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Abstract

Analysis of Personnel Interview Questions for Student Affairs Positions at Land-Grant Institutions

Personnel issues have always played an important part in any operation. There is no denying the fact that proper selection and placement of individuals could be the key to an organization's success. This study was made to compare the variables assessed and questions asked during final interviews to evaluate the candidates for open positions in the division of student affairs at all public land-grant institutions.

The theoretical base for the study stressed the necessity of comparing applicants' abilities. Variables being considered during the interviews were categorized as job knowledge, professional attitude, personal qualities, interpersonal skills and miscellaneous. Using these variables as a guide a survey-questionnaire was constructed to collect data from the pre-determined population.

Based on the content analysis of the data collected, a generic model of a set of interview questions was proposed which includes a total of 15 items.
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Chapter 1

Introduction

People are the most important asset of any organization. People establish the goals, they develop the strategies, they provide the directions and they follow those directions to set things in motion. Nothing gets done unless the right kind of people are in place to take on the responsibilities.

All recent literature suggested that emphasis be placed on the hiring of personnel. (Ulrich & Trumbo, 1965; Black, 1970; Hakel, Dobmeyer, & Dunnette, 1970; Jackson, 1972; Fear, 1973; Pursell, Campion, & Gaylord, 1980; and Eder, Kacmar & Ferris, 1989) The old cliche that "people make the world go around" holds true in today's society. For any organization to be effective and efficient, only the kind of people who best fit should be recruited and placed.

The cost of hiring the wrong persons is very high when one considers the expenses associated with selecting and orienting a new employee. "According to the U.S. Department of Labor, each 'wrong hire' could be costing your company 33 percent above the mis-hire's annual salary in lost productivity and replacement expense" (Gorman,
1989, p. 40). Furthermore, if a wrong person is hired and he/she stays on, the cost is not the only concern; morale of the entire workplace might be affected. Pursell et al. summed it up well when they stated that "Maximizing the effectiveness of personnel selection is vital to organizational health" (1980, p. 907).

When you hire a new employee, you hire more than an individual. You are selecting a member of your team. When hiring a new employee, therefore, you should be thinking about team building and the type of person needed. (Schneider-Jenkins & Carr-Ruffino, 1985, p. 38)

No management function is more critical to a company's success than the hiring of people who will, hopefully, go on to become competent, motivated, productive employees. A company is only as good as its people. (Half, 1985, p. 24)

To put it succinctly, according to Singer and Ramsden (1972), "If you get the right man in the first place, the problems of man management will be in the last place" (p. 53).

Statement of the Problem

Purpose:
The purpose of the study was to analyze and validate
the interview selection criteria, as utilized by the chief student affairs officers of the 72 land grant colleges and universities, for the successful placement of personnel in that particular area. The second purpose was to develop a generic model or instrument that could be used as a base for future personnel selections.

Statement:
The following questions served as a basis for the collection and analysis of data:

1. What were the common criteria used for the selection interviews based on the data collected?
2. What techniques or processes were used to validate these criteria?
3. What questions were used to address the criteria?
4. How were the answers evaluated?
5. Were enough validated criteria available to develop a generic model?

Significance of the Study
Limited research was found with respect to the recruitment, interviewing, placement and the subsequent evaluation of personnel in the area of student affairs in higher education. Considering how significant the personnel decisions are in affecting any organization, it should come as no surprise that much literature was found
in the business-related field concerning personnel matters.

When one is to evaluate the effectiveness of student affairs in a higher educational institution setting, the leadership provided in key positions becomes a major factor. R. C. Maxson (personal communication, October 18, 1990), President of the University of Nevada, Las Vegas stated that, "I would find it helpful to know exactly how student affairs chiefs do go about assessing candidates for the various jobs they must fill in their area" (Appendix A). On what criteria are these key personnel selections based? The selection decision can only be as good as the individuals who make the decisions since they are the ones who set the tone for the organization. Therefore this study deemed it important to examine the issue from the potential selection makers' prospective.

Research Design

This was a descriptive study using a questionnaire-survey technique to obtain data from a selected population. It was also developmental in that, based on the analysis of criteria, a generic model would be developed. The population of the study included all the chief student affairs officers at the 72 land-grant institutions across the nation.

A validated questionnaire was sent to obtain the following data: (a) samples of interview questions,
(b) samples of interview evaluation instruments (candidate rating forms), and (c) techniques or processes the institutions used to validate the selection process. Validation of the questionnaire-survey was done by a panel of experts.

A content analysis of both the questionnaire and validation process was made to determine if the construction of a generic model was feasible.

Assumptions

1. It was assumed that a large majority of interviews were structured.

2. It was assumed that interview evaluation instruments were used to objectively compare the candidates' qualifications (Half, 1985).

3. It was assumed that there were more similarities than differences among all interview questions asked and among interview evaluation instruments.

4. It was assumed that appraisals were conducted by the chief student affairs officers in evaluating the performance of the successful candidates to validate that the best candidates were selected for the jobs.

5. It was assumed that the nature of the institutional culture would affect decision-making on selecting the winning candidate.
Delimitations of the Study

1. The type of research conducted for this study was descriptive and developmental.

2. This study was intended to examine and compare the successful personnel placement practices among the chief student affairs officers in land-grant colleges and universities.

3. This study was limited to the examination of personnel placements in the past five years.

Conceptual Base for the Study

Two similar models for personnel selection as proposed by William B. Castetter and Ronald W. Rebore, respectively, served as the conceptual base for the study. Castetter (1986) stated that

As the process of securing competent personnel moves from recruitment to the selection phase, a number of formidable problems confront the personnel administrator. These include establishing role requirements, determining kinds of data needed to select competent individuals from the pool of applicants, deciding what devices and procedures are to be employed in gathering the data....In brief, one important facet of the personnel function includes designing, initiating, and executing an effective selection process (p. 221).
Rebore (1987) stressed that "The objective of the selection process is to hire individuals who will be successful on the job....its implementation requires a rather thorough process" (p. 96). The following ten steps in the selection process were further suggested.

1. Write the job description.
2. Establish the selection process.
3. Write the Vacancy announcement and advertise the position.
4. Receive applications.
5. Select the candidates to be interviewed.
6. Interview candidates.
7. Check references and credentials.
8. Select the best candidate.
9. Implement the job offer and acceptance.
10. Notify unsuccessful candidates. (p. 96)

Personnel selection is a decision-making process with the goal of filling a position vacancy with a qualified individual. Mathis and Jackson (1979) stated concisely that, "Selection is the process of picking individuals who have the necessary and relevant qualifications to fill jobs in the organization" (p. 173). But how does one determine whether a candidate meets the pre-established qualifications and appears likely to succeed on the job? According to Castetter (1986), planning is necessary if the thrust of the personnel selection process is to achieve
congruency between people and positions. The planning goes from pre-selection to selection to post-selection. And as suggested by Mathis and Jackson (1979), "...the selection process be seen as a series of data-gathering activities" (p.177).

