awareness involves recording thoughts about a persuasive message. Petty and Cacioppo (1977) found that asking pre-warned subjects to record their own general thoughts or topic related thoughts prior to receiving a persuasive message increased their resistance to attitude change. In other words, they were induced into an objective self-aware state by experimentally being persuaded to reflect on their tasks. This study suggests that if one anticipates being active during an interview, this may stimulate the preplanning and generally heighten awareness to an objective self-aware state. If individuals do not think about their role behaviour, they are more likely to enter a reduced state of self-awareness, and act in an automatic or scripted fashion, (Abelson, 1976; Langer, 1978).

A third factor related to self-awareness is the degree to which an individual is aware of his mental and behavioural responses when responding to another person. Nisbett and Wilson (1977) found that subjects tended to evaluate a person's appearance, mannerisms and accent as appealing when the person was warm and friendly during an interview. Subjects tended to evaluate the same appearance, mannerisms and accent as irritating when the subject was cold and distant in the interview. The subjects did not perceive a connection between their evaluation and the individual's behaviour. The Nisbett and Wilson study seems to dramatically display the "halo effect". Sarason defines the halo effect as, "... an individual rating someone more favourably on a specific characteristic because the rater has a generally favourable reaction to the person he is rating". (1972, p. 205). The Nisbett and
Wilson (1977) study revealed positive and negative halo effects. Dixon (1971) suggests that people may not have to perceive a stimulus in order to react to it. Perhaps in this study, the subjects were responding to nonverbal stimuli which were just below their perception threshold.

In an interview situation, we are being observed at the same time that we are observing. The very fact that people know they are being observed may affect the way that they normally behave. These people often try to present themselves in the most desirable light.

People respond to their perceptions which may or may not accurately reflect reality. If an individual perceives anger in another, he may act aggressively towards the individual. In turn, seeing the aggression, he will be more likely to reciprocate and behave aggressively. In effect, a self-fulfilling prophecy would have been created. Moreover, how an individual believes he is being perceived will influence the individual's response. That is, it does not matter what A really thinks of B, it is B's perception that is important. Also, in any relationship, there is a spiraling of reciprocal perspectives or "meta perspectives", (Wilmot, 1979, p. 86).

The Interview as a Communication Process

The interview is a form of communication. Communication has been defined in many different ways. One researcher discusses the range of the concept:

Definitions range from the monadic concept of a response to a stimulus, to a global view of communication, equivalent to a system which transcends the acts of individuals. In general terms communication can be viewed as human interaction and social
relatedness. Examined more closely, each communication act will be conceived as consisting of a multiplicity of messages, travelling in several channels enveloped in many contexts, with constant interaction between them. (Marcus, 1974, p. 372).

First, researchers made the point that an individual is going to communicate either verbally or nonverbally in any interactional situation, (Watzlawick, Beavin & Jackson, 1967). It is impossible for him not to communicate. Stimulus-response-stimulus cycles are continuously in motion.

A second concept has been described in the literature. What is communicated nonverbally may be as important as what is communicated verbally. Further, it is important to understand why one topic is discussed as opposed to another.

A third concept described by communication researchers is that a verbal message is made up of two components: a "report" and "command", (Watzlawick, et al, 1967, p. 51). The report aspect describes the content of the message. The command or nonverbal aspect explains and clarifies the content, provides instructions on how the content should be interpreted. It also informs what the speaker's intentions and feelings are. Finally, it describes the relationship between speakers. In any verbal statement the report and command aspects will vary in importance. Participants may hardly be aware of the command aspect in their communication or there may be a constant struggle for control of the relationship with the content aspect receding in the background.

Much of our nonverbal communication which accompanies our verbal communications clarifies the meaning we are intending or contradicts the message we are conveying. Knapp has identified the primary
uses of nonverbal behaviour as, "... expressing emotion; conveying interpersonal attitudes; presenting one's personality to others and accompanying speech for the purposes of managing the interaction." (1978, p. 25).

'Nonverbal communications researchers stress that verbal and nonverbal communication cannot be meaningfully separated. Knapp states:

"There is a danger that the reader may forget that nonverbal communication cannot be studied in isolation from the total communication process. Verbal and nonverbal communication should be treated as a total and inseparable unit." (1978, p. 20).

Birdwhistle writes:

My own research has lead me to the point that I am no longer willing to call either linguistics or kinesic systems ... All of the emerging data seems to support the contention that linguistics are infra-communication systems. Only in their inter-relationship with each other and with comparable systems from other sensory modalities is the emergent communication system achieved. (1970, p. 20)

The communication aspects of an interview require an interchange, since each participant must be both an encoder and decoder of messages. The participants each have unique ways of sending and receiving messages. If an interview is to be successful, both parties must become involved in a joint process. There should be a mutual sharing of thoughts, feelings, expectations and beliefs. One-way communication is reserved for interrogations, fights and debates. In the majority of situations, there is an interchange of information. Two-way communication may involve more time and effort than one-way communication, but, it is only when participants exchange feedback and explore each other's expectations and assumptions that the relevance and validity of the information collected may be
ensured.

The asking and answering of questions is an essential aspect of the communication process. Both parties involved in an interview anticipate certain outcomes which are achieved by exchanging information. Neither participant is a totally passive agent locked into one role. It is possible, in most situations, for the interviewing parties to exchange roles so that an information giver can become an information gatherer at a certain point during the interview.

No two individuals have the same attitudes, beliefs, values, ethics, stereotypes, goals and past experience and style of communication, (Stewart & Cash, 1978). Some of these characteristics combine to make up a person's "communication filter", (Downs, et al, 1980, p. 12). The communication filter is made up of: purpose, motivations, perceptions, thinking patterns, language expertise, bias, attitudes and memory. Combined, these factors affect how an individual perceives and evaluates information, (Downs, et al, 1980).

Our personality and communication attributes affect how we interpret stimuli and interact with others. As a result, the degrees of participation, openness, and sharing, fall within a wide range, all of which can be expressed during the interview. The degree to which a person expresses each trait affects the way interviewers and interviewees respond to one another and ultimately determines the way the interview progresses.

Definition of the Selection Interview

There are many types of interviews which have a variety of
goals, methods and interaction patterns. Wasser (1962) warns against the naive transfer of knowledge and skills from a casework interview to a research interview. Social workers are influenced by their professional standards and practices, and may transfer ways of interviewing which are not appropriate to the research situation. "It is the goal of research which determines the research interviewer's goal and function." (p. 286)

This same transfer or "carry over" effect may occur in casework and selection interviews. Social workers are influenced by their professional standards and practices. When social workers are involved in selection interviewing, it is possible that there is a carry over of ways of thinking and working, from the therapeutic context to the administrative context. Social work interviewing may be over-learned and form part of the social worker's script and behaviour as discussed above, (Abelson, 1976), so that a therapeutic interview may be applied to any interview situation, regardless of the context, function or goals.

An individual should not assume that there is only one kind of interview to be performed as a fulfillment of the job description. Social workers primarily employ the therapeutic interview. They may also find themselves recruiting social workers and appraising their performance. Stewart and Cash (1978) describe six different kinds of interviews: survey, journalism, employment, performance, counselling and persuasive. Downs, et al. (1980) outline several different kinds of interviews. Kadushin finds that: "Social workers spend more time in interviewing than in any single activity. It is the most important, most frequently employed social work skill." (1972, p. 7)
Social service workers not only use interviews for administrative purposes, which include: selection, appraisal, discipline, exit and negotiation, but also for mass media purposes, such as broadcasts and news conferences. The interview may also be used as a research tool for inter-organizational surveys. Most social work interviewing is within a therapeutic context and falls under three categories: "... informational (to make a social study), diagnostic (to arrive at an appraisal) and therapeutic (to effect change)". (Kadushin, 1972, p. 15).

This study will focus on the selection interview in social work. The selection interview has been defined as, "... nothing more than a conversation between two people who desire information from each other", (Figler, 1979, p. 164). Jackson writes: "The objective of the selection interview is to obtain information, facts, opinions and impressions, from which to predict the future performance of an applicant in a particular position." (1976, p. 25) Goodworth defines the purpose of an interview: "... to carry out a comprehensive and accurate background investigation--to seek out and verify the facts and past achievements and failures", (1979, p. 2). Downs et al. describe a selection interview as:

... a joint process in which all participants have their own purpose. In a sense, it is a sales interview, with the interviewer trying to sell a company to a candidate and the interviewee attempting to sell himself or herself. In a somewhat different sense it is an information getting interview for each of them. The interviewer tries to measure as many of the candidate's strengths and weaknesses as possible, while the interviewee tries to ascertain the strengths and weaknesses of the job with the company." (1980, p. 146).
Two of these four definitions describe both parties as seeking information for assessment purposes. The interviewer wishes to predict or know if the applicant has the qualifications for the position and the interviewee wishes to know or predict if he would be satisfied with the position and organization.

Objectives of the Selection Interview

The selection interview is just one of the many recruitment procedures used by employers, (Downs, et al., 1980). Clues to an applicant's qualifications can be found in resumes, application blanks, reference checks, psychological tests, school records and work simulation exercises. Selection procedures vary from agency to agency, depending on the type of position applied for, labour market and organizational requirements. Nevertheless, as discussed previously, a selection interview, screening or in-depth, seems to be a key component in the recruitment process.

The needs of the interviewee and interviewer, which appear to be met through the interview, may be difficult to achieve through other means. The interviewer can attempt to assess the interviewee's qualifications and abilities, communication skills, appearance, personality factors, thinking patterns and level of motivation. The interviewee should be able to receive information on the agency and obtain a sense of the working atmosphere and a feel for the interpersonal functioning in the agency.

Downs (1968) asked 76 college recruiters and 152 students who
had been recently interviewed, the objective of the selection interview. Only 14% of the candidates and 7% of the recruiters agreed that the objective of the interview was, "... to provide information about the job", yet 78% of the recruiter-interviewers and 68% of the candidates agreed that the purpose of the interview was, "... to find out what kind of person the candidate is", (p. 10).

In the literature examined for this study, the authors were unanimous in agreeing that it was necessary to match the applicant's qualifications with the requirements of the position. (Fine, 1968, p. 22)

This means that the interviewer should be clear about the requirements of the position and attempt to match them with the qualifications of the interviewee. The more knowledgeable the interviewer is in regard to understanding the requirements of the position, the easier the selection procedure becomes. The candidate with the most relevant knowledge, skills and abilities can then be chosen. Before the interview takes place, the interviewer should know exactly what to look for in a candidate. Determining what should be appraised can only be accomplished after a job analysis, job description and organization description are completed.

A job analysis, "... describes duties of the job and analyzes the qualifications needed by the applicant to fulfill the job. It should include what the worker does, how he does it, why he does it, and the skill involved in doing it." (Ehlers, Austin & Prothero, 1976, p. 163)

Fine (1968) has provided the conceptual tools that are needed to perform a job analysis in the social welfare field. Two other
researchers have outlined techniques which can be used for valid selec-
tion of personnel in social work, (Kleinman & Lounsbury, 1978). These
researchers did a detailed analysis of the job and then developed a
multiple choice examination of one-hundred items based on the information
provided by the job analysis. The test was found to be a reliable and
valid means of selecting personnel. Not all agencies may be in the
position of doing such a systematic and comprehensive analysis of the
job as Kleinman and Lounsbury. Nevertheless, all recruiters should do
some form of job analysis since selecting qualified people requires
precise knowledge of the nature of the work to be performed and the
human abilities required to perform it effectively.

After an outline of the essential duties of the position has
been completed, and the knowledge, skills and abilities needed to perform
these duties are understood, the recruiter is in a position to design
a position description. A position description:

... includes the work to be done and abilities and skills in-
volved in its performance. It should state what the position
is and to whom the person is responsible. Duties and respon-
sibilities, qualifications and relationships with fellow

A careful study of the position identifies the key requirements
of the job. Knowledge of the job requirements specifies exactly what
the recruiter is searching for. It provides a guide in the searching and
screening of applicants. It also assists the interviewer in evaluating
individuals with the most relevant qualifications.

An applicant should be evaluated within the context of the total
organization, not merely on the technical job details. In order to
choose the ideal candidate, the recruiter must assess how well a person
will interact within a particular organizational context. This context includes a superior and co-workers. An effective recruiter will need to have an intimate knowledge of the organization's style and atmosphere.

Regarding the non-technical requirements of the position the interviewer may expect: independence or dependence or autocratic or democratic supervision. (Schneider, 1976). The use of teams or units of staff social workers is an effective way of delivering services in today's social work agencies. This further stresses the necessity of finding individuals who complement each other, (Compton & Galaway, 1975).

Matching the applicant with the job and organizational description requires that the interviewers set objectives and plan the interview. Downs (1972) in a content analysis of twenty interviews found the interview content divided into three categories; information about the company, information about the candidate and information about the interviewer. Under the first category, organization orientation, specific job area and management development were discussed in 20, 18 and 12 of the interviews studied. The disadvantages of the company were not discussed in any of the twenty interviews. In the information about the candidate sections, job expectations, academic background, work experience, family background and goals were discussed in 16, 15, 12 and 9 of the interviews studied. It is interesting to note that personality factors such as enthusiasm, motivation and interest in people were mentioned in only one interview. Information about the interviewer was discussed in five of
the 20 interviews.

There was a consensus in the literature used for this study that the interviewer must assess four key areas during the selection process:

(1) Can the applicant fulfill the requirements of the position? Does the individual have the requisite aptitudes, education and experience for the position in question?

(2) Is the applicant motivated to work? Can the individual meet the qualitative and quantitative demands of the position? Is the applicant willing to do repetitive aspects of the job description?

(3) How will the applicant fit in with other members of the team or organization? Social work in particular requires cooperative individuals to work within the agency and with other professionals who may be involved with the same clients. Figler clearly states the importance and intensity of working relationships, "I believe a job is a very personal matter, second only to family relationships in its intimacy and demand for interpersonal cooperation." (1978, p. 209).

(4) There must be a mutual agreement regarding expectations, goals and values if there is to be a satisfactory contract. Continuity of service and worker security can only exist when there is a commitment between the applicant and agency.

Research Findings on Selection Interviewing

There is little discrepancy in the literature on the objectives
of the selection interview. There is however, controversy in the literature over what specific information is to be discussed in the interview and the means of obtaining the information. Experimental studies have not shown the selection interview to be reliable and valid, (Wright, 1969; Mayfield, 1964).

Wagner (1949) reviewed the literature on the selection interview from 1915 to 1949. He referred to 106 articles, 25% of which were experiments; the rest were "opinion articles". Wagner concludes that: "one wonders why it (selection interview) remains so popular, when if there is any preponderance of evidence it seems to be against the interview as a valid method of selection and placement." (1949, p. 17) Wagner made three suggestions from his review of the literature. The first suggestion was that structured interviews would be more valuable for further study than unstructured interviews. Secondly, intelligence seems to be the one trait which can be reliably assessed in the interview. Thirdly, the role of the interview should be limited to those functions which cannot be assessed by other means, such as social interaction.

Mayfield (1964) reviewed 300 articles on the selection interview. He found, as did Wagner, that 75% of the articles were opinions and uncontrolled studies. Mayfield calls for controlled studies for the purpose of investigating aspects, structure, length of the interview while holding other variables constant. Mayfield concludes that: "In summary then, our knowledge of the selection interview is only a little more advanced than it was when Wagner reviewed the literature in 1949." (p. 239)

Ulrich and Trumbo (1965) surveyed the literature on the selection
interview from 1949-1964. Their conclusion was:

Fifteen years ago Wagner concluded his review by urging greater standardization, wider use of conciliatory sources of data and a narrower scope for the interview. Subsequent research provides no basis for challenging these suggestions, although it does provide evidence which may make it possible to be more specific on some points. (p. 100)

Ulrich and Trumbo (1965) suggested that the selection interview might be more successful than the unstructured interview in assessing the applicant's motivation and his ability to relate to others. They agreed with Wagner (1949) and Mayfield (1964) that unstructured interviews seem to be of dubious value. They felt that researchers should focus more on the length of the interview, its structure and their own decision-making.

Wright (1969) surveyed the literature from 1964-69. He recommends:

... more macroanalytic research on the structured interview should be undertaken, particularly studies investigating the validity of this type of selection interview ... the structured interview has demonstrated consistent reliability and although its validity as a selection tool has not been conclusively demonstrated, it serves to control some of the most distorting influences (interviewer bias) that impinge on the use of the interview ... Secondly, work in the model-building area, involving a multi-disciplinary approach, would also seem to be in order. (p. 391)

The above studies indicate that the means of collecting relevant, reliable and valid information from the selection interview have not yet been devised. At this stage only tentative conclusions can be made about the selection interview. There is sufficient evidence to suggest that the interview should not be the only selection tool used for recruitment. Agencies should not rely exclusively on the interview as a selection device. Shaw (1968) found that 93% of the companies
surveyed made no attempt to validate their interviewing programs. Rusmore revealed that only 5% of a sample of employers reported any empirical validity for the employment interview. (1968, p. 50)

The following conclusions have been made on the selection interview:

(1) Structured interviews have been shown to be more reliable than unstructured interviews. "The amount of agreement between interviewers increased as the degree of interview structure increased", (Schwab & Hensman, 1969, p. 126).

(2) Situational factors have been shown to have an effect on the selection interview. A recruiter may evaluate an applicant in a better light if the previous applicant was inadequate. An individual's acceptance or rejection, "... for a job may well depend more on the characteristic of the previous applicant than on his own traits." (Rowe, 1967, p. 170)

Other situational factors that may pressure the recruiter are the demands to fill positions. Recruiters that are on a quota may be biased interviewers. "They would offer more employment contracts when behind in their recruiting than when ahead." (Carlson, Thayer, Mayfield & Peterson, 1974, p. 268)

(3) Negative information discovered on the applicant seems to carry more weight than positive information. "The investigators discovered that the managers responded more readily to negative than to favourable information ... inter-reliability was found to be significantly greater for unfavourable than favourable applicants." (Carlson & Mayfield, 1967, p. 441)
(4) One researcher found that immediately after a twenty minute inter-
view half of the twenty interviewers could not correctly answer
more than ten of the twenty questions concerning the interview they
just completed. Those interviewers who took notes and followed
guides could more accurately report on the interview, Carlson (1971).

(5) The selection interview research may benefit from an inter-
disciplinary approach. Social psychology, particularly cognitive
theories and person perception may be applicable to selection
interviewing. Also, understanding persuasion theory and the role
of receivers, senders and messages may offer new insights and pro-
vide a focus for fruitful research.

Conducting the Selection Interview

The writer found a great deal of controversy in the literature
concerning the proper means of conducting the interview. Also, there
was uncertainty as to how much information can be drawn from the inter-
view. As stated above, the interview is not an objective tool of selec-
tion. The research on the selection interview has not determined that
any one interviewing technique is valid and reliable.

There are two general types of interviews in recruitment:
screening and in-depth interviews. The screen or short list interview
is structured and its goal is to determine whether or not the interviewee
will continue in a formal relationship with the organization after the
interview. The screening interview's purpose is to establish whether
or not the applicant has the basic qualifications, such as, education
and experience, for the position.
The in-depth, hiring or determination interview considers all aspects of the individual in order to determine if he or she is the best applicant for the position. Not only is experience discussed, as in the screening interview, but personality factors, interests and goals are explored in the in-depth interview.

The in-depth interview can be further broken down into five kinds of interviews: directive, nondirective, stressful, group and board interviews. The directive interview is focused. The interviewer has an agenda and requests that the applicant respond to the selected topics. The interviewer determines the length of response, the topic selection, scope and pace of the interview, (Medley, 1978).

The nondirective interview is applicant-centered by decision of the interviewer. The applicant is usually asked to respond to open-ended questions. The length of response and topic selection is determined by the applicant. The interviewee is expected to supply the majority of the content for the interview and the interviewer does not talk as much as the interviewee during the interview, (Stewart & Cash, 1978).

The stress interview is designed to put the applicant ill at ease through a variety of methods. For example, the applicant's qualifications may be challenged and the interviewer then waits for the candidate's response. The interviewee may withdraw, become aggressive or assertively maintain his position. The rationale of the stress interview is to assess how much anxiety the individual can withstand and for how long. The interviewer also wants to assess the candidate's
ability to function under stress, (Peskin, 1971).

The group interview consists of more than one interviewee and one or more interviewers. A group of candidates are assigned a task to accomplish as a group. The applicants are observed in the group to see how they interact. The group interview may provide information on the applicant's degree of articulation, intelligence, interpersonal skills and leadership ability, (Peskin, 1971).

The board or panel interview consists of one interviewee and three or more interviewers. It is the researcher's experience that panel interviews are commonly used in social work for all levels of positions. Entry level personnel may be interviewed by a team of interviewers who represent the organization. Representatives from the administration and staff may be present. Administrative applicants may be interviewed by a personnel committee that represents board members, administration and staff, (Medley, 1978).

There is no conclusive support stating that any one approach is more effective than another. The literature suggests that directive interviews may be the most effective method for selection, (Schwab & Hensman, 1969). The stress interview was rarely mentioned in a positive light in the literature reviewed for this study. Its validity, in fact, was seriously questioned by many theorists, (Goodworth, 1979; Irish, 1978; Uris, 1975).

