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Abstract of the Dissertation

Purpose: The purpose of this study was to determine the relationship between the evaluations of recorded group interviews and standard personal interviews of prospective elementary and secondary teachers. The results could provide a possible alternate method for the preliminary screening of candidates on parochial school campuses.

Procedure: Forty prospective teachers in the education departments of five Seventh-day Adventist institutions of higher learning were selected to be interviewed in a group situation with three interviewers and one candidate. The interview was recorded and five copies of the taped interview were distributed to educators in the field for evaluation. During the recruiting period as each of these candidates was interviewed by the standard personal interview method, five evaluations of this method were secured for each candidate. When the ten evaluations for each candidate were received by the study director (98 percent return), the results were computerized and analyzed statistically.

Findings: A statistical analysis of the evaluations by a Pearson Product Moment Correlation procedure resulted in establishing that a positive relationship existed between the recorded group interview method and the standard personal interview method. A Hartley test for the ratio of variances indicated a significant difference in the variances for either method and a t-test for matched groups indicated a substantial difference in the means for the two methods with the recorded group interview having the higher mean. Thus, the evaluators of the recorded group interviews rated the candidates' performances lower than the evaluators for the standard personal interviews. In checking for inter-rater reliability, it was determined that neither group evaluators was consistent in their ratings.

Conclusions: Since a positive relationship existed between the recorded group interview method and the standard personal interview method, either method might be used as a preliminary screening device in recruiting prospective teachers. It was also concluded that raters as a whole were not consistent and a more standardized procedure for evaluating the interview should be considered.

Recommendations: 1. It is recommended that for the next school year one Seventh-day Adventist institution of higher learning adopt the recorded group interview method as the main technique for acquainting recruiters with candidates. 2. It is recommended that in-service sessions be arranged for administrators, superintendents, and supervisors in the field to acquaint them with the advantages of the recorded group interview method as an alternate to the standard personal interview method for the preliminary screening of prospective teachers.
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Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION AND STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The topic under consideration is an alternative to the standard personal interview used in the recruitment of teachers by educational administrators, superintendents, and supervisors of Seventh-day Adventist elementary and secondary schools. The personal interview, in almost all hiring, is the second step in the employment selection process.¹ The first step is usually the candidate's application blank and resume. The personal interview has been the most widely used and most readily accepted pre-employment procedure for recruitment and is still considered the best selection method available.²

All Seventh-day Adventist schools are staffed with denominational personnel. Therefore, administrators, superintendents, and supervisors traverse the continent visiting the denominational institutions of higher learning, as well as some denominational elementary and secondary schools in recruiting teachers. This process is somewhat unique inasmuch as it often seeks to interview teaching candidates rather than waiting for the candidates to submit applications. When one considers the financial outlay for this annual period of recruit-


ment, the loss of administrators' leadership in the schools for weeks at a time, and the multiplicity of interviews by the candidates, the possibility of exploring alternatives seems to be warranted.

This study examined an interview technique that may eventually supplement the standard personal interview as a pre-employment recruitment device for the administrators of the Seventh-day Adventist educational system. Administrators and superintendents of other parochial school systems as well as those in public education may also find the method to be useful.

Background Literature

Very little study has been done in recruitment procedures for parochial schools and the literature does not reveal any studies using a recorded group interview with three interviewers and one candidate. Educational Index, Current Index to Journals in Education, Psychological Abstracts, Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) and Dissertation Abstracts were searched for related studies. An ERIC computer search of educational literature and dissertation abstracts was conducted with very few results. In conducting the ERIC computer search, the following descriptors were used: teacher, interview, recruitment, group, personal, teacher recruitment, employment interview (s), group interview(s), personal interview(s), and recorded.

A recorded group interview method as examined in this study has not been discussed in the literature. However, several studies using the videotape recorder and other types of group interviews encouraged the pursuance of this method. Some of these basic studies have been included as background literature.
As a tool for administrators, Stanley Diamond used the group approach in hiring staff members for the Mill Creek School in Philadelphia. He found that using teachers, parents, and students as interviewers resulted in very positive questions. The team was able to discover what the candidate was like as a person as well as a teacher. He concluded that a team is less likely to miss key aspects of a candidate's personality or potential than would a single interviewer.\textsuperscript{3}

In another educational setting, the group interview was used as a selection procedure for applicants desiring admission to the counselor education program at the University of West Florida. Frank Biasco and David Redfering described how five to eight applicants and two to four professional persons in counseling and allied fields were engaged in a group interview. Following the interview, the faculty prepared written evaluations of each candidate and then conferred to share their perceptions and feelings. High inter-rater reliability was found among the evaluators. On occasion the participants were asked to rank the desirability of their fellow candidates and they were found to have a .90 to .80 correlation with the evaluators' judgments.\textsuperscript{4}

Stephen Robinson questioned whether the one-to-one interview was really an effective employment procedure. His research indicated that many employers were not satisfied with the personal interview method but had no attractive alternative to use. He suggests the group interview, so called because it involves an intra-group process,


\textsuperscript{4}Frank Biasco and David L. Redfering, "The Group Interview as a Selection Procedure," \textit{Improving College and University Teaching}, XXIV (Summer, 1976), 153-54.
involving about nine candidates with three prospective employers for a three hour interview. In working with a group this large demands would be increased for each participant to make the venture a success. It would "require greater skill, judgment, patience, maturity, and dedication, but the potential results would be more than commensurate."5

In regard to recorded interviews the work of Edward Kiradjieff and Michele Stimac encouraged pursuing the recorded group interview method. These individuals joined forces in videotaping unrehearsed interviews which turned out to be beneficial to both Kiradjieff as a recruiter representing Price Waterhouse of Boston and Stimac as director of career counseling at Babson College. Students interested in public accounting signed up to see Kiradjieff and agreed to be videotaped as a screening device for company personnel. The students who successfully passed the taped screening were scheduled for an office visit. The tapes were also used at the college as a device for preparing future applicants for the interview. By studying the videotapes, students could analyze the best procedures to follow during an employment interview.6

The Problem

Seventh-day Adventist recruitment procedures at present involve repetitious interviews by administrators and supervisors and may result in some interviews being of questionable quality. It is not uncommon


for twenty or more recruiters to interview the same candidate over a
period of two or three months. The candidates experience inconvenience
by having to be available at a moment's notice. In waiting for the
interviews, time is required possibly to the detriment of the candi-
date's studies. Since the administrators are usually making a general
survey of candidates with no intention of making any commitment, the
candidate may often be left feeling frustrated and dissatisfied.

There may be a needless expenditure of human resources as
administrators, superintendents, and supervisors leave their posts of
duty and are gone recruiting for weeks at a time. To compound the
problem, upon returning to the office, they are often confronted with
an accumulation of work and problems. It seems plausible that qualified
local candidates have been overlooked because an administrator felt he
should hire teachers from elsewhere to justify his recruitment expendi-
tures. On the other hand, administrators of small schools who do not
have a travel budget for recruiting may have felt at a disadvantage in
not being able to interview some of the most qualified candidates.

Purpose

The purpose of this study, then, was to explore the possibility
of a practical alternate method to the standard personal interview
method. This was accomplished by determining the relationship between
the candidate evaluations from the recorded group interview and the
standard personal interview. Both means and variances were compared
for the two methods to examine their equivalence.

Research Hypotheses

The study tested the following hypotheses:
Hypothesis 1. There is a positive relationship between the recorded group interview method and the standard personal interview method.

Hypothesis 2. There is no significant difference in the variances for the recorded group interview method and the standard personal interview method.

Hypothesis 3. There is no significant difference in the means for the recorded group interview method and the standard personal interview method.

The composite scores for each candidate by each method were pooled and statistically analyzed as a basis for obtaining the data used to reject or retain the above hypotheses.

Definition of Terms

1. Candidate. A prospective teacher on a college or university campus seeking placement in an elementary or secondary school.

2. Campus coordinator. The member of the department of education on one of the campuses selected for the study who oversaw the recorded group interview and the standard personal interviews of each randomly selected candidate on that campus.

3. Evaluation instrument. A 28-item evaluation sheet rating the candidate on a scale of one to five in seven basic areas of employment interest and personal qualifications.

4. Recorded group interview. A tape recorded consultation involving a prospective teacher and three educators which assessed the apparent aptitude, training, and overall suitability of the candidate to enter the field of teaching.

5. Standard personal interview. A formal one-to-one consultation to evaluate the aptitude, training, and overall suitability of the prospective employee for a teaching position.

6. Superintendent and supervisor. Personnel from the Seventh-day Adventist district office who recruit elementary and junior high teachers, administrators, and other credentialed school personnel in cooperation with school boards and principals, and assist secondary school administrators in the recruitment of school personnel.
Substudies

In addition to the main study several substudies were conducted to enrich the study. The substudies were: a) determining the comparability between the group interview evaluations and the standard personal interview evaluations, b) determining the relationship between the group interview evaluations and the recorded group interview evaluations, c) determining the inter-rater reliability of the evaluators, and d) conducting a factor analysis and item analysis of the evaluation instrument. The factor analysis clustered the items of the evaluation instrument as loadings on several factors, while the item analysis determined the correlation between the items of the instrument.

Delimitations

This study is delimited to prospective teachers in Seventh-day Adventist institutions of higher learning who are seeking denominational employment. It may be limited more to teaching personnel than to deans, secretaries, business managers, and denominational personnel in general. The study may also be limited by the method of randomization suggested to the campus coordinators, by ten different teams doing the recorded group interviews and by the conscientiousness of the individual evaluators both on the campuses and in the field. However, the incidence of irregularities may have been minimized since the evaluators and interviewers were not randomly selected and had the option of not participating.

Procedures

Population and Sample

The direct target population was prospective teachers on the
camps of Andrews University in Michigan, Loma Linda University and Pacific Union College in California, Southern Missionary College in Tennessee and Walla Walla College in Washington. These five institutions were chosen because they are the five largest denominational campuses and they also geographically represent the United States.

The sample was comprised of a representative selection of 40 prospective elementary and secondary teachers on the five campuses selected. From an alphabetical list of candidates, every fifth name was selected until the required number of candidates for that campus had been reached. To determine the comparability of the two methods in the study, it was decided that five evaluations of the recorded group interview and five evaluations of the standard personal interview would be secured for each sample. It seemed that five evaluations by each method would provide adequate data and still be a manageable number.

Data and Instrumentation

The first step in securing data was the candidate's recorded group interview. At the conclusion of each recorded group interview, the three interviewers evaluated the candidate with an evaluation instrument. Five tapes were then made from the recorded group interview tape and mailed to administrators, superintendents, and supervisors in the field accompanied by the candidate's resume and copies of the evaluation instrument. During the recruiting period, as the candidates were interviewed by the standard personal method, each interviewer was supplied with the areas to be covered and suggested questions as used by the recorded group interview team. At the conclusion of the standard personal interview, the interviewer used the evaluation instrument to
rate the candidate. This procedure was continued until five evaluations for the recorded group interview and five for the standard personal interview were secured for each member of the sample. A full explanation of the procedure is found in Chapter 3. The evaluation instrument was a standard form for all the evaluations both on campus and in the field. The results were analyzed to determine the comparability between the two methods.

The evaluation instrument reflected the general areas covered in 40 recorded group interviews conducted by ten three-person teams composed of experienced Seventh-day Adventist administrators, superintendents, and supervisors. The instrument features a five-point assessment scale for evaluating the various areas. Specific directions for interpreting the scale were included with each instrument. (See Appendix A and B for samples of the evaluation instrument and the directions for using it.) A panel of experienced interviewers evaluated the instrument, which was generated from the 40 interviews, in terms of its content, relevancy and comprehensiveness. Suggestions made from the interviewers were incorporated when appropriate.

Significance of Study

The results of the study indicate to what extent the recorded group interview is comparable to the standard personal interview as a pre-employment screening device in teacher recruitment. If this alternate method should be utilized, it may eventually supplement the standard personal interview with the possibility of reducing administrator, superintendent, and supervisor recruiting time and expenditures. In addition, it may reduce the multiplicity of interviews for
a single candidate and make each prospective teacher more equitably available to a wider range of employers. While the primary target population is the five institutions of higher learning, in a broader scope, the results of this study may be applicable to the entire Seventh-day Adventist educational system and to other parochial school organizations.

Organization of the Study

Literature related to the standard personal interview, the recorded group interview and the videotaped interview is reviewed in Chapter 2. In Chapter 3, the research design and methodology are described. The population and sample used are identified, the procedure for collecting the data is described and an explanation of the statistical methods utilized is included.

In Chapter 4 the data collected are presented in tables, as well as in discussion form. The statistical analysis forms part of this chapter.

Chapter 5 consists of a summary of the findings of the study and conclusions are drawn. The theoretical and practical implications are discussed and recommendations suggested.
Chapter 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Although there is an abundance of literature on recruitment with emphasis on the employment or selection interview, very little study has been reported on recruitment procedures for parochial schools. None of the literature revealed any studies using a recorded group interview, with three interviewers and one candidate as a recruitment procedure. Since the principles of recruiting and interviewing for public education and for industry apply to parochial administration as well, the review of the literature was focused on the employment interview as it relates to the recruitment process. The results have been summarized under four general headings: (1) The Role of the Employment Interview During the Past Three Decades, (2) The Rationale for Utilizing the Employment Interview, (3) The Methodology of the Employment Interview, and (4) The Group or Recorded Interview Methods as Variations of the Employment Interview. Each topic will be dealt with separately.

The Role of the Employment Interview During the Past Three Decades

The literature supports the importance and necessity of having a recruitment process. Speaking as an industrialist, Matthew Jackson commented as follows:

Recruitment is only one of the many significant aspects of a
manager's role. A manager can work only so many hours in a day and influence directly only a limited number of people. Therefore, he is measured not by his contribution as an individual but by the results of his team. The basis of a successful team must be the recruiting of the right personnel...Therefore, although one of the most demanding and tiring of all management activities, effective recruitment brings both immediate and long-term benefits, and is often a determining factor in the manager's success.\(^1\)

So, while the need for recruitment has been recognized, controversy for the past three decades has centered around the role of the employment interview in the recruitment procedure. The first major study, which became the backbone for future studies, was published in 1949. In this study Wagner presented a critical summary of employment interview research up to that time. He concluded that of the 106 articles located, only 25 concerned actual experiments and "reported quantitative information about the value of the interview in selection."\(^2\) He found that intelligence was the only trait consistently rated with high reliability and sociability was the only area which had satisfactory validity and reliability. He suggested that the information obtained from an interview should not be used alone for predictive purposes but should be combined statistically with other data.\(^3\)

During the next ten years the interview failed to gain stature, and in 1960 England and Patterson called for a moratorium on books, articles, and other writings on "how to interview," "do's and don'ts" about interviewing, and the like, until research had established the


\(^{3}\)Ibid., p. 43.
reliability and validity of the method to warrant its use. In 1963, Dunnette and Bass stated that the resistance on the part of management to carry out research on the personnel interview was a prime problem. The following excerpt crystallized their concern:

The personnel interview continues to be the most widely used method for selecting employees, despite the fact that it is a costly, inefficient, and usually invalid procedure. It is often used to exclusion of far more thoroughly researched and validated procedures. Even when the interview is used in conjunction with other procedures, it is almost always treated as the final hurdle in the selection process. In fact, other selection methods (e.g., psychological tests) are often regarded simply as supplements to the interview.