During the pre-selection process, position requirements are established and applicants' pool reviewed. Decisions are made during the selection process and, "...the employment decision should be based on a combination of techniques to maximize the probability of achieving the desired match between position and person" (Castetter, 1986, p. 237).

This "combination of techniques" uses various predictors to measure applicants' abilities to meet selection standards so that a sensible decision can be made to hire the best-suited candidate for a given position. It was indeed the intent of this study to compare one of such techniques, namely, the interview questions and its evaluation instrument.

**Definition of Terms**

1. Applicant--a person who is applying for or recruited for an available position in an organization.

2. Candidate--this term is used interchangeably with applicant for the sake of discussion in this particular research.
3. Candidate's Interview Rating Form--the instrument used in comparing candidates' qualifications during selection interviews based on established criteria.

4. Chief Student Affairs officers--refers to the vice presidents or their equivalents at higher educational institutions who have the direct responsibilities overseeing the areas in student services such as housing, financial aid, personal counseling, etc.

5. Interview Evaluation Instrument--used interchangeably with Candidate's Interview Rating Form.

6. Interview Questions--the list of questions prepared for all candidates being interviewed for the same position.

7. Key Positions--the line administrative positions in student affairs.

8. Recruitment--the process of searching for prospective employees.

9. Selection Interview--a discussion between an individual applying for a job and one or more representatives of the organization that is hiring.

10. Successful Personnel Placement--the selection of personnel that deems to be a perfect fit for the position.
Chapter 2

Review of Literature

This study focused on the comparison of interview questions used and the evaluation instruments utilized during selection interviews for key positions in student affairs in all land grant institutions. As outlined in the conceptual base, "...one important facet of the personnel function includes designing, initiating, and executing an effective selection process" (Castetter, 1986, p. 221). A review of literature, therefore, was conducted in the following interrelated areas: (a) the federal guidelines concerning employment interviews, (b) screening prior to selection interview, (c) the selection interview's value, (d) variables to be considered during the selection interviews, (e) the selection interview's techniques, and (f) interview evaluation instruments for decision-making.

The Federal Guidelines Concerning Employment Interviews

"Federal legislation and court decisions have had a significant impact on the types of questions that legally may be asked in an interview" (Rebore, 1987, p. 103).

Anyone involved in the interviewing process should have at least a basic knowledge of the Equal
Employment Opportunity Commission's (EEOC) Uniform Guidelines on Employee Selection Procedures....The Guidelines apply to any selection procedure used to make an employment decision. Thus, you must make every effort to ensure that all employment selection devices used (i.e. interviews, scored application forms, paper and pencil tests, other screening devices, etc.) are directly related to successful performance of the job in question. (College and University Personnel Association (CUPA), 1981, p.1)

Besides the aforementioned Uniform Guidelines on Employee Selection Procedures, there are other major laws at the federal level governing the employment practices. As referenced by Kovarsky, 1976; Northrup, 1978; Peres, 1978; Stokes, 1979; Sullivan, Zimmer and Richards, 1980; and Bequai, 1990, the most applicable laws pertaining to the hiring in higher educational institutions are as follows:

1. Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 barring employment discrimination based on race, color, religion, sex, and national origin.

2. The Federal Equal Pay Act barring wage differentials based on sex.

3. The Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967, as amended, barring age-based employment practices against persons between 40 and 70 years of age, with some
exceptions.


6. Executive Order 11246 barring federal contractors and subcontractors, or individuals with federal or federally assisted construction contracts of $10,000 or more, from discriminating against applicants because of sex, race, color, religion, or national origin.

7. The Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986 barring employers from hiring other than American citizens and aliens who are authorized to work in the United States.

It is important to note that, in addition to the federal laws and regulations, institutions may also be subject to the laws, regulations and guidelines adopted by the local government. For example, many states have open meeting and record laws which require public institutions to name candidates and to open meetings and/or records. In the event that the state laws clash with stricter federal laws, the federal law will prevail.

Ryan and Lasek (1991) warned that "Employers need to provide evidence (e.g. job analyses) that the information they are collecting related to ability to do the job" (p. 315). CUPA in its 1981 edition of Interview guide for supervisors suggested that special attention be paid to
...the manner in which you ask applicants questions regarding the following subjects, either orally or on an application form.

Pregnancy

...EEOC has issued guidelines prohibiting employers from using pregnancy in and of itself as a reason for rejecting applicants for employment. Pregnant applicants may only be rejected if the pregnancy actually prevents them from satisfactorily performing the duties of the position involved...

Marital Status or Sex

...it is not unlawful per se to ask an applicant to indicate his or her marital status (including Mr., Mrs., Ms., etc.) or whether they are male or female, such questions are in most cases not job related and therefore irrelevant as pre-employment inquiries...

Age

...While it is not unlawful to ask an applicant to indicate his or her age during the pre-employment process, it is unwise and unnecessary in most cases, unless age is related to successful performance of the job in question...

Health and General Physical Requirements

...It is no longer appropriate for you to screen out otherwise qualified applicants on the assumption that they will not meet certain physical or mental
standards of the job. In order for a physical or mental impairment to be disqualifying, it must severely limit the applicant’s capacity to perform activities that are a significant portion of the assignment and are integral to the safe and successful performance of the job. An impairment that meets these criteria and cannot be reasonably accommodated may be considered disqualifying... It is not unlawful to require applicants for a job to take a medical exam for jobs requiring certain physical abilities (e.g. jobs requiring physical labor), as long as the tests are administered fairly and applied uniformly... Keep in mind, however, that medical exams should only be required when the results will measure ability to perform the duties of the job... Generally, height and weight requirements are closely scrutinized because they are rarely related to successful job performance...

Police Records

1. Arrest records—without convictions
An arrest without a resulting conviction does not serve as proof that the arrested individual committed an illegal act. Without such proof the arrest is not relevant to that individual’s ability or competency to perform a given job. It follows that if it is not a job-related question it should not be asked....
2. Arrest records—with convictions

A conviction may or may not be relevant, depending on the particular job in question. The relevancy of such an inquiry will depend on the circumstances in each case. The crucial question is whether or not the offense relates to performance of the particular job....

Sexual Preference

No federal law specifically prohibits discrimination on the basis of sexual preference (e.g. homosexuality). However, a refusal to hire on that basis alone could run afoul of state or local laws or give rise to a claim of violation of constitutional rights.

Educational Background

...Whether or not a college degree requirement is job related is a question of fact to be decided on a case-by-case basis....