The literature used for this study did not specify the ideal number of participants who should be involved in an interview. As soon as more people are added to the dyad, interactions become more complex.
Wilmot (1979) claims that a collection of three or more individuals constitutes a small group which is qualitatively different from a dyad. "When a group numbers three or more, the basic properties of all larger groups begin to emerge. Leadership functions become more identifiable, communication networks are established and coalitions or subsystems are formed." (p. 18) The push towards conformity is also a factor in groups. Asch (1952) found that when subjects were asked individually to judge the length of an object, they were incorrect 7.4% of the time. However, in the group setting, 33% of the judgments given were inaccurate. Asch's study findings has implications for both interviewer and interviewee behaviour. The pressure towards conformity may inhibit the interviewer and interviewee from communicating in a group setting. Thibault and Kelly (1959) point out the different moods, interests, values and goals which are found among group members and the difficulty they may experience in working in a synchronized manner. In summary, if the group is to be used in selection interviewing, the above factors must be taken into consideration.

These five kinds of interviews have been presented in a static and linear way. In actual practice they may be combined within the same interview. For example, an interviewer may combine directive or non-directive techniques within the same interview.

The different interviewing styles reflect various goals, values and views of human behaviour. The kinds of information gathered may also vary. The purpose of conducting an interview may be to collect an accurate background investigation. At the other end of the spectrum, an
interviewer may test the applicant in a stress interview by observing his reactions to accusations. Also some interviewers may ask objective, closed questions in order to collect information from the applicant. Other interviewers may ask subjective, open-ended questions in order to accomplish the same objectives. From the literature reviewed for this study, most interviewers seem to choose a style in between these two extremes. The literature did not discuss in depth any tests designed to evaluate the applicant's knowledge, skills and abilities. Jernberg (1979) advocates role playing as the most effective way to evaluate the candidate's skills. She recruits child therapists through an elaborate system of role playing. The applicant is asked to role-play by providing counseling to a staff member who is posing as a child. Other staff members will then observe the techniques used by the applicant. Jernberg has found this method to be effective with over 150 new recruits, "No one, about whose skills the staff were uniformly enthusiastic about, proved to be other than an effective Theraplay therapist." (1979, p. 421). Other methods of assessing the interviewee are hypothetical problem situations and a review of case discussions. In the case of the former, the interviewer wants to predict the extent of success a person will have on a job. Consequently, the interviewee is asked how she might perform in specific circumstances. These hypothetical situations need to be clearly described and fairly typical. A close examination of the applicant's previous cases may also reveal much about a candidate's perspective and how she thinks.
Interviewee's Role in the Selection Interview

It seems to be a common perception that an interviewee's role consists solely of responding to the interviewer. This image casts the interviewee in a passive role without needs, wishes, wants or rights. This conception of interviewee behaviour is not appropriate for an individual who is contemplating entering an employer-employee contract. The interviewee needs to gather information about the position and organization if intelligent decisions are to be made. The literature referred to for this study describes the interviewee as an individual who exchanges information with the interviewer by asking and answering questions, (Stewart & Cash, 1978; Downs, et al, 1980). Downs, et al. (1980) very graphically states: "The interviewer is shopping for good employees and the interviewee is shopping for a company that suits his or her needs. Finally both individuals try to test the personal chemistry of their interactions." (p. 146)

There are a great many popular books on the market providing the interviewee with information on how to succeed in the selection interview: How To Win In A Job Interview (Robertsons, 1978); What Colour is Your Parachute? (Bolles, 1979); Go Hire Yourself An Employer (Irish, 1978); The Complete Job Search Handbook (Figler, 1979). In addition there are numerous courses on all aspects of the job search offered at colleges and universities. As a result of these courses, it is now possible for graduates of these programs to be better prepared for the interview than the interviewer. The applicants may have role-played interview situations, researched the organization, anticipated
the recruiter's questions and have answers prepared which highlight their strengths and downplay their weaknesses. A professional interviewee, such as this may actually subvert the functions of interviewing. In summary, today's interviewees may fall anywhere within the range from passivity and ineptness to being a professional interviewee. If they are professional interviewees, they may be knowledgeable of every aspect of the recruitment process and competent in using their skills to achieve their goals.

Development of the Theoretical Selection Interview Model.

From a review of the literature used for this study, key components of the interview were frequently discussed, such as interviewer preparation, format, content and interviewing style. These concepts were found to be relevant in relation to industry and business recruitment. The researcher believes that these same concepts may have relevance to social work recruitment. The researcher has integrated these various selection interview concepts into an overall framework or model of selection interviewing. The selection interview model, for example, consists of the following concepts: preparation, format, content, stress, directive or nondirective. These concepts describe the interviewers' behaviour in terms of planning the interview, outlining the agenda and implementing the interview. Such a model represents the ideal method of implementing an interview in business and industry. The researcher wishes to compare and contrast this theoretical interview model with social work recruitment practices.
The literature also described the ideal or model interviewee as one who prepares and participates to a great extent in the selection interview. The interviewer and interviewee models combined to represent the theoretical selection interview model. Each interviewer and interviewee concept is operationally and conceptually defined in the methodology chapter.

The data collected in this study are compared to the operational definitions. This comparison allows the researcher to test the existence of the theoretical selection interview model against the data collected.

Implications of the Literature Review

The research literature which exists on the selection interview indicates that a reliable and valid interviewing technique does not currently exist, (Mayfield, 1964). The interview is subject to enormous distortion as is any method of data collection. Richardson, Dohrenwend and Klein (1965) describe the interviewer's position as one of healthy skepticism about the reliability and validity of any information received. Interviewers must be constantly aware of possible sources of errors. With this thought in mind a recruiter would be wise to use other recruitment methods, such as application blanks, resumes, reference checks and simulations in order to assess applicants. Current research suggests that structured interviews may be more reliable than unstructured interviews and that situational factors influence the interviewers. Carlson's 1971 study indicated that a dramatic memory loss is liable to occur if the recruiter does not take notes during or immediately after an interview.
Although the selection interview has limitations, it does offer unique advantages to both interviewer and interviewee. The recruiter has a chance to observe and assess the interviewee's communication skills, personality factors, thinking patterns, level of motivation, goals and appearance. The interviewee is able to actually observe the agency functioning and perhaps obtain an appreciation for the work atmosphere and people in the organization.

Theorists are unanimous in stating that a recruiter must do a position and organizational analysis before the recruitment process begins. A recruiter should know precisely what requirements are needed for the position and understand the organization before candidates are screened and selected.

Jernberg (1979) claims a high success rate with her use of role playing in selecting candidates. Jernberg's study may pave the way for greater use of simulations in social work recruiting.

The literature referred to in this study was very clear on the selection interview as being a joint process in which interviewer and interviewee must gather information about one another. With this information, they may decide whether or not to enter into an employer-employee contract. The mutual participation implies that each participant must prepare for the interview, develop a plan and be active in the interview. The arrival of professional interviewees has added another dimension to the interview. Recruiters must not only assess the usual characteristics of applicants, but must also determine if the interviewee is a graduate of a job search program.
The knowledge gained from a review of the literature provided the information used in the development of the theoretical selection interview model. The researcher integrated key components of the selection interview into a theoretical model. The theoretical selection interview model was measured against the data collected in this study.

Summary

The generic interview has been defined and its interpersonal and communicational aspects described. The characteristics of the selection interview have been presented in regard to its goals, purposes and methods. Research findings on the selection interview have been outlined as well as their implications for the recruitment process. The various styles of conducting the selection interview were discussed and the roles of interviewer and interviewee explored. The development of the theoretical selection interview model was described, as well as its role in the study.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Classification of the Study

Within the classification system developed by Tripodi, Fellin and Meyer (1969), this was an exploratory study of the sub-type, exploratory-descriptive. This study did not present a hypothesis for testing. Its purpose was to describe quantitatively and qualitatively the selection interview in social work. The researcher compared the findings to a theoretical model developed from the literature. Strengths and weaknesses were pointed out, suggestions for improvement were made and questions were raised for subsequent investigation.

Rationale for Conducting an Exploratory Study

The researcher did a computer search exploring four data bases: the Eric system covering 800 periodicals and documents was searched back to 1966; Psychological Abstracts covering 1000 journals were searched back to 1961; Comprehensive Dissertation Abstracts was searched back to 1960; and Social Science Citation Index covering 2500 journals was searched back to 1972. The writer found fewer than twelve articles relating to the study in this computer search.

The purpose for conducting this research project as an exploratory study was to investigate the under-developed field of the employment interview in the social work profession. Hopefully, the study
will provide needed information which will have immediate and practical use for administrators involved in the selection interviewing process. It is also hoped that the study will identify areas which may be fruitful for future research.

Research Question and Related Questions

Research Question: Is the social work employment interview as perceived by interviewers and interviewees in three Children's Aid Societies different or similar to a theoretical employment interview model that has been developed from the literature, finally what are the implications?

Components of Major Research Question:

1. The description of the interviewees and interviewers in terms of age, sex, education, length of time at the agency and in the social service field.

2. The description of the interview process from the interviewers' and interviewees' perspective in terms of the number of interviews conducted for each position and the number of individuals who participated in each interview.

3. The description of the recruitment process from interviewers' and interviewees' perspectives. Specifically, what use was made of job application forms, reference checks, resumes, position descriptions and job specifications?
(4) The study was focused on the interviewer's format, content, and preparation for the interview. The interviewer's style, whether it was a stress, non-directive or directive interview was also asked. An index was developed for each of these six topics.

(5) The study attempted to measure the degree to which the interviewees prepared, participated and were satisfied with their interviews. Also the researcher attempted to measure the interviewees' observations of the interview format and its content. Interviewees were also asked if the interview was stressful, directive or nondirective. An index was developed for each of these eight topics.

Assumptions:

It was assumed that the response errors would be "non-systematic" (Smith, 1972, p. 20). That is, errors tend to cancel each other out in the survey as a whole. Pretesting the questionnaire should have eliminated the "systematic response errors" (Smith, 1972, p. 19).

Respondent error due to memory failure was expected to be small, since only people employed after Jan. 1/75 were included in the study. Since such experiences are usually memorable, it is hoped that the respondents could accurately recall the details of their employment interview. Hopefully, the questionnaire, did not pose a threat to respondents, thus minimizing conscious and unconscious distortions of the truth. It was expected that the personal administration of both questionnaires to
each agency motivated the respondents to carefully and accurately record their answers.

The researcher attempted to establish a rapport with the respondents by making introductory remarks which outlined the purpose and value of the study. Also, the layout of the questionnaire, question order, question wording and length of questionnaire were designed to stimulate recall and encourage respondents to communicate relevant information.

Operational Definitions

Interviewees - For purposes of this study, interviewees are defined as those social service personnel who were hired by the Children's Aid Society (CAS) after Jan. 1, 1975. They are non-supervisory personnel and are involved in direct service delivery.

Interviewers - For purposes of this study, interviewers are employed by Children's Aid Societies and as part of their position description, the recruitment of social service personnel is included.

Selection Interview - Face to face conversation between two people or parties. Parties include one or more interviewers and one or more applicants.

Children's Aid Society (CAS) - An agency which has the legal mandate of enforcing the Child Welfare Act of Ontario.
Interviewee Questionnaire - Consists of 62 questions and statements requesting information about the interviewees' experience during the selection interview for their current position. (see Appendix G for complete derivation)

Interviewer Questionnaire - Consists of 49 questions and statements requesting information about the interviewers' experiences in their most recent and typical selection interview. (see Appendix E for complete derivation)

Theoretical Selection Interview Model - A model of an ideal selection interview was constructed from a review of the literature on the selection interview.

Selection Group Interview - Consists of two or more interviewees and one or more interviewers.

Board or Panel Interview - Consists of one interviewee and three or more interviewers.

Stress Interview - A plan employed by the interviewer which uses tactics to make the interviewee uncomfortable.

Directive Interview - Consists of the interviewer using a guide and asking specific questions from that guide. The interviewer determines the topic and length of the applicant's response.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview Method</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nondirective Interview</td>
<td>The interviewer does not use a guide. The interviewee determines interview content, topic selection and length of response.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index</td>
<td>Provides measurements of a variable based on responses to more than one questionnaire item. (see Appendices I and J for complete derivation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewee Preparation Index</td>
<td>The preparation index is determined by the interviewees' response to the following three questions from Section B of the interviewee questionnaire: 8, 9 and 15.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewee Participation Index</td>
<td>The participation index is determined by the interviewees' response to the following three questions from Section B of the interviewee questionnaire: 23, 30 and 37.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewee Satisfaction Index</td>
<td>The satisfaction index is determined by the interviewees' response to the following twelve questions from Section B of the Interviewee questionnaire: 3, 4, 11, 17, 22, 26(b), 26(c), 26(g), 26(1), 29, 31 and 34.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewee Format Index</td>
<td>The format index is determined by the interviewees' response to the following seven questions from Section B of the interviewee questionnaire: 6, 26(a), 26(k), 28, 33, 35, and 36.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Interviewee Content Index

- The content index is determined by the interviewees' response to the following ten items from Section B of the interviewee questionnaire: 18, 19, 27, 38, 39, 40, 42, 43, 44 and 45.

Interviewee Stress Index

- The stress index is determined by the interviewees' response to the following four items from Section B of the interviewee questionnaire: 5, 13, 26(c) and 26(j).

Interviewee Directive Index

- The directive index is determined by the interviewees' response to the following ten items from Section B of the interviewee questionnaire: 7, 10, 13, 21, 25, 26(d), 26(e), 26(f), 26(h) and 30.

Interviewee Nondirective Index

- The nondirective index is determined by the interviewees' response to the following ten items from Section B of the interviewee questionnaire: 7, 10, 13, 21, 25, 26(d), 26(e), 26(f), 26(h) and 30.

Interviewer Preparation Index

- The preparation index is determined by the interviewers' response to the following seven items. The first five are from Section A of the interviewer questionnaire and the last two from Section B of the interviewer questionnaire: 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 15 and 16.
Interviewer Format Index
- The format index is determined by the interviewers' response to the following five items from Section B of the interviewer questionnaire: 4, 19, 23, 24 and 25.

Interviewer Content Index
- The content index is determined by the interviewers' response to the following nine items from Section B of the interviewer questionnaire: 10, 11, 26, 27, 28, 30, 31, 32 and 33.

Interviewer Stress Index
- The stress index is determined by the interviewers' response to the following three items from Section B of the interviewer questionnaire: 3, 8 and 18.

Interviewer Directive Index
- The directive index is determined by the interviewers' response to the following eleven items from Section B of the interviewer questionnaire: 5, 6, 8, 12, 13, 14, 17, 18, 20, 21 and 22.

Interviewer Nondirective Index
- The nondirective index is determined by the interviewers' response to the following eleven items from Section B of the interviewer questionnaire: 5, 6, 8, 12, 13, 14, 17, 18, 20, 21 and 22.

Theoretical Selection Interview Model
The theoretical model serves as a reference point against which the data collected are evaluated. The theoretical model
concepts have been operationalized into interviewer and interviewee indexes. These indexes serve as a tool to summarize the essential topics in the selection interviews. In total, there are fourteen indexes, six interviewer indexes and eight interviewee indexes. The interviewer indexes are: preparation, format, content, stress, directive and nondirective. The interviewee indexes are: preparation, participation, satisfaction, format, content, stress, directive and nondirective.

The interviewer preparation index consists of the action which the interviewer took in anticipation of the interview. Specifically, the interviewer should have performed a job analysis, been aware of the position requirements and reviewed the candidate's file which includes a resume, application form and references. The interviewer might also prepare an agenda which outlines essential areas to be explored and organized the interview strategy by framing questions for each topic.

The interviewer format index is categorized by three stages: beginning, middle and closing. The initial stage serves to develop a rapport with the interviewee and provide an orientation. The body includes the topics the interviewer wishes to cover. The third stage, closing the interview, may include statements concerning if and when results will be available. The interviewee may have questions at this time and the interviewer may thank the applicant for the time and effort he or she spent on the interview.

The interviewer content index includes the topics covered in the selection interview. The topics cover the interviewee's qualifi-
cations, training experience and the requirements of the position.

There are three interviewer style indexes which refer to the
tactics, techniques and strategies employed by the recruiter in order
to obtain information about the applicant during the selection interview.
The interviewer may use a stress, directive or nondirective style of
interviewing. Each of these styles has been defined above under oper-
ational definitions. The interviewer stress index attempts to measure
the degree of stress intentionally created by the interviewer in the
selection interview. The interviewers' directive index measures the
extent to which the interviewer used an interview guide and determined
the topics and length of the applicants' response. The interviewers'
nondirective index measures the extent to which the interviewer did not
use a guide. In the nondirective interview the applicants determined
interview content, topic selection and length of their response.

The interviewee preparation index consists of the number of
steps which he or she completed before the selection interview. This
index measures the extent to which the interviewee prepared, planned
and researched the agency before the in-depth interview.

The interviewee participation index measures the applicant's
activity during the selection interview. This index consists of three
questionnaire items:

(1) The extent to which the interviewee asked questions during the
interview.

(2) The extent to which topics for discussion were introduced in the
interview.
(3) Was a follow-up letter sent to the agency after the interview?

The interviewee satisfaction index measures the interviewee's satisfaction with the selection interview. This index consists of ten questionnaire items which cover the degree to which the interviewee is satisfied with the interview and interviewer.

The interviewee format index reflects the interviewee's perception of the interview format. This index consists of seven questions which probe the format of the interview.

The interviewee content index reflects the interviewee's perception of the interview content. This index consists of ten questionnaire items which measure the extent to which ten different topics were discussed.

The interviewee's perception of the interviewer's style consists of three interviewee indexes: interviewee stress index, interviewee directive index and interviewee nondirective index. Each of these three interviewee indexes measures the extent to which their selection interview was believed to be either a stress, directive or nondirective interview.

Instrument Pretest

The subjects of the pretest were similar to respondents in the study. The pretest group were child welfare workers as were the respondents in the study. The mailed pilot questionnaires were administered to the respondents under conditions similar to those in the study. That is, the questionnaires were completed with no collaboration and within a set period of time.

Pretest respondents were encouraged to write their comments directly on the questionnaire if they felt a question was vague or ambiguous. They were also requested to record on the instrument the time it took to complete the questionnaire. In reading the pretest results, the writer was able to ascertain whether or not the respondents inter-
Description of the Agencies Involved in the Study

Children's Aid Societies in Ontario operate under the mandate of provincial statute, which is the Child Welfare Act of 1978. The Child Welfare Act stipulates that Children's Aid Societies shall be operated for the purpose of:

(2) (a) Investigating allegations or evidence that children may be in need of protection.
(b) Protecting children where necessary.
(c) Providing guidance, counseling and other services to families for protecting children.
(d) Providing care for children assigned or committed to its care under this or any other Act.
(e) Supervising children assigned to its supervision.
(f) Placing children for adoption.
(g) Assisting the parents of children born or likely to be born outside of marriage and their children born outside of marriage. (The Child Welfare Act, 1978)

There are 51 Children's Aid Societies in Ontario. Each serves a county or district. Each Society is operated by a board of directors which is elected annually by the membership of the society. The board also includes municipal representatives appointed by city council and county council. The board of directors is responsible for determining policy which is executed by the local director of the agency. Each society is funded by the provincial government for 80% and the municipal government supplies the remaining 20%.

The four Children's Aid Societies that participated in this study were Essex County Children's Aid Society, Roman Catholic Essex County Children's Aid Society, Hamilton-Wentworth Children's Aid Society, and for the pretest, Norfolk County Children's Aid Society.
The Children's Aid Societies of Essex in Windsor, Ontario, and Hamilton-Wentworth in Hamilton, Ontario, are unique in that no other mid-size city has a public and Roman Catholic Children's Aid Society. Both Essex County C.A.S. and Roman Catholic C.A.S. of Essex are located in Windsor and have jurisdiction throughout Essex County. There is no duplication of service, since the agencies' clientele is determined by religious denomination. The Hamilton-Wentworth Society is located in the city of Hamilton and it provides services to both the urban population of Hamilton and rural residents of Hamilton-Wentworth. The Societies involved in this study are all primary social service agencies with a common mandate. They are all of similar size and, therefore, represent a homogeneous sample, large enough for the purposes of this study.

**Subjects**

**Interviewees:** There were 35 interviewees in the study; 32 were female and 3 were male. The vast majority of the interviewees were non-supervisory personnel and involved in the direct delivery of social work services. They have job responsibilities common to those of the majority of social workers. The quality of their performance, to a great extent, determines whether an agency is effective and meets its objectives.

**Interviewers:** There are 7 interviewers in the study; 3 are female and 4 are male. All of the interviewers were in administrative positions. The success of an agency is largely dependent on its personnel practices and the quality of the staff. The interviewers have the difficult task of recruiting social
Sample Source

The researcher chose three Children's Aid Societies to participate in the study. (Essex Public, Essex Roman Catholic, and Hamilton-Wentworth Public). They are all located in Southwestern Ontario, and it was thought that they would be representative of many similar agencies in Ontario. For purposes of this study, it was assumed these three societies would provide a homogeneous and adequate size sample.

All non-supervisory social workers (interviewees) hired after January 1, 1975 in each agency were included in the study. The reason for including only staff social workers hired within the last six years is that it reduced the sample to a manageable size. Also, there should not be a significant memory loss with recent employees.