The continued uncritical use of the personal interview offers a clear illustration of what is perhaps personnel management's prime problem—that is, the great resistance to carrying out fundamental research on its practices and techniques.

The next major reevaluation of published research was produced by Mayfield in 1964. In reviewing some 300 articles he supported Wagner's findings that many simply gave opinions concerning the selection interview with a lesser number actually involved with experimental studies. He recommended that future research emphasis should concentrate on the variables that affect the decision as it occurs in the selection process, and that the interview be divided into small units so controlled studies might be performed on one or two variables at a time.

Schmitt in his survey of the major conclusions of interview

---


7Ibid., p. 255.
reviewers summarized Mayfield's findings as follows:

(1) interview validities are low even for highly reliable interviews; (2) structured interviews are more reliable; (3) interviewers who are consistent in their treatment of interviewees are still inconsistent in their interpretation of data obtained; (4) interviewer attitudes bias their judgments; (5) decisions are made early in the interview; and (6) intelligence is the trait most validly estimated by an interview, but the interview information adds nothing to test data.⁸

In 1965, Ulrich and Trumbo published their review of the research dealing with the selection interview and stated findings generally consistent with those of Mayfield, even though their method was different. They echoed Wagner's suggestion for greater standardization, wider use of data other than the interview, and limiting the scope of the selection interview.⁹

The last major summation of research on the selection interview was published by Wright in 1969 and contained a summary of the research from 1964-69. He stated that more significant than the reviews by Mayfield, Ulrich and Trumbo was Webster's work at McGill University, which was published in 1964 but did not come to the attention of Ulrich and Trumbo as it was probably still at press as they completed their review.¹⁰ Webster experimented with decision-making in the employment interview using personnel from the Canadian Army. After extensive investigation, seven principal findings were reported and were summarized by Wright as follows:


¹⁰Ibid., p. 394.
(1) interviewers developed a stereotype of a good candidate and seek to match interviewees with stereotypes; (2) biases are established by interviewers early in the interview and tend to be followed by favorable or unfavorable decisions; (3) unfavorable information is most influential on interviewers; (4) interviewers seek data to support or deny hypotheses and, when satisfied, turn their attention elsewhere; (5) empathy relationships are specific to individual interviewers; (6) a judge's decision (and, by implication, an interviewer's) is different when fed information piece by piece rather than simultaneously; and (7) experienced interviewers rank applicants in the same order although they differ in the number they will accept.11

Wright argued that Mayfield's suggestion to dissect the interview, performing studies on one or two variables at a time, would result in fragmentation to the point of meaninglessness. He suggested that research designs deal with the interview as a totality, that a multidisciplinary model be developed and that a computer analysis of interview responses be used in the study of decision making.12 However, despite the warnings and suggestions, the goals and methods of the employment interview were not modified and the practice of using the interview to select personnel was retained as part of the recruitment process of "every conceivable organization regardless of its size or function."13

The employment interview, with its limitations, still remains the most frequently used tool for the selection of individuals by organizations14 and particularly in the field of teacher recruitment. Jones stated that the interview is the last and most decisive part in

11Ibid., p. 393. 12Schmitt, p. 81.
one's campaigning for a teaching position. In quoting from the March, 1977 AASPA Bulletin he noted that 79 percent of 354 school districts surveyed rated the personal interviews "high" as a screening device in teacher selection. He also noted that Prentice-Hall reported that six out of ten respondents in a survey rated the interview as the most important employer selection procedure.15

The Rationale For Utilizing the Employment Interview

The researchers who summarized the literature dealing with the employment interview have made recommendations for further experimenting with the interview and have generally left the impression that it would be advisable to discontinue its use for the present. However, one of the main reasons why the employment interview has continued to be used by nearly all occupations is that no attractive or viable alternative that seemed feasible has been forthcoming. Nearly all the studies surveyed for this study, for both industry and education, reflected that the procedure still has considerable merit with advantages outweighing the disadvantages. So in spite of recommendations to limit the use of the employment interview, it is still a popular method in recruitment today.

"In almost all cases of hiring, the employment interview is the second step and one of the most significant phases of the employment selection process. The first step is generally filing an application

blank." and submitting a personal resume. It is really the first screening procedure in a chain of procedures that leads to actual employment and has been praised and severely criticized by researchers. McIntyre stated that research shows that interviewing is about as useful as horoscopy in predicting behavior and hence in selecting qualified personnel. Yet the interview has remained an important part of personnel interrelations as it is often the first interpersonal experience between the prospective employer and the individual seeking employment. It has been called an appraisal session where the recruiter observes various applicant behaviors and is prompted to refer the candidate for further decision or to forget him then and there.

The high cost of personnel operations has stimulated renewed interest in the employee interview process as organizations endeavor to secure the most qualified and best prepared candidates possible to reduce training costs. One corporation reported that the cost of researching, recruiting, and training each new employee was about $10,000. Therefore, the present expense of interviewing, when compared with overall recruiting and training costs, may not be nearly as


18Kenneth E. McIntyre, "How to Interview a Prospective Teacher," The National Elementary Principal, LI (October, 1971), 69.

19Rosenthal and Gessner, p. 50. 20Cohen and Etheredge, p. 77.

significant as it was in times past.

With the tight job market today, it is imperative that the candidate put his best foot forward in the interview and prepare for it by learning as much as possible about the essentials of an interview. 22 Bacon, who has chaired or participated in over one hundred professional interview teams, noted that competent candidates for the "big job" blew it during the oral interview, 23 and all too frequently the key to success or failure in obtaining the job rested with the selection interview. 24 Fear maintained that the final interview represents the solid core of any good selection process 25 and the most vital element involved is interpersonal communications. 26

Advantages of the Interview

The majority of the studies concerned with the selection interview reflected a number of advantages for this method. The prime advantage is that it provides the opportunity for the interviewer to observe the candidate face-to-face and to form opinions about him based on his appearance, manners, and mannerisms, whether they be agreeable or disagreeable. It also allows the recruiter to assess the likability of the candidate and to note his initiative in responding, his alertness in

22Ibid.


26Bradley, Loc. cit.
conversation, his forcefulness and creativity, as well as his general interests and involvement with hobbies.\(^{27}\) Since the interviewer represents the company or employer to the candidate, the candidate also has the opportunity to "get the feel" of his possible future employer.\(^{28}\) So essentially both interviewer and candidate are judging each other, and within minutes personal evaluations take place, although, in the majority of interviews, the interviewer is not asked to directly evaluate the candidate as a person. There is ample evidence to indicate that personal evaluations take place on the part of all parties concerned\(^{29}\) and that the recruiter can get a useful impression of a limited range of personality traits that impress him positively or negatively.\(^{30}\)

A satisfactory interview is a purposeful, professional\(^{31}\) conversation involving both verbal and nonverbal interaction between two or more people working toward a common goal.\(^{32}\) Since it is usually a two-way conversation, the expectations of the interviewer as well as his attitude during the interview can influence the responses from the

---


\(^{29}\) Charles A. Harkness and Mary Claire Madole, "Interview Evaluations That Work Both ways," *Journal of College Placement*, XXIV (Spring, 1974), 80.

\(^{30}\) Bingham et al, Loc. cit.


interviewee in a way that would not be possible through a questionnaire or resume. However, this advantage can also be a disadvantage if something about the candidate triggers a negative attitude on the part of the interviewer. In addition, the interviewer, through his personality and knowledge of interviewing skills, can generally control the degree of responsiveness of the candidate and the quality of the information supplied. Jackson contended that the interview is the best method of reviewing the candidate for the job through the skill and knowledge of the interviewer.

Another advantage of the selection interview is that its use is not limited to a few highly trained professionals. Some types of interviews may be employed by an individual who has not had extensive training or supervision. However, the ability to conduct an effective interview is an acquired skill. In learning interview skills, many interviewers simply started by interviewing, then by developing skills in human relations and interpersonal communication and profiting by experience became efficient. Other beginners failed and gave up, while still others failed but not recognizing the fact, unfortunately, kept on interviewing. Those who work with selection and training of interviewers know that some "catch on" rather quickly, while others, quite
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often the majority, never do, regardless of how hard they may work at it.\textsuperscript{39} Minimal or better proficiency in interviewing skills is probably within the reach of a substantial portion of the population.\textsuperscript{40}

Stewart stated that the directive interview where the interviewer establishes the purpose of the interview and controls the pace of communication is easy to learn, provides quantifiable data, and can be used to supplement other data collected such as questionnaires, interaction analyses and observations.\textsuperscript{41} Bingham and his coauthors expressed doubt that good interviewers are born but did not venture to guess what percentage of the population could be trained to become skilled or even competent interviewers.\textsuperscript{42} Even with the possibility that everyone who aspires to become a recruiter may not become competent if given a chance, it is still the method that allows for individual initiative and flexibility, for imaginative innovations, and for a new combination of old approaches that will vary with the interviewer and the purpose or intent of the interview.\textsuperscript{43}

In this day of mounting legal concerns some establishments have had their information securing methods scrutinized by the courts, and for some of these organizations the selection interview has been the best way to avoid legal entanglements. Dipboye and his coauthors stated that the courts are finding an increasing number of organizations guilty of discriminatory hiring practices and as a result "some employers have discarded tests as a vehicle of hiring and are relying
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chiefly on the findings and judgment of an interview."\textsuperscript{44}

The final advantage is the control of time which may vary from a few minutes to hours depending upon whether the recruiter is doing a preliminary screening of a candidate or an in depth analysis. In one Chicago factory with 30,000 employees, the time was limited to five minutes on the average for each employment interview and during emergency periods shortened to three minutes. To adequately review a candidate for one of the supervisory or executive positions, however, a longer time was required.\textsuperscript{45} Both the short and longer interviews depended on the interviewer's skill in fact-finding as well as in motivating the candidate to respond quickly and lucidly. The most desirable candidate has to be "wooed and won as well as chosen."\textsuperscript{46} One can conclude that the time factor, then, is at the discretion of the interviewer to prolong or terminate the interview to suit his needs.

**Disadvantages of the Interview**

While the list of advantages of the interview is impressive, one must also look at the disadvantages before deciding whether the selection interview is appropriate for his organization. Jackson, in studying the interview, found it criticized for possessing several disadvantages: (a) it is time consuming and therefore expensive; (b) one interview is usually not sufficient; (c) an interview of less than one hour is not considered of great value; (d) the average interview is reduced to a non-systematic chat, following no plan; (e) too


\textsuperscript{45} Bingham et al, p. 101.  \textsuperscript{46} Ibid.
many interviewers think they can quickly "sum up" a prospective employee; (f) little forethought is given to deciding the areas for discussion; (g) methodology varies from interview to interview leaving little real consistency; and (h) the greatest drawback is that the interview is subjective and depends on the personal interpretation of the interviewer who is likely to be inconsistent.47

Additional research has added to the list of drawbacks that may limit the effectiveness of the employment interview. Hatfield and Gatewood stated that most of the information gathered is limited in use and has a low relationship to the job characteristics for which the candidate has sought to be interviewed.48 Cohen and Etheredge have noted that both the recruiter and interviewee are totally unfamiliar with each other and the "behavior manifested probably lacks job relatedness."49 Therefore, it is not unusual for the interviewer and candidate to both feel ill at ease in the interview situation;50 it is particularly stressful for the candidate who knows that the majority of the interviews do not result in job placement.51

The interview has also been criticized because it can potentially be biased by the recruiter. This may be partially the result of the background information he has studied about the candidate prior to

47Jackson, p. 81


49Cohen and Etheredge, p. 75. 50Creth, Loc. cit.

the interview. He, then, may not bother to probe deeply into the candidate's qualifications or give the candidate sufficient time or opportunity to respond to questions because he is convinced that the interviewee has little to offer.\textsuperscript{52} It is possible that the interviewer may fail to hear a respondent's statement if it threatens him or runs counter to his own attitudes or biases, or is contrary to what he expected the candidate to say.\textsuperscript{53} Dipboye, Arvey and Terpstra explained that the interviewer can evidence both covert and overt prejudices, and if the interview is left unstructured or unstandardized, protected groups may be adversely affected.\textsuperscript{54} Jorpeland stated that some courts, in trying to keep personal bias out of the interview, have ruled that "heavy reliance on the subjective judgment of interviewers" was unlawful.\textsuperscript{55} The interviewer can attempt to keep bias out of the interview by avoiding questions that may be legally disqualified and trying not to make personal judgments as to the candidate's suitability until the interview has been completed and the notes taken during the interview have been carefully reviewed. Thus, while the bias of the interviewer could be considered a disadvantage, the action of the courts in limiting the use of the questions that can be used and the judgments that can be made has actually added to the list of disadvantages of using the interview.

In theory the employment interview serves three functions:


\textsuperscript{53}Ibid, p. 191.  \textsuperscript{54}Dipboye et al, p. 522.