Appearance and Grooming Requirements

An employer generally may require reasonable standards of dress and grooming where applied uniformly...

Work Experience

...relevant work experience can be a valid job criterion...

Credit Ratings

In general, any inquiries into an applicant's
financial status...are unlawful unless proven to be job related....

Membership in Organizations, Religious Preferences, Names of Relatives
Such inquiries should be avoided...(except in the case of professional organizations.)

Citizenship
...employers cannot hire aliens of one nationality and deny similar opportunities to aliens of other nationalities....

Honorable discharge From Service
...it is illegal for an employer to prefer honorably discharged applicants unless it can be proven that the requirement has a strong relationship to successful performance of the job... (p.2).¹

Similarly Rebore (1987) listed ten common inquires that have legal implications:

1. Name: It is lawful to inquire if an applicant has worked under a different name or nickname in order to verify work or educational records; it is unlawful to ask questions in an attempt to discover the applicant's ancestry, lineage, or national origin.

¹ Reprinted with permission of the College and University Personnel Association, Washington, D.C.
2. Age: For a minor, requiring proof of age in the form of a work permit or certificate of age is lawful; it is unlawful to require the adults to present a birth certificate or baptismal record...

3. Race: To request information about distinguishing physical characteristics is legal; to ask the color of the applicant's skin, eyes, etc., is illegal if this indicates directly or indirectly race or color.

4. Religion: All inquiries are illegal.

5. Sex: Inquiries regarding sex are permissible only when a bona fide occupational qualification exists.

6. Ethnic Background: It is legal to ask which languages the applicant reads, writes, or speaks fluently; inquiries about the applicant's national origin are illegal.

7. Marital and Family Status: Questions to determine if a man or woman can meet specific work schedules are lawful; inquires about being married, single, divorced, etc., are unlawful.

8. Credit Rating: All questions about charge accounts or credit rating are unlawful.

9. Work Experience: It is lawful to ask why an applicant wants to work for a particular company or institution; asking what kind of supervisor the applicant prefers is unlawful.

10. Lifestyle: Asking about future career plans is
lawful; asking an applicant if he/she drinks alcoholic beverages or takes drugs is unlawful. (p. 103)

Stokes (1979), based on his research in applicable laws, grouped discrimination into the following categories:
(a) sex discrimination, (b) race discrimination, (c) national origin discrimination, (d) religious discrimination, (e) age discrimination, (f) handicap discrimination, (g) veteran and military status discrimination, and (h) union preference discrimination. (p. 50)

"In other words, when interviewing candidates,...[one] must avoid discriminatory questions. Questions should be relevant and unrelated to factors such as age, sex, race, religion, nationality, sexual orientation, marital status, and handicap" (Black, 1992, p.8).

With all the legal considerations faced by the potential employers, how can one feel confident in any established hiring practice? Bequai (1990) summed it up well when he stated that "Fortunately...fairness and equity...these principles lie at the heart of the U.S. legal system, and the courts have made it clear that they apply to the hiring process, too" (p. 5).

Screening

It can be assumed that when a job becomes open, multiple applications will be received in answer to the
recruiting efforts. Should all applicants be given the opportunity for an interview? It should be obvious that this practice would not be feasible. As explained by Flippo (1971):

The hiring procedure is essentially a series of methods of securing pertinent information about the applicant. At each step we learn more about the prospect. The information obtained can then be compared to the job specification, the standard of personnel. If the applicant qualifies, he advances to the next step; if he does not, he may be rejected...(p. 127)

The basic objective of recruiting candidates is to attract not only numbers but quality. (Half, 1985, p. 31) It is a necessary part of selection process to review all applications and reject all obviously unsuitable ones. Ryan and Lasek (1991) suggested a screen-out approach which "...would involve looking for reasons to disqualify an individual" (p. 304). As expressed by Fear in 1973, the early screening process served two functions: "1. to eliminate those applicants whose qualifications can be determined as inappropriate at that stage; 2. to provide information that will be helpful to the interviewer at the time he makes his final decision" (p. 15).

Good screening procedures go a long way to ensure that only candidates who have a reasonable chance of being hired
are eventually interviewed. (Half, 1985, p. 80) For individuals in managerial positions, recruiting personnel is a time-consuming practice yet a crucial and necessary one. By carefully screening all applications, a lot of undesirable ones would be eliminated early in the process thus affording those personnel in charge a more manageable pool of candidates for further consideration.

McQuaig, McQuaig and McQuaig (1981) shed a different light on the subject by suggesting that,

Many of the people who apply to you for positions or promotions do not know whether they are suitable or not. It is up to you to appraise them in such a way that you can make a wise decision for both the company and applicant. (p. 159)

It can be deduced from this statement that since an average applicant will not be discriminatory in the positions applied for, the burden is on the organization to ensure the quality of the final pool of candidates is up to a certain, acceptable standard. The same idea was expressed by Levine and Flory (1975), "...a review of job applications is done to determine whether an individual meets minimum qualifications for a position. If minimum qualifications are not met, then the applicant is barred from any further consideration" (p. 378).

Higgins and Hollander (1987) suggested a two-tier screening process: an initial screening and a second
The purpose of the initial screening is simply to determine if the applicant has the requirements .... It is a quantitative not qualitative review. The second review is more qualitative in character than is the initial screening. During the second review the search committee examines the material sent by applicants with great care and assesses the degree to which the applicant has met or exceeded the criteria established by the committee. (p.49)

Obviously there would be some time-honored rules in screening applicants to ensure of its feasibility. A sensible approach as suggested by Black (1970) is carefully reviewing the applicants’ resumes and

1. Look for indications of attitudes.
2. Search for signs of self-reliance and initiative.
3. Review the applicant’s reason for leaving his last job.
4. Evaluate the applicant’s intelligence as indicated by his application or resume.
5. Weigh the applicant’s educational background.
6. Consider the application or resume as a guide to hiring.
7. Study the quality of the applicant’s writing.
8. Analyze the applicant’s replies.
9. Not to pass final judgment in advance.
10. Check the applicant's employment history.
11. Not to use the application as a brief for indicting the applicant.
12. Use the application to give direction to questioning. (p. 49-52)

Screening, undoubtedly, has earned its place in the selection process if one would consider this reasoning expressed by Fear (1973); "An employment setup that does not allow for reasonably quick screening is not only inefficient but also unfair to the individual" (p. 14). It can be assumed that without proper screening, both the applicants and organizations would be spending a whole lot more time in attempting to decide whether there would be any possibility of employment.

The Selection Interview's Value

The first comprehensive research review associated with employment interviews was conducted in 1949 by Wagner who saw the interview as a valuable tool in only three situations: (a) where rough screening is needed, (b) where the number of applicants is too small to warrant more expensive procedures, and (c) where certain traits may be most accurately assessed by the interviewer.