Also included in the sample were administrative personnel (interviewers) who interview potential social work employees. The total sample from the three agencies was 35 interviewees and 7 interviewers.

Sample Method

This study is an exploratory-descriptive study and therefore it is not essential to have a random, representative sample. Consequently, non-probability, purposive sampling was used. (Miller, 1964). The three societies (Essex Public, Essex Roman Catholic and Hamilton-Wentworth) were chosen for this study for reasons of size, homogeneity, similar clientele served, location, and common mandate. Also, the researcher has easy access to these agencies, since they are in Southwestern Ontario.
Data Collection Method

(a) The researcher discussed the purpose and nature of the study with Mr. G. Caldwell, Executive Director of Ontario Association of Children's Aid Societies. Mr. Caldwell encouraged the project and allowed the researcher to use his name when introducing the study to the societies involved. (see Appendix A for complete derivation.)

(b) The researcher received approval from the three societies involved in the study. The researcher explained the general nature of the project, possible benefits and the demands required of the agency during the data collection phase of the study.

Furthermore, the researcher agreed to confidentiality with regard to the data collected. The researcher also agreed to describe the report in aggregate form so that individuals and agencies would not be identified. (see Appendices B & C for complete derivation).

(c) The questionnaire was pretested with Norfolk County Children's Aid Society under conditions comparable to those anticipated in the study. Revisions were made in the data collection instruments after pretesting the questionnaires and the researcher was able to obtain the length of time required to complete the questionnaires. (see Appendix D for complete derivation).

(d) The researcher administered the questionnaires as a group to all interviewers and interviewees in two of the three agencies. The purpose and general nature of the study was explained to the respondents before the questionnaires were distributed. The writer remained with the respondents while they were completing the questionnaires, in order to
clarify any questions. All respondents completed the questionnaires in under forty-five minutes. At that time the questionnaires were collected. The third agency could not devote the staff time required for group administration of the questionnaire. Consequently, the writer met with two agency administrators and arranged the procedures for distributing the questionnaires. These two agency officials administered the questionnaires in a manner similar to the other agencies in that they introduced the research study, had the questionnaires completed within forty-five minutes and requested the questionnaires be completed without collaboration. In the third group, one-half of the respondents completed the questionnaire as a group in team meetings and the remaining number completed the questionnaire individually. The agency administrators collected the questionnaires after the time elapsed. The writer at the scheduled time, collected the completed questionnaires from the agency.

**Data Collection Instrument**

Oppenheim defines a questionnaire as a: "... scientific instrument for measuring and for collection of particular kinds of data. Like all such instruments, it has to be specially designed according to particular specifications and with specific aims in mind." (1966, p.2)

The questionnaires in this study provide the interviewer's and interviewee's perspective on the same phenomenon. The questions are similar in many respects. In Section A, nine questions are identical and in Section B, twenty-three questions are identical and seven questions cover inter-related material.

Two two-part questionnaires were designed for use in this study. Section A of the interviewer questionnaire consisted of fifteen questions requesting demographic information and agency procedural information on
recruitment. Section B of the questionnaire consists of thirty-four questions which explore the interviewers' preparation, format, style and content. All but one of the questions were fixed alternative and scaled questions. The last question is an open-ended question designed to encourage the respondent to present information which may not have been included in the questionnaire. The order in which questions are presented has been shown to influence the respondent. Consequently, the question's scales (1 - 7) were reversed in order to decrease "rating errors". (Isaac & Michael, 1971, p. 58). (see Appendices E & F for complete derivation).

The interviewee questionnaires are similar to the interviewer questionnaires. Section A consists of sixteen questions requesting demographic data and information on the interviewees' experiences with their respective agency's recruitment process. Section B of the questionnaire consists of forty-six questions which explore the interviewees' preparation for the interview, participation in the selection process, satisfaction with the interview and the interviewees' perception of the interviewer's style, format and content. All but one of the questions are closed and scaled questions. The last question is open-ended and requests that respondents contribute relevant information not covered by the questionnaire. (see Appendices G & H for complete derivation).

The issue of reliability and validity can not be easily resolved when using attitudinal questionnaires. Smith (1972) has pointed out the difficulties in determining the validity of the data received from attitude questionnaires, since there is often no objective standard
against which the information can be compared. Babble (1973) confronts this complex issue by stressing the utility of the research task:

It must be recognized that all such measurements (all measurements, in fact) are arbitrary at best. The social scientist cannot unequivocally describe one person as "religious" and another as "unreligious". Rather he will describe people as relatively more or less religious. This is by no means unique to social science, however, as evidenced by the "hardness scale" used by physical scientists, the Richter scale for earthquakes, and so forth.

Ultimately, all scientific measurements must be judged on the basis of their utility for inquiry, rather than on the basis of absolute truth. The social scientist can never hope to describe a person as "religious" in an absolute sense any more than the chemist can never describe a given element as "hard". (p. 24-25)

The point is made even more succinctly by the same author: "In a very real sense, then, the researcher can never make accurate measurements, only useful ones." (Babble, 1973, p. 133)

Babble (1973) outlines unique scientific and social benefits offered when a questionnaire is employed as a data collection instrument. The questionnaire as a research instrument is transparent and reflects critical decisions made on the measurement and operationalization of concepts. The questionnaire lends itself to replication, since, the research instrument remains intact in original form and the data that it generated may be reanalyzed at any time. The questionnaire assists the community of researchers interested in a particular topic. The instrument's transparency and specificity increases the possibility of building knowledge and contributing to further research.

Also, the data collected may serve multiple purposes. Different studies may be done on the same data concurrently or at a later point in time. These advantages are particularly applicable to this study, since very little has been written on the selection interview in social work.
Most importantly, the instrument chosen for this research project meets study objectives by facilitating the collection of information in a short period of time. This benefits both the agency and researcher. The questionnaires' average completion time was twenty-five minutes. Therefore, it involved minimal agency staff hours. This also allows the data to be processed effectively and efficiently. Babble sums up the main advantage of the questionnaire: "When it comes to detailed counting and describing, survey research is usually unexcelled." (1973, p. 369).

Development of the Indexes

Babble defines an index as "a composite measure of variables: measurements based on responses to more than one questionnaire item." (1973, p. 254). An individual's score on an index would be determined by the answers given to the questions on the questionnaire. The number of questions varies per index. An index compares one respondent's score with another respondent's score. Each index measures one variable.

Since this study is exploratory-descriptive, a large number of variables are described and analyzed. Indexes made the data analysis more efficient. A single score for each individual on each variable permitted the data to be described and summarized in a simple and clear manner.

Questions were selected for the indexes on the grounds of face validity and unidimensionality. Each question making up the index measures an aspect of each variable. The questions making up the index are unique to each variable. With one exception, Question 30 on the
interviewee questionnaire, "To what extent did you introduce topics during the interview?" was used for the participation index and directive and nondirective indexes. The unidimensionality of the index should also provide a check on the validity of the index. Interviewees who scored high on the preparation index should have also scored high on the participation and interview satisfaction index. Similarly, those individuals who scored the lowest on the preparation index should have obtained a low ranking on the participation and satisfaction index. In summary, it may be possible to predict a respondent's rank on similar indexes.

Most questions were weighted equally in the scoring of these indexes. Missing data or improperly completed answers were scored as zero. The indexes ranged from 0 - 15, 0 - 60, depending on the number of questions in each index. On each question, the respondents were assigned a score for choosing the variable being measured and a zero if the variable was not chosen. (see Appendices I & J for complete derivation).

The researcher developed the indexes used in this study. The literature reviewed for this study did not demonstrate an index construction similar to the one used in this study. This limits the validity of the findings. Lack of previous research did not permit the researcher to compare the indexes developed in this study with other studies.

Validation of the Indexes

The indexes were examined for internal consistency by a question analysis. The indexes were also scrutinized for relationships with other
indexes. This helped to validate the indexes.

Interviewer Stress Index - In terms of question analysis, the three questions from this index appear to be consistent. None of the interviewers stated that they planned to have a stress selection interview. Three of the interviewers scored zero on the index and four of the interviewers ranked five on the index which was below the mid-point (7.5).

The stress index is inversely related to the nondirective interview. All interviewers categorized their interview as nondirective and 57.14% of the interviewers' scored at or above the mid-point category on the nondirective index. This compares with all of the interviewers who fell below the stress index mid-point.

Nondirective Index - All but two of the eleven questions contributed to the index score. The two questions which did not add to the index suggests that the interviewers were using a particular type of nondirective interview. Perhaps, a semi-nondirective interview. In reply to the questions (14) and (22), "To what extent did you participate during the interview?" and "What percentage of your (and co-interviewers')

questions were:

(a) Objective questions, (example - Where did you go to school?)
(b) Subjective questions, (example - Describe yourself?)
(c) Non-specific questions, (example - What is your career objective?)"

The majority of interviewers responded that they did participate to a great extent in the interview. In the second question none of the interviewers responded with a 50% or more for subjective questions. The directive and nondirective indexes are inversely related. The individual
with the highest nondirective index had the lowest directive score and
the individual with the lowest nondirective index score had the highest
directive index score.

Interviewer Directive Index - None of the interviewers categorized their
interview as a directive interview. The directive index scores support
their intentions, in that 85.71% of the interviewers fell below the mid-
point category.

The interviewer indexes are related as one would expect. Respond-
dents categorized their interview as nondirective and that index repre-
sents the highest scores, 57.14%, at or above the mid-point on the non-
directive index. Compared with 14.29% at the mid-point for the directive
index, all interviewers were below the mid-point on the stress index.

Interviewer Preparation Index - The three of the seven items which did
not contribute to the index scores referred to specific forms. These
were selection evaluation forms, job specification forms and reference
evaluation forms, which were not used by the interviewers.

The preparation and format indexes reflect a similar trend.
The score, 42.86% of the respondents in the preparation index, fell below
the mid-point compared to 71.43% of the interviewers who fell below the
mid-point on the format index.

Interviewer Content Index - The nine questions in this index reflect
nine different topics. One of the questions did not contribute to the
index score. The question which did not contribute to the composite
score requested information on psychological testing.

The individual with the highest content index score also had the highest format index score and the second highest preparation index score. This suggests that the indexes are measuring related variables.

Interviewer Format Index - All questions in this index contribute to the overall index score. Therefore, they appear to be indicators of the same variable.

The preparation and format indexes appear to be measuring similar variables. The two individuals with the highest preparation index scores placed first and middle in the format index. The two lowest scoring individuals on the preparation index were also last on the format index.

Interviewee Stress Index - Most of the interviewees 91.43% categorized their interview as nondirective or directive. Only 11.43% perceived their interview to be a stress interview. The stress index score reflected the respondents perceptions. Falling below the mid-point were 91.43% of the interviewees. The average score for the respondents who perceived they had a stress interview scored above the mid-point on the stress index.

The stress index is inversely related to the satisfaction index. On the stress index, 91.43% of the respondents fell below the mid-point category and on the satisfaction index 14.26% fell below the mid-point category. The individual with the lowest satisfaction index score was the highest on the stress index score.
Interviewee Nondirective Index - The interviewees for the most part, (82.66%) categorized their interview as nondirective. The index scores were consistent with the respondents' perceptions. At the mid-point and above, were 40.01% of interviewees. The remaining 59.99% were under the mid-point category. Compared with the stress index, 8.57% were at or above the mid-point and 17.14% of the interviewees on the directive index were at or above the mid-point category.

Interviewee Directive Index - Two or 5.71% of the interviewees categorized their interview as directive. This low number of perceived directive interviews was reflected in the index scores, 82.85% of whom were below the mid-point category.

The respondents' observations of their interview as being nondirective was reflected by the interviewee's stress and directive indexes, as described above in the nondirective index.

Interviewee Satisfaction Index - This index consists of twelve questions which reflect the respondents' positive comments regarding the interview and interviewer. The satisfaction index scores show that 85.71% of the interviewees were at or above the mid-point on the index score.

There is an inverse relationship between the stress-and satisfaction index as described above in the stress index.

Interviewee Content Index - The index is made up of ten questions each of which covered a different topic. Each item contributed to the index scores.

The content and format indexes seem to be related. The
individual who scored the highest on the content index also scored above
the mid-point on the format index. Also, the two individuals with the
lowest format index scores placed well below the mid-point on the content
index.

Interviewee Format Index - All questions contributed to the index score.
In response to question six: "To what extent did you understand the
format of the interview?" 65.71% of the respondents reported they under-
stood the format to a great extent. This compares with 37.15% of the
interviewees who placed at or above the mid-point category.

As discussed above, the content and format indexes seem to be
interrelated. Individuals scoring high on the one index also placed high
on the other index. Conversely, interviewers who placed low on the con-
tent index usually scored low on the format index. This seems to indicate
that the indexes are measuring similar variables.

Interviewee Participation Index - Three questions make up this index.
All questions in this index are direct indicators of the participation
variable. All three questions that make up the index are empirical
indicators of the action interviewees took during or immediately after
the interview.

There is a 20% point difference between the preparation and
participation indexes. Above the mid-point category on the preparation
index were 17.14% of the interviewees and 37.14% of the interviewees
scored above the mid-point category on the participation index. The
number of interviewees below the mid-point was similar in that 37.14% of
the respondents on the preparation index and 34.29% of the respondents on the participation index fell below the mid-point category.

Interviewee Preparation Index - In response to question eight: "To what extent did you prepare for the interview?", 40% of the interviewees felt they had prepared to a great extent. This compares to 17.14% of the respondents in the preparation index who scored above the mid-point category. These scores seem to indicate a consistency between questions. The preparation and participation indexes seem to be closely related as described above in the participation index.

Data Processing

The questionnaire was constructed so that the data could be analyzed by computer. Consequently each questionnaire item was numbered. The data were punched on to computer cards. All but one of the questionnaire items were assigned a category. The last question on the interviewer and interviewee questionnaires was open-ended. The responses from these items were not assigned to a category. They were reproduced in the appendices as they appeared on the questionnaire. (see Appendices F & H for complete derivation)

Limitations of the Study

The major limitations of the study were described under two broad categories, technical and theoretical. Under the technical category, the limitations of the study are in the measurement and design section of the project. The researcher specified how the variables were measured in the study. Several indexes were developed from both ques-
tionnaires. Questions from the questionnaires were selected as indicators for each variable. According to the researcher's knowledge, such indexes have not previously been developed. Therefore, it is difficult to compare indexes for reliability and validity. This problem has been partially overcome by an analysis of each question in the index in terms of consistency and contribution to the overall index score. Also validation checks were made by comparing each index with indexes that measure related variables.

The second set of technical limitations involved the design of the study: sample size, representativeness of sample, data collection method and data collection instrument. The size of the sample used in the study—55 interviewees and 7 interviewers—limits the conclusions that can be drawn from the data. Any generalizations made regarding interviewers may be unique to those involved in this study. They may not reflect the views of social work interviewers in general.

Initially, 55 interviewees from three agencies were eligible to participate in the study, but only 35 respondents participated. The number of interviewees who did not participate in the study represents 36% of the sample size. Three interviewers also did not participate in the study. The number of interviewers who did not participate in the study represents 30% of the sample. This raises a question of a bias sample. Are participants and non-participants two different populations? Do those interviewees who did not participate have different characteristics from those who did?

The data collection method was not consistently applied to all
respondents. The researcher administered the questionnaire in group form to two of the three agencies. In the third agency, the researcher did not administer the questionnaire nor did the respondents complete the questionnaire as a group. This agency represents 55% of the sample. It is possible that this inconsistency in data collection may confuse the influences of the study and cast doubt on the reliability and validity of the study findings.

There are two limitations of the self-administered questionnaire used in this study. First, one does not know if the respondents correctly interpreted the questions. Downs et al. write, "It is important to recognize that people are creating different realities out of the same materials." (1980, p. 24) Secondly, other data collection instruments, such as an interview, may have more easily detected a respondent's misinterpretation. An interviewer may use strategies, techniques, and tactics designed to correct the situation, so that relevant and valid information is obtained.

In regard to the theoretical limitations, perhaps the most significant one is the weakness of the exploratory nature of the study. It cannot explore causal relationships or explain why an event occurred. Rather, it has a more modest aim of describing, counting or measuring what occurred. (Twain, Hatlow & Merwin, 1970)

This study did not attempt to correlate the variables between interviewee and interviewer. The interviewer and interviewee questionnaires gathered two sets of perceptions of a similar event. Considering the high percentage of the interviewees (36%) and interviewers (30%) who did not participate in the study, it is possible that few of the inter-
viewees and interviewers actually met in the selection interview situation.

A further theoretical limitation is that subjects pertinent to this study were not explored. The selection interview involves many disciplines: psychology, sociology, social-psychology, anthropology and business administration. In particular, the psychology of self-awareness, persuasion theory and cognitive theories all have implications for interviewing. Other than being mentioned briefly in the review of the literature, these concepts have been excluded from the study. These concepts became apparent to the researcher after the data had been collected. Self-awareness, persuasive processes and cognitive theories are interrelated. To determine the influences each of these concepts has on the selection interview would be a major undertaking which may require numerous studies.

Summary

This chapter described the study design developed by this researcher to measure interviewer, interviewee and interview variables. The sample consisted of 35 viewees and 7 interviewers, all of whom are employed with Children's Aid Societies. This chapter included a description of the research question, specific terminology used in the study and a description of the study sample. The data method and the selection of the data collection instruments were discussed. Limitations of the study were also outlined.
CHAPTER IV

DATA ANALYSIS

The purpose of this chapter is to provide some descriptive information about the sample used in this study and to present and discuss the data collected which relates to the research question proposed for investigation. The description of the sample includes demographic variables, such as age, sex and education. The respondent's work history, interviewing experience and procedures are also presented. The research question and its components have been developed into fourteen indexes. The data relating to the indexes will be presented and the indexes will be compared in order to assess their validity.

The population for this study includes 35 interviewees and 7 interviewers, all employed at Essex Public, Essex Roman Catholic and Hamilton-Wentworth Children's Aid Societies. From an examination of Table 4.1, it can be seen that there is an inverse age relationship between interviewers and interviewees. Slightly over one quarter (28.54%) of the interviewers are under 40 years of age, whereas 85.72% of the interviewees are under 40 years of age. There were no interviewees in the over sixty category and only 14.28% of the interviewees were in the 40-49 and 50-59 categories. As expected, the interviewees were, for the most part, younger than the interviewers. The interviewer's ages were
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Categories</th>
<th>All Interviewers (N=7)</th>
<th>Male Interviewers (N=4)</th>
<th>Female Interviewers (N=3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>60 and over</td>
<td>28.57%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 - 59</td>
<td>28.57</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>33.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 - 49</td>
<td>14.29</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>33.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 - 39</td>
<td>28.57</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>33.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 - 29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note - Figures may not total 100.0%
Table 4.1 (continued)
Percentage Distribution on Age of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Categories</th>
<th>All Interviewees (N=35)</th>
<th>Male Interviewees (N=3)</th>
<th>Female Interviewees (N=32)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>60 and over</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 - 59</td>
<td>5.71%</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td>3.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 - 49</td>
<td>8.57</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 - 39</td>
<td>31.43</td>
<td></td>
<td>34.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 - 29</td>
<td>54.29</td>
<td>66.66</td>
<td>53.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note - Figures may not total 100.0%
evenly distributed throughout the 30-65 age categories.

**Sex**

Table 4.2 reveals the high percentage of female interviewees, 91.48%. Despite this overwhelming number of females at the entry level positions, only 42.86% of the interviewers were female.

**Education**

All study respondents were requested to report the highest degree or diploma they received. The data in Table 4.3 shows that the interviewers all fell within the BSW or MSW category; 42.86% of the interviewers have a BSW and 57.14% have an MSW. Regarding their education, the interviewees are a more diverse group. The largest percentage of interviewees, 74.28% have a BSW. The MSW category represents 20.00% of the interviewee population. In total, these two categories represent 94.28% of the interviewee population. Comparing the interviewers and interviewees, the modal category for the interviewer was a MSW and BSW for interviewees. When the interviewees are compared by sex, 66.66% of the males have an MSW whereas 15.62% of the females have an MSW. This figure may be misleading, since the male sample is very small, one male interviewee represents 33.33% of the total male sample.

The BSW and MSW seems to be the standard working qualification in the Children's Aid Societies chosen for this study. Over 90% of the interviewees and all of the interviewers have either a BSW or MSW. In general, the respondents are a well educated work group.
Table 4.2
Percentage Distribution on the
Sex of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>All Interviewers (N=7)</th>
<th>All Interviewees (N=35)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>57.14%</td>
<td>8.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>42.86</td>
<td>91.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.3
Percentage Distribution on the Highest Education Attained by Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Degree or Diploma held</th>
<th>All Interviewers (N=7)</th>
<th>Male Interviewers (N=4)</th>
<th>Female Interviewers (N=3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Child Care Diploma</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.S.W.</td>
<td>42.86%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>66.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S.W.</td>
<td>57.14%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note - Figures may not total 100.0%
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Degree or Diploma held</th>
<th>All Interviewees (N=35)</th>
<th>Male Interviewees (N=3)</th>
<th>Female Interviewees (N=32)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Child Care</td>
<td>2.86%</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.S.W.</td>
<td>74.28%</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td>78.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S.W.</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
<td>66.66%</td>
<td>15.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2.86%</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note - Figures may not total 100.0%
Work History

The percentage distribution outlined in Table 4.4 shows that a high percentage 85.71% of the interviewers in the sample have been with their respective agencies for more than six years. It should be noted that one of the criteria for eligibility in this study was that interviewees had to be employed at their agencies since January 1, 1975. Therefore, individuals with more than six years service at their current agency were not represented in the interviewee population. Nevertheless, the trend is evident; interviewees have a higher turnover rate than interviewers. The figures reveal that, of the interviewees, 71.43% have been with the agency for less than three years, 57.14% less than two years, and 28.57% have been with the agency for less than one year.