\textsuperscript{55}Elaine Jorpeland, "Keeping Bias Out of Job Interviews," Association Management, XXIX (August, 1977), 89.
securing information, giving information, and establishing a friendly relationship. However, in practice the interviewer may be so overworked that he may have too little time to obtain the necessary information to make a sound judgment of the applicant's suitability, to describe the work sufficiently to enable the candidate to make a realistic decision as to whether he is best suited for the job, and also to leave the candidate with the impression that the recruiter's purpose was to be helpful and friendly.\textsuperscript{56} One researcher visited 21 employment offices and then rated the interviews from best to worst. One of the worst lasted less than three minutes and the candidate had traveled ten miles and waited for two and one half hours for the brief encounter.\textsuperscript{57} In a study of 195 business firms, 55 percent indicated that employment interviews should last from 20-25 minutes while 28 percent considered 15-25 minutes as adequate.\textsuperscript{58} The vast majority of employment interviews are short and no satisfactory appraisal of the candidate is possible in so brief a time if the interviewer has not apprised himself of the candidate's experience and history from a resume or a well-designed application form.\textsuperscript{59}

Although many factors, such as appearance and mannerisms, may be appraised by the interviewer, he cannot determine such qualities as dependability, honesty, persistence or loyalty during the few minutes spent in an ordinary interview, as the climate of the situation may not

\textsuperscript{56}Bingham et al, p. 97.  \textsuperscript{57}Ibid.  
\textsuperscript{59}Bingham et al, p. 101.
be warm enough for open communication. Communication, at best, is not a simple matter, and communication in interviewing may be complicated by the personalities of the people involved. It has been noted that the candidate usually reacts more to his relationship with the interviewer than to the content of the questions being asked of him. Respondents may remember more about the interviewer and the details of the interview than about the content and method of interrogation. To be effective, the interviewer must be an understanding person "willing to accept the responses of the candidate without apparent judgment or rejection of the person." 61

Webb and Salancik question the validity of interview data. They proposed that journalists and social scientists do not trust the report of a single interview and even really question how much they can trust anything that is obtained by this method. The experience of some psychological investigators suggests that the accuracy of self-report must always be suspect. When one considers how difficult it is to get an interviewee to give a dependable report of the past, how much more unpredictable will be the assumptions he will make about how he will act in the future. 62

The Methodology of the Employment Interview

Candidate's Preparation for the Interview

In preparation for an employment interview the candidate should

---
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lay groundwork for the crucial appointment. In a school situation it is possible to role play simulated job interviews and to use films and lecturers from the placement center to stress the importance of the employment interview. This procedure should impress the candidate with the fact that his immediate future may depend on the initial impression he makes by his dress, cleanliness, posture, poise, mannerisms, composure, enunciation, facial expressions, attitude, and personality.63 Unfortunately candidates have mistakenly thought that others viewed them as they envision themselves but this has not been the case. Leach and Flexman suggested in their study, which concerned business education students, that an individual could get a proper perspective of himself by comparing his own self-rating with the ratings of a friend and an authority figure. In this way an awareness of his strengths and weaknesses,64 his assets and liabilities may be established. Anxiety has been a perpetual problem for prospective employees and some schools have attempted to groom the candidates for the interview situation. However, leading employers, such as General Electric, suggested that candidates refrain from acting during the selection interview and concentrate on techniques for relaxing and thus show their true personality in the interview.65


Drake, Kaplan and Stone conducted a survey of corporate representatives from 195 business firms to determine the characteristics desired in prospective employees. The results were compiled from responses of 60 percent of the companies (the ones directly engaged in interviewing) with the conclusion that "over 33 percent of the respondents viewed self-expression as the most important factor, with personality and expressed goals closely following. 66 The alert candidate will think through his goals carefully and plan his method of communication before the interview hour.

In the educational setting, the candidate would do well to review his strengths and weaknesses as discovered during his student teaching experience. This is a regular topic for discussion in the employment interview and Lowe reported that in 25 interviews of prospective teacher, the only item that all 25 reported as one of the topics discussed was that of the candidate's student teaching experience. 67

A list of carefully thought through questions can be a real asset to the candidate during the interview. The applicant that has no questions for the interviewer commits the "sin of unfamiliarity" and leaves the interviewer with the impression that the candidate has not taken the time or shown the initiative to come up with several appropriate, intelligent questions. 68 Finally, a carefully prepared, typed
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resume should be provided for the recruiter in advance or at the time of the interview.  

Recruiter's Preparation for the Interview

The recruiter's preparation should be involved with planning the interview time and preparing an outline, studying the applicant's resume, reviewing the parameters which legally control the choice of questions and the direction of discussion, jotting down a few choice questions, and arranging for a setting that will be free from distractions.  

A management consultant firm suggested an eight-point plan for the recruiter to use in studying the candidate. The areas were: physical make-up, attainment (education and work experience), general intelligence, special aptitudes, interests, disposition, personal circumstances, and motivation.  

By reviewing his knowledge of the structure of the framework of the interview, the recruiter can help keep the interview from wandering aimlessly and aid in accomplishing the goals he has set. The time schedule should be planned carefully to allow the interviewer time to listen so that as the candidate responds, the recruiter can evaluate.  

To facilitate the discussion, the interviewer should make available to the candidate a comprehensive job description, as it has proved to be


70 Creth, p. 367.  71 Jackson, p. 62.


the best tool for focusing on the employer's expectations. The competent and experienced recruiter should realize that a successful interview depends on careful organization. In the event of failure, the interviewer, according to Lopez, should shoulder the blame as he, like most interviewers, evidently did not understand the subtleties of this complex process.

**Beginning the Employment Interview**

Since the interviewer sets the mood for the interview, it becomes his responsibility to establish a relationship of confidence that will help the candidate to feel at ease and more readily communicate openly. Regardless of the number of candidates waiting to be interviewed or other pressures influencing the recruiter, he must still convey an unhurried appearance to the candidate.

There are two suggestions for beginning an employment interview and establishing appropriate rapport. The traditional view is to spend time in "small talk" to put the candidate at ease. However, this may only waste time as well as increase the anxiety of the candidate and actually prevent the establishment of the desired rapport. The second method is to launch the interview immediately and let the course of the interview establish the rapport. The initial questions should
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be general in nature with the more difficult questions reserved for later in the interview. As confidence is established and the candidate communicates freely, information desired by the recruiter may be revealed without the interviewer having to probe.\(^{82}\)

**Conducting the Employment Interview**

It is during the interview that the recruiter's skills are most clearly evidenced. Since almost everything the interviewer does has some bearing on the candidate's motivation to respond adequately,\(^{83}\) an effective interviewer must possess emotional maturity, social skills, insight into personality and attitudes, as well as the ability to motivate the interviewees. Mandell recommends that he also have "the talents of the advertising expert, the skills of the salesman, and the insights of the market research specialist.\(^{84}\) His grooming, his apparent background, and his manner will influence the candidate as to whether this is the kind of person for whom he would like to work.\(^{85}\)

Both parties explore the psychological dimensions of the position under discussion. The expectations of both are largely based upon their needs and the candidate generally places greater emphasis on physical and security needs than does the recruiter.\(^{86}\)

The recruiter must not monopolize the interview time. Jackson believed that a typical interview should consist of the interviewer
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\(^{82}\)Archer, p. 22.  \(^{83}\)Kahn and Cannell, p. 191.


\(^{85}\)Ibid, p. 135.  \(^{86}\)Coleman et al, p. 55.
talking 57 percent of the time, the candidate participating 30 percent, and silence occupying thirteen percent.\textsuperscript{87} However, Fear stated that the recruiter should only consume 15-20 percent of the time, providing him with much more time to analyze the candidate while listening.\textsuperscript{88} Alderfer and McCord reported that college students liked the recruitment interviews best where they could talk half the time and were not embarrassed or put on the spot.\textsuperscript{89}

The art of active listening "described as active because of the attention, posture, and turned-in state of the listener's senses to the other person,"\textsuperscript{90} will indicate an openness to the candidate which will foster a growth experience for both parties. In an experimental setting it was discovered that there was a significant relationship between the length of the experimenter's discourse and the length of the respondent's answer. When the experimenter was brief, the response was brief. When the explanation was lengthened, the candidate followed suit.\textsuperscript{91} More in-depth responses will result if the interviewer accepts the candidate as a conversational equal during the interview.\textsuperscript{92}

Since the art of listening is important, both parties should be aware that silence is healthy and expected. The secure interviewer will never fear periods of silence and will realize that the candidate may be suffering an emotional block, may need time to recover his poise.

\textsuperscript{87}Jackson, p. 126 \hspace{1em} \textsuperscript{88}Fear, p. 27.
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or redirect his conversational channel. Kahn and Cannell recounted an experiment where doctors' interviews with patients were tape-recorded. In reviewing the tapes the doctors were amazed to find that they did virtually all the talking, even answering their own questions before the patient had a chance; they evidently feared silence. Unfortunately, typical campus interviews last 20-30 minutes with the interviewer reading the resume and doing most of the talking.

While the length of the interview may influence its quality, the questions posed by the recruiter will generally be the determining factor. The questions should be straightforward and frank, asked one at a time, kept strictly to the subject, made perfectly clear, and not imply an expected answer. In general, stressful questions will probably produce guarded answers while nondirective and nonstressful questions will be more productive. However, by probing, the interviewer can elicit responses revealing some of the candidate's basic feelings about education and life. The interviewer should accept whatever attitudes and ideas are expressed by the candidate without overtly showing approval or disapproval or expressing moral or ethical judgments.

With his knowledge of body language, the recruiter can structure the interview and arrange the seating so certain characteristics
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of the candidate’s behavior will be revealed.\textsuperscript{101} The interviewer should minimize nonverbal communication such as the tone of voice, raising eyebrows, or shifting in his seat \textsuperscript{102} as such communication may influence the candidate. Conversely, research confirms that the nonverbal responses of the candidate often influence the interviewer’s perceptions.\textsuperscript{103} Inferences are usually drawn from four behavior patterns: appearance, touching behavior, body language, and proximity preferences.\textsuperscript{104} Females generally exhibit more eye contact than males and the distance from the recruiter has a tendency to increase or decrease this behavior.\textsuperscript{105} Characteristics associated with eye contact or the lack of it are generally easier to isolate because people are aware of them,\textsuperscript{106} whereas such behavior as proximity preference is not as readily understood. Research has established that the most desirable distance for effective communication in the selection interview is about three to five feet and can be controlled by the recruiter arranging the seating in advance.\textsuperscript{107}

Frequently the interviewer tends to emphasize the nonverbal aspects of the interview more than the verbal. Hatfield and Gatewood stated that 30-35 percent of the meaning conveyed in a conversation is verbal but when it comes to attitudes and feelings, only seven percent is verbal with 93 percent nonverbal.\textsuperscript{108} The interviewer should not be
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afraid to be influenced by his "gut feeling" which is basically an inherent sense that often represents the reaction of the subconscious to subliminal clues and helps one person relate to another realistically. He should also recognize that there are no well rounded people without weaknesses. Strong people generally have strong weaknesses too.\textsuperscript{109} While some nonverbal aspects tend to leave the strongest impressions, the recruiter must not rely upon his memory or impressions but should also take notes during the interview.

The importance of taking notes of the interview cannot be overstressed. The most accurate method is to do the recording immediately while the interview is in progress using key words and phrases of the candidate. If the recording is left until later, relevant information may be forgotten and distortions may occur.\textsuperscript{110} Mandell stressed the importance of note taking during the interview in these words:

Many people are so worried about running a smooth interview that they fail to take notes. Consequently, they get relatively little from the interview. It is very important to take the time necessary to make clear and adequate notes. This may result in some periods of silence, but don't let it worry you. Good notes are absolutely necessary if you are to make an accurate review and evaluation of the candidate following the interview. If you do a good job of taking notes, you should almost have "writer's cramp" when the interview has been completed. Two basic reasons: if you take notes only on information you consider important, you will tip the candidate off to the things he should, or should not, say to impress you. By taking notes continuously, you are telling the candidate that you are interested in everything he has to say.\textsuperscript{111} The interviewer runs the risk of getting skewed responses if he only takes notes occasionally.\textsuperscript{112} On the other hand, he must not let note taking give the candidate the impression that he is not commanding the
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recruiter's full attention.\textsuperscript{113}

**Importance of Recruiter's Sensitivity**

Since the problem of bias has entered the picture, employers are tending to select recruiters who are dedicated to equal opportunity for all.\textsuperscript{114} The interviewer can keep bias out of the interview by keeping the questions job related and using a vocabulary that he is confident the interviewee understands. A typical middle-class white interviewer would have difficulty with some words and phrases used by minority groups. In these cases it is especially important that the interviewer be able to sense the unspoken language, where body signs, veiled hostility, and reaction that stems from frustration and a lack of understanding are revealed.\textsuperscript{115}

As a representative of management, the recruiter must be keenly aware of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission's stand on recruiting:\textsuperscript{116} "an employer has an affirmative duty at the recruitment stage to see that black and other minorities come in and apply for jobs."\textsuperscript{117} This means that management must do more than guarantee neutrality with regard to sex, color, religion, and ethnic background; management is required to put forth an effort to recruit, employ as well as promote qualified members of minority groups\textsuperscript{118} as well as members of both sexes.
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Teacher Surplus and Recruiting

The recruiter must be careful that the candidate not see him as being pessimistic about employment possibilities in such fields as teaching. There have been articles written about the potential teacher surplus in the years ahead and this possibility may complicate the recruiter's job, as he will be expected to make the best selection possible from an abundance of applicants. Sivulich has stated that he fears there will be a surplus of over one million teachers by the year 1980. While this seems unlikely, there will still be a tremendous challenge in conducting teacher recruitment interviews and in selecting the best candidate for the position. Morris stated that there will always be a need for the well-prepared teacher, especially the one who has demonstrated his ability to hold a job.

In the past, most principals were happy to have someone else do the recruiting chores. Cross and Davis, however, expressed the view that the administrators are in the best position for teacher selection because they know the community to be served and the qualifications needed for a teacher to be successful in that community. He recommended that the power for recruitment be transferred from the central district office to the individual school. The principal would recog-
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nize that he was accountable and could no longer blame the people "downtown" for poor teacher selection. There is also the possibility of training teachers to be recruiters. In one survey, 25 percent of those polled indicated a willingness to help recruit outside their school district. As the teacher surplus abates the employment situation from a "buyer's to a seller's market," the skills of the interview will become increasingly significant to both parties.

Closing the Employment Interview

As the interview comes to a close; the candidate will usually begin to relax as he feels the worst is over. At that time, the interviewer needs to be particularly alert to comments that will probably more fully reveal the real self that may have been hidden behind a professional mask during the interview. The candidate may now say things he had wanted to say earlier but which seemed too irrelevant or trivial to mention. The interviewer needs to remember that the interview is not closed until the candidate is gone, even though the last question has been asked and a final handshake has taken place.