However, forty years after Wagner's review, the selection interview has firmly established itself as the most widely used technique in choosing employees. The Wall
Street Journal reported that a majority of companies are now relying solely on the selection interview for making hiring decisions. (Lancaster, 1975, pp. 1) What are some of the perceptions expressed by experts in the field concerning the value of selection interviews? Especially in view of O'Leary's (1976) concerns that while the selection interview is widely in use, there is meager efforts extended in investigating whether the interview is doing its job in selecting the most qualified people for the job. (p. 86)

According to O'Leary (1976); in theory, the objective of any selection process is to find the best person for the job. (p. 3) The only way possible to achieve this is to gather as much information as possible on the applicants before making a decision. The selection interview essentially serves as the final direct link between the applicant and the employer as far as decision-making is concerned. In selecting an applicant to fill a position, many questions concerning the applicant should be answered, if not during the initial screening process, then during the final selection interview.

The philosophy of this interview, and indeed the philosophy of the entire selection program, is based on the principle that the more relevant information it is possible to obtain about the applicant, the better the basis for an intelligent employment decision.
An interview is considered by Black (1970) to be the basic method of securing the information one needs to make a final judgment. (p. 48) While Hakel, Dobmeyer and Dunnette (1970) stated that the "...interview is the crucial step in the employment process, for the interviewers' task is to combine all the available information about each job applicant and make a recommendation about each applicant's probable usefulness to the organization" (p.66). Eder and Ferris (1989) further elaborated that the interview is "... a face-to-face exchange of job-relevant information between organizational representatives and a job applicant with the overall organizational goal of attracting, selecting, and retaining a highly competent workforce" (p. 18).

Ulrich and Trumbo (1965) saw the interview as: (a) a recruiting device, (b) a public relations device, (c) an information-disseminating device for the company, and (d) a selection tool. Similarly, Arvey and Campion (1982) saw interviews fulfill these functions: (a) allowing accurate assessment of observable interpersonal dimensions of behaviors, (b) facilitating the communications of accurate job information, and (c) serving as an important public relations tool for the company. Campion, Pursell, and Brown (1988) suggested that face-to-face interviews had a substantial job knowledge or
cognitive ability component through which job performance could be predicted. While in earlier research, Ulrich and Trumbo (1965) felt that an interview was best used to assess personal relations and motivation to work.

Despite evidence showing interviews are of relatively low validity, reliability, and susceptible to bias and distortion, Black (1970) stated that, "The interview is still the key to successful hiring and placement...In face-to-face conversation the personality of an applicant may be judged, his reactions evaluated, and a final decision made as to his suitability" (p.7). And Eder and Ferris (1989) concurred by clarifying the role of interview in the following manner:

...the employment interview provides the organization with the opportunity to infer whether the applicant possesses the critical knowledge, skills, abilities, and interests to be successful in the targeted position. (p.18)

Following the same line of thinking but more on the passive side, Pursell, Campion and Gaylord (1980) felt that:

Companies can no longer afford the luxury of making poor personnel selection decisions. Organizational goals are clearly affected every time a personnel selection decision is made. These selection decisions include the hiring, transferring, promoting and
terminating of employees. Maximizing the effectiveness of these decisions directly affects training time, turnover, absenteeism, safety and satisfaction—in addition to job performance. (p. 907)

But perhaps Jackson (1972) summarized the best when he said that:

The interview is the best method of assessing a candidate in total and of verifying information which the interviewer has obtained about the candidate from other sources. It is the best method of relating the candidate, through the skill and knowledge of the interviewer, to the job. In addition, the interview has become such a standard practice that it is widely accepted by candidates as a selection instrument. It, therefore, has considerable face validity and is an expected part of the selection procedure. (p. 81)

Similarly, Higgins and Hollander (1987) felt interviewing was important for the following reasons:

1. The search committee can assess the candidate's communication abilities, appearance, personality traits, thinking habits and motivation.

2. The interviewee may reveal the extent of his/her true interest in the position. (The amount of background material...that the candidate has unearthed may be one indicator of real interest.)

3. In conversation, the candidate often will reveal
information about him/herself that might not be obtained elsewhere. Most people are willing to say more about themselves than they will write down.

4. Any lingering questions about a candidate's academic, research, or administrative abilities and interests may be clarified.

5. The candidate's reactions or attitudes towards real issues or problems on campus may be explored at length. (p.59)

Mathis and Jackson believed that "Selection, if properly done, ensures that high-quality people can be brought into the organization" (1979, p. 197). While on a lighter note, regardless how one views interview as a selection tool, one does well to remember that "...there seems to be a certain human curiosity which can be satisfied in no other way than by 'seeing the man in the flesh'" (Wagner, 1949, p. 42).

If interviews are to be conducted for potential employees, what qualifications should be assessed of individuals during this process?

Variables to be Considered During the Selection Interviews

"The primary goal of the employee selection process is the successful matching of individuals to jobs within organizations" (Kirnan, Farley, & Geisinger, 1989, p.293).

This seems to be a reasonable enough statement, but,
can complex human beings be effectively evaluated considering all individuals are different in their aptitudes, personalities, characters and motivation? Mayfield (1964) had the impression that only intelligence or mental ability of the applicants could be judged satisfactorily in an interview situation. If such is the case, how can an interview improve on its reliability and validity?

Much of the literature also suggested that applicants' communication skills during interviews play a critical role in interview decision-making to the extent that Cissna and Carter (1982) would posit it to be "the single most important determinant of success" in the employment process. (p. 57) While others such as Levine and Flory (1975) stressed the importance of T&E (training and experience) or E&E (education and experience). (p. 378) Schmidt, Hunter, and Outerbridge (1986) argued, and Singer and Bruhns (1991) concurred, that "work experience has a causal effect on job performance, primarily through its positive impact on job knowledge as well as on job performance capability" (p. 550).

Presumably the job requirements have been clearly identified so that during the selection interview, focus should be on the applicant in relation to the specific job. Latham, Saari, Pursell, and Campion (1980) asserted that "...when the intentions measured are job-related they can
serve as valid indicators of on-the-job behavior" (p. 426). And according to Guion (1987), "Any variable that reliably predicts a job-related criterion is itself job related" (p.212). Wagner (1949) had the foresight to recommend assessing traits which have been demonstrated to be job-related as a standard approach during interview. In 1978 the "Uniform Guidelines on Employee Selection Procedures" stipulated that employment decisions must be based on job-related criteria. In following the set guidelines, Pursell et al. (1980) stressed the importance of asking four different types of questions: (a) situational, (b) job knowledge, (c) job sample, and (d) worker requirements.