There is no significant difference when relating interviewers' sex to the length of time at the agency. All of the female interviewers and 75% of the male interviewers have been employed at the same agency for over six years. There is a difference in the length of time during which male and female interviewees have been employed at their current agency. It is difficult to say if this represents a trend since the male sample is so small. Two, or 66.66% of the male interviewees have been employed with the same agency for more than two years and 40.62% of the female interviewees have been with their current agency for more than three years.

The high turnover rate may be a reflection of the highly stressful positions within the Intake and Family Service Departments of a Children's Aid Society. Through the researcher's experience, these
Table 4.4
Percentage Distribution on Length of Employment at Current Agency for Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of Employment at Current Agency</th>
<th>All Interviewers (N=7)</th>
<th>Male Interviewers (N=4)</th>
<th>Female Interviewers (N=3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>more than 6</td>
<td>85.71%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;5 ≤ 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;4 ≤ 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;3 ≤ 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;2 ≤ 3</td>
<td>14.29%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;1 ≤ 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>less than 1 year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note - Figures may not total 100.0%
Table 4.4 (continued)
Percentage Distribution on Length of Employment at Current Agency for Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of Employment at Current Agency</th>
<th>All Interviewees (N=35)</th>
<th>Male Interviewees (N=3)</th>
<th>Female Interviewees (N=32)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>more than 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 5 ≤ 6</td>
<td>17.14%</td>
<td></td>
<td>18.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 4 ≤ 5</td>
<td>5.71</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td>3.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 3 ≤ 4</td>
<td>5.71</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 2 ≤ 3</td>
<td>14.29</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td>12.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 1 ≤ 2</td>
<td>28.57</td>
<td></td>
<td>31.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>less than 1 year</td>
<td>28.57</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td>28.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note - Figures may not total 100.0%
positions appear to have the greatest turnover.

The interviewers provide their agencies with a great deal of experience as shown by Table 4.5. The interviewers' positions are occupied by the more experienced social workers. No interviewer has under six years of experience in the social service field. The figures reveal that 85.71% of the interviewers have more than ten years experience in social services. This contrasts with 17.14% of the interviewees who have more than ten years experience in the social service field.

**Interviewing Experience**

As shown in Table 4.6, the interviewers are relatively experienced in interviewing. Over forty percent (42.86%) of the interviewers perform more than ten interviews per year. There is no major difference between female and male interviewers. All of the females fell between the two categories (5-10, and 10-15) and 75% of the males fell within the same categories. As evidenced by this study sample of seven, interviewers from three mid-size agencies, interviewing seems to be reserved for a few individuals.

As shown in Table 4.5, 85.71% of the interviewers have more than ten years social work experience. This wealth of experience should assist the interviewers in the selection of social service personnel. Experienced interviewers are in a position to know the requirements of the positions as well as the qualifications needed to adequately fulfill them.
Table 4.5
Percentage Distribution on Length of Employment in the Social Service Field for Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of Employment</th>
<th>All Interviewers (N=7)</th>
<th>Male Interviewers (N=4)</th>
<th>Female Interviewers (N=3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>more than 10 years</td>
<td>85.71%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>66.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 8 ≤ 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 6 ≤ 8</td>
<td>14.29</td>
<td></td>
<td>33.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 4 ≤ 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 2 ≤ 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 0 ≤ 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note - Figures may not total 100.0%
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of Employment</th>
<th>All Interviewees (N=35)</th>
<th>Male Interviewees (N=3)</th>
<th>Female Interviewees (N=32)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 10 years</td>
<td>17.14%</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td>15.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 8 ≤ 10</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 6 ≤ 8</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 4 ≤ 6</td>
<td>17.14%</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td>15.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 2 ≤ 4</td>
<td>31.43%</td>
<td></td>
<td>34.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 0 ≤ 2</td>
<td>28.57%</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td>28.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note - Figures may not total 100.0%*
Table 4.6
Percentage Distribution on Number of Interviews Performed per Year for Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Interviews per year</th>
<th>All Interviewers (N=7)</th>
<th>Male Interviewers (N=4)</th>
<th>Female Interviewers (N=3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&gt;20 ≤ 25</td>
<td>14.29%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;15 ≤ 20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;10 ≤ 15</td>
<td>28.57</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;5 ≤ 10</td>
<td>.57.14</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>66.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;0 ≤ 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 100.0% 100.0% 100.0%

Note - Figures may not total 100.0%
Method of Selection Interviewing

As shown in Table 4.7, there is a fair degree of diversity in recruiting social service staff. The interviewers described three styles of interviewing: dyad, triad and board or panel interview. It appears social service recruiters use a flexible approach. For example, the applicant may have a dyadic screen interview, a triadic in-depth interview, followed by a panel interview involving the immediate supervisor and team unit. As shown in Table 4.7, the triad was the modal category used by 57.14% of the interviewers. The panel interview was chosen by 57.14% of the interviewers. The third most common style was the dyadic interview, as 42.86% chose this category.

The figures in Table 4.7 indicate that interviewers did not use the group interview. In summary, recruiters in the sample frequently use the three methods as stated above and all rejected the group interview.

As shown in Table 4.8, the interviewees experience in being interviewed fell within the same categories as described by the interviewers. The dyad and panel interview were the most common style of interviewing, each representing 48.29% of the respondents. The triad represents 29.41% of the respondents. The interviewer and interviewee responses are very similar. They both describe a dyadic, panel and triadic interviewing style and both were unanimous in rejecting the group interview.

Recruitment Process

Table 4.9 outlines key components in the selection process.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is the Agency's Method for Employment Interviewing</th>
<th>All Interviewers (N=7)</th>
<th>Male Interviewers (N=4)</th>
<th>Female Interviewers (N=3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. One interviewer and one interviewee</td>
<td>42.86%</td>
<td>57.14%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Two interviewers and one interviewee</td>
<td>85.71%</td>
<td>14.29%</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Three interviewers and one interviewee</td>
<td>28.57%</td>
<td>71.43%</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. More than three interviewers and one interviewee</td>
<td>28.57%</td>
<td>71.43%</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. One interviewer and more than one interviewee</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. More than one interviewer and more than one interviewee</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Table 4.8
Percentage Distribution on Method of Interviewing for Interviewee Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Was your final or only interview?</th>
<th>All Interviewees (N=34)</th>
<th>Male Interviewees (N=3)</th>
<th>Female Interviewees (N=31)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. One interviewer and one interviewee</td>
<td>35.29%</td>
<td>38.70%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Two interviewers and one interviewee</td>
<td>29.41</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td>29.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Three interviewers and one interviewee</td>
<td>14.71</td>
<td></td>
<td>16.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. More than three interviewers and one interviewee</td>
<td>20.59</td>
<td>66.66</td>
<td>16.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. One interviewer and more than one interviewee</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. More than one interviewer and more than one interviewee</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note** - Figures may not total 100.0%
The first three questions in the Table refer to the recruiter's method of obtaining background information on the applicant. The last two questions relate to the preparation and planning which the interviewers did in order to determine the requirements of the position.

As shown in Table 4.9, 85.71% of the interviewers required the applicant to complete a job application form. All interviewers routinely made reference checks on applicants before hiring. None of the interviewers used a reference evaluation form. A majority (57.14%) of the interviewer respondents stated that a position description was used in the selection of applicants. The majority of respondents, 85.71%, did not use job specifications for the positions they were trying to fill.

In summary, complete background information was generally requested by the interviewers. The majority of recruiters (85.71%) required the applicant to complete an application form and all of the interviewers required reference checks on the applicants. A standard reference evaluation form was not used by the interviewers. Reference checks are often the best means of collecting background information on the applicant's personality, knowledge, skills and abilities. A standard reference form may assist the recruiters in collecting relevant information. The literature reviewed for this study was unanimous in urging the recruiters to perform a careful position and organization analysis before searching for a candidate. This would assure that a match would be made between the position requirements and the candidate's qualifications. Without this preparation and planning, the recruiter has no idea what he or she is looking for in an applicant. The interviewer
Table 4.9
Percentage Distribution on Recruitment Practices
for Interviewer Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency Recruitment Procedures</th>
<th>All Interviewers (N=7)</th>
<th>Male Interviewers (N=4)</th>
<th>Female Interviewers (N=3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) Does the applicant complete a job application form?</td>
<td>85.71% 14.29%</td>
<td>75% 25%</td>
<td>100% 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Are reference checks routinely made?</td>
<td>100 0</td>
<td>100 0</td>
<td>100 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Is a reference evaluation form used?</td>
<td>0 100</td>
<td>0 100</td>
<td>0 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Do job descriptions exist for entry level social service positions?</td>
<td>57.14 42.86</td>
<td>50 50</td>
<td>66.66 33.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) Do job specifications exist for the entry level social service positions?</td>
<td>14.29 85.71</td>
<td>0 100</td>
<td>33.33 66.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note - Figures may not total 100.0%
respondents were in a difficult position to recruit, since 42.86% of the interviewers did not have a position description and 85.71% did not have job specifications.

Table 4.10 indicates 71.03% of the interviewees completed a job application form. Slightly more, 80.00% sent resumes to their employers before being interviewed. A very small portion, 5.71% of the respondents were asked to show proof of their academic qualifications. Only 14.29% of the interviewees were shown job descriptions and even less, 5.41% were shown job specifications for the positions.

Comparing Table 4.9 and 4.10, the interviewees' responses differed from the interviewers' responses. Twice the number of interviewees (28.57%) did not complete a job application form as compared with the number given by the interviewers (14.29%). More than twice the number of interviewers (57.14%) stated position descriptions were used compared with 14.29% of the interviewees. The number of job specifications used in the sample was low. During the selection process, 14.29% of the interviewers stated they were in use at their agency and 5.71% of the interviewees stated they were shown a job specification. A majority of the applicants (80.00%) completed a resume before their interview. Surprising, was the number of applicants (94.29%) who were not asked to show proof of their credentials.

Indexes

There are eight interviewee indexes and six interviewer indexes. The actual scoring varies for each index. For example, on the index for interviewer preparation, the respondent can attain a maximum score
Table 4.10
Percentage Distribution on Recruitment Experience for the Interviewee Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recruitment Experience for Current Position</th>
<th>All Interviewees (N=35)</th>
<th>Male Interviewees (N=3)</th>
<th>Female Interviewees (N=32)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) Did you complete a job application form?</td>
<td>71.03%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>68.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Did you send in a resume before your job interview?</td>
<td>80.00</td>
<td>66.66</td>
<td>81.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Were you asked to show proof of your credentials?</td>
<td>5.71</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Were you shown a job description before the interview?</td>
<td>14.29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) Were you shown a job specification?</td>
<td>5.71</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note - Figures may not total 100.0%
of 35, which indicates that the respondent has adequately performed all aspects of preparation. The minimum which an interviewer can score is zero, denoting a lack of interviewer preparation for the selection interview. This index, therefore ranges from 35 to zero. Most of the 14 indexes have a different range. The mid-point for this index is 17.5. The mid-point category is (15-19). The interpretation of each index is based on the variety of ranges. (see Appendices I and J for complete derivation)

**Interviewer Preparation Index**

Table 4.11 shows that the interviewer preparation index ranges from a minimum category of (5-9), to a maximum category of (20-24). The results indicate that the interviewers' responses centered around the mid-point category (15-19). This is also the modal category. The mode represents 42.85%. Falling below the mid-point category were 42.86% of the interviewers. The males in this group were the most diverse. They ranged from the (5-9) category to the (20-24) category. This contrasts with the female interviewers who were in two categories (10-14) and (15-19). In general, the index scores suggest that the interviewers could have been better prepared for the interviews. Only one interviewer scored above the mid-point category.

**Interviewer Format Index**

Interviewers did not score as well on the format index as they did on the preparation index. As shown by the figures in Table 4.12, 71.42% of the interviewers fell below the mid-point category. Only one interviewer, or 14.29% was above the mid-point category. There is no
### Table 4.11
Responses to the Interviewer Preparation Index

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preparation Index Scores</th>
<th>All Interviewers (N=7)</th>
<th>Male Interviewers (N=4)</th>
<th>Female Interviewers (N=3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 - 34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 - 29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 - 24</td>
<td>14.29%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 - 19</td>
<td>42.85</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>66.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - 14</td>
<td>28.57</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>33.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - 9</td>
<td>14.29</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note** - Figures may not total 100.0%
major difference between male and female interviewers. Two, or 66.66% of the females and 75% of the males fell below the mid-point category. The interviewers overall appeared to inadequately explain the format of the interview. They did not attempt to sell the job or agency to the qualified applicant and did not summarize the points covered in the interview. Conversely, all interviewers informed the applicant of the next step in the hiring process.

**Interviewer Content Index**

As Table 4.13 indicates, content is covered relatively well. Shown at or above the mid-point category were 71.42% of the respondents. There were 28.58% of the interviewers below the mid-point category. It is interesting to note that none of the interviewers tested the applicants psychologically during the interview process. All of the interviewers commented on the disadvantages of the job and thoroughly covered the demands of the job, during the interview.

**Interviewer Style-Stress Index**

Table 4.14 suggests that interviewers do not use stress interviews. Below the mid-point category (5-9), were 42.86% of the interviewers. However, all of the interviewers fell below the mid-point (7.5). The stress index consists of three questions from the questionnaire. Each contributes a value of five and consequently it is not a sensitive index. The highest score attained was five out of a maximum of fifteen. A score of five places the interviewer within the mid-point category, giving a distorted view of the interviewer's style during the interview.
### Table 4.12
Responses to the Interviewer Format Index

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Format Index Scores</th>
<th>All Interviewers (N=7)</th>
<th>Male Interviewers (N=4)</th>
<th>Female Interviewers (N=3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 - 29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 - 24</td>
<td>14.29%</td>
<td></td>
<td>33.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 - 19</td>
<td>14.29%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - 14</td>
<td>28.57%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>33.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - 9</td>
<td>42.85%</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>33.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note** - Figures may not total 100.0%
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content Index Scores</th>
<th>All Interviewers (N=7)</th>
<th>Male Interviewers (N=4)</th>
<th>Female Interviewers (N=3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 - 44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 - 39</td>
<td>14.29%</td>
<td></td>
<td>33.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 - 34</td>
<td>28.57%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 - 29</td>
<td>14.29%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 - 24</td>
<td>14.29%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 - 19</td>
<td>14.29%</td>
<td></td>
<td>33.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - 14</td>
<td>14.29%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note - Figures may not total 100.0%*
### Table 4.14
Response to the Interviewer Style - Stress Index

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stress Index Scores</th>
<th>All Interviewers (N=7)</th>
<th>Male Interviewers (N=4)</th>
<th>Female Interviewers (N=3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - 14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - 9</td>
<td>57.14%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 - 4</td>
<td>42.86%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>66.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Figures may not total 100.0%*
Interviewer Style - Directive Index

As shown in Table 4.15, 85.71% of the interviewers fell below the mid-point category which was (25-29). No interviewer was in a category above the mid-point. The modal category was (5-9), representing 42.85% of the respondents.

Interviewer Style - Nondirective Index

As shown in Table 4.16, the interviewers scored higher on the nondirective index than on the directive index. Over half of the interviewers (57.14%) were at or above the mid-point category. The modal category is the mid-point. Below the mid-point, fell 42.86% of the respondents. The male interviewers were evenly distributed throughout the four categories (15-19, 20-24, 25-29, 30-34). The female interviewers were in two categories, 66.66% in the (25-29) category, and 33.33% in the (15-19) category. All of the interviewers categorized their interview as free response, giving the interviewee a large measure of responsibility for the formulation of responses. Consistent with the interviewer's style of interviewing, all interviewers encouraged the applicants to express their opinions during the interview. None of the interviewers restricted their participation to a limited extent. Also, no interviewer spent more than 50% of the interview time on subjective questions. The results seem to indicate that the interviewers chose a semi-nondirective interview style. The interviewers' scores were lowest on the stress index. The respondents scored slightly higher on the directive index. The nondirective index revealed the highest scores with 57.14% of the respondents at or above the mid-point and 42.86% below the mid-point category.
Table 4.15
Responses to the Interviewer Style - Directive Index

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Directive Index Scores</th>
<th>All Interviewers (N=7)</th>
<th>Male Interviewers (N=4)</th>
<th>Female Interviewers (N=3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 - 54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 - 49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 - 44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 - 39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 - 34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 - 29</td>
<td>14.29%</td>
<td></td>
<td>33.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 - 24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 - 19</td>
<td>28.57%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - 14</td>
<td>14.29%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - 9</td>
<td>42.85%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>66.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note - Figures may not total 100.0%
Table 4.16
Responses to the Interviewer Style - Nondirective Index

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nondirect Index Scores</th>
<th>All Interviewers (N=7)</th>
<th>Male Interviewers (N=4)</th>
<th>Female Interviewers (N=3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 - 54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 - 49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 - 44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 - 39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 - 34</td>
<td>14.29%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 - 29</td>
<td>42.85</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>66.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 - 24</td>
<td>14.29</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 - 19</td>
<td>28.57</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>33.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note - Figures may not total 100.0%
Interviewee Preparation Index

Table 4.17 shows that 17.14% of the interviewees were over the mid-point category. The modal category (5-9), included 45.72% of the respondents. Just over one-third 37.14% of the interviewees fell below the mid-point category.

The respondents' research consisted, for the most part, of discussing the position with friends. None of the respondents did four or more of the following:

(a) Visited the agency to observe the interpersonal atmosphere.
(b) Visited the agency to determine the dress code.
(c) Read an annual report.
(d) Read an agency journal.
(e) Discussed the job with target people within the agency.
(f) Did an information interview regarding the job with workers.

In general, the interviewees did not research the agency thoroughly before the hiring interview.

Interviewee Participation Index

Table 4.18 shows that 37.14% of the respondents were above the mid-point category. The modal category was (10-14), representing 37.14% of the interviewees. The participation index consists of three items from the questionnaire. It is interesting to note that none of the respondents sent a follow-up courtesy letter to the interviewer immediately after the interview.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preparation Index Scores</th>
<th>All Interviewees (N=35)</th>
<th>Male Interviewees (N=3)</th>
<th>Female Interviewees (N=32)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - 14</td>
<td>17.14%</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td>15.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - 9</td>
<td>42.72%</td>
<td>66.66%</td>
<td>43.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 - 4</td>
<td>37.14%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>40.63%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total**

|                          | 100.0%                   | 100.0%                  | 100.0%                    |

**Note** - Figures may not total 100.0%
Table 4.18
Responses to the Interviewee
  Participation Index

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participation Index Scores</th>
<th>All Interviewees (N=35)</th>
<th>Male Interviewees (N=3)</th>
<th>Female Interviewees (N=32)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - 14</td>
<td>37.14%</td>
<td></td>
<td>40.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - 9</td>
<td>28.57</td>
<td>66.66%</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 - 4</td>
<td>34.29</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>34.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note - Figures may not total 100.0%
Interviewee Satisfaction Index

Table 4.19 shows that 85.71% of the respondents were at or above the mid-point category. The figures, very dramatically show that the majority of the interviewees were satisfied with the interview. The modal category was (55-59), including 34.28% of the respondents. All of the males in the study were at or above the mid-point and 84.36% of the females were above the mid-point category.

All but four of the interviewees, 88.57%, stated that they were not interrupted during the interview. Regarding the interviewer/interviewee relationship, all interviewees felt satisfied to very satisfied in regard to the interest shown by the interviewers. Most interviewees (80%) felt very comfortable in expressing their views during the interview. The majority of interviewees, 87.71%, felt that the interviewers listened to them to a great extent during the interview. The respondents reported 88.57% in favour of the interviewer's nonverbal communication. It is not surprising that 74.29% of the interviewees felt that they had developed a rapport with the recruiter. It appears, from the results, that a satisfactory rapport developed between the interviewers and interviewees. These six questions represent 50% of the questions included in the index.

Interviewee's Perception of Format Index

As shown by Table 4.20, the majority of interviewees (62.85%) were under the mid-point category. This suggests that the interviewees did not understand the interview format. The modal category was (15-19) representing 28.37% of the respondents. Three categories, (10-14, 15-19...
Table 4.19
Responses to the Interviewee
Satisfaction Index

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction Index Scores</th>
<th>All Interviewees (N=35)</th>
<th>Male Interviewees (N=3)</th>
<th>Female Interviewees (N=32)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 - 59</td>
<td>34.28%</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td>34.37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 - 54</td>
<td>14.28</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>12.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 - 49</td>
<td>17.14</td>
<td>18.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 - 44</td>
<td>11.42</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 - 39</td>
<td>5.71</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 - 34</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 - 29</td>
<td>8.57</td>
<td>9.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 - 24</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 - 19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - 14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - 9</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 100.0% 100.0% 100.0%

Note - Figures may not total 100.0%
contain 74.14% of the interviewees. The sexes were similar in
that 66.66% of the male interviewees were below the mid-point and 62.50%
of the female interviewees were below the mid-point category.