The applicant should be able to leave the interview feeling he had received fair treatment and with no feelings of disenchantment with the interview process. His self-esteem should not be impaired. He must believe that he has been given exactly the same opportunity at the

123 Ibid.
125 Morris, p. 39. 126 Jackson, p. 128.
127 Bingham et al, p. 69.
interview as was given to every other candidate.\textsuperscript{128} Above all, the recruiter, who is doing preliminary screening, must not give the candidate the impression he has been offered a job when in reality he has not.\textsuperscript{129}

Recruiters should maintain close contact with college placement officers even when they have no specific openings. Favoring one or two institutions may develop a staff with a slanted outlook. Very often, teachers from geographic areas outside the local one can give a new dimension to the faculty.\textsuperscript{130}

To help prevent criticism of being biased, the interviewer, whenever possible, should present his evaluations to a committee to make the final decision. Generally, more judges will provide a variety of views and help eliminate possible prejudices that may occur in the one-to-one arrangement.\textsuperscript{131}

### The Group or Recorded Interview Methods as Variations of the Employment Interview

Although group and recorded interview methods are not new, they can still be considered in the experimental stage as very little has been published concerning their use. Lopez discussed several techniques for group interviewing and, although he endeavored to be impartial, he appeared to be biased toward using the traditional method of one inter-
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viewer. 132 The methods described were: (a) serial--the candidate goes from one individual or group of individuals to another within the same organization, (b) panel--a group of recruiters interview one candidate, (c) group--two or more candidates are interviewed at one time, and (d) leaderless group discussion--a group of candidates is presented with a problem to solve and the evaluators observe the process. 133 Every method has advantages and disadvantages but the probability of a tension factor being present certainly exists in any group interview situation. 134

The size of the group interview has promoted some speculation but no common consensus has been reached by the advocates of the process. Experimenters have found that in groups as large as eleven, a minority tended to become nonparticipants and with less than five the group seemed too small to add the variety that was expected. 135 Merton summed up the problem by stating that the size should be large enough to provide substantially greater coverage than a single interview but not so large that individual participation would be stifled. 136

Expectations may vary with the type of interview being utilized. Abrams stated that a different type of response can be obtained from a group interview with one investigator and several participants than from the one-to-one interview. The candidate will usually be freer to discuss ideas that might appear selfish if presented in a traditional interview and many times the thoughts will be deeper and more revealing.

136 Merton, p. 137
than in a regular interview. As in any interview, the responses will depend upon the recruiter's expertise. One of the principal problems has been in training individuals to assume the role, as the virtues needed are:

...he must be clear and easy in speech, self-confident, alert, stimulating, reassuring, well informed, a good mixer, preceptive, unobtrusive and objective; finally he must be able to translate his experiences and his records into a fair and lucid assessment—he has to be articulate and analytical.137

Robinson, in suggesting the use of the group interview, questioned whether the one-to-one is really an effective procedure. He indicated that many employers have been dissatisfied with the practice but have not had an attractive alternative. The "group interview,"138 so called because it involves an intra-group process, would involve about nine candidates with three prospective employers for a three-hour interview. The proposed "system demands more of all participants in terms of the acceptance of responsibility for the success of a group endeavor...but the potential results can be more than commensurate."139

Field found that the group oral interview has gained popularity in a variety of agencies throughout the country. The procedure involved giving a group of candidates a challenging topic related to the prospective employment and letting them direct the discussion themselves. The longer the discussion, the more advantageous it proved for the examiners who sat around the examination room but did not enter into the discussion. Forty-four agencies that were using the procedure stated that
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the values were not overrated, the results were satisfactory and they planned to continue using the method.\textsuperscript{140}

In an industrial setting, Goldman suggested that the group depth interviewing method be used to help solve marketing problems. He envisioned it being used when broad sampling was needed but for security reasons would not be advisable outside of the company involved. In addition, he felt the group interview could profitably explore attitudes about the corporation, about public relations, personnel turnover and recruiting appeals.\textsuperscript{141}

Various uses for the group interview have been suggested in the field of education. One such use involved applicants desiring to be admitted to the counselor education program at the University of West Florida and has been described by Biasco and Redfering. Five to eight applicants and two to four professional persons in counseling and allied fields engaged in a group interview. Following the interview, the faculty evaluators prepared a written evaluation of each candidate and then conferred to share their perceptions and feelings. High inter-rater reliability was found among the evaluators. On occasion the participants were asked to rank the desirability of the candidates and they were found to have a .90 to .80 correlation with the evaluators' judgments.\textsuperscript{142}


\textsuperscript{142}Frank Biasco and David L. Redfering, "The Group Interview as a Selection Procedure," \textit{Improving College and University Teaching}, XXIV (Summer, 1976), 153-54.
Unlike the studies reported above, Diamond reported using the group interview in the Mill Creek School in Philadelphia specifically for the recruiting of teachers. He found that using teachers, parents, and students as interviewers resulted in the asking of very perceptive questions. These questions were geared toward determining what each candidate was like as a person as well as his qualifications to teach. He concluded that a team is less likely to miss key aspects of a candidate's personality or potential than would a single interviewer.143

In this same vein, Marcotte has proposed that peer interviewing, with teachers helping the principal interview prospective teachers and the principal helping the superintendent interview prospective principals would provide additional strength during the interview and an additional evaluation that would be very realistic. In addition, the teachers and principal would know first hand the special needs of the employees in that district.144

David Zatz, an elementary principal, has for several years used a group interview method for teacher selection. When a conference is scheduled with a teacher applicant, Zatz notifies the head teacher of the appointment and in turn the head teacher selects two additional teachers to help with the interview. After the interview, each teacher prepares a written evaluation with an accompanying vote, the principal adds his vote and makes the results known to the personnel department.145


Ideally, the best way to obtain an accurate account of an interview would be to tape the entire proceedings with a recording device. However, the tape recorder is not used extensively because the tapes and machines are expensive and because the high cost of transcribing the results makes the process impractical for many organizations. Then there is the possibility that the interviewers themselves are nervous about operating the machine, and preoccupation with worrying about the taping can have a negative effect on the interview process. In some instances candidates have objected to being recorded as they did not want to be heard by anyone except the recruiter and they, too, were nervous about the distraction possibility of the tape recorder. Finally, there is always the possibility of machine malfunction and the recruiter's work for the day resulting in a batch of blank tapes.

In recent years experimentation has taken place using video transcription recording (VTR) equipment. DuVall and Krepel stated that VTR would not work for all candidates, as some were camera-shy and others were overly concerned about their appearance on the screen rather than being concerned with the recruiter's questions. According to Stewart and Veruki, use of VTR for recruiting has not been widespread not only because of the cost of videotaping and dispensing tapes to

146Interviewer's Manual, p. 6-1.
148Ibid., p. 178. 149Ibid., p. 295.
countless employers but also because of the fear that in trying to tape all college graduates the process would become too "canned."\(^{151}\) However, it has been used successfully in workshops where placement representatives videotaped mock televised interviews which were played back to the group and analyzed. This procedure helped prospective employees to recognize their abilities, and skills.\(^{152}\) Rosson and coauthors described a "candid camera" approach in interview training. Each candidate was interviewed and videotaped three times and each tape was reviewed by the candidate to help prepare him for the actual job interview. Candidates reported that the training sessions were much more difficult than the real job interview.\(^{153}\)

One report described a situation in which videotaping served a dual purpose, first for recruiting evaluations for industry and then as an instructional aid for future interviewees at a college. Kiradjieff, a recruiter, and Stimac, a career counselor, joined forces in videotaping unrehearsed interviews that proved to be beneficial to both employer and educator. Students interested in public accounting signed up to see the recruiter and agreed to the use of videotaping as a screening device for company personnel. Candidates that successfully passed the screening session were given an office visit for further evaluation. Tapes were used at the college in preparing future appli-


cants for the interview, for by studying the videotapes, students could make informed preparation for an actual interview. 154

Summary

A review of the literature related to recruitment with emphasis on the employment interview was presented in this chapter. The review included: the role of the employment interview during the past three decades, the rationale for utilizing the method, the methodology involved, and variations of the method such as group or recorded employment interviews.

During the last three decades, four comprehensive reviews of research on the employment interview have been published. Beginning with Wagner in 1949, followed by Mayfield in 1964, Ulrich and Trumbo in 1965 and Wright in 1969, researchers reviewed and analyzed hundreds of studies. The uniform conclusion was that the employment interview, as commonly used, lacked both validity and reliability. The researchers showed that management had not been enthusiastic about conducting interview research and recommended that, to improve the credibility of the method, experimental research be undertaken using one or two variables at a time in a controlled situation or that a multidisciplinary model using computer analysis of interview responses be developed.

To those interested in experimentation the recommendations for further research were both appealing and challenging, but no alternative was presented to the greater number actively involved with using

the employment interview on a day by day basis. It may be assumed that
the field was left open for proposals of an alternative method and
the possibility that a recorded group interview method might be an
attractive alternative for preliminary screening of candidates seeking
a teaching position prompted this study.

Critics in presenting negative aspects of the employment inter-
view method have stated that it is costly, time-consuming, requires
repeat performances, has little preparation for areas to be discussed,
lacks consistency, is biased, and is often conducted by an interviewer
who prides himself on being able to "sum up" a candidate in a few
minutes. These problems suggest the desirability of exploring alterna-
tive methods that might alleviate some of the criticism. With the more
standardized process of the recorded group interview for teacher
recruitment, the candidate would know the general areas to be covered
from the list of suggested questions, the interviewer would have a
standard outline for the interview based on these suggested questions,
and an evaluation sheet would act as a personal check sheet which would
allow for a more realistic comparison of candidates and tend to lessen
the criticism of inconsistency between interviews.

Already some experimentation has been conducted using a group
interview process in a variety of settings such as: solving market
research problems, screening applicants for admission to a professional
school, and for recruiting teachers. In one school, for example,
teachers, parents, and students were members of a group interview team
which proved to be very satisfactory. Another school found that using
three teachers to assist the principal in teacher recruitment strength-
ened the recruitment procedure. This group approach to interviewing has
been so satisfactory that it seems reasonable to use the concept as a base and build into it additional features to compensate for the limitations researchers have discovered in the standard personal interview process.

Further experimentation has been conducted using recording devices to aid the recruiter in the employment interview. Although this method provides a permanent record it has been avoided because of the high cost of transcription, the expense of tapes and machines, the possibility of machine malfunction with resulting blank tapes, and the apparent reluctance on the part of both recruiter and candidate to be taped. However, a cassette recorded group interview would contain a complete record without incurring the drawbacks and expenses of using highly sophisticated equipment. Since cassette recorders are household items today, there would be little fear that the recruiter or candidate would be intimidated by its use, and the cost would be minimal.

Since the literature recommends that further study of the employment interview is not only desirable but necessary and since no viable alternative has been forthcoming, it seemed reasonable, expedient, and challenging to test the recorded group interview method. If this method becomes recognized and utilized, the process could eventually be expanded to incorporate more highly technical VTR equipment.
Chapter 3

PROCEDURES OF THE STUDY

In this chapter the procedures used to conduct the study are presented. The chapter is divided into three parts: (1) The Population and Sample, (2) Data to Be Collected, and (3) Statistical Procedures for Analyses of the Data. It was assumed that the data gathered from all sources were conscientiously prepared according to the procedures specified. It was also assumed that the candidate would consider the interviews as being realistic recruiting sessions and not just an exercise for improving interviewing skills. The data were punched on computer cards directly from the evaluation instruments as they came from the evaluators. The cards were manually checked for accuracy and then analyzed by the computer.

The Population and Sample

The direct target population was prospective teachers on the campuses of the five largest Seventh-day Adventist educational institutions in the United States. These schools which comprise 50 percent of the Seventh-day Adventist institutions of higher learning in the United States were: Andrews University in Michigan, Loma Linda University and Pacific Union College in California, Southern Missionary College in Tennessee, and Walla Walla College in Washington. These schools were chosen not only for their size but geographically they encompassed both
the East and the West. Since the study director was experienced in the Seventh-day Adventist educational system, he chose to use it for the study judging it to be typical of other parochial education systems.

In a broader scope, the results of the study may be applicable to the entire Seventh-day Adventist educational system. In addition, it may be applicable to other parochial and private school systems and to some segments of the public school system.

The sample was a random selection of 40 prospective elementary and secondary teachers on the campuses of five Seventh-day Adventist institutions of higher learning. Ten candidates were selected at each of the three colleges on the West Coast, Loma Linda University, Pacific Union College and Walla Walla college. Five candidates were chosen at Andrews University and five at Southern Missionary College to complete the sample. While a national sampling of Seventh-day Adventist schools was desired, the logistics of obtaining the same number from each school was complicated by the different recruiting procedures followed in the West and the East. The western schools have education days when recruiters are invited to come to campus for interviewing prospective teachers. In the East, no education days are held and the number of recruiters available for participating in the study from November to March would be much more limited than in the West. Therefore, ten candidates were selected at each of the Western institutions and only five at the Eastern schools.

The procedure used to secure randomization was to take a separate alphabetical roster of prospective elementary and secondary teachers on each campus and select every fifth name until the required number of candidates with alternates was reached. These individuals
were then apprised of the study and their willingness to participate was solicited. In the event that a candidate did not wish to participate, an alternate was chosen. (See Appendix D for sample of the guide for campus coordinator.)

Data Gathering Procedures

Arrangements were made with the education department of the five Seventh-day Adventist institutions selected to have one faculty member coordinate the project on that campus. On two campuses the department chairmen coordinated the study and on the other three, faculty members involved with student teacher supervision were chosen. Each coordinator was provided with a detailed guide which listed the duties of the campus coordinator as to procedures for: selecting the candidates, orienting the candidates, selecting the group interview teams, orienting the interview teams, scheduling and conducting the group interviews, securing the personal interview evaluations, and setting up the time schedule for completing the project on campus by the deadlines established by the study director.

According to the process outlined above, each coordinator was responsible for the random selection of five or ten prospective elementary and secondary teachers for a total experimental population of 40 candidates.

Recorded Group Interview Team

The college campus coordinator selected a three-member team to conduct the recorded group interview. The composition of the team was: (1) the principal of the elementary or secondary school on campus,
depending on whether the candidate was a prospective elementary or secondary teacher, (2) a faculty member responsible for supervision of elementary or secondary student teachers, and (3) one additional faculty member from the education department or a local superintendent or supervisor. Each interviewer was an educator currently engaged in Christian education and, in some cases, was previously acquainted with the candidate. With at least one interviewer acquainted with the candidate the interview rapport would probably be more easily established.