Swan, Margulies, Rosaler and Kayle (1989) took this approach one step further by stating that "When we are interviewing a candidate for that job, the questions become: Can they do the job? Will they behave in the ways necessary? and Will they fit into our special environment" (p. 90)? According to these experts, in selecting the right person for the job, the considerations of at least three areas should be given to job applicants: (a) applicant’s abilities (knowledge and skills), and aptitudes (capability to learn); (b) applicant’s attitudes (personalities and characters), and (c) applicant’s potential relationship with the organization.

Indeed these questions sound like a logical way in
Can Do Factors. Can the candidate do the job, in terms of relevant Knowledge, Skills, and Abilities? Do they have the relevant prior work experiences, technical skills, formal educational background, specialized training, intelligence, communications skills, leadership abilities, ability to prioritize, or organizational skills?...Do they have an analytical approach to problem solving?...

Will Do Factors....just because someone is technically competent and has solid previous work experience and everything else that indicates they "Can Do" the job, there is still no assurance that that candidate will behave in the ways that you need...We want to know if the candidate will behave in the ways required on our job...

Fit Factors....you want to know if a candidate is going to "Fit" into your particular set of environmental circumstances. (Swan et al., 1989, p. 90-92)

While it is easy to understand why the can do factors, will do factors and fit factors all figure prominently in the interview process, but how would one assess individuals for these qualities? According to Singer and Bruhns,

...previous work experiences enhance an individual’s
job knowledge as well as his or her job performance capabilities...previous academic experiences have a primary impact on an individual's cognitive abilities, motivation, and general effectiveness. Work experience therefore could be seen as having a specific and direct effect on job performance whereas academic qualifications could be seen as exerting a more global and less direct influence. (1991, p. 552)

Goodale (1989) defined the interview purpose as (a) collect information, (b) provide information, and (c) check personal chemistry. And again, all the emphasis should be on the determination whether the applicant can do and will do the job. (p. 316-317)

Fear (1973) outlined a formula: ability times motivation equals achievement. (p. 9) Herden, Kuzmits and Sussman (1984) had a similar version: performance equals ability times motivation. (p. 26)

Gorman (1989) felt that "There is a grave difference between what a person can do and what he will do on a job" (p. 41). It is important, therefore, for the managerial personnel to assess and clarify this "grave difference" when considering candidates.

Ulrich and Trumbo (1965) addressed the concern by suggesting that an applicant's motivation and personal relations in the social context of the job are two areas worth bearing attention. "How one determines the ability
of prospective and present employees to fit the organizational environment and culture is an important issue" (Ross, 1979, p. 86). Caplan (1987) stressed the "fit" issue by saying that:

Organizations and their members have a fundamental stake in how well characteristics of the person and the environment of the organization fit one another. Organizations wish to select persons who will best meet the demands of the job, adapt to training and changes in job demands, and remain loyal and committed to the organization...(p. 248)

In appraising applicants for a position, it is important to realize that it is unlikely to find one candidate who possesses all the favorable qualities deemed necessary for the job. By the same token, it is equally important to consider that some of the qualities found in an applicant might compensate for some other ones that are found lacking in this particular individual. (Fear, 1973, p. 56) Singer and Bruhns (1991) also found that "...academic or educational qualifications were used as predictors of job performance have shown that these variables... significantly predict managerial performance as well as performance in certain skilled occupations" (p. 551). Research findings also suggest that "...work experience should be used and has been used as a predictor in actual personnel-selection" (Singer & Bruhns, 1991,
Fear in 1973 stated that
...there is no such thing as a 'good man.' A man is 'good' only when placed in a job that makes maximum utilization of his abilities, satisfies his level of aspiration, stimulates his interests, and provides for his social needs. (p. 4)

In other words, Herzberg’s Motivation-Hygiene Theory is very much evident in Fear’s thinking. Herzberg (1959) stressed that motivation factors such as achievement, recognition for accomplishment, challenging work, responsibility, growth, etc. would encourage people to perform better on their jobs. Maslow’s (1970) Human Motivation Theory stated that even if the basic human needs for a person such as physiological, safety, esteem and love ones were satisfied, unless the individual was doing what one, individually, was fitted for a new discontent would soon develop. (p. 46).

Fear (1973) further stated that "We must therefore rely upon the interview as a means of appraising personality, motivation, interests. character, and the nature of intellectual functioning" (p.56).

On a different twist, Guion (1987) proposed this idea for further consideration:

If your purpose is to hire generally good people, a global criterion is useful. If you aren’t very sure
what distinguishes good from better employees, mix up a little of every kind of job behavior...in developing a truly global criterion. However, if you need to solve a very specific problem, then more specific criterion is needed. If there is more than one specific problem, then more than one specific criterion is called for. (p. 205)

Singer and Bruhns in 1991 stressed that

To maximize the effectiveness of a selection practice, it is essential that only job-relevant variables be used as selection criteria and that these variables be ascribed the relative weight reflecting their levels of validity in predicting the particular job performance. (p. 557)

Regardless of what variables are considered, it is important to always remember that "The basic purpose of selection...interview is...to choose the best person to fill a specific job" (Moffatt, 1987, p.1).

Selection Interview's Techniques

"Successful selection is like a successful marriage--it is planned, not made in heaven" (Smart, 1983, p. 1).

This statement leads one to believe that if a selection interview is planned carefully and conducted properly, it is likely to produce successful results. "If valid selection procedures are being used, there will be a
significant correlation between interviewer assessments and performance" (Kinicki & Lockwood, 1985, p. 125). Ulrich and Trumbo (1965) reflected that "The how-to-do-it books and articles have continued to appear and generally have echoed Murray (1947) and Wagner (1949) in their appeals for greater planning, organization, standardization, and utilization of other, frequently more reliable, sources of information in conjunction with the face-to-face interview" (p. 101).