The three most significant differences between the interviewees' experience and the theoretical interview model were: the interviewers' lack of summarizing the contents of the interview, the interviewer neglecting to sell the job and agency to the interviewee and the interviewer not providing the interviewee with complete and adequate information. Eighty percent of the interviewees did not feel the interviewer adequately summarized the material covered in the interview. Over half of the interviewees (68.57%) did not feel the interviewer attempted to sell the job and agency to them. Slightly over one-third of the interviewees (34.29%) did not feel they received adequate information about the job from the interviewer. These three topics represent 42.86% of the overall index and may account for the low index scores.

**Interviewee's Perception of Content Index**

The content index measures the depth and scope of topics covered in the interview. A perfect score of 50 would indicate that ten topics were thoroughly discussed. A score of 25 (mid-point) indicates that five topics were thoroughly discussed. A zero would mean that none of the topics were sufficiently covered.

Slightly over one-quarter (25.72%) of the respondents were at or above the mid-point. Below the mid-point category, were 74.28% of the interviewees. The male and female interviewees were similar in their scores, in that 66.66% of the males were below the mid-point
Table 4.20
Responses to the Interviewee Format Index

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Format Index Scores</th>
<th>All Interviewees (N=35)</th>
<th>Male Interviewees (N=3)</th>
<th>Female Interviewees (N=32)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 - 39</td>
<td>2.86%</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 - 34</td>
<td>8.57</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td>6.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 - 29</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 - 24</td>
<td>22.86</td>
<td></td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 - 19</td>
<td>28.57</td>
<td></td>
<td>31.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - 14</td>
<td>25.71</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - 9</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 - 4</td>
<td>5.71</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note - Figures may not total 100.0%*
category and 75.00% of the females were below the mid-point category.

The three content areas with the lowest scores on the index were: psychological testing, negative aspects of the management and organizational policies and interviewees' views on child welfare. One individual or 2.86% of the interviewees stated he had psychological testing during the recruitment process. A high percentage 91.43% of the interviewees felt that the negative aspects of the management and organization were not discussed to a great extent during the interview. Over three-quarters (77.14%) of the respondents were not requested to discuss their views on child welfare to a great extent. In general, it seems the scope and depth of the material covered in the interview could be improved, since 74.28% of the interviewees were under the mid-point category.

Interviewee's Perception of Stress Index

The stress index has a maximum score of 20, which indicates the interviewee experienced a stress interview. The mid-point of 10 denotes a stressful component to the interview. A zero indicates the interviewee did not believe that he or she was under stress during the interview.

The data in Table 4.22 reveals that the interviewees experienced little stress in their selection interviews. Below the mid-point category, were 91.42% of the respondents. Two individuals, or 5.72% of the sample were above the mid-point category. The modal category was (0-4) representing 68.57% of the interviewees. Four interviewees (11.43%) categorized their interview as stressful and felt, to a great extent, that the interviewers intentionally created stress. Slightly over half of the respondents (51.43%) were satisfied to very satisfied with the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content Index Scores</th>
<th>All Interviewees (N=35)</th>
<th>Male Interviewees (N=3)</th>
<th>Female Interviewees (N=32)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>2.86%</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td>9.37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 - 49</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 - 44</td>
<td></td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td>9.37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 - 39</td>
<td>8.57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 - 34</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 - 29</td>
<td>8.57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 - 24</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td>18.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 - 19</td>
<td>11.43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - 14</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td>9.37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - 9</td>
<td>5.71</td>
<td></td>
<td>21.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 - 4</td>
<td>17.14</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note - Figures may not total 100.0%
Table 4.22
Responses to the Interviewee Stress Index

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stress Index Scores</th>
<th>All Interviewees (N=35)</th>
<th>Male Interviewees (N=3)</th>
<th>Female Interviewees (N=32)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.86%</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 - 19</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - 14</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - 9</td>
<td>22.85</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td>21.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 - 4</td>
<td>68.57</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td>71.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note - Figures may not total 100.0%
relationship they developed with the recruiters during the interview. In general, the figures indicate that stress interviewing was not practiced in the sample studied.

**Interviewee's Perception of Directive Index**

The directive index measures the degree to which the interviewee perceived the selection interview as a limited response interview. The limited response interview is one in which the interviewer has a prepared list of questions which are asked in a predetermined manner. A score of 50 would indicate a very directive interview. A mid-point of 25 would imply that the interview was structured to a certain extent. Zero would indicate an absence of a directive interview. The figures in Table 4.23 suggest a lack of directiveness in the interview. A majority of the respondents (82.85%) scored below the mid-point category. At and above the mid-point category, were 17.15% of the interviewees. The modal category (15-19) represents 31.42% of the interviewees. All of the males and 81.24% of the females fell below the mid-point. The data suggests that the recruiters in this study were not using directive interviewing to a large extent.

**Interviewee's Perception of Nondirective Index**

The nondirective index measures the extent to which the selection interview was free-response, meaning that the applicant had a large measure of freedom and responsibility for the formulation of the response. A maximum score of 50 indicates that the interview was nondirective. The mid-point is 25. A score of zero indicates that the employment
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Directive Index Scores</th>
<th>All Interviewees (N=35)</th>
<th>Male Interviewees (N=3)</th>
<th>Female Interviewees (N=32)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 - 44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 - 39</td>
<td>2.86%</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 - 34</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 - 29</td>
<td>11.43</td>
<td></td>
<td>12.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 - 24</td>
<td>17.14</td>
<td></td>
<td>18.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 - 19</td>
<td>31.42</td>
<td></td>
<td>34.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - 14</td>
<td>17.14</td>
<td></td>
<td>66.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - 9</td>
<td>14.29</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>12.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 - 4</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note - Figures may not total 100.0%
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nondirective Index Scores</th>
<th>All Interviewees (N=35)</th>
<th>Male Interviewees (N=3)</th>
<th>Female Interviewees (N=32)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 - 49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 - 44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 - 39</td>
<td>2.86%</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 - 34</td>
<td>14.29</td>
<td></td>
<td>15.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 - 29</td>
<td>22.86</td>
<td>66.66%</td>
<td>18.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 - 24</td>
<td>14.29</td>
<td></td>
<td>15.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 - 19</td>
<td>37.14</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>37.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - 14</td>
<td>5.71</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - 9</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note - Figures may not total 100.0%
interview was no longer nondirective. Under half of the respondents, 40.01% rated their interview as at or above the mid-point category. As shown in Table 4.24, 59.99% were below the mid-point category (25-29). The modal category (15-19) represents 37.14% of the interviewees. There seems to be a strong nondirective element to the interview as interpreted by the interviewees. In conclusion, selection interviews appear to have a nondirective component. However, the amount the interviewer talked and the type of questions asked (closed or direct) suggests that there was a blending of interviewing styles.

Relationships Among Indexes

Intra-group and inter-group index comparisons will be made. First, the interviewer indexes will be compared in order to determine if these indexes are consistent with each other. A similar procedure will follow in order to assess interviewee index patterns, trends and relationships. Finally, the interviewer and interviewee indexes will be compared for similarities and differences.

Interviewer Index Comparisons

The majority of interviewers (71.42%) were at or above the mid-point category on the content index. A significant percentage (28.58%) fell below the mid-point. This suggests that some interviewers did not comprehensively cover a wide variety of topics.

The data on the preparation index revealed 57.14% of the respondents scored at or above the mid-point. Since 42.86% of the interviewers fell below the mid-point, there appears to be a lack of planning
and organizing on the part of some interviewers.

The interviewers scored poorly on the format index. Since 71.43% of the respondents fell below the mid-point category. It appears that the interviewers in the study did not generally introduce the interview format to the interviewee. That is, they did not summarize the major points in the interview or sell the position and agency to the candidate.

Interviewer style indexes revealed that the scores ranged from stress to directive and nondirective interviewing. The stress index scores indicated that stress interviewing is seldom used by the sample interviewers. All of the respondents fell under the mid-point and 42.86% of the sample were in the lowest category (0-4).

The directive index scores were slightly higher than the stress index. Almost all of the respondents (85.71%) were below the mid-point category. The modal category, (5-9) was 42.86%. In general, the figures suggest that the selection interviews had a low directive component.

The respondents scored the highest on the nondirective index. At or above the mid-point category were 57.14% of the interviewers. The modal category was the mid-point category (25-29) which represented 42.86% of the sample. The higher index score of the nondirective index is consistent with the interviewers' goals. One objective of the questionnaire was to directly and indirectly measure the interviewer style. One of the questions on the questionnaire requested the interviewer to categorize his interviewing style. All of the interviewers labelled their interviewing approach as nondirective. In the more indirect questions:
To what degree did the interviewer talk during the interview; To what degree did the interviewer determine the length of interviewee's responses; To what degree did the interviewer determine the topics for discussion; What type of questions did the interviewer ask (objective vs. subjective), all indicated that the interviewers did not use a nondirective approach. The nondirective index seems to reflect the interviewers' style of interviewing more than the stress and directive indexes do.

Yet, there is a discrepancy between the index scores and what interviewers reported they did. All the interviewers stated they employed a nondirective interview, but, when an index was developed to measure nondirectiveness, 57.14% of the interviewers were at or above the mid-point category and 42.86% were below the mid-point category. Perhaps interviewers were using a combination of a directive/nondirective interview.

**Interviewee Index Comparisons**

The most striking figures among the interviewee indexes appeared in the interviewee satisfaction index. At or above the mid-point, were 85.71% of the interviewees. This index ranges from (0-60). The modal category was (55-59), representing 34.29% of the respondents. The index measures positive comments made by the interviewees regarding the interviewer and interview. The majority of interviewees found the interview to be a positive experience. Many of the interviewees were not well prepared for the selection interview, since 37.14% of the respondents had scores below the mid-point category. The mode was the mid-point category (5-9), representing 45.71% of the interviewees.

The participation index measures the interviewees' degree of
involvement in the interview. Over half of the respondents, (65.71%) placed at or above the mid-point and 34.29% of the interviewees scored below the mid-point category. The high percentage of respondents under the mid-point is puzzling, considering the non-threatening environment developed during the interview as evidenced by the satisfaction index scores. Also, the interviewer nondirective style allows the interviewee to control the content of the interview. It is in the applicant’s interest to prepare and participate in the selection interview.

The format index measures the interviewees’ understanding and orientation of the interview agenda. Over one half, 62.86%, of the respondents scored under the mid-point category. This suggests that the majority of interviewees did not fully understand the recruitment process in which they were involved.

The content index gauges the interviewees’ perception of the number and depth of topics covered in the interview. Over one-quarter (25.72%), of the respondents were at or above the mid-point category and 74.28% of the respondents were below the mid-point category. According to the data, a significant portion of the interviewees’ (74.28%), observed that less than five topics were discussed during their interviews. This indicates a lack of preparation and planning by the interviewers and interviewees.

Three indexes were developed to measure interviewer style: stress, directive and nondirective. According to the interviewees’ responses, the stress interview was seldom used by interviewers, since 91.43% of the respondents were below the mid-point category. The mode
was the (0-4) category representing 68.37% of the respondents. Stress clearly did not play a major role in the respondents' interviews.

The directive interview was more common than the stress interview in that 82.86% of the interviewees were below the mid-point category (25-29). The modal category is (15-19), representing 31.42% of the interviewees. The directive selection interview was an uncommon occurrence within this sample.

The nondirective interview was the most common interviewing style reported by the interviewees, since 40.01% of the interviewees were at or above the mid-point category (25-29). The modal category was (15-19) representing 37.14% of the respondents. The nondirective interview was the most common interviewing style according to the data, but even this approach was not observed by a majority of the respondents, since 59.99% scored under the mid-point on the nondirective index.

Comparison Between Interviewer and Interviewee Indexes

As both interviewer and interviewee have information to obtain from each other during the selection interview, it is necessary for the interviewees and interviewers to prepare for the interview. Having done this, they can efficiently and effectively meet their goals. If the interviewee does not prepare for the interview, this puts a heavy burden on the interviewer. The interviewee is not seen in the best light and when the interviewee has not thought about his or her career needs, desires and objectives, the interview becomes inefficient. The interviewer must also have knowledge of the applicant's background and employment record if maximum use is to be made of interviewing time. Over one-
third of the interviewees (37.14%) and 42.87% of the interviewers were below the mid-point category on their preparation indexes. These figures suggest that a large percentage of interviewing participants did not prepare for the interview.

Interview orientation was poor, as reflected in the format indexes, since 71.43% of the interviewers fell below the mid-point category and 62.86% of the interviewees were below the mid-point category. If the applicants knew the sequence of events to follow in the interview, their nervousness may have decreased.

There was a large discrepancy between the interviewer and interviewee content indexes, as 25.72% of the interviewees were at or above the mid-point and 71.42% of the interviewers were at or above the mid-point. The majority of the interviewees did not believe that many topics were thoroughly discussed.

The interviewing style was ranked by the interviewers and interviewees in a similar way. In the stress index, all of the interviewers fell below the mid-point and 91.43% of the interviewees scored below the mid-point category.

Respondents indicated that the directive interview was used more than the stress interview. Interviewer and interviewee figures are similar: 82.85% of the interviewees were below the mid-point and 85.71% of the interviewers were below the mid-point category. These figures suggest that although more frequent than the stress interview, the directive interview did not play a large role in the population used for this study.
Both groups observed that the nondirective interview was the dominant style of interviewing. Over half of the interviewers, (57.14%) and 40.01% of the interviewees were at or above the mid-point category.

**Summary**

This chapter presented a description of the sample of social service workers used in this study. Respondents were described in terms of the demographic variables from section A of the questionnaires. This chapter also described interviewee and interviewer indexes and compared the indexes within and between each group.
CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

This chapter compares the findings of the study with the theoretical selection interview model. The respondents' descriptions of their selection interview style, objectives and content was similar to that outlined in the theoretical model. There was a discrepancy between the theoretical selection interview model and the respondents' preparation and format of the selection interview. The findings in this study indicated that respondents' preparation and planning were not done in the depth and detail outlined by the model. The interview format, as described by the model, was rarely followed in all aspects related to the research question proposed or the elements of the recruitment process. Recruiters, in this study, perceived the selection interview to be just one component of the recruitment process. Application forms, resumes and references were used by all respondents. This diversified approach was stressed in the literature.

Objectives of the Selection Interview

The literature on the selection interview varies in regard to objectives, methods and content. The three questions Downs (1968) posed in his survey were included in this study. The interviewer respondents ranked as first priority: "To find out what kind of person the applicant is." Second was, "To provide information about the job." and third,
"To determine the applicant's non-personal qualifications."

The interviewee respondents ranked as first priority: "To find out what kind of person the applicant is." Second was, "To determine the applicant's non-personal qualifications." Third, "To provide information about the job."

Priority was given by the interviewers and interviewees to determine the applicant's personality characteristics. This is similar to Downs' (1968) survey. The participants in the interview seem to share common expectations. These common expectations between interviewer and interviewee probably assisted them in reaching their goals.

At an abstract level all theorists agreed on the general goal of the selection interview, which is to select an applicant who: (1) can fulfill the requirements of the job description, (2) is willing and motivated to work, (3) is able to get along with other members of the organization, and (4) agrees with the organization's values and goals. (Schneider, 1976).

However, when these objectives were implemented into strategies, differences occurred. These differences will be discussed under, "Methods of the Selection Interview."

Methods of Selection Interviewing

There is a great deal of variety in the literature concerning the methods for obtaining the above objectives. The number of interviews before selection varies as does the number of people participating in the interview. Seventeen (48.59%) of the interviewees reported they had two interviews. Under one-third of the interviewees (31.43%) had one
Interview. Altogether, 80.02% of the interviewees had one or two interviews. Only 11.43% of the interviewees had three interviews. The norm appeared to be one or two interviews before the candidate was selected. The figures reflected what would be expected in the recruitment of entry level personnel.

The literature used for this study discussed a variety of approaches used in selecting personnel, such as, dyads, triads, panel or board interviews and group interviews, (Medley, 1978).

Table 4.8 in Chapter IV indicates that one of the common methods of interviewing is the dyad, which consists of one interviewer and one interviewee. This style was used in slightly over one-third, (35.29%), of the interviews.

The panel or board interview, as shown in Table 4.8, equals the dyad in popularity. Over one-third of the interviewees (35.29%) had this style of interviewing. The board interview consists of three or more interviewers and one interviewee. The triad consists of two interviewers and one interviewee. Ten interviewees or 29.41% had this type of interview. It is interesting to note that there were no groups consisting of more than one interviewee.

The researcher received the impression from the literature review that the norm for the selection interview was one interviewer and one interviewee. This norm was not reflected in this study, as 64.71% of the interviewees did not have this kind of interview. In effect, most selection interviews took place within a group context. Wilmot defines that, "A collection of three or more individuals constitutes a small
group." (1979, p. 18). Little material was found on the influence that a group has on the applicant. As described in Chapter II the basic characteristics of groups emerge when three or more people interact. If a group is to be used in selection interviewing, the above characteristics should be considered.

The three common interviewing styles quoted in the literature are: stress, directive and nondirective interviewing. In the literature used for this study, stress interviewing was not considered conducive to providing relevant, reliable and valid information. The stress interview is difficult to interpret. If the applicant does respond appropriately, it still does not answer many of the interviewer's questions. If the interviewee does not respond appropriately, it does not mean that the candidate lacks the qualifications needed for the position. As shown by Table 4.14, 57.14% of the interviewees were at the mid-point category on the stress index and 42.86% were below the mid-point category. As Table 4.22 indicates, 91.43% of the interviewees were below the mid-point category on the stress index. Both interviewer and interviewee index scores indicate that the stress interview was rarely used with this sample population.

The directive or structured interview is frequently discussed in the literature as a common approach to selection interviewing. Ulrich and Trumbo (1965) suggest that the structured interview provides the most reliable interview. As shown by Table 4.15, 85.71% of the interviewer respondents were below the mid-point category. Table 4.23 reveals that 82.56% of the interviewees were below the mid-point category. These
findings reveal that the structured interview was uncommon in the sample used for this study. Perhaps recruiters should consider Ulrich and Trumbo's (1965) recommendations when developing their recruitment procedures.

Since nondirective interviewing is a common style used for counselling, a blending between the therapeutic interview and the selection interview can be expected. The figures support this view. As revealed in Table 4.16, 57.14% of the interviewers were at or above the mid-point category and 42.86% of the interviewers were below the mid-point category. On the nondirective interview, as shown in Table 4.24, 40.01% of the interviewees were at or above the mid-point and 59.99% were below the mid-point category in the nondirective index. In summary, all of the interviewers categorized their interviewing style as nondirective and 82.80% of the interviewers perceived their interview as nondirective. The indexes support interviewer and interviewee perception. The interviewees' nondirective index scores were higher than the directive and stress index scores. The directive interview was ranked as second by both the interviewers and the interviewees, directive indexes and the stress index was ranked as third.

A predominant counselling technique is the nondirective interview. As measured by this study, the nondirective interview was the prevalent interviewing style employed by recruiters. Hence, the recruiters must be aware of the carry-over effect as described in Chapter II of this study. As pointed out by a number of researchers (Wasser, 1962; Langer, 1978; Abelson, 1976) social workers may have over-learned non-
directive interviewing and unconsciously apply it whenever they are in an interview situation. Social workers must take precautions against this "scripted" behaviour and not allow it to interfere with their objectives (Abelson, 1976, p. 33).

Content of the Selection Interviews

The content of the selection interview is subject to various interpretations. Goodworth (1979) believes the selection interviewer should carry out a comprehensive and accurate background investigation. Jackson (1976) believes the purpose of the interview is to obtain information, facts and opinions and to predict future performances of the applicant. These two representative definitions of the selection interview imply different areas to be covered during an interview. The first definition suggests that only factual material need be discussed. The second definition encourages the candidate to reveal personal goals, aspirations, discuss likes and dislikes and career plans.

In this study, interviewer respondents scored reasonably well on the content index. As shown by Table 4,13 in Chapter IV, 71.42% of the interviewers were at or above the mid-point category. Slightly over one-quarter (25.72%) of the interviewees were at or above the mid-point and 74.28% were under the mid-point category. The majority of interviewees reported that under five topics were discussed in depth.

Interviewer Preparation for the Selection Interview

As stated above, there is little discrepancy in the literature on the interviewers' and interviewees' preparation and planning, interview
format and the recruitment procedures. The literature was unanimous in matching the requirements of the position with the qualifications of the applicant. Moffatt (1979) and Fine (1968) stress the need to do a job analysis and job description in order to determine the requirements of the position. Compton and Galaway (1975) emphasize the team concept of social work and emphasize the need for an organizational analysis. From this job and organizational analysis, requirements needed for the position could be obtained. This analysis forms the base of the criteria used in the search for qualified personnel. As shown by Table 4.9, 57.14% of the interviewers stated job descriptions existed for the positions and 14.29% of the interviewers used job specifications. As shown by Table 4.10, five or (14.29%) of the interviewees were shown a job description. Two or (5.71%) of the interviewees were shown job specifications. The findings indicate that there is a lack of job and organizational analysis. This lack of planning would only hinder the recruiter's search for the ideal candidate. If agency requirements or needs were not explored, it would be difficult to effectively select an appropriate candidate. An applicant's qualifications become meaningful only in the context of the position and organizational requirements. For example, the ability to tolerate boredom may be an advantage for the security guard, but a disadvantage for a salesman.