The rationale for having a three-member team was that a team of individuals would probably be less likely to miss key aspects of a candidate's personality or philosophy than would a single interviewer. Furthermore, this type of interview tended to be more comprehensive and more of a discussion rather than an interrogation. For the candidate, the group interview was generally a fairer and more satisfying experience, as Diamond has stated.¹

In preparation for the recorded group interview, the candidates on each campus were divided into two groups. One group was to have the standard personal interviews first followed by the recorded group interviews. The second group began with the recorded group interviews followed by the personal interviews. The interview team was provided with a cassette recorder, a tape, copies of the candidate's resume (see Appendix E for sample) and copies of the 28-item evaluation instrument, the validation of which is discussed below. (See Appendix C for a sample of the Instrument.) In addition, members were supplied with copies

of the instructions to interviewers and evaluators which contained the five-point rating scale to be used for the evaluation instrument and suggested questions covering six basic areas. (See Appendices A and B for samples of the instructions to interviewers and evaluators with five-point rating scale, and suggested questions for the interviewers.)

The six basic areas of suggested questions were: personal background, career selection, educational accomplishments, goals and ambitions, philosophy, and spiritual life style. These categories reflected the general areas covered in a pilot study consisting of 40 group interviews conducted by 30 Seventh-day Adventist superintendents, supervisors, and principals. The 30 educators were divided into three-person teams and without having a prepared list of suggested questions, conducted recorded group interviews with 40 prospective elementary and secondary teachers on a college campus. During the course of the summer, the tapes were carefully screened and the questions asked by the interviewers compiled and then categorized under the six basic areas identified above. As an aid to future interviewers, the most frequently asked questions were listed as suggestions under each of the headings. A 28-item evaluation instrument was generated from the data and was used by all interviewers and evaluators in the study.

After the pilot study the evaluation instrument as well as the guide to basic areas with suggested questions was given to a group of twenty Seventh-day Adventist educators for further refinement. All of the group were experienced in interviewing and in evaluating teachers. Each reviewed the instruments in terms of their content, relevancy and comprehensiveness. Suggestions submitted from this group were incorporated when appropriate.
The instructions given to the recorded group interview team by the campus coordinator gave them liberty to phrase their questions as they pleased as long as the desired areas were covered adequately to provide the necessary information to use the evaluation instrument. All interviewers were free to participate in the discussion of any of the six areas but were encouraged to each select two basic areas in advance so that all areas would be covered. This procedure tended to lessen the possibility of one interviewer monopolizing the time.

Standard Personal Interview Evaluators

The campus coordinator was also responsible for securing the standard personal interview evaluations. During the recruiting period, as superintendents, supervisors, and administrators came to the campus to interview prospective teachers in the standard personal way, the campus coordinator would request their participation in the study. Their participation consisted of evaluating the candidate at the end of the interview. The coordinator provided the recruiter with copies of the evaluation instrument, the instructions to interviewers and evaluators, the guide to suggested questions, and the candidate's resume. The recruiter was asked to review the materials before conducting the interview.

Data and Instrumentation

At the conclusion of each recorded group interview, the three interviewers rated the candidate by filling out the evaluation instrument. The leader of the interview team was then responsible for delivering the tape of the interview, the candidate's resume, and the three completed evaluation instruments to the campus coordinator who
in turn mailed the lot to the study director.

At the conclusion of each standard personal interview, the recruiter used the evaluation instrument and rated the candidate. This procedure continued for five months until the coordinator had collected five evaluations for the standard personal interview for each member of the sample. The evaluations were then sent to the study director and the campus coordinator immediately scheduled the remaining half of the recorded group interviews.

The collection of data for each candidate is diagrammed as follows:

\[ C_1 \cap C_2 \text{- Composite pooled scores used to determine comparability between the variances and means of the two methods} \]
As each recorded group interview was received by the study director, the tape was duplicated five times. Each of the five copies of the tape accompanied by the instruction sheet for evaluators, the candidate's resume and an evaluation sheet was sent to five Seventh-day Adventist superintendents, supervisors, or principals in the United States to be evaluated. Each of these persons had agreed to participate in the study by evaluating taped interviews. (See Appendices F and G for samples of letter requesting participation and participation consent form.)

One hundred twenty letters were sent out to educators in nearly every state of the Union requesting participation in the project. A wide variety of experienced evaluators was desired so the evaluations would reflect more than a territorial view. However, the involvement in the study depended primarily on the educator's willingness to participate. Eighty-two percent (100) replied positively and eight percent (10) negatively. Some evidently did not feel the necessity to respond as they had already been asked to assist with recorded group interviews on various campuses. Here the procedure for the study became intricate as the 240 taped interviews were channeled in the requested numbers to 89 of the 100 educators who had agreed to participate. Only one shipment of two or three tapes was sent to 69 of the evaluators while twenty were sent a second shipment of two tapes as quickly as the second half of the recorded group interviews was received by the study director from the various campus coordinators.

The data were computerized and analyzed in regard to the research hypotheses concerning the comparability of the means and variances of the two methods. The same data were utilized to determine
the inter-rater reliability of the interviewers and evaluators for all the methods. In all, there was a total of 175 field evaluations for the recorded group interview, 177 on-campus evaluations for the standard personal interview, 108 evaluations from the educators who conducted the recorded group interviews and 60 evaluations for the single tape used to check inter-rater reliability.

**Statistical Procedures for Analyses of the Data**

Different statistical procedures were used to test the three research hypotheses.

**Hypothesis 1.** There is a positive relationship between the recorded group interview method and the standard personal interview method.

A Pearson Product Moment Correlation was used to determine the relation between the pooled composite recorded group mean and the pooled composite standard personal interview mean for each member of the population.² The five evaluations for each method were pooled for the composite score and mean for each method. The correlation was considered substantial and important practically when the correlation coefficient was greater than .70 after correction for attenuation. The correction for attenuation is a statistical procedure for estimating the correlation between the scores on two variables—that is, what the correlation between them would be if both tests were perfectly

---

reliable. The procedure was used to add credibility to the study. To
determine whether there is a non-chance relationship, the .05 level of
significance was used.

Hypothesis 2. There is no significant difference in the
variances for the recorded group interview method and the standard
personal interview method.

To determine whether the variances differed more than just by
chance a Hartley Test producing F-ratios was used.

Hypothesis 3. There is no significant difference in the means
for the recorded group interview method and the standard personal
interview method.

A t-test for paired scores was used to determine the differ­
ence in the means for the two methods.

In addition to the main study, the inter-rater reliability of
the evaluators for the various methods was determined. An analysis of
variance procedure using subjects as the rows and the methods as the
columns was used.

To document the nature of the evaluation instrument, an item
analysis was conducted to determine the contributions of specific
items and a factor analysis was done to examine the clusters of related
areas.

---

3 Julian C. Stanley and Kenneth D. Hopkins, Educational and
Psychological Measurement and Evaluation (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-

4 B. J. Winer, Statistical Principles in Experimental Design

5 Ibid., p. 32. 6 Stanley and Hopkins, p. 130.
Summary

This chapter described the procedures followed in collecting and statistically analyzing the data for the study. Campus coordinators on five Seventh-day Adventist campuses selected the candidates, selected the individuals to conduct the recorded group interviews, solicited the cooperation of recruiters for the standard personal interview evaluations, and forwarded all the materials to the study director. The taped interviews were duplicated and mailed to Seventh-day Adventist educators in the United States to be evaluated.

Under the direction of the five campus coordinators, 177 evaluations for the standard personal interview and 108 evaluations for the recorded group interview were collected and sent to the study director. From the mailing of taped interviews, the study director obtained 175 field evaluations which were compared with the 177 standard personal evaluations using a Pearson Product Moment Correlation to determine the relationship.

In addition, statistical procedures were utilized to determine the inter-rater-reliability of evaluators for each of the three methods used. To document the nature of the evaluation instrument, an item analysis was used to determine the most significant items and a factor analysis was utilized to cluster related areas.
Chapter 4

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

In this chapter the data and the analyses of these data are presented. The chapter is divided into four sections. First, the sample is analyzed and the data collected for each member of the sample are reported. Second, the statistical analysis of the data in regard to the research hypotheses is discussed. Third, the rater consistency of the interviewers and evaluators is analyzed. Fourth, item and factor analyses of the evaluation instrument are reported and discussed.

Sample Used and Data Collected

The sample consisted of 40 prospective teachers on five Seventh-day Adventist college or university campuses in the United States. Since there are only ten Seventh-day Adventist institutions of higher learning in the United States, the sample consisted of individuals from 50 percent of them. Thirty candidates were from the West and ten from the East representing both the elementary and the secondary fields of teaching. Over a period of five months the candidates were interviewed and taped in a recorded group interview session and were interviewed by recruiters in the standard personal way. The taped interviews for 36 out of the 40 were suitable for duplicating and sending to educators in the field for evaluation. Of the 180 tapes distributed to 101 field evaluators, 175 (97 percent) were evaluated and the evaluation instrument returned to the study director. This high percentage of return
was facilitated by sending a follow-up letter (see Appendix H for facsimile), personal visitation, and numerous phone calls during the last few weeks of data collection. To test for inter-rater reliability, one tape was selected and duplicated 60 times and distributed to twenty elementary principals, twenty secondary principals and twenty supervisors or superintendents. All 60 (100 percent) of these evaluations were received and tabulated (see Appendix I for table).

For the recorded group interviews, ten three-person teams were involved and at the conclusion of the interview the candidate was evaluated by the interviewers. All the evaluation instruments (120) were received by the study director and were tabulated (see Appendix J for tabulations).

For the standard personal interviews, the campus coordinator on every campus involved in the study endeavored to secure the cooperation of five recruiters to evaluate each candidate. Two hundred standard personal interviews were sought and 194 (97 percent) were secured and tabulated. However, four of the taped interviews were not usable, so only 36 candidates with 180 possible personal interviews were used in the study. Of these 180 solicited, 177 (98 percent) were secured (see Appendix J for tabulation). The total number of interviewers and evaluators involved in the study was 160.

Analyses of the Data

The data from the evaluation sheets were punched on computer cards, manually checked for errors and then computerized using several programs of the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) available on the Burroughs 6700 computer of the University of the Pacific.
The statistical analysis of the data relating to the research hypotheses was the first to be considered.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methods</th>
<th>Correlation r</th>
<th>r squared</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal vs. Recorded</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.0050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal vs. Group</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recorded vs. Group</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.0005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first of the research hypotheses was concerned with the correlation between the personal interview method and the recorded group interview method.

Hypothesis 1. There is a positive relationship between the recorded group interview method and the standard personal interview method.

The Pearson Product Moment Correlation of the SPSS program was used to determine the relationship between the personal interview method and the recorded group (taped) interview method. The results are tabulated in Table 1.

The Pearson r = .42 was significant at the .01 level with 35 degrees of freedom. According to Downie and Heath, any correlation larger than r = .42 with 35 degrees of freedom is significant at the

.01 level. Although the correlation did not reach the practical level of r=.70 set for the study which would have allowed the methods to be used interchangeably, the correlation was still significant. The r=.70 correlation was set without knowing the degrees of freedom that would exist when the deadline for processing data was reached.

The study called for using a correction for attenuation on the calculated correlation. However, when this process was completed, the resulting correlation was greater than 1.00 which was not valid due to the very low inter-rater reliability. Correlations can range from -1 to +1 and anything outside those limits is not valid. Thus the computed correlation between methods cannot be high due to the unreliability of the evaluators. These errors of measurement may conceal substantial relationships between methods but the magnitude of the relationship is not apparent.

Since the correlation of r=.42 is positive but moderate, the hypothesis was retained and the conclusion was that a positive relationship existed between the personal interview method and the recorded group interview method. Approximately 18 percent of the variation in the recorded group interviews is accounted for by the performance in the personal interviews. In comparing the group method with the recorded method and the group method with the personal method, a positive relationship was found to exist between all three methods. The correlation between the personal and the group methods showed the highest relationship with a Pearson r of .58 with the personal accounting for about 34 percent of the variation in the group interviews. Between the group and recorded group interview methods the Pearson r was .52.

It appears that there is not a great deal of difference in the
selection of one method over another but a better correlation seems probable when a group is involved in the interviewing process. This was the most important hypothesis of the study as it was predicted that there would be a substantial positive relationship and thus either method could be used.

Hypothesis 2. There is a significant difference in the variances for the recorded group interview method and the standard personal interview method.

To determine if the variances differed more than chance, a Hartley test for the ratio of the variances of the two groups was examined.

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methods</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>F-ratio</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Significant F at .05 level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>9.84</td>
<td>96.82</td>
<td>8.18</td>
<td>35,35</td>
<td>2.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recorded Group</td>
<td>28.15</td>
<td>792.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>9.84</td>
<td>96.82</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>35,35</td>
<td>2.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>15.78</td>
<td>249.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recorded</td>
<td>28.15</td>
<td>792.42</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>35,35</td>
<td>2.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>15.78</td>
<td>249.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the summary table it is obvious that the F-ratio of 8.18 between the personal interview method and the recorded group interview method was statistically significant at the .05 level with 35 and 35 degrees of freedom. The ratio needed to be greater than 2.01 to be considered significant. Since there were significant differences in
the variances for the two methods, the null hypothesis was rejected. The recorded method produced the greatest variability in the judges' assessment, while the personal method showed the least variety.

In comparing the group interview method with the recorded group interview method, the ratio of variance was 3.18 which was statistically significant. Also, between the personal and group methods, an F-ratio of 2.57 was significant. In analyzing all three methods, the results indicated that the recorded group interview method produced the greatest variability in the judges' assessment, the group method next and the personal method showed the least variability.

The third hypothesis was concerned with the means for the two methods under study.

Hypothesis 3. There is no significant difference in the means for the recorded group interview method and the standard personal interview method.

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methods</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>t value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>56.19</td>
<td>9.84</td>
<td>17.54</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recorded</td>
<td>73.74</td>
<td>28.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recorded Group</td>
<td>73.74</td>
<td>28.15</td>
<td>20.83</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Group</td>
<td>56.19</td>
<td>9.84</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>&gt;.100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>52.91</td>
<td>15.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To determine if there was a significant difference in the means for the different methods, a t-test for matched groups was used. The tabulated results appear in Table 3.

The mean for the personal interview method was 56.19 and for the recorded group interview method 73.74. Since this is a difference of 17.54 resulting in a t value of 3.80, the t value is significant beyond the .001 level when the degrees of freedom are 35. The null hypothesis was rejected. There was a significant difference in the means between each of the methods used. The nature of the differences is explained as follows. The group method having a mean of 52.91 differed from the recorded group method by 20.83 and from the personal method by 3.63. The higher mean for a specific method showed that the evaluators for that method rated the candidate less highly than methods with a lower mean. The evaluation instrument's scale was from one for outstanding to five for insufficient. The personal interviewers gave the highest rating to the candidates, the group interview teams next and the recorded group interview evaluators the lowest. There seems to be something about the personal contact of the group and personal interview situations that may have allowed the candidate's performance or appearance to influence the evaluators. The recorded group interview evaluators, not having any visual image of the candidate to impress them, nor the chance to establish rapport through personal contact, may have been less venturous in rating the candidate as evidenced by their tendency to use the insufficient column more often than the other evaluators. The possibility of one or more of the group interviewers being acquainted with the candidate may have influenced some of the evaluators from the group.
Inter-Rater Consistency

A two-factor (Rater X Method) analysis of variance was performed separately on each of the three methods. The results gave the mean squared between subjects and the mean squared within subjects which are used in statistically computing inter-rater reliability. The formula

\[ R = 1 - \frac{MS(\text{within})}{MS(\text{between})} \]

was used to determine the inter-rater consistency and the data are summarized in Table 4.

Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Mean Square Between</th>
<th>Mean Square Within</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Calculated Reliability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>730.69</td>
<td>165.81</td>
<td>36,74</td>
<td>.587</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>477.88</td>
<td>241.50</td>
<td>37,152</td>
<td>1.506</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recorded</td>
<td>396.32</td>
<td>283.41</td>
<td>35,144</td>
<td>1.089</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The group interviewers with a consistency of \( r = .77 \) were the only evaluators that demonstrated consistency. The personal interviewers with a rating of \( r = .49 \) and the recorded interview evaluators with \( r = .28 \) each showed a lack of consistency in the ratings of the candidates. Evidently the group method which allowed two team members to concentrate on evaluating the candidate while the third was doing the questioning gave the team the most realistic appraisal of the candidate.
As an added interest to the study, 60 recorded group interview tapes of the same candidate were sent to educators in the field to be evaluated to determine if one group would rate the candidate higher than the other two groups. Twenty tapes were sent to elementary principals, twenty to secondary principals, and twenty to superintendents or supervisors. The evaluation scores for each group are tabulated in Appendix I and were analyzed by an analysis of variance procedure to determine the deviation from the grand mean. The results of the statistical analysis are summarized in Table 5.

Table 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Grand Mean</th>
<th>Adjustment (Deviation)</th>
<th>Adjusted Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#1 (Elementary)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5.85</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>6.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2 (Secondary)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5.85</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>5.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3 (Superintendent or Supervisor)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5.85</td>
<td>-.37</td>
<td>5.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The grand mean was 5.85 and the mean for the elementary principals was 6.08, for the secondary principals 5.99 and for the superintendents and supervisors 5.48. There was no significant difference in the evaluating by any one of the three groups of evaluators. Therefore, the choice of method of interviewing is optional as far as the raters are concerned and this supports hypothesis 1 that all three methods are comparable.
Factor Analyses and Item Correlation of the Evaluation Instrument

For the item correlation of the evaluation instrument, 468 evaluations were used. This analysis included thirteen evaluations for each of the 36 candidates in the study. A Pearson Product Moment Correlation program of the SPSS correlated each item sum across raters with every other item sum for all candidates and then correlated each item sum with the total sum of the scores for the entire evaluation instrument.

The majority of the correlations were above .50 and were significant at the .001 level. The correlations below .50 at .001 significance level were identified and tabulated in Table 6. Seven items of the 28 showed a correlation of less than .50. The items were numbers 10, 11, 14, 15, 22, 23, and 26. The areas evaluated in these items were: a) the candidate's extra-curricular activities which promoted development of leadership, b) the candidate's articulation of the benefits of student teaching, c) the candidate's description of non-professional interests and aspirations, d) the candidate's awareness of the need for continued study and professional growth, e) the candidate's enthusiasm for the church's philosophy, doctrines and writings of Ellen G. White, f) the candidate's perception of giving a Christ-centered focus to his teaching area, and g) the candidate's ability to give full responses without monopolizing the interview.

In correlating the sum of the individual items with the total sum of the 28 items of the instrument, the correlations indicated that all items contributed significantly at the .001 level to the over-all instrument. Item one which evaluated the candidate's alertness and perceptiveness had the highest correlation with .90. The remainder of
Table 6

Summary of Item Analysis Correlations below .5000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>21</th>
<th>22</th>
<th>23</th>
<th>24</th>
<th>25</th>
<th>26</th>
<th>27</th>
<th>28</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</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>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</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>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</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>9</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>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</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>10</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</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>
<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>19</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>
<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>20</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>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</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>21</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>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</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>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</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>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>X</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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</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>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the items except 11 and 15 showed correlations of .80 or .70. Item 15 concerning the need for continued study and professional growth had a correlation of 1.65 and item 11 dealing with student teaching correlated at .51.

In general, the evaluation instrument was statistically satisfactory. With minor revisions, reorganization of certain areas, and the rephrasing of some evaluation statements, the instrument should be adequate for further use.

A factor analysis procedure was used to cluster the items of the evaluation instrument. A variety of statistical procedures were conducted and the results summarized in a varimax rotated factor matrix, which designated the significant factors with the loading of items on each factor. The selected limit for any factor to be considered was set at .60 with no other factor for that item carrying a load of over .40. Only factors loaded with more than one item were considered.

The evaluation instruments were divided into three categories, analyzed and then combined for a final run. The personal interview evaluations, the group interview evaluations, and the recorded group interview evaluations were each analyzed separately and then all 468 were combined for the final analysis. The results are summarized in Table 7.

The combined analysis resulted in the identification of two general factors. One factor dealt with the candidate's attitudes, ability to articulate and being able to state goals. This factor was evidently dominant in two of the methods as the combined analysis had ten loadings, the personal six loadings, and the recorded group an undetermined number as this factor absorbed 100 percent of the recorded
Table 7
Factors Identified by Varimax Rotated Factor Matrix
With the Item Loadings on Each Factor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Factor #1</th>
<th>Factor #2</th>
<th>Factor #3</th>
<th>Factor #4</th>
<th>Factor #5</th>
<th>Factor #6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Combined</td>
<td>1, 2, 4</td>
<td>14, 16, 28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methods</td>
<td>6, 13, 19,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20, 25, 26,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>6, 13, 25,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26, 27, 28</td>
<td>15, 16, 17,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10, 19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5, 8</td>
<td>9, 20, 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recorded</td>
<td>All items loaded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>on first factor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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group interview factors. The second factor for the combined evaluations dealt with the candidate's activities outside the teaching profession and had three loadings.

The second factor for the personal interview method had six loadings and explored philosophical and spiritual issues as well as hypothetical situations with the candidate. The third factor for the personal interview had two loadings that did not seem to have any direct relationship.

The group interview method had two factors with two loadings on one and three on the other. The first factor dealt with the candidate's statement of goals and recognition of strengths and weaknesses. The other factor was concerned with recognizing the problems facing parochial education today as well as recognizing the special role of a parochial school teacher.

The factor analysis procedure revealed that a rearrangement of the items of the evaluation instrument would cluster areas more accurately. Some of the present headings might be eliminated and a larger number than four items could be clustered under a single present heading. It also indicated differences in the way the instrument was used in the different interview situations.

Summary

In this chapter the data and analyses of these data were reported. The planned sample of 40 candidates was reduced to 36 when four of the recorded group interviews were found not usable. For the 36 candidates a combined total of 468 evaluations was solicited and 460 (98 percent) were received and computerized to be analyzed statistically.
by the SPSS program for the Burroughs 6700 computer.

A Pearson Product Moment Correlation of .42 significant at the .001 level showed a positive relationship between the recorded group and the standard personal interview methods even though it did not reach the practical equivalence level suggested for the study. The hypothesis that there would be a positive relationship between the two methods was maintained. The correlations showed that all three methods were positively related.

Hypothesis 2 was concerned with the variances between the two methods and was rejected, as a Hartley test for the ratio of variances established that there were significant differences in the variances for the three methods. This meant that depending on the method, the rater's assessment of the candidates showed a great deal of variability.

The third hypothesis that there would be no significant differences in the means between methods was rejected. A t-test for matched groups indicated a substantial difference in the means for all three methods. This indicated that the evaluators of the different methods as a whole rated the candidates higher or lower by one method than by another. The recorded group interview evaluators were most critical of the candidates.

An analysis of variance procedure was used to check the consistency of the raters, and the low inter-rater reliability indicated a lack of consistency for the personal and recorded group interview evaluators. As an additional check for consistency, the same recorded group interview was sent to twenty secondary principals, twenty elementary principals, and twenty superintendents or supervisors to compare the consistency of ratings. The results showed no significant difference
in the ratings among the groups.

The items of the evaluation instrument were correlated with each other across all candidates and correlated with the total sum of all scores for the instrument. The Pearson r designated 21 items as correlated above .50. In the over-all comparison, the correlations were all significant at the .001 level, establishing that every item had contributed to the usefulness of the instrument and that it was generally consistent in evaluating candidates interviewed by any of the three methods.

As a final substudy, a factor analysis of the instrument clustered the items on two factors. The dominant factor dealt with the candidate's attitudes, ability to articulate, and established goals. The second factor was concerned with the candidate's activities outside the teaching profession.
Chapter 5

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study was conducted to determine if a recorded group interview method might be comparable with the standard personal interview method as a preliminary screening device for prospective teachers in a parochial educational system. A summary of the study will be presented in the first section of this chapter. In the second section the statistical analyses of the data collected will be discussed and conclusions drawn. In the third section recommendations for further research and study and for the refining of the group interview method will be offered.

Summary

A brief history of the problems faced by Seventh-day Adventist educators in recruiting teachers was presented in Chapter 1. Since all Seventh-day Adventist schools are staffed with denominational personnel, the recruiting administrators, superintendents, and supervisors have traveled the continent visiting the ten denominational institutions of higher learning to survey the prospective teachers. The standard personal interview method has been the primary technique used for this preliminary screening process. There has been little consideration given to the use of other techniques. In this study the recorded group interview has been suggested as a possible alternative interview method.

Literature related to recruitment, with emphasis on the employ-
ment interview, was reviewed in Chapter 2. Between 1949 and 1969, four comprehensive reviews of the research on the employment interview were published. The researchers concluded that the employment interview as presently used lacked both validity and reliability, and they suggested changes in research methodology which might lead to more positive results. These suggestions were challenging to readers interested in research but gave little direction to those involved in the day by day process of interviewing prospective employees, who were the ones needing an alternate method. Therefore, a suggested alternative, a cas-
sette-recorded group interview using three interviewers with each candidate, seemed to be a viable alternative suitable for experimentation.

Some previous experimentation has been published using a group interview process in such settings as solving market research problems, in screening applicants for admission to a professional school, and in recruiting prospective teachers. The method was considered very worthwhile by the administrators and teachers involved in the process. Experimentation had also been conducted using recording devices which evidently did not gain popularity because of the high cost of transcription, the expense of obtaining and servicing the machines, and the possibility that the machines would intimidate the parties involved. However, a cassette recorder is so common today that both the intimidation factor and the cost of maintenance are negligible.

Therefore, it seemed that experimentation with a recorded group interview method was timely, as well as challenging. There was the possibility that a positive relationship might be obtained between the standard personal interview and recorded group interview methods. If
this occurred, the alternative process might be promoted, become recognized, be utilized, and eventually be expanded to incorporate such highly technical equipment as the VTR.

A detailed presentation of the procedures used to conduct the study was presented in Chapter 3. The population and the sample were discussed, the data to be collected were identified and the procedures for collecting the data were described. In addition, the statistical methods for analyzing the data for the three research hypotheses as well as for the several substudies were described.

In Chapter 4, a presentation and analysis of the data were provided. The planned sample of 40 candidates was reduced to 36 when four of the recorded group interview tapes were found unusable. The statistical analysis of the 460 evaluations received for the 36 candidates was presented in tables and interpreted as to how it related to the research hypotheses and the substudies.

Findings and Conclusions

Seventeen computer runs were completed using portions of the data or the data in its entirety and were analyzed in regard to the research hypotheses and related substudies. The data showed that a positive relationship existed between the recorded group interview method and the standard personal interview method. The Pearson correlation of $r = 0.42$ indicated a positive relationship at the .01 level of significance, even though it did not reach the practical level of $r = 0.70$ set for the study.

Further analyses of the data revealed that a positive but low correlation existed between the recorded group interview method and the
group interview method. In addition, a low but positive correlation existed between the group interview method and the standard personal interview method.

In the gathering of data for this study, considerable feedback was received from the campus coordinators, interviewers, and field evaluators about the three interview methods. In addition, the study director in screening the taped interviews noted possible influencing factors. Since the compilation of this information was not part of the research design for the study, it was not included in Chapter 4. However, the feedback could prove invaluable to those experimenting further with various interview methods and therefore it is being summarized in this chapter.

In interviewing and evaluation of candidates, a number of factors may have had a definite influence. Some personal interviewers noted that the evaluation was far too complex for the "quickie-get-acquainted" type of personal interviews they were accustomed to conducting. They indicated that the instrument was gauged more to in-depth interviews, while their primary purpose was to scrutinize the candidate's appearance and poise and assess his warmth and friendliness. The personal interviewers, as well as the group team and field evaluators, expressed frustration in having to evaluate all 28 items and this could have had a negative effect on some evaluations.

Some group interviewers stated that they appreciated the opportunity to be able to relax and observe while other members of the team did the questioning. This was a marked contrast to the personal interviewing where the interviewer feels almost the same pressure as the candidate to keep a rapid-fire exchange of ideas as time is usually so
limited. Both the personal interviewers and group interviewers had the advantage over the field evaluators in not having to form a mental picture of the candidate strictly from a tape recording.

For the group interview and subsequently for the taped interviews sent to the field evaluators, the basic motivation of the interviewers and candidates could have influenced the interviews. Some interviewers suggested that the procedure was an experiment to explore an alternate method of interviewing and failed to inform the candidate of the possibility that the taped interview would allow him to be exposed to a wider range of prospective employers than would be experienced by his fellow candidates who were not being tape recorded. When this was the case, the enthusiasm of all concerned could have been limited. The candidate could easily have said to himself, "Why should I defend my philosophy of discipline or exert myself to explain my commitment to Christian Education? These interviewers are not considering me for employment so let's just get the exercise over with." When this was the case, the candidate would stand to have a lower rating from the group interviewers and the field evaluators than from the personal interviewer who was seriously considering the candidate for appointment.

For the interviewers the mind-set would definitely influence their participation both in interviewing and evaluating. If they were not sure of the values of the procedure other than to make it an interesting study, the interview would probably be a casual twenty-minute chat with a hasty conclusion as the time expired. Many of the interviewers and evaluators had little knowledge of past research in regard to the employment interview and since it is the only method familiar to them, the halo surrounding it may be difficult to dispel.
In listening to the tapes, some evaluators noted that interviewers, who were usually very aggressive, proceeded very cautiously. They gave the impression of being reserved and took a non-threatening stance. Evidently they did not want to appear aggressive and may have feared criticism from their fellow educators in the field as to their expertise in conducting an employment interview.