According to Petit and Mullins (1981): "the employee selection decision is no different from any other type of decision making; the best results come from a logical, step-by-step process" (p. 72). There is little doubt that anyone in managerial position would be interested in learning the appropriate rules, if such exist, to structure a successful selection interview. Black (1970) elaborated on this point by stating that

The value of any interview depends on how much information you are able to get the applicant to give you and how accurately you evaluate it. In the selection interview, you must have a deep knowledge of people and jobs to be able to match them up properly. (p. 71)

But how? McQuaig et al. (1981) shared their perception of the four stages of an interview:
(a) build rapport, (b) draw out the information,
(c) relate to the candidate's history, and (d) look for a pattern of behavior. (p. 144)

During any one of these four stages the ability to ask the right questions in the right words and the talent for listening and understand what is said are two important factors in conducting an effective interview. (Black, 1970, p.13) Based on those factors, Black felt that there were three basic principles for good interviewers:

1. While interviewer has the initiatives, do not put the interviewee on defensive and become guarded.
2. The primary objective for the interviewer is to get the information.
3. The interviewer is there to control, direct and guide the interview to its desired objectives. (p.15)

In an earlier study, Daniels (1953) outlined similar expectations for the interviewers: stick to the point, not dominate, but control, listen, be permissive, and give no advice. But Mayfield (1964) cautioned interviewers to note the following points: (a) the form of the question affects the answer obtained, (b) the attitudes of interviewers affect their interpretation of what the interviewee says, (c) interviewers appear to be influenced more by unfavorable than favorable information, and (d) interviewers tend to make decisions based on manner, facial expression, and personal appearance. (p.253-254)

While Arvey and Campion's (1982) research suggested that
not all communication skills are equally important to all positions and interview might be the right context in which to test the extent to which an applicant should possess the essential job-related communication skill. It is important for the interviewers to note that as Ralston's (1989) research has pointed out effective communication in applicants was favored. (p.359)

Interview outcomes are the result of combination of applicant, interviewer and situational factors according to Schmitt (1976). Situational factors as defined by Eder (1989) are "four distinct dimensions each of which influences interview judgment: task clarity, interview purpose, decision risk and accountability" (p. 117). While in an earlier study, Schmitt (1976) identified the following five: (a) political, legal and economic forces in marketplace and organization, (b) role of interviews in selection system, (c) selection ratio, (d) physical setting: comfort, privacy, number of interviewers and, (e) interview structure.

Schmitt (1976) also felt that both interviewer's and interviewee's age, race, sex, physical appearance, psychological characteristics (such as attitude, intelligence and motivation), experience and training, verbal and non-verbal behavior would impact on the outcome of the interview. Furthermore, interviewer's prior knowledge of the applicant, goals for the interview and
perceptions of job requirements as well as interviewee’s background, job interests and career paths, and the perceptions regarding the job and the company would also play important roles during the interview.

When discussing possible guidelines, many variations of similar ideas were present. Zedeck, Tziner, and Middlestadt (1983) advocated evaluations on behaviorally anchored rating scales while Janz (1982) discussed the virtue of so-called "patterned behavior description interview" which involved a critical incident job analysis.

One most recently reviewed technique suggested by Latham, Saari, Pursell, and Campion (1980) is to develop a so-called "situational" interview. Candidates were asked to respond to questions developed through analysis of critical incidents relating to specific positions. Their research results suggest that careful linking of job analysis and interview content can prove to be beneficial. Osburn, Timmrick, and Bigby (1981) and Petit and Mullins (1981) agreed that when evaluating candidates on specific and relevant job dimensions, the interview judgments tend to be more accurate.

A technique called "Comprehensive Structured Interviews," as advocated by Pursell et al. (1980) expanded Latham et al.’s (1980) Situational Interview, includes questions relating to situations, job knowledge, job simulation and worker requirements.
Some, like Janz, Hellervik and Gilmore (1986), believed that "The best predictor of future behavior/performance is past behavior/performance" (p.32). Based on this belief they devised the "Behavior Description Interviews" with the intention of assessing past behavior by using questions to address various situations.

Campion, Pursell and Brown (1988) extended Latham et al.'s (1980) research and presented a more highly structured interviewing technique to include questions on situations, job knowledge, worker requirements, job sample and simulation questions. Campion et al. felt that their presentation of the technique is superior to the previous ones by virtue of their extensive attention afforded to the guidelines on test development from both the professional perspective and the legal perspective thus enhancing the likelihood of validity and legal defensibility. (p.27)

Campion et al.'s technique includes the following steps:

(1) develop questions based on a job analysis,
(2) ask the same questions of each candidate,
(3) anchor the rating scales for scoring answers with examples and illustrations,
(4) have an interview panel record and rate answers,
(5) consistently administer the process to all candidates, and
(6) give special attention to job relatedness, fairness, and documentation in accordance with testing
guidelines. (p. 35)
Regardless which technique is followed, there seems to be some general rules to observe. McQuaig et al. (1981) suggested the following as the interview guidelines.

1. Make each interview important.
2. Give the candidate all the facts.
3. Be prepared for each interview; review the resume and application.
4. Avoid the use of trick methods.
5. Avoid preconceived images.
6. Don't be misled by appearances.
7. Ask for examples to support the candidate's claims.
8. Beware of the "halo" effect.
10. Dig beneath superficial explanations.
12. Don't jump to conclusions.
13. Avoid the use of leading questions.
14. Don't give advise or counsel.
15. Don't take notes during the interview.
16. Recognize and compensate for your biases.
17. Don't hire the best if they fail to meet your standards.
18. No negative feedback when rejecting a candidate.
19. Avoid wasting time. (p. 159)
Similar in nature was Half's (1985) ideal:

1. Screen carefully.
2. Have a plan.
3. Follow a logical sequence.
4. Create a proper interview environment.
5. Put the candidate at ease.
6. Let the candidate do the talking.
7. Perfect your questioning techniques.
8. Become a better listener.
9. Keep your reactions to yourself.
10. Stay in control.
11. Take notes.
12. Don't oversell the position.
13. Conclude the interview on the proper note.
14. Write an interview summary.
15. Learn from each experience. (p. 79-80)

Black (1970), perhaps, was more systematic and theoretical in identifying the following rules:

1. Getting ready: plan the schedule in advance.
2. Defining the goals of the interview
3. Determining the environment of the interview: privacy and comfort should be assured.
4. Managing the interview: How the interview should be conducted.
5. Deciding the nature and timing of questions.
7. Coming to the conclusion.
8. Explain future action: what the interviewee can expect.
9. Weighting the facts and making decisions. (p. 17-24)

Eder and Ferris (1989) cautioned interviewers to (a) review the job description, (b) determine the weighted rating factors, (c) develop a set of questions, (d) review interview content and process to remove potential discrimination factors, (e) arrange questions to ensure fairness and (f) review applications and resumes.

Rothstein and Jackson (1980), and Arvey and Campion (1982) suggested that by using interview panels, and directly related job analysis and other job information as a basis for interview questions, the overall validity and reliability of the interview would be improved. Campion et al. (1988) again affirmed the importance of using interview panels and consistently administering the same process to all candidates. (p. 29)

Hollandsworth, Kazelskis, Stevens, and Dressel (1979) showed that appropriateness of verbal content, fluency of speech, composure, body posture, eye contact, voice level, and personal appearance were all considered important variables by the interviewers. In other words, interviewees' nonverbal behavior influences interviewers' evaluation. According to this study the perceptual-
judgmental process involves both verbal and non-verbal dimensions. Therefore it is important for the interviewers to recognize such influence exist, fair or unfair.