Other aspects of preparing for the interview are: the completion of application forms, background investigation and use of reference evaluation forms and selection evaluation forms. Almost all of the interviewers (85.71%), required the applicant to complete an application form,
as indicated in Table 4.9. All of the interviewers routinely made reference checks. Reference evaluation forms were not used by any of the interviewers. Only one or 14.29% of the interviewers used a selection evaluation form. The reference evaluation forms and selection evaluation forms should be used for all candidates. These recruitment forms provide internal consistency for evaluation purposes, highlight relevant experience and competence or lack of it, expedite the selection process and assist recruiters in the screening of applicants, (Ryan & Ullery, 1976).

Use of the recruitment forms may also stimulate the interviewer to gather information which is relevant to the needs of the position and agency. Also, the selection forms may serve to heighten interviewer awareness by specifying the goals and objectives of each step. This may prevent the interviewer from lapsing into a routine and automatic role as described by Langer (1978).

The majority of the interviewers (85.71%) did not take notes to any great extent during the interview. Most of the interviewers (85.71%) reported they took notes after the interview. A study done by Carlson (1971) suggests that memory quickly fails. Carlson found that when twenty interviewers were asked twenty questions on the interview they had just completed, half of the interviewers could answer only 50% of the questions. The interviewers who had the best recall took notes during the interview. Unless notes are taken at the time of the interview or immediately after, candidates may begin to look alike after a day's interviewing.
As shown in Table 4.10, 71.43% of the interviewees completed a job application form. Slightly more, 80% sent a resume to the organization.

Two or (5.71%) of the interviewees were asked to show proof of their credentials. Less than half, 42.86% of the interviewees reported that interviewers did not take notes during the interview. It is surprising that applicants were rarely asked to show proof of their credentials, as this should be an automatic first step in assessing the candidate. The interviewees indicate that just under one-half of the interviewers do not take notes. Considering the Carlson study, note taking during the interview appears to be a necessary procedure to safeguard against poor recall.

**Format of the Selection Interview**

There was a consensus in the literature on the description of the interview format. Stewart and Cash (1978) portray a format as consisting of a beginning, middle and end. In the opening or beginning, the interviewer attempts to establish a rapport and introduce the purpose and nature of the interview for the applicant. The middle or body consists of the areas to be explored, questions that need to be asked and things to look for. The end contains a summing up, noting if and when results will be available, answering questions the interviewee may have and thanking the interviewee for their time and effort. Table 4.12 shows that 14.29% of the interviewers were above the mid-point on the format index and 71.42% of the interviewers were below the mid-point. As shown by Table 4.20, 37.14% of the interviewees were at or above the mid-point
and over one-half, (62.86%) of the interviewees were below the mid-point on the format index. In both groups of respondents, the majority fell below the mid-point on the format index. These indexes indicate that the interview format in the study sample did not follow the format described by the model. Perhaps the interviewers may have been more effective if they had followed the format employed by the model. If interviewees knew the format of the interview, for example, what is expected of them and the length of the interview, they would be able to relax and put their energies into other areas. The last question on the interviewee questionnaire was open-ended and asked for suggestions to improve the effectiveness of the interview. Fourteen, or (40%) of the interviewees completed the question. Five of the fourteen interviewees felt the format of the interview should be improved. (see Appendices F & H for complete derivation).

**Recruitment Process**

The literature agreed that the selection interview was only one aspect of the recruitment process. This is particularly important for recruiters to keep in mind since the selection interview has not been proven to be a valid and reliable means of collecting information, (Ulrich & Trumbo, 1965). Consequently, it is wise to use different recruiting methods and to have a larger sampling of the applicant's behaviour under different conditions. The interview, application forms, resumes, references and psychological testing may all provide valuable information on the applicant. Each of the five procedures can assess or test an aspect of the candidate's behaviour. Together, they may give a
comprehensive view of the candidate.

As shown in Table 4.9, the interviewers used various methods for assessing the applicant's application forms, reference checks and resumes were used by all of the interviewers. None of the interviewers and only one of the interviewees stated psychological testing (intelligence and personality) was done. Wagner (1949) believes that an applicant's intelligence can be accurately assessed from biographical data as well as from an interview. McClelland (1973) writes, "... the results of tests and academic achievements only allows one to predict how well the individual will do on further tests and schoolwork. Neither tests nor school grades seem to have much power in predicting real competence in life's outcomes." (p. 6). McClelland further states that the current focus on intelligence testing should be abandoned and that more steps should be made towards criterion sampling based on job analysis. For example, "... if you want to test who will be a good policeman, go find out what a policeman does. Follow him around, make a list of his activities and sample from that list in screening applicants." (p. 6).

The approach described by McClelland is similar to the approach described in the literature on job and organizational analysis as described above.

Testing for personality factors appears to be in the exploratory stage. It is of questionable validity and reliability, (Dahlstrom 1969). Allport (1953) reports in an experimental study that projective tests failed to show the craving of food among men on a starvation diet. The number of food associations actually declined with longer periods of fasting. Psychological tests failed to uncover this unsatisfied need in the subjects.
Simulations seem to resemble McClelland's (1973) proposition. They provide an opportunity to assess the applicant's knowledge, skills and abilities. Simulations include role playing, hypothetical problem situations or discussion of one of the applicant cases. Three, or (42.86%) of the interviewers did not use simulation. The remaining 57.14% of the interviewers employed some form of simulation. Slightly under one-half of the interviewees (45.71%) reported simulations were not used during their interview. Downs et al. (1980) writes, "It is suitable for an interviewer to ask an employee how he or she might perform in a specific circumstance. These hypothetical situations need to be clearly described and fairly typical. They can reveal much about a candidate's perspective and how he or she thinks." (pp. 125-6).

Recruiters and interviewees can use simulations to assist them in reaching their objectives. As Downs et al. (1980) suggest that simulations may enable the recruiters to assess the applicant's response to concrete and specific situations. The interviewees, in turn, can use simulations to their advantage by conveying to the interviewer exactly what skills and benefits they have to offer the organization.

Every agency should have a training-program and a built-in system for monitoring, collecting feedback and analyzing the effectiveness of the recruitment program. This is particularly crucial, since selection interviewing has not proven to be valid and reliable. As the studies described earlier (Shaw, 1968; Rusmore, 1968) reported that only 5% and 7% of the organizations sampled attempted to measure the effectiveness of their own recruitment practices.
An enriching environment may be the result of such a training program. Studies (Davis & Wicklund, 1972; Petty & Cacioppo, 1977) have found that if individuals were expected to defend or discuss their performance it was of higher quality and if subjects are encouraged to reflect on their role behavior their consciousness is raised. In other words, if people are aware of their behavior or its implications and consequences, they will be in a higher state of awareness and act accordingly. A recruitment training program may increase interviewers' awareness of their roles and increase the performances of these roles.

Interviewee Preparation for the Selection Interview

The literature stressed the joint process of the selection interview, (Downs et al., 1980). Interviewer and interviewee have unique purposes and require information about each other so that they may accomplish their goals. An interviewee must prepare and plan for an interview as efficiently as recruiters do in order to obtain information on the position and organization.

The following interviewee preparation steps have been outlined in the literature:

(1) Interviewees should do a self analysis which involves taking inventory of skills, knowledge, training, experience, interest, goals and needs.

(2) Job applicants should list their most important needs and goals.

(3) Candidates should match jobs and organizations with their needs, desires and goals for the future.
(4) Individuals should decide on the geographical area within which they would like to work and approach organizations within that location.

(5) Applicants should research the organization. This involves determining: the quality of service provided, the organization's image in the community, the specific descriptions of the position, knowledge of the interviewer's personality, and problems the organization is experiencing.

These goals can be accomplished by visiting the agency to observe its atmosphere, dress code and style of relating. An information interview on the agency of interest, may provide information on its needs and problems.

(6) The applicants' job tactics and strategies are a result of the research that has been carried out.

(7) Interviewees should be prepared to participate in the selection interview. They should become familiar with their own skills, knowledge and experience and with the various interviewing styles. It is possible to role play the interview situation until the role of the interviewee is mastered. It would be advantageous for the applicants to tape record their voice and critique its pronunciations, clarity and volume.

(8) Interviewees should be prompt, appropriately dressed, warm and responsive and follow the interviewer's lead. The interviewee should observe the interviewer's verbal and nonverbal behaviour so that the interviewee can act accordingly.
(9) Interviewees should be prepared to supply the content for the interview. This is particularly likely to occur if the selection interview is nondirective. Applicants should have an agenda in mind which outlines the areas they would like to cover during the interview. Questions should be answered positively and applicants should be prepared to demonstrate their knowledge and skills to interviewers by discussing past cases and hypothetical problem situations.

(10) If interviewees wish to create a favourable impression with the interviewer, a follow-up "Thank-you" letter should be sent to the agency. For candidates still being considered, a follow-up letter which elaborates on the points discussed in the interview can be sent.

The Davis and Wicklund (1972) and Petty and Cacioppo (1977) studies suggest that interviewees could benefit by preparing and planning their goals and establishing objectives and strategies for the selection interview. Unless such planning is undertaken, interviewees are likely to lapse into a reduced state of self-awareness as described by Langer (1978) and Abelson (1976), thus limiting their effectiveness.

The findings in this study indicate that none of the respondents completed a job search program. None of the respondents sent a follow-up letter to the recruiters after the interview, nor did any of the interviewees read an annual report. Also, none of the interviewees responded with a seven on the one to seven scaled question, "To what extent did you introduce topics during the interview?" Finally, none of the respondents scored the maximum on the preparation index.
As shown by Table 4.17, 37.14% of the interviewees scored under the mid-point category and 62.86% of the respondents were at or above the mid-point on the preparation index.

As indicated by Table 4.18, 34.29% of the interviewees scored below the mid-point category on the participation index. The selection interviews in this study were predominantly nondirective. The very definition of that term means that the interviewer is giving control of the content to the interviewee. Interviewees should be prepared to take control of the content of an interview. They should also present themselves in the best light and volunteer information that demonstrates their qualifications. These two indexes indicate a significant degree of passivity on the part of the interviewees and a neglect of their role.

Summary

The study findings are similar to the theoretical selection interview model on objectives, methods, content and components of interviewing. Most noticeable was how interviewers deviated from the theoretical model in terms of preparation and format. The interviewees deviated from their roles by not being as prepared and active in the interviewing process.
CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of this exploratory study was to explore the research question: Is the social work employment interview, as perceived by interviewers and interviewees in three Children's Aid Societies, different from or similar to a theoretical employment interview model that has been developed from the literature, and finally, what are the implications?

The findings of this study agree with some points and disagree with others from the theoretical model. The interview objectives, methods, and variety of recruitment procedures in this study are in accordance with the theoretical model. The lack of interviewer and interviewee preparation for the interview was the most significant deviation from the theoretical model. Also, the low scores on the format indexes suggest that the interviews in the study were not in agreement with the interview format of the theoretical model. Finally, the low scores on the interviewees' content index indicate that few topics were stressed and probed in detail. This is unfortunate, since it defeats the purpose of the selection interview.

The literature emphasized the prevalence of the interview as a tool in the recruitment of personnel. According to surveys (Spiegel & James, 1957; "Survey finds . . .", 1977), the selection interview appears to be used by most organizations. The selection interview seems
to be best suited to serve the needs of the interviewee and interviewer. The selection interview allows the interviewer to assess the applicant's qualifications, expertise, interpersonal behaviour, motivation, energy level and initiative. The interviewee can also observe the working environment and obtain a flavour of the interpersonal atmosphere of the organization.

Studies on the selection interview indicate that directive or structured interviews are more reliable than unstructured or nondirective interviews. In addition, the literature reviewed stressed the need for interviewer and interviewee preparation prior to the interview. The selection interview was seen as one of many tools available to the recruiter. Other components of the recruitment process, such as application forms, references and resumes supplément the interview.

Recommendations

There are a number of recommendations which arise from this study. They fall into four categories: interviewer, agency, interviewee and recommendations for further research. The recommendations are action oriented. They outline steps which may be immediately acted on and incorporated into practices and procedures.

Interviewer Recommendations

The four recommendations which follow are suggested proposals which may assist interviewers in the performance of their duties. The recommendations are comprised of two interview functions which are preparation and methodology.
(1) None of the interviewers in this study and only 5.72% of the interviewees scored over the mid-point category on the directive interview index. These figures indicate that few interviews in this sample were directive. Research studies (Ulrich & Trumbo, 1965) suggest that directive interviews are more reliable than nondirective interviews. Consequently, interviewers should consider incorporating directive selection interviews into their recruitment programs. Structured interviews provide the interviewer with a framework which may reduce the negative influences of situational factors, such as the "halo effect". The halo effect may have positive and negative influences. For example, an applicant may appear more qualified if the previous candidate interviewed was inadequate. Also, if an interviewer is impressed with one characteristic of the applicant, he may overlook the applicant's other traits.

(2) Interviewers are vulnerable to the "carryover effect", which is transferring the interviewing skills used in the therapeutic context to the selection interview. To eliminate or reduce the carryover effect, recruiters should use selection evaluation forms, reference evaluation forms and take notes on the applicants during the interview. The recruitment forms would assist interviewers in gathering relevant information from the applicants. In effect, these forms permit the interviewers to be more effective problem solvers by highlighting interview goals, objectives and strategies.

(3) Simulations such as role playing and hypothetical problem
solving allow one to test the applicant's theoretical knowledge as well as his or her actual working knowledge. More experimentation with simulations while interviewing may increase interviewer effectiveness.

(4) The literature on the selection interview stressed the need to match the job requirements with the applicant's qualifications. Interviewers should have access to job descriptions and job specifications which will assist them in screening and selecting the qualified candidates.

Agency Recommendations

The researcher suggests that agencies devote more time and resources to the recruitment process. The recommendations which follow are concerned with interviewing, evaluation, training programs and preparation.

(1) Studies (Shaw, 1968; Rusmore, 1968) suggest that organizations rarely evaluate their interviewing programs. Valid selection practices allow interviewers to place more confidence in their interviewing programs. It is recommended that agencies evaluate their recruitment programs in order to assess their effectiveness.

(2) Interviewers, as mentioned above, are likely to be influenced by the carryover effect. Also, they may function in a stereotype or "scripted" manner. Scripted behaviour occurs when an individual performs routine duties in an automatic fashion. Interviewer training programs which are designed to highlight the interview objectives, methods and strategies may ensure a high quality of selection
interviewing. It is recommended that agencies implement interviewer training programs. The organization would benefit through improved recruitment programs.

(3) As stated above, job descriptions and job specifications provide a guide for recruiters and alert them to the requirements of the position. This will assist them to recruit more effectively. Ideally, if agencies had job descriptions and job specifications, it would facilitate the selection of personnel. The researcher recommends that agencies have job descriptions and specifications for each position.

Interviewee Recommendations

The recommendations which follow suggest that the interviewee become more involved in the preparation and participation of the selection interview.

(1) Interviewees should be aware of their strengths and weaknesses, likes and dislikes. This self-assessment will assist interviewees in realizing their goals. It is recommended that interviewees prepare, plan and research the organizations in anticipation of the selection interview.

(2) Interviewees require information on the position and organization before they can make a decision to enter an employer/employee contract. This study found that the nondirective interviewing style is common in social service recruitment. Interviewees should use the nondirective interviewing style to their advantage. It is recommended that if the nondirective interview is used, the interviewees
should be prepared to control its content.

If other interviewing styles, such as stress or directive occur, it is recommended that interviewees be prepared to control or influence the content of the selection interview.

Recommendations for Further Research

The research recommendations pertain to interviewing methods and further development of the data collection instrument. Interviewing styles: group vs. dyad, and directive, nondirective and stress, constitute the independent variables. Interviewing effectiveness as measured by the applicant's success on the job and interviewee's perception of his or her relationship with the interviewer may be used as the dependent variables.

(1) Sixty-five percent of the interviewee respondents in this study reported they had a selection interview with two or more interviewers. The popularity of the group interview raises the question of its effectiveness, as opposed to the dyad in selecting personnel. Also, the effects on individuals in the group need to be considered.

To investigate interviewing effectiveness, the researcher suggests that two samples of forty interviewees be taken: one group assigned to the group method of selection and the other group assigned to the dyadic interview for their in-depth or hiring interview. Interviewer's predictions and assessments of the candidate's suitability for the position made at the point of hiring could be compared and contrasted to the employees' progress six months later. This comparison would permit a researcher to estimate the effective-
ness of each interviewing method.

Interviewee respondents would also complete an interviewee questionnaire similar to the one used in this study, in order to obtain the interviewee's perception of his or her relationship with the interviewers. It would also record the interviewee's perception of the effectiveness of the selection interview. In summary, the data collected on the interviewee's success on the job and his or her perceptions of the interview could be compared for reliability and validity.

(2) The three interviewing styles, directive, nondirective and stress can be compared for effectiveness, as described above for groups and dyads. Interviewers could be instructed to perform the three styles in a systematic and standard way. Three groups of thirty interviewees could participate. Each group of thirty could be assigned to each interviewing style. Interviewers' predictions for the three groups could be compared to measure interviewing effectiveness.

Secondly, interviewees would complete a questionnaire gathering information on their estimation of the effectiveness of the interview and their relationship with the interviewers.

A third validity check could be made by comparing ten interviewers with the highest scores for effectiveness and rapport, on the interviewee questionnaire with ten interviewers who obtained the lowest score. These interviewers could be rated on film by trained judges. In summary, data collected from three sources: interviewees' progress on the job, interviewee questionnaires and
films of interviewers rated by trained judges would provide checks on the validity of the data.

The indexes used in this study may be further tested and refined in another study. Logical or face validity could be examined by surveying a large number of interviewers and interviewees to determine the clarity and completeness of the index questions.

A second validity check would be to compare ten interviewers who receive the most positive scores from the interviewee questionnaires with ten interviewers who receive the least positive scores. These twenty interviewers could be rated on film by using trained judges and interviewers. These two procedures may serve to validate the indexes.

Conclusions

In terms of the research question, the study findings were similar to the theoretical model regarding interview style, objectives, content and overall recruitment practices. The major differences between the theoretical model and the findings were: lack of interviewer and interviewee preparation, insufficient position and organization analysis and unsatisfactory interviewing format and lack of topics covered.

The interview style was predominantly nondirective, which is a common method discussed in the literature. The stress interview was a rare occurrence; this also is compatible with the literature. Few theorists favoured the stress interview. The directive interview was not common in this study. Only one interviewer and six of the interviewees scored high on the directive index.
Interviewers and interviewees both gave first priority to determining the personality characteristics of the applicant. This is similar to Downs' (1968) survey.

All interviewers used alternative methods to assess the applicant, such as application forms, resumes and reference checks. Since the selection interview has not been shown to be valid and reliable, this is a wise practice.

Over one-third of the interviewers were under the mid-point category on the preparation index and over one-third of the interviewees were under the mid-point category on the preparation index. None of the interviewers used job specifications and slightly under one-half did not use job descriptions. Interviewees did not research the agency to any great extent. If interviewees are to have a productive selection interview, they should prepare and plan for it. Also, it is difficult for recruiters to screen the applicants if the requirements of the position have not been determined. Consequently, if one is to effectively recruit personnel, position and organizational analyses must be conducted.

The majority of the interviewees fell below the mid-point category on the format indexes. Interviewers for the most part failed to provide an orientation for the interviewees and failed to promote the position and agencies, as well as summarize the major points covered in the interview.

The majority of the interviewers placed high on the content index. Whereas, the majority of the interviewees placed low on the content index. The interviewers' index scores indicate a broad scope and
depth of subject matter covered in the interview. The interviewees' index scores suggest that few topics were thoroughly discussed in the interview.

The interviewers' and interviewees' index scores were similar in direction and magnitude, except for the content index scores. Perhaps replication of these findings in different settings and with different respondents may increase the validity and reliability of these indexes.

The findings are tentative considering the limitations of this study. Recommendations for future research were made, which may provide further knowledge for recruitment in social work.
December 1, 1980.

Mr. George Caldwell, Executive Director,
C.A.C.A.S.:
633 Yonge Street, Fifth Floor,
Toronto, Ontario.

Dear Sir:

I am a graduate student in my final year of the M.S.W. program at the University of Windsor. I am undertaking a research project on the "employment interview in social work" as a partial fulfillment for the program. This project is exploratory in nature and may provide needed information in this underdeveloped field.

The data collection phase of the study will require administering a questionnaire to staff and management. It is thought that three C.A.S.'s would provide a large enough sample that would be representative of the social work profession. Would it be possible for you to assist me in introducing the project to the above mentioned societies? I wish to contact you on December 12, 1980 at 10:30 hours to provide you with more details of the project.

The research project will be supervised by a graduate committee made up of: Chairman - Professor V. Cruz, Reader - Professor H. Morrow, (Faculty of Social Work) and Reader - Professor T. Carney (Faculty of Communications).

I will guarantee anonymity and confidentiality of the agency and the staff will be protected. I agree to discuss the results of this study in seminar form to the above societies and provide the C.A.C.A.S. with a copy of the thesis.