In some interviews the complexity of the questions seemed to overwhelm the candidate, and some interviewers seemed oblivious to the strain their questioning and probing was producing in the candidate. In other interviews too much time was spent on non-essential "small talk" and when the critical areas were reached, the group began rushing the interview leaving little time for thorough answers or for the candidate to ask relevant questions.

The fact that many candidates were just beginning their student teacher experience or had not started at all seemed to influence the interviewers. Student teaching is the one topic that appears in nearly every teacher recruitment interview and, without having had the experience, the candidate would not be in a position to relate adequately to the hypothetical situations set up by the interviewers.

The technical production and resulting quality of the taped interview was a relevant factor. Some interviewers' questions and the candidate's responses were hard to hear and in addition conflicting exterior noises added to the problem. Several evaluators stated that having to strain to hear the candidate's responses and not being entirely sure what was said tended to result in a lower score than was probably deserved.

As a last possibility, many evaluators and interviewers have
been so accustomed to an annual recruiting excursion that an alternative method which might curtail their personal desire to travel might be less than appealing and consequently their participation less enthusiastic. On the other hand, if the evaluator knew that he needed to make definite preliminary screening decisions from the recorded group interview he would probably have evaluated the interview more seriously.

Hypothesis 2 was concerned with the difference in the variances between the standard personal interview method and the recorded group interview method. The F-ratios for these two methods as well as for comparing all three methods were statistically significant. The conclusion was that the null hypothesis should be rejected as there was a significant amount of disagreement or lack of agreement between interviewers or evaluators.

Hypothesis 3 predicted no significant difference in the means between the two main methods under study. The statistical analysis of the data produced means that varied from 52.91 for the group interviewers to 73.74 for the field evaluators of the recorded group interviews. The null hypothesis was rejected as there was a substantial difference in the means between each of the three methods. The conclusion reached was that the higher mean for the recorded group interview method indicated that the evaluators had given lower scores to the candidates interviewed by that method. Since the candidate was evaluated on a scale of one to five with one being outstanding and five being insufficient or inadequate.

According to a number of evaluators, the request that all items of the evaluation be completed resulted in using the number five column, insufficient response, to indicate lack of information rather than an
inadequate answer on the part of the candidate. It seems that the recorded group interview evaluators seemed hesitant to venture an opinion as readily as did the evaluators using the other methods. It is possible that the lack of a visual image or the absence of personal rapport may have been influencing factors.

The three substudies which added interest to the main study dealt with the consistency of the evaluators and item and factor analyses of the evaluation instrument. The first of these, the consistency of the raters, was determined by using an analysis of variance procedure. As one would expect after reviewing the literature, the personal interview evaluators showed a lack of consistency. However, the recorded group interview evaluators showed a similar lack of consistency. The group evaluators were the only ones who showed any degree of consistency and since there were fewer of them, 120 compared with 180 for each of the other two methods, one might speculate that the consistency might have decreased as the number of evaluators increased. The conclusion in judging rater consistency was that raters as a whole were not consistent regardless of the method being used.

The correlations for the item sums indicated that the instrument as a whole was significantly correlated to have done a satisfactory job with all items contributing. However, seven items were less correlated than the other 21 and the conclusion was that if these seven items were removed, rephrased, or combined with another item the items of the instrument would then have correlated higher. The seven items dealt with the candidate's extra-curricular activities, non-professional activities, ability to respond fully, articulation of student teaching benefits, awareness of further study needs and professional growth, and
enthusiasm for the church's philosophy, doctrines, and for making his teaching area Christ-centered.

Inasmuch as many of the candidates had not started or were just beginning student teaching, the evaluators may have felt this area was not significant at the time of the interview. Also, the evaluators did not seem concerned that the candidate consider future study and professional growth until the experience of employment dictate the desirability. Since the majority of the candidates had a Seventh-day Adventist background and were educated in Seventh-day Adventist schools, the evaluators evidently felt discussing church philosophy, doctrines, and the writings of Ellen G. White to determine the candidate's enthusiasm was not necessary during the pre-screening employment interview. During most of the interviews time was of essence and little opportunity was provided the candidate to develop full responses. Therefore, the evaluators did not relate this item significantly to the over-all evaluation instrument.

The conclusion was that the instrument as used in the study was reasonably adequate, but for future use some modification would make it even more useful. Modification or deletion of the seven least correlated items could probably add strength to the instrument.

The factor analysis of the evaluation instrument identified two main factors with several item loadings on each. The most significant factor, that related to the candidate's attitudes and his ability to articulate goals, was dominant with all three methods of interviewing. The second significant factor was concerned with the candidate's activities outside the teaching profession.

The conclusion reached from the clustering of items by factor
analysis was that a rearrangement of some items and possibly the elimination of some others would provide a more concise and more highly correlated instrument. There is the possibility that the evaluation instrument as used contained too many items and a reduction by means of item analysis and factor analysis would improve it considerably.

Recommendations

The recorded group interview method seems worthy of further study as an alternate to the standard personal interview method in the preliminary screening of prospective teachers for the Seventh-day Adventist and other parochial school systems. Therefore, it is recommended that for the next recruiting period one Seventh-day Adventist institution of higher learning make this the primary method of acquainting recruiters with candidates.

To facilitate future use of the method, the following suggestions are submitted:

1. The taping area should be free from exterior noises such as vacuum cleaners and telephones which may not disturb the immediate group but are very disturbing to those evaluating the taped interview.

2. A 90-minute tape should be provided so there will be no interruption to turn the tape over. The 45-minutes on one side is ample for any recorded group interview.

3. Each participant in the recorded group interview session should be provided with his own microphone and preferably a lapel mike.

4. The group leader should set up the equipment before the candidate arrives and test a short portion of the tape to set the controls at the proper volume.
5. The suggested questions be reduced to two or three specific items for each area which would encourage greater consistency between interviews.

6. Interviewers should endeavor to avoid questions that have obvious expected answers and also questions that can be answered by "yes" or "no."

7. Interviewers should read the candidate's resume before the interview and refrain from asking questions that have been answered in the resume.

8. Questions on philosophy and other areas that require in-depth responses should be circulated in advance to the candidates so greater depth of responses might be elicited in a shorter span of time.

9. The candidate should not be slated for the recorded group interview session until he has had some student teaching experience.

10. The evaluation instrument should be reduced in size to possibly two statements for each area and a sixth column should be included marked "no basis for evaluating."

11. When the interview closes, the interviewers and the candidate should spend a few minutes listening to segments of the tape to see that the production meets their expectations.

The second recommendation is to have an inservice program to acquaint educators in the field with the recorded group interview method. Since some recruiters have felt their one-to-one interviews were not of sufficient depth to evaluate, they should be encouraged to participate in some group recorded sessions to improve their skills. By being involved with other interviewers these recruiters would be able
to analyze their own techniques and draw conclusions as to how to make their in-depth interviews more valuable to themselves and more meaningful to the candidates.

To increase the credibility of the merits of the recorded group interview, administrators, superintendents, and supervisors in the field need to learn more of its possibilities. Recruiters who have profited from experience with the recorded group interview might be used as resource persons in inservice sessions held at various locations. Not only would the value of the method be stressed but the educators would be assured as well that the recorded group interview was not intended to replace the standard personal interview method but is an alternate method particularly useful in the preliminary screening of candidates. They should be encouraged to try using this method and perhaps save many of their travel dollars since they would have to leave their campuses only for the final in-depth interviews, or, they might invite the final candidates to their campuses.

An additional sheet of suggested questions could be provided for the recruiters giving realistic hypothetical situations to use in the follow-up interview. An evaluation sheet similar to the one used by the group interviewers could provide a useful rating of each candidate interviewed and provide for greater consistency when the recruiter reviews all the candidates after the recruiting trip.

In addition, from the administrator's perspective, the effort put forth to make the personal in-depth interviews more standardized could contribute to later evaluation after the teachers have been hired. The residual benefit would be in the formation of a competent teacher evaluation system, as the qualities and qualifications explored by the
recruiter and the specific concerns expressed during the interview would still be the same after hiring the candidate. The interview could thus form a basis for evaluating teacher performance in relation to expectations.

As college education departments become involved with the recorded group interview process, the director of student teaching will become an integral part of the program. The recommendations for the candidates he supervised should become part of the packet sent out to recruiters. This will require greater accountability of the college personnel giving recommendations and they will have to arrange conference time with the candidates to become better acquainted. Only in this way will their recommendations become the forthright, candid appraisals desired by recruiters.
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APPENDIX A

INSTRUCTIONS TO INTERVIEWERS AND EVALUATORS
Since these instructions are for all three groups taking part in this study, please select only the specific items that pertain to you.

1. You will note from the Prospective Teacher Resume Form that considerable information about the candidate is already available. This information should be studied before conducting the recorded group or personal interview or before evaluating the tape of the recorded group interview. This will allow more time to be devoted to other areas not covered in part by the resume as you interview the candidate.

2. Select two areas in advance so that all six areas will be covered by a different interviewer and thus the possibility of overlapping in questioning or of one interviewer monopolizing the time can be averted. However, during the interview, no interviewer is to be limited strictly to the areas previously selected.

3. Select a chairperson to give introductions and to set the candidate at ease. Budget your time; interviews should last about thirty minutes.

4. The Interviewer's Guide contains the specific areas to be covered during the interview. The chairperson should see that all these areas are covered. The suggested questions are given as a guide and you may be selective in the ones you use and may rephrase them to suit your satisfaction as long as the basic areas are covered adequately.

5. The RATING SCALE for the Interview Evaluation is as follows:

   (1) EXCELLENT --- INADEQUATE (5)

   1. EXCELLENT RESPONSE

      -mature, clear, thorough, creative answers
      -consistently showed depth of knowledge and understanding
      -confident

   2. GOOD RESPONSE

      -considerable confidence
      -nearly always showed depth of knowledge and understanding
      -well organized

   3. ADEQUATE RESPONSE

      -common, somewhat ordinary, adequate responses
      -usually reflected sufficient knowledge and understanding
      -average composure and confidence

   4. LIMITED/POOR RESPONSE

      -very general, groped for answers
      -sometimes showed little depth or understanding
      -indecisive, unsure

   5. INSUFFICIENT/INADEQUATE RESPONSE

      -seldom answered questions directly or satisfactorily
      -hedged, seemed uneasy and very unsure of self
      -needed considerable reassurance to give answers
APPENDIX B

INTERVIEWER'S GUIDE TO INTERVIEW AREAS
WITH SUGGESTED QUESTIONS
INTERVIEWER'S GUIDE TO INTERVIEW AREAS WITH SUGGESTED QUESTIONS

A. Personal & Background

1. Tell something about yourself, your family background, precollege schooling, etc.
2. What are some of the factors that motivated you to go to college?
3. How would you describe yourself—temperament, human relations skills, etc.?
4. How do you think a friend or professor who knows you well would describe you?
5. Describe the social activities in which you participate.
6. What are your leisure time interests and hobbies?
7. What motivates you to put forth your greatest effort?
8. How well do you work under pressure?

B. Career Selection

1. Why did you choose teaching as a career and why elementary or secondary level?
2. What do you consider the basic goals of Seventh-day Adventist education?
3. How do you evaluate or determine success?
4. What qualities should a successful teacher have?
5. What qualifications do you have that you think will help you succeed as a teacher?
6. What do you consider to be your greatest strengths and weaknesses?
7. What are your unique teaching qualities?
8. What satisfactions have you had in working with young people?
9. What accomplishments have given you a great deal of satisfaction?
10. What two or three things are most important to you in a job?

C. Educational Accomplishments

1. How has your college work prepared you for teaching?
2. Was your student teaching a meaningful experience?
3. What did you like and dislike about student teaching?
4. How was your college education financed?
5. What kind of jobs have you held since high school graduation?
6. What special areas or abilities do you feel qualify you for this career?
7. What extra curricular activities did you participate in during high school and college?
8. Did any experience in the last five years involve community service or working with children or adolescents?
9. In what activities have you assumed a leadership role?
10. Describe the reading you have done during the last year that was not required for course work.

D. Goals and Ambitions

1. What are your long range and short range goals and objectives?
2. What do you see yourself doing five years from now? ten years?
3. What do you really want to do in life?
4. What is your prime goal in working for young people?
5. What are the most important rewards you expect in your career?
6. What are your plans for continued study or an advanced degree?
7. How do you plan to become involved in community activities?
E. Philosophy

1. How do you feel about assuming non-teaching responsibilities around the school?
2. What major problem have you encountered recently and how did you deal with it?
3. To whom do you feel a teacher should be loyal?
4. What is your definition of "individualized instruction" and how does it work?
5. How will you feel about enforcing a faculty action that lessens your popularity with the students?
6. What is your philosophy on discipline?
7. Describe your attitude toward the reading of fiction and competition.
8. How would you feel about being on the job 24 hours a day, seven days a week?
9. How important is the teacher "model" role?
10. Do you feel that teachers work harder than other professional people?
11. Are schools responsible for developing ethical standards?
12. What are some major problems facing parochial education today?
13. What should be the parent's role in today's education?
14. What are some kinds of experiences in elementary or secondary schools that will allow students to leave with a positive attitude?
15. Do you feel standards should be different depending on the geographic location of the elementary or secondary school or if it is a boarding situation?

F. Spiritual

1. Briefly describe your religious background and training.
2. Are you a baptized, tithe-paying Seventh-day Adventist?
3. Describe as best you can your present relationship with God.
4. How do you spend a typical Sabbath day?
5. Describe your solution to one of the following problems confronting the church: music, theatre attendance, dancing, jewelry, drugs, pre-marital sex, homosexuality, and vegetarianism.
6. What has been your involvement in church activities and outreach programs?
7. How can classes other than "Bible" have a Christ-centered focus?
8. How do children learn to love and know God?
9. Which Ellen G. White books have you read?
10. What are the two most important things you know about God?
APPENDIX C

INTERVIEW EVALUATION INSTRUMENT
INTERVIEW EVALUATION

PLEASE CIRCLE ONE RESPONSE FOR EACH STATEMENT. EVERY STATEMENT MUST BE EVALUATED.