Regardless of what prospective each of these researchers has, the underlying theme throughout the interview process is asking questions. Fear (1973) suggested that three categories of questions be included in the interviews: (a) credentials (factual, qualitative details), (b) experience descriptions, and (c) self-perceptions. Campion et al. (1988) stressed the importance of developing questions based on a job analysis. Knowledge, skills, abilities, and other requirements upon which to base interview questions and the measure of importance of each are to be predetermined during job analysis according to Campion et al. (1988, p. 27) This trend of thought conformed to the 1978 "Uniformed Guidelines on Employee Selection Procedures," that organizations select applicants on the basis of valid selection criteria.

This not only necessitates the identification of job-related criteria through job analytic procedures but further specifies that job-related criteria must be operationalized in a valid and reliable fashion. As such, assessing whether or not an applicant possesses an acceptable level of a job-related criteria must be done in an objective and nondiscriminatory fashion.
McQuaig et al. (1981) suggested that the essence of the interview technique is getting what you need to know out of the candidate.

The successful interview relies on how well you are able to:

1. Establish rapport with the candidate.
2. Ask the right questions
3. Use a variety of probing techniques and draw out significant information tactfully
4. Listen for both facts and feelings
5. Judge the candidate's responses and from them, accurately appraise attitude, motivation, stability, level of maturity, aptitudes, and temperament.

(Rynes, Bretz and Gerhart, 1991) asserted that job applicants "...mentioned job characteristics as important factors in positive assessments of initial fit" (p. 497).

As cautioned by Powell in 1991:

Applicants are more likely to respond positively to recruiters who give them precise information about the job they would hold, rather than to those who give them only general information about the company...Thus, an appropriate goal of recruiter training, beyond emphasizing the importance of positive recruiter behaviors, is to make sure that
recruiters are well-informed about the jobs for which they are hiring and prepared to convey this information to applicants. (p. 80)

Singer and Bruhns also suggested that "...training courses for interviewing or selection skills could include relevant information about the actual validity of academic qualifications in predicting managerial potential...as well as about potential utility gains obtained by employing the academically highly qualified" (1991, p. 557).

Interview Evaluation Instruments

"Choosing the right people is more than an art, less than a science" (Half, 1985, p. 24).

Assessing the applicants sometimes involves assigning numbers to pre-defined dimensions of job requirement. This would allow a quantitative comparison of all candidates. "Through the interview process, the interviewer must evaluate and come to a conclusion about suitability of each candidate. A selection criteria instrument will be used to quantify the observations of the interviewer, but ultimately the observations are subjective interpretations" (Rebore, 1987, p. 103).

An ideal selection system is one which integrates all available avenues of information (including the interview, biographical information, references, and test) to maximize the hits and minimize the misses. (O’Leary, 1976, p. 8)
An interview may be extremely important, but "...is never a process in itself. It is simply a single sequence in a series of related actions" (Black, 1970, p. 23). Since an interview is an interaction of two personalities, it is not cut and dried. In order to eliminate as much subjectivity as possible, it is vital to have interview instruments assisting the interviewers. As Saville (1986) has suggested,

To add consistency and increase the validity of a personnel interview a specially tailored interview form should be used....A...instrument...developed to assist interviewers in (1) seeking consistent information from different candidates, (2) providing a scoring system and profile for comparing candidates, (3) assisting in summarizing and establishing priorities based on the interview. (p. 3)

Thorndike (1949) established four criteria for evaluating a measurement instrument, namely: validity, reliability, freedom from bias, and practicality. Latham (1989) incorporated Thorndike's elements in analyzing selection the interview instrument by stating that the interview instrument should consistently identify people who can do the job, must be able to withstand legal challenges and must be practical. (p. 177) Goodale (1982, in press) echoed the same concerns by outlining the following four categories as essential in measuring an
applicant's qualifications:

1. overall applicant suitability,
2. what applicants are (e.g., personal traits),
3. what applicants have (e.g., intelligence, motivation, cognitive abilities, interpersonal skills, job-related knowledge, skills and abilities), and
4. what applicants can and will do (potential and willingness to perform job responsibilities).

Weighing the facts and evaluating an applicant's suitability for employment are the final steps in the selection process. (Black, 1970, p. 68) Black proposed some guidelines to follow:

1. Look at the whole man.
2. Use checks and balances.
3. Seek the successful combination.
4. Pay attention to essentials.
5. Analyze the significance of the information.
(p. 69-70)

Petit and Mullins (1981), Campion et al. (1988) and Goodale (1989) agreed that interview ratings should be job key-factors related. And Campion et al. (1988) further stressed the importance of anchoring the rating scales answers with examples and illustrations.

...example answers must be scaled to the requirements of the job so that good answers do not far exceed the requirements, and poor answers are not so low that
they do not help distinguish between candidates. Predetermined answer-rating scales enhance consistency across interviews and objectivity of judging candidate responses. Making the scoring system explicit is essential to justifying the content validity of assessment procedure. (p. 28)

Levine and Flory (1975) proposed an elaborate scheme to assess applicants and it involves assigning scores according to certain key factors.

1. High job relatedness, surface characteristics, judgmental evaluation: the determination of "...the extent of match between prior positions and the position applied for. The closer the match the higher the score."

2. High job relatedness, surface characteristics, statistical evaluation: the matching of the major job tasks can be performed by the applicant and those required by the position. The more the match, the higher the score.

3. High job relatedness, inferred traits, judgmental evaluation: examination of the background work history, noting "...the pattern of positions as indicators of an individual's orientation with regard to people, data and equipment." The determination of "...how well this orientation fits that called for on the job."
4. High job relatedness, inferred traits, statistical evaluation: Judging career history and computing scores on job-related traits.

5. Low job relatedness, surface characteristics, judgmental evaluation: judging personal history and evaluating "...the extent of match with those patently required by the position."

6. Low job relatedness, surface characteristics, statistical evaluation: "A bio Data Blank containing information on race, age, sex, and membership in civic groups is empirically weighted by relationship to tenure."

7. Low job relatedness, inferred traits, judgmental evaluation: "A personal history questionnaire containing questions on childhood and family life and extracurricular activities is reviewed...Patterns within applications are matched against presumed job requirements..."

8. Low job relatedness, inferred traits, statistical evaluation: "...pattern of scores on underlying traits such as leadership potential are evaluated...as against the desired pattern for the job" (p. 380).

Moffatt (1987) was in favor of prioritizing the following listed criteria when assessing applicants: appearance, personality, communication skills, mechanical aptitude, analytical ability, numerical ability,
interpersonal relations, awareness, drive, work ethic, energy level, aggressiveness, realistic motivation, goal vs. task orientation, self-discipline, tolerance to failure, maturity, planning and organizational ability, leadership, tact and tough-mindedness. Moffatt, just as Campion et al. (1988), advised having sets of indicators for each criterion in order to maintain consistency in rating applicants.