Yours very truly,

Phil Waller (student)

Professor V. Cruz (Thesis Chairman)
January 14, 1981.

Mr. J. Finlay, Executive Director,  
Hamilton-Wentworth Children's Aid Society,  
143 Wentworth Street,  
Hamilton, Ontario  
L8N 2Z1

Re: Request cooperation in Research Project

Dear Sir:

I am a graduate student in my final year of the M.S.W. program at the University of Windsor. I am undertaking a research project on the "employment interview in social work" as a partial fulfillment for the program. I have discussed this project with Mr. G. Caldwell, last month and he felt that such a study may be valuable and feasible. This study is exploratory in nature focusing on what occurred rather than why and should provide needed information in this underdeveloped field. A computer search of several thousand journals revealed very little had been written on personnel selection in social work. The results of such a study could be useful in identifying the critical factors in the recruitment process.

Would your agency be willing to participate in this research project? The agency's role is at the data collection phase of the study. The data collection consists of a questionnaire administered to line staff social workers hired after January 1, 1975 and to
current interviewers. The questionnaire would be given to the
staff as a group and should involve approximately twenty-five minutes
of agency time.

I will be doing the study and will be supervised by a Thesis
I have previously been employed at Thunder Bay C.A.S., 1977-79 and was
Assistant Supervisor at Lambton County C.A.S. before returning to the
University of Windsor.

The findings will be described in aggregate, the questionnaire
will be unsigned; thus the anonymity and confidentiality will be pre-
served. I agree to discuss the results of this study in seminar form
to your agency and provide the O.A.C.A.S. with a copy of the thesis.

I will follow-up this letter with a phone call February 12,
so that we can discuss the project.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Yours very truly,

Phil Waller
School of Social Work
January 14, 1981

Mr. F. McCabe, Executive Director,
Essex County Children's Aid Society,
690 Cataraqui Street,
Windsor, Ontario.

Re: Request cooperation in Research Project

Dear Sir:

I am a graduate student in my final year of the M.S.W. program at the University of Windsor. I am undertaking a research project on the "employment interview in social work" as a partial fulfillment for the program. I have discussed this project with Mr. G. Caldwell, last month and he felt that such a study may be valuable and feasible. This study is exploratory in nature—focusing on what occurred rather than why—and should provide needed information in this underdeveloped field. A computer search of several thousand journals revealed very little had been written on personnel selection in social work. The results of such a study could be useful in identifying the critical factors in the recruitment process.

Would your agency be willing to participate in this research project? The agency's role is at the data collection phase of the study. The data collection consists of a questionnaire administered to line staff social workers hired after January 1, 1975 and to
current interviewers. The questionnaire would be given to the staff as a group and should involve approximately twenty-five minutes of agency time.

I will be doing the study and will be supervised by a Thesis Committee. I completed the undergraduate degree in Social Work in 1977. I have previously been employed at Thunder Bay C.A.S., 1977-79 and was Assistant Supervisor at Lambton County C.A.S. before returning to the University of Windsor.

The findings will be described in aggregate, the questionnaire will be unsigned; thus the anonymity and confidentiality will be preserved. I agree to discuss the results of this study in seminar form to your agency and provide the O.A.C.A.S. with a copy of the thesis.

I will follow-up this letter with a phone call February 12, so that we can discuss the project.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Yours very truly,

Phil Waller
School of Social Work
January 14, 1981.

Ms. L. Tuite, Executive Director,
Essex County Roman Catholic Children's Aid Society,
1700 Assumption Street,
Windsor, Ontario.
NSY 4S2

Re: Request cooperation in Research Project

Dear Madam:

I am a graduate student in my final year of the M.S.W. program at the University of Windsor. I am undertaking a research project on the "employment interview in social work" as a partial fulfillment for the program. I have discussed this project with Mr. G. Caldwell, last month and he felt that such a study may be valuable and feasible. This study is exploratory in nature—focusing on what occurred rather than why—and should provide needed information in this underdeveloped field. A computer search of several thousand journals revealed very little had been written on personnel selection in social work. The results of such a study could be useful in identifying the critical factors in the recruitment process.

Would your agency be willing to participate in this research project? The agency's role is at the data collection phase of the study. The data collection consists of a questionnaire administered to line staff social workers hired after January 1, 1975 and to
current interviewers. The questionnaire would be given to the
staff as a group and should involve approximately twenty-five minutes
of agency time.

I will be doing the study and will be supervised by a Thesis
I have previously been employed at Thunder Bay C.A.S., 1977-79 and was
Assistant Supervisor at Lambton County C.A.S. before returning to the
University of Windsor.

The findings will be described in aggregate, the questionnaire
will be unsigned; thus the anonymity and confidentiality will be pre-
erved. I agree to discuss the results of this study in seminar form
to your agency and provide the O.A.C.A.S. with a copy of the thesis.

I will follow-up this letter with a phone call February 12,
so that we can discuss the project.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Yours very truly,

Phil Waller
School of Social Work
APPENDIX C
March 3, 1981.

Mrs. [Name], Supervisor,
Essex County Children's Aid Society,
690 Cataraqui Street,
Windsor, Ontario.

Re: Research Project

Dear Mrs. [Name]:

I spoke to Mr. McCabe on March 2, 1981 and he stated that you would be the contact person and would assume the role of coordinator between the agency and the thesis project.

Please see my letter of February 23, 1981, which outlines the details of the study. I expect that the questionnaire will be pre-tested and ready to administer by the middle of April. I will contact you at that time.

I look forward to working with you on this project.

Yours truly,

Phil Waller
School of Social Work
University of Windsor
March 3, 1981.

Mr.
Family Services Dept.,
Essex R.C.C.A.S.
1700 Assumption Street,
Windsor, Ontario
N9Y 4S2

Re: Research Project

Dear Mr. :

I spoke to Miss Tuite on February 12, 1981 and she stated that you would be the contact person and would assume the role of coordinator between the agency and my thesis project.

Please see my letter of January 14, 1981, which outlines the details of the study. I expect that the questionnaire will be pretested and ready to be administered by mid-April and I will contact you at that time.

I look forward to working with you on this project.

Yours truly,

Phil Waller
School of Social Work
March 2, 1981.

Miss , Executive Assistant,
Children's Aid Society of Hamilton-Wentworth,
143 Wentworth Street,
Hamilton, Ontario
L8N 2Z1

Re: Research Project

Dear Miss :

I received your letter and I am pleased that your society is willing to partake in the study. Two other societies, (Essex R.C., and Essex Public) have also agreed to participate in the project.

I would like to administer the questionnaire at your office on Friday, April 24, 1981 at 1:30 p.m.

Please let me know if this is convenient for all concerned.

Yours truly,

Phil Waller
School of Social Work
APPENDIX D
March 2, 1981.

Mr. M. Ewer, Social Director,
Norfolk County Children's Aid Society,
Box 601, County Building,
Simcoe, Ontario.
N3Y 4M1

Re: Request Cooperation in Pretest for Research Project

Dear Mr. Ewer:

I am a graduate student in my final year of the M.S.W. program at the University of Windsor. I am undertaking a research project on the "employment interview in social work", as a partial fulfillment for the program. This study is exploratory in nature - focusing on what occurred, rather than why - and should provide needed information in this underdeveloped field. A computer search of several thousand journals revealed very little information on personnel selection in social work. The results of such a study could be useful in identifying the critical factors in the recruitment process.

Three societies have agreed to work with me on this project, (Essex R.C., Essex Public and Hamilton Public) at the data collection phase of the study. The data collection method consists of a questionnaire administered to line staff social workers hired after January 1, 1975, and to current interviewers. Would your agency be willing to participate in pretesting the
questionnaire? The questionnaire consists of thirty-five questions, all but one of which will be closed questions. It should only take twenty-five minutes of agency time to complete.

I will be doing the study and will be supervised by a Thesis Committee. I completed the undergraduate degree in Social Work in 1977. I have previously been employed at Thunder Bay C.A.S., 1977-79 and was Assistant Supervisor at Lambton County C.A.S. before returning to the University of Windsor.

I agree to discuss the results of this study in seminar form with your agency and provide the O.A.C.A.S. with a copy of the thesis.

I would be pleased to discuss this project with you at greater length and I will follow-up this letter with a phone call on March 6, 1981, at 1:30 p.m.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Yours truly,

Phil Waller
School of Social Work
March 23, 1981

Mr. Mark Ewer, Local Director,
Norfolk County Children's Aid Society,
Box 601, County Building,
Simcoe, Ontario,
N3Y 4M1

Re: Research Project (Pretest)

Dear Mr. Ewer:

As discussed and agreed to in our March 6, 1981 conversation, I am sending 6 interviewer questionnaires and 8 interviewee questionnaires.

I would also like to thank you in writing for agreeing to have your agency pretest the employment interview questionnaires. In order that all the information is pretested most effectively I would ask that:

1. The time it takes to fill out the questionnaire be recorded.

2. The questionnaire be completed on an individual basis, (no collaboration).

3. If the respondents find 'unclear' questions have him/her check the question and briefly comment on its lack of clarity.

Thank you for your time.

Yours truly,

Phil Waller,
Social Work Department
INTERVIEWER QUESTIONNAIRE

Section A: Characteristics of Interviewer and Agency.

This questionnaire is on the employment interview. The following questions are required in order to obtain an understanding of the agency and participants in the study. Please fill in blanks or circle the responses as appropriate.

Note: Do not sign the questionnaire

(1) What is your age?  Yrs _____

(2) What is your sex?  Male   Female
   (Please circle)

(3) How long have you been employed at your agency?
   Yrs _____ months _____

(4) How long have you been in the Social Service field?
   Yrs _____ months _____

(5) What is the highest degree or diploma you hold?
   (Please circle)
   B.A., B.S.W., M.S.W., M.B.A., D.S.W., Ph.D.
   Other, (please specify) ________________

(6) How many interviews do you do per year?
   Number ________________

(7a) How many interviews have you done in your lifetime?
   Number ________________
   (b) Your job title? __________________

Agency Information

(8) What is the agency's method for employment interviewing?

(a) One interviewer and one interviewee?
(b) Two interviewers and one interviewee?
(c) Three interviewers and one interviewee?
(d) More than three interviewers and one interviewee?
(e) One interviewer and more than one interviewee?
(f) More than one interviewer and more than one interviewee?
(g) Some other method of interviewing. (Please explain)

(9) What is the agency's procedure for the employment interviewing process?

(a) Screening interview, selection testing, in depth interview, hiring interview
(b) Other interviewing process. (Please explain)
Agency Information.

(10) What is the size of the agency? Total number of entire staff

(11)i) Does the applicant complete a job application form?
   (a) No
   (b) Yes

(11)ii) If yes, is it completed:
   (a) before the interview?
   (b) after the interview?

(12)i) Are reference checks routinely made?
   (a) No
   (b) Yes

(12)ii) If yes:
   (a) before screening interview?
   (b) after screening interview?
   (c) before in-depth interview?
   (d) after in-depth interview?
   (e) before hiring interviewee?
   (f) after hiring interviewee?
   (g) other, (Please explain)

(13) Is a reference evaluation form used?
   (a) No
   (b) Yes

(14)i) Do job descriptions exist for the entry-level social service positions?
   (a) No
   (b) Yes

(14)ii) If yes, were they referred to in the interview?
   (a) No
   (b) Yes

(15)i) Do job specifications exist for the entry-level social service positions?
   (a) No
   (b) Yes

(15)ii) If yes, do the new employees sign the job specification?
   (a) No
   (b) Yes
Section B: Characteristics of Interview Process

The following items are for the purpose of gaining an understanding of employment interviewing. The information obtained may be useful in providing more effective employment interviewing in the future.

Instructions:

Please fill in blanks or circle the responses as appropriate.

example

1 not at all

7 to a great extent

In this case 3 has been circled

Note: To aid you in completing the questionnaire, please answer by recalling a typical interview.
(1) Would you mark the box below indicating the office setting during the job interview

\[ x = \text{interviewee(s)} \]
\[ o = \text{interviewer(s)} \]
\[ \_\_\_ = \text{desk, if used} \]

(2) Please rank the answers to the following questions, (1 - most significant to 3 - least significant).

What is the primary objective of the interview?

( ) a) To provide information about the job?
( ) b) To determine applicant's non-personal qualifications?
( ) c) To find out what kind of person the applicant is?

(3) To what extent did you intentionally create stress in the interview?

\[ \begin{align*}
1 & \rightarrow \text{not at all} \\
7 & \rightarrow \text{to a great extent}
\end{align*} \]

(4) To what extent did you explain the format of the interview?

\[ \begin{align*}
1 & \rightarrow \text{not at all} \\
7 & \rightarrow \text{to a great extent}
\end{align*} \]

(5) To what extent did you follow a plan during the interview?

\[ \begin{align*}
1 & \rightarrow \text{not at all} \\
7 & \rightarrow \text{to a great extent}
\end{align*} \]
(6) To what extent did you use a guide, (application form, resume), during the interview?

1 not at all 7 to a great extent

(7) To what extent was the interview task-centered?

1 not at all 7 to a great extent

(8) Which category would you put your interview in?

(a) Limited response interview, (Interviewer has a prepared list of questions which are asked in a pre-determined manner.)
(b) Free-response interview, (The applicant has a large measure of freedom and responsibility for the formulation of the response.)
(c) Defensive-Response or Stress Interview, (Interviewer tries to force applicant into a particular position.)

(9) To what extent did you show interest towards the applicant?

1 not at all 7 to a great extent

(10) Did you test the applicant's knowledge or skill in a formal way during the interview by:

(a) Discussion of one of his/her cases?
(b) Role playing?
(c) Written test? (example, in basket)
(d) Hypothetical case situation?
(e) None of the above.
(f) Other, (Please explain) ____________________________
(11) Was the applicant psychologically tested during the interview process?

(a) Rorschach, (ink blot)
(b) Word association
(c) Intelligence test
(d) Personality test, (example, M.M.P.I.)
(e) None of the above
(f) Other, (Please explain) ____________________________

(12) What % of your questions were:

_____ (a) Closed or direct questions? (example only - Do you have a car?)

_____ (b) Moderately focused questions? (example only - Could you describe your hobby?)

_____ (c) Open or Free answer questions. (example only - Could you tell me about yourself?)

(13) To what extent did you encourage the applicant to express opinions during the interview?

1 7
not at all to a great extent

(14) To what extent did you participate during the interview?

1 7
not at all to a great extent

(15) To what extent did you take notes during the interview?

1 7
not at all to a great extent
(16)i) Did you take notes after the interview?

   (a) No
   (b) Yes

(16)ii) If yes, is a selection evaluation form used?

   (a) No
   (b) Yes

(17) What % of the time did you (and the co-interviewers) talk during the interview?

   (a) 30 or below
   (b) 31 - 40
   (c) 41 - 50
   (d) 51 - 60
   (e) 61 - 70
   (f) 71 - 80
   (g) 81 - 90

(18) The following criticisms have been made about interviewees. Please rank the items on a scale from 1 (not at all) to 7 (to a great extent) as you have experienced them while interviewing for social service positions.

   (a) To what extent did the interviewee talk during the interview?
   (b) To what extent did the interviewee establish a rapport during the interview?
   (c) To what extent did the interviewee prepare for the interview?
   (d) To what extent did the interviewee listen during the interview?
   (e) To what extent did the interviewee appear to be presenting a false image during the interview?
   (f) To what extent did you believe that the interviewee had unrealistic expectations regarding the position?
   (g) To what extent did the interviewee have vague career goals?
   (h) To what extent did the interviewee have a lack of understanding about what the job really entailed?
   (i) Other, (Please explain and rank)

(19) Please assign a % figure to the amount of time spent during the interview to the following topics.

   (a) Pleasantries (small talk)
   (b) Interviewing process - outlining format of interview
   (c) Interviewer's job and opinion beliefs
   (d) Agency and job description
   (e) Interviewee's personality and qualifications
(20) To what extent did you introduce topics during the interview?

1 not at all 7 to a great extent

(21) To what extent did you determine the length of the applicant's responses during the interview?

1 not at all 7 to a great extent

(22) What % of your (and co-interviewers') questions were:

(a) Objective questions, (example—Where did you go to school?)
(b) Subjective questions, (example—Describe yourself)
(c) Non-specific questions, (example—What are your career objectives?)

(23) To what extent did you sell the job and the agency to the qualified applicant?

1 not at all 7 to a great extent

(24) To what extent did you summarize the points covered in the interview?

1 not at all 7 to a great extent
(25) To what extent did you inform the applicant of the next step in the hiring process?

1 not at all to a great extent

(26) To what extent were the disadvantages of the job discussed?

1 not at all to a great extent

(27) To what extent were the demands of the job, (deadlines, accuracy) discussed in the interview?

1 not at all to a great extent

(28) To what extent was supervision discussed in the interview?

1 not at all to a great extent

(29) What areas of supervision discussed in the interview?
(a) Quantity of supervision
(b) Quality of supervision
(c) Type of supervision (i.e. Team, group, individual conference)
(d) Focus of supervision, (Administrative, Educational or Supportive)
(e) None of the above
(f) Other, (Please explain)
(30) To what extent was the interpersonal atmosphere of the agency discussed?

1 to 7
not at all to a great extent

(31) To what extent were the management and organizational policies discussed?

1 to 7
not at all to a great extent

(32) To what extent were the negative aspects of the management and organizational policies of the agency discussed?

1 to 7
not at all to a great extent

(33) To what extent were the opportunities for professional development discussed?

1 to 7
not at all to a great extent

(34) Could you make some suggestions that would have made the interview more effective and/or efficient? (Note: Please answer in a few sentences)

---

---
APPENDIX F

Below are the interviewers' responses to question (34) on the questionnaire, the only open-ended question on the questionnaire.

Two, or 28.57% of the interviewers responded to this question. These responses are reproduced here as they appeared on the questionnaire.

(34) Could you make some suggestions that would have made the interview more effective and/or efficient? (Note: Please answer in a few sentences.)

(1) "Form for tabulating the interview.

More time for preparation."

(2) "Probably would be better if I was better skilled in the interview process."
INTERVIEWEE QUESTIONNAIRE

Section A:

This questionnaire is on the employment interview. The demographic data provides a brief description of the interviewee and the kind of interviewing experiences he or she has had.

Note: Do not sign the questionnaire.

Demographic Data:

(1) What is your age? _____ years

(2) What is your sex? (Please circle) Male Female

(3) How long have you been employed at your current agency? _____ years _____ months

(4) How long have you been employed as a Social Worker or Social Service Worker? _____ years _____ months

(5) What highest degree or diploma do you hold?
   (a) Child Care Diploma
   (b) Social Service Diploma
   (c) B.A.
   (d) B.S.W.
   (e) M.S.W.
   (f) M.B.A.
   (g) D.S.W.
   (h) Ph.D.
   i) Other, (Please explain)________

(6) How many interviews did you have for your current position? Number ______

(7) Was your final or only interview:
   (a) one interviewer and one interviewee?
   (b) two interviewers and one interviewee?
   (c) Three interviewers and one interviewee?
   (d) more than three interviewers and one interviewee?
   (e) one interviewer and more than one interviewee?
   (f) more than one interviewer and more than one interviewee?

(8) In the final interview, what sex was the interviewer(s)?
   number of Male(s): ______ number of Female(s): ______

(9) How did you become aware of the position?
   (a) Advertisement
   (b) Letter of introduction
   (c) Unannounced visit to agency
   (d) Other, (Please explain)________
Demographic Data,

(10)i) Did you complete a job application form?
   
   (a) No
   (b) Yes

   (10)ii) If yes did you:
   
   (a) complete the form before the interview?
   (b) complete the form after the interview?

(11)i) Did you send in a resume before your job interview?

   (a) No
   (b) Yes

   (11)ii) If yes, kind of resume:
   
   (a) Basic resume
   (b) Chronological
   (c) Chronological with summary page
   (d) Functional

(12) Were you asked to show proof of your credentials?

   (a) No
   (b) Yes

(13)i) Were you shown a job description before or during the interview?

   (a) No
   (b) Yes

   (13)ii) If yes, was it discussed in the interview?

   (a) No
   (b) Yes

(14)i) Were you shown a job specification?

   (a) No
   (b) Yes

   (14)ii) If yes, did you sign the job specification?

   (a) No
   (b) Yes

(15) What is your job title?

________________________________________

(16) Which department do you work in?

________________________________________
Section B: Characteristics of interview process

The following items are for the purpose of gaining an understanding of employment interviewing. The information obtained may be useful in providing more effective employment interviewing in the future.

Instructions:

Please fill in blanks or circle the responses as appropriate.

EXAMPLE

1 not at all

7 to a great extent

In this case 3 has been circled.

Note: To aid you in completing the questionnaire, please answer by recalling the interview for your current position.
Section B: Interviewee

(1) Would you mark the box below indicating the office setting during your job interview.

\[ \begin{array}{c}
x = \text{interviewee(s)} \\
o = \text{interviewer(s)} \\
\_\_\_ = \text{desk if used}
\end{array} \]

(2) Please rank the answers to the following questions, (1 - most significant to 3 - least significant).

What is the primary objective of the interview?