Personal and Background

The candidate:

a) showed mental alertness, perceptiveness, grasped intent of questions  
   1  2  3  4  5
b) demonstrated communicative ability...clarity, organization, forcefulness  
   1  2  3  4  5
c) exhibited leadership ability in using human relation skills and resourcefulness  
   1  2  3  4  5
d) seemed to show maturity--self-reliance, stability  
   1  2  3  4  5

Career Decision

The candidate:

a) demonstrated knowledge of self, recognized strengths and weaknesses  
   1  2  3  4  5
b) showed professional awareness of his role as a teacher  
   1  2  3  4  5
c) had a personal philosophy of altruism  
   1  2  3  4  5
d) identified realistic career goals and a plan for attainment  
   1  2  3  4  5

Educational Accomplishments

The candidate:

a) has shown personal drive and effort in reaching present educational status  
   1  2  3  4  5
b) discussed involvement in extra-curricular activities which promoted the  
   development of leadership abilities  
   1  2  3  4  5
c) was able to articulate those aspects of student teaching which were especially beneficial  
   1  2  3  4  5
d) indicated personal initiative and resourcefulness  
   1  2  3  4  5

Goals and Ambitions

The candidate:

a) expressed well-defined, thought through personal goals and objectives  
   1  2  3  4  5
b) described non-professional interests and aspirations  
   1  2  3  4  5
c) sensed need for continued study and professional growth  
   1  2  3  4  5
d) recognized need for community involvement  
   1  2  3  4  5

Philosophy

The candidate:

a) expressed a relevant personal philosophy on issues such as discipline  
   1  2  3  4  5
b) tackled hypothetical situations realistically  
   1  2  3  4  5
c) avoided "expected answers" not seeming overly anxious to please but rather  
   gave apparently honest responses  
   1  2  3  4  5
d) was sensitive to the problems facing Seventh-day Adventist educators today  
   1  2  3  4  5

Spiritual

The candidate:

a) recognized the spiritual role of a teacher in a parochial school  
   1  2  3  4  5
b) showed enthusiasm for the church's philosophy and doctrines and the writings  
   of Ellen G. White  
   1  2  3  4  5
c) saw the possibility of giving a Christ-centered focus to his teaching areas  
   1  2  3  4  5
d) was able to describe an active, growing commitment to the church  
   1  2  3  4  5

General

The candidate:

a) took the initiative to explain or point out facts when necessary  
   1  2  3  4  5
b) took advantage of opportunities to give full response without monopolizing  
   the interview  
   1  2  3  4  5
c) shows promise for pursuing a successful teaching career  
   1  2  3  4  5
d) asked relevant questions of interviewers  
   1  2  3  4  5

Does your "gut level" evaluation tell you something about the candidate that is different from what is expressed in the above evaluation?

If Yes, Explain Yes No
APPENDIX D

GUIDE FOR CAMPUS COORDINATOR
GUIDE FOR CAMPUS COORDINATOR

1. Primary Duties of the Coordinator

A. Select five elementary and five secondary prospective teachers for a total of ten candidates
   1) Selection must be done randomly
   2) Select two alternates randomly

B. Arrange for group orientation session
   1) Discuss the purpose of the study
   2) Explain the candidate's role
   3) Distribute resume forms

C. Select two three-person interview teams with following membership:
   1) Elementary and secondary school principals
   2) Supervisors of student teaching
   3) Educator currently in Educational Administration or with recent administrative experience which involved hiring school personnel

D. Arrange luncheon or dinner meeting with interview teams
   1) Discuss purpose of the study and interviewers' role
   2) Select a chairperson
   3) Distribute materials

E. Schedule the recorded group interviews
   1) Three elementary and three secondary by November 30
   2) Two elementary and two secondary by January 30

F. Schedule each candidate for five standard personal interviews
   1) Solicit assistance of recruiters who have made appointments with candidates involved in the study
   2) Distribute materials to recruiters
   3) Collect the completed interviewers' evaluation sheets

G. Send materials to the study director
   1) First set of cassette tapes, candidate's resumes and recorded group interviewers' evaluations as soon as they are ready and not later than November 30
   2) Standard personal interview evaluations on January 15 and balance January 30
   3) Remainder of recorded group interview cassette tapes and interviewers' evaluations by January 30

H. Submit expense reports to the study director periodically and the final report around January 30
2. Selection of Participants

A. A cross section of both elementary and secondary prospective teachers is desired; a random selection process will be necessary.

B. Coordinator will select five elementary and five secondary level candidates.

C. For random selection use an alphabetical listing of each group and select every fifth name until the desired number is reached.

D. One alternate for each level should be selected in case a candidate cannot serve.

3. Orientation Meeting with Candidates

A. Coordinator will contact candidates and alternates and arrange for an orientation meeting.

B. During the meeting the coordinator will:
   1) Discuss the purpose of the study.
   2) Outline the candidate's role.
   3) Read a random sample of interview questions to brief candidates on areas to be covered in an interview.
   4) Distribute resume forms with deadline of November 30 for returning them to the coordinator.
   5) Substitute an alternate if a candidate declines the invitation to be involved.
   6) Provide refreshments for which coordinator will be reimbursed.

4. Selection of Recorded Group Interview Teams

A. Coordinator will select a three-person interview team for each level.

B. The composition of the elementary level team should be:
   1) Elementary supervisor of student teaching
   2) Elementary school principal
   3) Educator currently in Educational Administration or with recent administrative experience which involved hiring school personnel

C. The composition of the secondary level team should be:
   1) Secondary supervisor of student teaching
   2) Secondary school principal
   3) Educator currently in Educational Administration or with recent administrative experience which involved hiring school personnel

D. The same interview team should conduct all five interviews for one level.

5. Meeting of Recorded Group Interview Teams

A. Coordinator will schedule an orientation meeting for the recorded group interviewers. It is suggested that this be a luncheon or dinner meeting at a local restaurant at the study director's expense.
B. Each team will choose a chairperson who will be responsible for setting the stage for the interviews and for seeing that the coordinator receives the cassette tapes and completed evaluations.

C. The coordinator would be the chairperson if involved as a member of the interview team.

D. The coordinator will introduce the interviewers to the following materials:
   1) Instructions to Interviewers and Evaluators
   2) Prospective Teacher Resume Form
   3) Interviewer's Guide to Interview with Suggested Questions
   4) Interview Evaluation Instrument

6. Scheduling of Interviews

A. Coordinator selects six candidates for the November recorded group interviews which will then be followed by standard personal interviews.

B. Coordinator will inform the remaining four candidates that they will have the standard personal interviews before being scheduled for recorded group interviews in January.

7. Standard Personal Interviews

A. The coordinator will check the appointment sign-up sheets to see when the candidates involved in the study are meeting with recruiters.

B. The recruiters will be given the same materials as the recorded group interview team members and will be asked to complete an interview evaluation for certain candidates.

C. The coordinator will solicit the help of the candidates to see that recruiters get necessary materials.

D. When five evaluations for a candidate are secured from recruiters, no further standard personal evaluations will be necessary for that candidate.

8. Tapes and Evaluations

A. By the end of November the coordinator will send the following to the study director:
   1) Six cassette interviews
   2) Eighteen evaluation sheets from the recorded group interview teams
   3) Resume forms for 10 candidates

B. By January 15 the coordinator will send the first batch of standard personal evaluations and the balance by January 30.

C. The coordinator will send the remainder of the recorded group interview cassette tapes and team evaluations by January 30.

9. Reimbursement

A. The coordinator is expected to submit to the study director a statement of expenditures for supplies, postage, telephone calls, refreshments, and restaurant entertainment for which reimbursement will be made.
10. Materials

A. The study director will supply the coordinator with the following materials:
   1) 10 cassette tapes
   2) 50 copies of Instructions to Interviewers and Evaluators
   3) 50 copies of Interviewer's Guide to Interview Areas with Suggested Questions
   4) 15 Prospective Teacher Resume Forms
   5) 100 Interview Evaluation Sheets
APPENDIX E

PROSPECTIVE TEACHER RESUME FORM
## Personal Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Major</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College address</th>
<th>Phone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Permanent address</th>
<th>Phone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Height</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>U.S. Citizen?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital status</th>
<th>Dependents</th>
<th>Spouse desires employment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spouse's skills for employment?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Describe your health</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What are your special interests and hobbies?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Desired Position(s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elementary (grade level)</th>
<th>Secondary (subjects)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date available for employment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specify any restrictions geographically for employment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Certification Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Certification status by next September: (check those that apply)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of hours in other subject concentrations?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>If not qualified for certification, how many hours in Education and Psychology?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## General

| Curricular and extra curricular activities capable of directing: |
|                                                               |
|                                                               |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arts and Crafts training?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Music training?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Spiritual

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>List the people on campus and off who are best able to describe the quality of your commitment to Christian principles.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX F

LETTER TO EVALUATORS
Dear Friend,

You may be surprised by this letter as it's possible that we have not visited since I left the principalship of PUC Prep School in June of 1977. That does not mean that I have forgotten you, but working on a doctoral degree has not left much time for travel or letter writing. Since July of 1977 I have been commuting to the University of the Pacific in Stockton during the week to study. With the Lord's blessing, the coursework has been completed and the oral and written examinations passed. For the past three months I have been involved with my dissertation; and if all goes according to schedule, I expect to finish in the spring and graduate in June of 1979.

During my years of principalship I was often perplexed with Education Days and the multiplicity of interviews scheduled for both the candidate and the administrator. After the first several interviews there seemed to be a danger of becoming somewhat superficial as everyone hastened to meet the next appointment. Thus for my doctoral dissertation I have been developing a proposed alternative to the traditional personal interview in the recruitment of prospective teachers that may prove practical to administrators. The proposed alternative is a three-person team conducting a recorded group interview with a candidate, and the taped interview would then be available to administrators and supervisors in the field to use as a preliminary screening device.

Part of my dissertation involves using this procedure with a wide range of samples in several of our colleges and having the resulting taped interviews evaluated by administrators and supervisors in the field. That is why I am writing to you as I need your assistance in evaluating taped interviews. Each thirty-minute tape will be accompanied by the candidate's personal resume and a one-page evaluation sheet of 28 statement statements judging the candidate's strengths and weaknesses on a one-to-five point scale. The evaluation sheet has been reviewed by personnel in the field and is not considered time-consuming to complete. Therefore, the total time involved with reading the resume, listening to the tape and evaluating the interview should not run more than 45 minutes.

I do not want to appear presumptuous of your friendship as I realize how busy you are. But with hundred of tapes to evaluate, it will necessarily involve quite a number of administrators to make this study possible. Thank you for considering carefully the possibility of participation and for returning the enclosed participation form at your earliest convenience. I shall be awaiting your reply.

Have a pleasant Thanksgiving break.

Sincerely yours,

Ervin Bigham
APPENDIX G

PARTICIPATION FORM.
Dear Ervin,

I will be willing to evaluate the following number of taped interviews for you during the next four months:

2 3 4 5

Please do not send more than ___ tapes at one time.

I am sorry but I will not be able to participate in the evaluation of taped interviews during the next four months.

Name

Address

Zip

Phone
APPENDIX H

FOLLOW-UP LETTER
Dear Friend,

There comes a time when one must face the timetable. I am now in the final weeks of finishing my dissertation and the deadline for having the evaluations of the recorded tapes to the computer center is March 20. This means that if you have not mailed the tapes and evaluations to me already, a different procedure will need to be used. Since fourth class mail is really slow, please send the evaluation sheets by letter and the tapes then can come by 4th class rate as they will not be sent on to other evaluators. The evaluation sheets are goldenrod in color and that is the only item that I urgently need. If these are mailed to me by March 16 they will be in Stockton by March 19. Thank you for making this adjustment and special effort to meet the March 20 deadline.

I want to thank you for participating in this project. It was more complicated than anticipated but is coming to a successful conclusion. After graduation in mid-May, I plan to send you a brief summary of the results of the study.

Sincerely yours,

Ervin H. Bigham
APPENDIX I

SIXTY SCORES FOR THE SAME CANDIDATE
TO CHECK INTER-RATER RELIABILITY
## APPENDIX I

### Sixty Scores for the Same Candidate to Check Inter-rater Reliability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elementary Principals</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>64</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Secondary Principals</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>58</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>69</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supervisors and Superintendents</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>66</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>81</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX J

CANDIDATES' COMPOSITE SCORES FOR GROUP PERSONAL AND TAPED INTERVIEW METHODS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Personal</th>
<th>Taped</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>69</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>68</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>58</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>69</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>52</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>58</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>58</td>
<td>73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>72</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>52</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>57</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>66</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>56</td>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>58</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>76</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>83</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>87</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>97</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>89</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>104</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>92</td>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>86</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>65</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>57</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>105</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>61</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>57</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>59</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>61</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>68</td>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tape not usable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>73</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>99</td>
<td>112</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>67</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>64</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>65</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>66</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>66</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>58</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>56</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>68</td>
<td>87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>78</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>63</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>64</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>111</td>
<td>92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>63</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>72</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>90</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>95</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>112</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>111</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>76</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>89</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>62</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>89</td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
<td>81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>93</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>72</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>61</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>73</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>67</td>
<td>77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>59</td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>58</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>66</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>86</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>Taped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>37 36 70</td>
<td>56 71 73 40 54</td>
<td>68 65 39 47 71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>29 41 44</td>
<td>39 39 47 48 56</td>
<td>61 86 47 65 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>39 38 37</td>
<td>28 28 43 63 47</td>
<td>69 82 60 58 72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>28 41 32</td>
<td>33 41 61 44 33</td>
<td>46 40 36 60 87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>33 33 28</td>
<td>30 35 51 30 82</td>
<td>76 43 36 53 82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>40 34 32</td>
<td>63 28 51 49 28</td>
<td>42 59 71 73 70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>35 30 31</td>
<td>51 28 56 41 28</td>
<td>68 53 84 82 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>64 33 52</td>
<td>42 53 45 55 56</td>
<td>57 52 91 56 83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>38 51 59</td>
<td>79 54 58 77 58</td>
<td>56 72 78 80 78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>38 41 45</td>
<td>60 50 54 40 64</td>
<td>57 53 63 54 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>63 74 38</td>
<td>60 68 57 50 34</td>
<td>61 86 65 47 62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>79 49 48</td>
<td>41 80 66 28 74</td>
<td>80 77 94 83 74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>62 28 43</td>
<td>54 78 47 42 46</td>
<td>44 67 74 60 67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>39 43 37</td>
<td>56 61 70 60</td>
<td>Tape not usable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>53 63 43</td>
<td>58 40 73 43 38</td>
<td>Tape not usable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>33 39 41</td>
<td>56 41 48 69</td>
<td>Tape not usable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>