\( \begin{array}{c}
( ) a) \text{To provide information about the job?} \\
( ) b) \text{To determine applicant's non-personal qualifications?} \\
( ) c) \text{To find out what kind of person the applicant is?}
\end{array} \)

(3) To what extent were you comfortable in the interview?

\[ 1 \text{ not at all} \quad 7 \text{ to a great extent} \]

(4) To what extent were you free from interruptions, (phone, noises, etc.)?

\[ 1 \text{ not at all} \quad 7 \text{ to a great extent} \]

(5) To what extent did the interviewer(s) seem to intentionally create stress in the interview?

\[ 1 \text{ not at all} \quad 7 \text{ to a great extent} \]

(6) To what extent did you understand the format of the interview?

\[ 1 \text{ not at all} \quad 7 \text{ to a great extent} \]
(7) To what extent did the interviewer(s) appear to follow a plan in the interview?
   1 not at all
   ? to a great extent

(8) To what extent did you prepare for the interview?
   1 not at all
   ? to a great extent

(9) To what extent did you feel in control of the interview?
   1 not at all
   ? to a great extent

(10) To what extent did the interviewer use a guide, (application form, resume), in the interview?
    1 not at all
    ? to a great extent

(11) To what extent were you satisfied with the general tempo of the interview?
     1 not at all
     ? to a great extent

(12) To what extent was the interview task-centered?
     1 not at all
     ? to a great extent
(13) Which category would you put your interview in?
   (a) Limited response interview, (interviewer has a prepared list of questions which are asked in a pre-determined manner.)
   (b) Free-response interview, (the applicant has a large measure of freedom and responsibility for the formulation of the response.)
   (c) Defensive-responsive or stress interview, (the interviewer tries to force you into a particular position.)

(14) To what extent did the interviewer focus on non-related issues, (e.g. pleasantries, small talk.)

not at all
                     7
to a great extent

(15) Did you research the agency before your interview by:
   (a) visiting the agency to observe the interpersonal atmosphere?
   (b) visiting the agency to determine the dress code?
   (c) reading an annual report?
   (d) reading an agency journal?
   (e) discussing the job with target people within the agency?
   (f) doing an information interview regarding the job with workers?
   (g) None of the above.
   (h) Other, (Please explain)________________________

(16) Did you have exposure to the agency before the interview by:
   (a) school placement?
   (b) on-site observation?
   (c) personal projects?
   (d) volunteer work?
   (e) part-time work?
   (f) none of the above.
   (g) other, (please explain)________________________
(17) To what extent did the interviewer(s) show interest towards you?

1
not at all

7
to a great extent

(18) Was your knowledge or skill tested in a formal way during the interview by:

(a) discussion of one of your cases?
(b) role playing?
(c) written test? (e.g., in basket)
(d) hypothetical case situation?
(e) none of the above.
(f) Other, (please specify).

(19) Did you have any psychological testing during the interview process. Such as:

(a) Rorschach, (ink blot).
(b) Word association.
(c) Intelligence test.
(d) Personality test, i.e., M.M.P.I.
(e) None of the above.
(f) Other, (please specify).

(20) To what extent did the interviewer(s) seem to be pursuing a course?

1
not at all

7
to a great extent
(21) What % of the interviewers' questions were:

( ) a) Closed or direct questions. (example only - Do you have a car?)
( ) b) Moderately focused questions. (example only - Could you describe your hobby?)
( ) c) Open or Free answer questions. (example only - Could you tell me about yourself?)

(22) To what extent were you able to express your opinions during the interview?

1 not at all 7 to a great extent

(23) To what extent did you ask questions during the interview?

1 not at all 7 to a great extent

(24) To what extent did the interviewer(s) take notes during the interview?

1 not at all 7 to a great extent

(25) What % of the time did the interviewer(s) talk during the interview?

( ) a) 30 or below
( ) b) 31 - 40
( ) c) 41 - 50
( ) d) 51 - 60
( ) e) 61 - 70
( ) f) 71 - 80
( ) g) 81 - 90
(26) The following have been claimed to be obstacles to good interviewing on the part of the interviewer. Please rank the following items as they existed in your interview on a scale from 1 (not at all) to 7 (to a great extent).

(a) To what extent did you receive adequate information about the job from the interviewer?
(b) To what extent were you pleased with the time given to the interview?
(c) To what extent did you establish a rapport with the interviewer?
(d) To what extent did the interviewer talk during the interview?
(e) To what extent did the interviewer probe for information?
(f) To what extent did the interviewer structure the interview?
(g) To what extent did the interviewer listen to you during the interview?
(h) To what extent were you interrupted by the interviewer?
(i) To what extent did the interviewer provide information that was not requested?
(j) To what extent were you 'bombarded' with questions during the interview?
(k) To what extent was the format of the interview explained to you?
(l) To what extent were you pleased with the amount of time the interviewer talked during the interview?
(m) Other, (Please explain and rank)

(27) To what extent did the interviewer(s) focus on your views of Child Welfare?

1 not at all 7 to a great extent
(28) Please assign a % figure to the amount of time spent during the interview on the following topics:

(a) Pleasantries, (small talk)
(b) Interviewing process - outlining format of interview
(c) Interviewer's job and opinion, beliefs
(d) Agency and job
(e) Applicant's personality and qualifications

(29) How would you evaluate the interviewer(s)' non-verbal behaviour?

(a) Consistently comfortable and appropriate
(b) Usually comfortable and appropriate
(c) Occasionally unpleasant and inappropriate
(d) Usually unpleasant and inappropriate
(e) Consistently unpleasant and inappropriate

(30) To what extent did you introduce topics during the interview?

1 not at all

7 to a great extent

(31) To what extent did you feel you had time to answer the questions during the interview?

1 not at all

7 to a great extent

(32) What % of the interviewer(s)' questions were:

(a) Objective questions, (observable characteristics of person, places, event), E.g. Where did you go to school?
(b) Subjective questions, (opinions, feelings or inferences), e.g. Describe yourself
(c) Non-specific questions, (not objective or subjective questions) e.g. What are your career objectives?
(33) To what extent did the interviewer(s) sell the job and agency to you?

not at all to a great extent

(34) How did you feel about the length of the interview?

much too long just right much too short

(35) To what extent did the interviewer(s) summarize the points covered in the interview?

not at all to a great extent

(36) To what extent did you know the next step in the hiring process?

not at all to a great extent

(37)i) Did you send a follow-up letter to the agency after the interview?

(a) No
(b) Yes

(37)ii) If yes, by:
(a) Courtesy, Thank you letter
(b) Follow-up letter which elaborated on points discussed in the interview

(38) To what extent were the disadvantages of the job discussed?

not at all to a great extent

(39) To what extent were the demands of the job, (deadlines, accuracy, emergency), discussed during the interview?

not at all to a great extent
(40) To what extent was supervision discussed in the interview?
not at all to a great extent

(41) What areas of supervision were discussed in the interview?
( ) a) Quantity of supervision
( ) b) Quality of supervision
( ) c) Type of supervision (Team, Group, Individual)
( ) d) Focus of supervision, (Administrative, Educational or Supportive.)
( ) e) None of the above
( ) f) Other, Please specify -

(42) To what extent was the interpersonal atmosphere of the agency discussed?
not at all to a great extent

(43) To what extent were the management and organizational policies discussed?
not at all to a great extent

(44) To what extent were the negative aspects of the management and organizational policies of the agency discussed?
not at all to a great extent

(45) To what extent were the opportunities for professional development discussed?
not at all to a great extent

(46) Could you make some suggestions that would have made the interview more effective and/or more efficient? (note: Please answer in a few sentences)
APPENDIX H

Below are the interviewees' responses to question (46) on the questionnaire; the only open-ended question on the questionnaire.

Fourteen or 40% of the interviewees completed this question. Their responses are reproduced here as they were written on the questionnaire.

(46) Could you make some suggestions that would have made the interview more effective and/or efficient? (Note: Please answer in a few sentences.)

(1) "I thought it was a very professional and yet relaxed interview. The principle interviewer was very thorough and very open."

(2) "Interviewees were classmates having graduated with me 7 months previous. This was uncomfortable, allowing many personal questions that otherwise would not have been asked."

(3) "More organized and personal allowing more time for questions. Team interviews are frightening, should be well thought out before hand."

(4) "Somewhat threatening by having 7 interviewers--but the first interview was with one person. In general no changes necessary."

(5) "Better description of the organization--structure of the agency. I felt confused about this. Would have liked a job description and salary range. Only after tripped on the latter did I realize it existed and negotiated on it to have my experience recognized."

(6) "Interview (2nd) was not a real challenge - perhaps more of a 'test' of my skills, knowledge, etc. may have been good for interviewer."
"No interruptions what so ever."

"No - the interview process was very positive and helpful."

"1. More Structure
2. Less defensive on part of agency."

"As far as I can remember, the interviews I attended were fairly straightforward. The only problem I experienced was a lack of prompt follow-up from the agency, not knowing for some time after, how I did."

"Would have like to have format of interview presented by interviewer as format appeared scattered (at times jumped around to different topics)."

"as I was well acquainted with the interviewer prior to the interview, the interview was quite short and informal. My qualifications and skills were known to him as well as my knowledge of agency's operational policies and procedures."

"I felt that I would have liked to see the acting local director, but because of circumstances beyond his control he was not able to be there."

"A written job description would have been helpful as would meeting with respective team mates prior to beginning the job."
Interviewer Preparation Index

Scoring - If the respondent indicates a "yes" to questions 11, 12, 13, 14 or 15 of section A, five points are assigned to the interviewer. Five points are assigned for a response between (5-7) on the scaled question 15 in section B of the interviewer questionnaire. Five points are assigned for a combined "yes" response to question 16(i) and (ii) in section B of the interviewer questionnaire.
Table 4.25
Interviewer Preparation
Index Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewers</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16, Questions (section A &amp; B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ZRA</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YRA</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YRB</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YRC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XRA</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XRB</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XRC</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Interviewer Format Index

Scoring - If the respondent answers within the 5-7 range on each of the four questions 4, 23, 24 and 25 of section B of the interviewer questionnaire, a five is assigned. Question 19 is scored according to the respondent's similarity to the percentage of time devoted to each topic. The ideal percentages are derived from the review of the literature. For example: (19) "please assign a percentage figure to the amount of time spent during the interview on the following topics:

05% (a) Pleasantries
05% (b) Interviewing process - outlining the format of the interview.
00% (c) Interviewer's job, opinions and beliefs.
45% (d) Agency and job description.
45% (e) Interviewee's personality and qualifications."

If the respondents' answer is within 5% positive or negative of these values, two points are assigned for each section of the question for a maximum value of ten.
### Table 4.26
**Interviewer Format**

**Index Scores**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewers</th>
<th>Questions (section E)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ZRA</td>
<td>5 6 0 5 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XRA</td>
<td>0 6 0 6 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YRB</td>
<td>0 4 5 0 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YRC</td>
<td>5 6 0 0 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XRA</td>
<td>6 4 0 0 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XRB</td>
<td>0 4 0 0 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XRC</td>
<td>0 4 0 0 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Interviewer Content Index

Scoring - If the respondents place within the 5-7 range on each of the seven questions 26, 27, 28, 30, 31, 32, and 33 of section B of the interviewer questionnaire, a five is assigned for each response.

Questions 10 and 11 of section B are scored by assigning a five for any "yes" response to part a, b, c, or d.
Table 4.27
Interviewer Content Index
Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviews</th>
<th>Questions (Section B)</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>26</th>
<th>27</th>
<th>28</th>
<th>30</th>
<th>31</th>
<th>32</th>
<th>33</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ZRA</td>
<td>5 0 5 5 5 5 5 0 5 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YRA</td>
<td>5 0 5 5 5 0 0 0 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YRB</td>
<td>5 0 5 5 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YRC</td>
<td>5 0 5 5 5 0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XRA</td>
<td>0 0 5 5 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XRB</td>
<td>0 0 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XRC</td>
<td>0 0 5 5 5 0 5 5 5 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Interviewer Stress Index

Scoring - If the respondents answer within the 5-7 range on the scaled question 3 of section B, a five is assigned.

If the respondents answer within the 1-3 range on the scaled question 18b of section B, a five is assigned.

If the respondents select 8(c), five points are assigned.
Table 4.28
Interviewer Stress
Index Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewers</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ZRA</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XRA</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YRB</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YRC</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XRA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XRB</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XRC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Interviewer Directive Index

Scoring - If the respondent answers within the 5-7 range on each of the scaled questions 5, 6, 14, 20, and 21 of section B, a five is assigned.

If the respondent answers within the 1-3 range on each scaled question 13 and 18a of section B, a five is assigned for each response.

If the respondent selects 8(a) and 22 (a), five points are assigned.

If the respondent assigns 50% or more to question 12a of section B, a five is assigned.

If the respondent selects d, e, f, g, of question 17 in section B, five points are assigned.
Table 4.29
Interviewer Directive
Index Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewers</th>
<th>5 6 8 12 13 14 17 18 20 21 22</th>
<th>Questions (section B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ZRA</td>
<td>5 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YRA</td>
<td>0 5 0 0 0 5 0 5 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YRB</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 0 5 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YRC</td>
<td>0 5 0 0 0 5 0 5 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XRA</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 5 0 -5 -5 -0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XRB</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 5 0 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XRC</td>
<td>5 5 0 0 0 5 0 5 5 0 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Interviewer Nondirective Index

Scoring - If the respondent answers within the 1-3 range on each of the scaled questions 5, 6, 14, 20 and 21 of section B, a five is assigned.

If the respondent answers within the 5-7 range on each scaled question 13 and 18a of section B, a five is assigned.

If the respondent selects 8(b) or 22(b), five points are assigned.

If the respondent assigns 50% or more to question 12(c) of section B, a five is assigned.

If the respondent selects 17(a), five points are assigned.
Table 4.30
Interviewer Nondirective Index Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewers</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>21</th>
<th>22</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ZRA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YRA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YRB</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YRC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XRA</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XRB</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XRC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX J
Interviewee Preparation Index

Scoring - If the respondents answer within the 5-7 range on question 8 and 9 of section B, a five is assigned.

If the respondents answer a "yes" response to four or more parts of question 15 of section B, a five is assigned.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewee</th>
<th>Questions (section E)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZEA</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZEB</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZEC</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZED</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZEE</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZEF</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZEG</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YEA</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YEB</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YEC</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YED</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YEE</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YEF</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YEG</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XEA</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XEB</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XEC</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XED</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XEE</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XEF</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XEG</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XEH</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XET</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XEJ</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XEK</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XEL</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XEM</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XEN</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XEO</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XEP</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XEQ</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XER</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XES</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XET</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XEU</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Interviewee Participation Index

Scoring - If the respondents answer within the 5-7 range on questions 23 and 30 of section B, a five is assigned.

If the respondents answer "yes" to question 37, five points are assigned.
Table 4.32
Interviews Participation Index Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewee</th>
<th>23</th>
<th>30</th>
<th>37</th>
<th>Questions (section E)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ZEA</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZEB</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZEC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZED</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZEE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZEP</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZEG</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YEA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YEB</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YEC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YED</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YEE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YEF</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YEG</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XEA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XEB</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XEC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XED</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XEE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XEF</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XEG</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XEH</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XEI</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XEJ</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XEK</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XEL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XEM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XEN</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XEO</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XEP</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XEQ</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XER</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XES</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XET</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XEU</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Interviewee Satisfaction Index

Scoring - If the respondents answer within the 5-7 range on questions 3, 4, 11, 17, 22, 26b,c,g,l, 31 and 34 of section B, a five is assigned.

If the respondents select 29(a) or (b), a five is assigned.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviwee Satisfacion Index Scores</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>c</th>
<th>d</th>
<th>e</th>
<th>l</th>
<th>Questions (section B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ZEA</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZEB</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZEC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZED</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZEE</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZEF</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZEG</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YEA</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YEB</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YEC</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YED</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YEE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YEF</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YEG</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XEA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XEB</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XEC</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XED</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XEE</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XEF</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XEG</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XEH</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XEI</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XEJ</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XEK</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XEL</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XEM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XEN</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XEO</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XEP</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XEQ</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XER</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XES</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XET</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XEU</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Interviewee's Perception of the Format Index

Scoring - If the respondents answer within the 5-7 range on questions 6, 26a,k, 33, 35 and 36 of section B, a five is assigned.

Question 28 is scored according to the respondent's similarity to the percentage of time devoted to each topic. The ideal percentages are derived from the review of the literature. For example: (28) "Please assign a percentage figure to the amount of time spent during the interview on the following topics:

05% (a) Pleasantries
05% (b) Interviewing process - outlining the format of the interview.
00% (c) Interviewer's job opinions and beliefs.
45% (d) Agency and job.
45% (e) Applicant's personality and qualifications."

If the respondents answer is within 5% positive or negative of these values, two points are assigned for each section of the question for a maximum value of ten.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewee</th>
<th>Score 1</th>
<th>Score 2</th>
<th>Score 3</th>
<th>Score 4</th>
<th>Score 5</th>
<th>Score 6</th>
<th>Score 7</th>
<th>Score 8</th>
<th>Score 9</th>
<th>Score 10</th>
<th>Score 11</th>
<th>Score 12</th>
<th>Score 13</th>
<th>Score 14</th>
<th>Score 15</th>
<th>Score 16</th>
<th>Score 17</th>
<th>Score 18</th>
<th>Score 19</th>
<th>Score 20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ZEA</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZEB</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZEC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZED</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZEE</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZEP</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZEG</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YEA</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YEB</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YEC</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YED</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YEE</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YEP</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YEG</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XEA</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XEB</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XEC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XED</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XEE</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XEF</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XEG</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XEH</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XEI</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XEJ</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XEK</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XEL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XEM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XEN</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XEO</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XEP</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XEQ</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XER</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XES</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XET</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XEU</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Interviewee's Perception of the Content Index

Scoring - If the respondent answers within the 5-7 range on questions 27, 38, 39, 40, 42, 43, 44 and 45 of section B, a five is assigned.

If the respondent selects a, b, c or d on questions 18 or 19, a five is assigned.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewees</th>
<th>Questions (section B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ZEA</td>
<td>527341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZEB</td>
<td>527341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZEC</td>
<td>005500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZED</td>
<td>005500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZEE</td>
<td>527341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZEP</td>
<td>527341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZEG</td>
<td>527341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YEA</td>
<td>555505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YEB</td>
<td>555550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YEC</td>
<td>527341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YED</td>
<td>527341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YEE</td>
<td>527341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YEF</td>
<td>527341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YEG</td>
<td>527341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XEA</td>
<td>505050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XEB</td>
<td>005050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XEC</td>
<td>555555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XED</td>
<td>505550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XEE</td>
<td>005550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XEF</td>
<td>005050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XEG</td>
<td>505550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XEH</td>
<td>050550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XEI</td>
<td>050550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XEJ</td>
<td>500050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XEK</td>
<td>000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XEL</td>
<td>005550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XEN</td>
<td>000050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XBO</td>
<td>000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XEP</td>
<td>555550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XEQ</td>
<td>555550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XER</td>
<td>000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XES</td>
<td>555555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XEU</td>
<td>000000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.35: Interviewee Content Index Scores
Interviewee's Perception of the Interview Stress Index

Scoring - If the respondent answers within the 5-7 range on questions 5 and 26j of section B, a five is assigned.

If the respondent selects (c) of question 13, a five is assigned.

If the respondent answers within the 1-3 range on question 26c, a five is assigned.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewer</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>5</th>
<th></th>
<th>Questions (section B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ZEA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZEB</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZEC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZED</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZEE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZEP</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZEG</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YEA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YEB</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YEC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YED</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YEE</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YEP</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YEG</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XEA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XEB</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XEC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XED</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XEE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XEF</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XEG</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XEH</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XEI</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XEJ</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XEK</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XEL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XEM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XEN</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEO</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XEP</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XEO</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XEP</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XEQ</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XER</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XES</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XET</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XEU</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Interviewee's Perception of the Directive Index

Scoring - If the interviewee responds within the 5-7 range on questions 7, 10 and 26d, e, f, h of section B, a five is assigned.

If the respondent selects (a) of question 13, a five is assigned.

If the respondent assigns 50% or more to 21(a), a five is assigned.

If the respondent selects d, e, f or g of question 25, a five is assigned.

If the interviewee responds within the 1-3 range on question 30, a five is assigned.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewee</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>21</th>
<th>25</th>
<th>26</th>
<th>26</th>
<th>26</th>
<th>30</th>
<th>Questions (section B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ZEA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZEB</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZEC</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZED</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZEE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZEF</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZEG</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YEA</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YEB</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YEC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YED</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YEE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YEF</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YEG</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XEA</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XEB</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XEC</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XED</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XEE</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XEP</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XEG</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XEH</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XEI</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XEJ</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XEK</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XEL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XEM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XEN</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XEO</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XEP</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XEQ</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XER</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XES</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XET</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XEU</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Interviewee's Perception of the Nondirective Index

Scoring - If the respondent answers within the 1-3 range on questions 7, 10 and 26d, e, f, h of section B, a five is assigned.

If the respondent selects (b) of question 13, a five is assigned.

If the respondent assigns 50% or more to 21(c), a five is assigned.

If the respondent selects (a) of question 25, a five is assigned.

If the interviewee responds within the 5-7 range on question 30, a five is assigned.
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