McDaniel (1988) advocated using an T&S (training and experience) method in assessing applicants, and based on judgmental weighting, applicants were given scores for each year of related job experience and education. "Different types of training or experience are assigned point values depending upon their judged worth. This rating method is essentially credentialistic" (p. 285).

Summary

As a selection method, the interview has enjoyed unmatched popularity. Since Wagner’s research on the validity of interview in 1949, many experts have followed suit by examining the value of the interview in the selection process. At best, one can summarize all the research and find that the interview gets a mixed review.

However, the interview has earned its place in the business world as the most utilized tool in selecting employees despite research evidence showing there are known
deficiencies such as interviewers' biases and unwarranted unfavorable information influences. It would be rare indeed to find organizations that would be willing to hire employees without a face-to-face interview.

Generally, all reviews indicated that a structured interview with specific job-related questions to be asked of all applicants is a valuable way to select potential employees (Welling, 1991). While there is no indication as to why there is such a general consensus, if one considers that the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission guidelines on employment procedures and Title VII regulations have essentially mandated that employers be legally liable for showing that their selection practice is job-related, then the reasoning seems to become clear.

Personal motivation and interpersonal skills are two variables consistently identified by experts as best to be evaluated by the interview. Face-to-face interactions during the interview allow everyone involved in the process the opportunity to observe and assess these abilities. When one considers how the modern work environment is structured, it should not come as a surprise to anyone that interviews are so well-received by the managerial personnel. No organization wants to have employees who have to have constant supervision and extrinsic motivation in order to do the job. Not only that, many times one hears the comment that "an employee has all the talents in
the world, but can’t get along with others." Organizations can certainly get along without employees who do not get along!

In summary, a review of the literature examines issues concerning the selection interview and re-affirm its' place in today's society.
Chapter 3

The Design of the Study and Analysis of the Data

Introduction

It was the purpose of the study to analyze the interview selection criteria, questions and evaluation instruments utilized by the chief student affairs officers at all land-grant colleges and universities. Chapter 3 includes: (a) a description of the population; (b) the survey used in collecting data; (c) the procedure used in mailing the survey; (d) the method used to analyze the data; (e) presentation of the data; and (f) a summary.

The Population

The listing of 72 land-grant colleges and universities was provided by the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges (Appendix B). While compiling the mailing list, it was discovered that several of these member institutions were purely administrative units with no traditional campus functions. By removing these entities from the listing, some states would have been omitted from the study. Therefore a conscious decision was made, when possible, to substitute those
affected institutions with the related campuses. These member institutions and their substitutions were listed below:

1. University of Alaska Statewide System, Fairbanks, AK 99775
   Substitutions:
   - University of Alaska, Anchorage
     Anchorage, AK 99508
   - University of Alaska, Fairbanks
     Fairbanks, AK 99775-0500

2. University of California Systemwide, Oakland, CA 94612-9167
   Substitutions:
   - University of California, Berkeley
     Berkeley, CA 94720
   - University of California, Davis
     Davis, CA 95616
   - University of California, Irvine
     Irvine, CA 92717
   - University of California, Los Angeles
     Los Angeles, CA 90024
   - University of California, Santa Barbara
     Santa Barbara, CA 93106

3. Connecticut Agricultural Experiment Station, New Haven, CT 06504
   - No suitable substitution could be found.
4. Louisiana State University System, Baton Rouge, LA 70813

Substitution:
- Louisiana State University & A&M College
  Baton Rouge, LA 70803

5. Southern University System, Baton Rouge, LA 70813

Substitution:
- Southern University and Agricultural and
  Mechanical College at Baton Rouge
  Baton Rouge, LA 70813

6. University of Maryland, Central Administration, Adelphi, MD 20783

Substitution:
- University of Maryland, College Park
  College Park, MD 20742

7. University of Massachusetts, Boston, MA 02116

Substitution:
- University of Massachusetts at Amherst
  Amherst, MA 01003

8. University of Puerto Rico, San Juan, Puerto Rico 00936

Substitution:
- University of Puerto Rico
  Rio Piedras, PR 00936

As a result of substitutions, a total of 76 institutions were surveyed (Appendix C). These
institutions average 17,896 students. The largest institution is Ohio State University with over 66,900 students, while the smallest campus, University of Maryland, Eastern Shore, enrolls only 1,559 students.

The Survey

A survey instrument was constructed (Appendix E) listing criteria to be considered and related questions to be used during the interviews with all final candidates. The positions under considerations were professional-level, directors and above, in the Division of Student Affairs.

This survey was first reviewed and validated by a panel of experts (Appendix D) consisting of the following individuals from the same institution: a vice president for student services, an associate dean of students, an associate dean of a college and an executive assistant to a vice president of academic affairs. The panel unanimously endorsed the research project and, as a result of input received from the panel, some questions were re-written or re-addressed to ensure of their consistency.

The Experts suggested the considerations of at least the following listed areas when selecting personnel: (a) abilities (knowledge and skills); (b) aptitudes (capability to learn); (c) attitudes (personalities and characters); and (d) potential relationship with the organization. In Swan et al.’s words, "Can they do the
job? Will they behave in the ways necessary? and Will they fit into our special environment" (1989, p. 90)? In keeping with this line of thought, the survey was divided into eight sections with each section addressing a different concern. Five sections addressed criteria under consideration for all final candidates:

1. Criterion A: Job Knowledge (knowledge),
2. Criterion B: Professional Attitudes (skills),
3. Criterion C: Personal Qualities (aptitudes),
4. Criterion D: Interpersonal Skills (attitudes and potential relationship with the organization),
5. Criterion E: Miscellaneous.

Section 6 provided the respondents with the option to address any additional criteria and their related questions. Section 7 spoke specifically about the validity of interview questions being used on various campuses and Section 8 dealt with the usage of interview rating forms.

The Procedure

The survey, with a cover letter (Appendix F), was sent to the chief student affairs officers at targeted land-grant institutions and substitute institutions on September 12, 1991. The time allowed for the return of the survey was approximately two weeks following the mailing of the survey, until September 30, 1992.

A stamped, self-addressed envelope was provided with
each survey to facilitate better response. And a postcard reminder (Appendix G) was sent out one week following the initial mailing on September 20, 1991 to encourage the return of the survey.

Of the 76 surveys sent out, 51 or 67% were completed and returned. (see Table 1 below) Of the 51 received, a majority of them (45) were returned by the deadline, and 51% of the respondents requested a copy of the compiled results. Immediately following the receipt of the returned survey, a thank-you letter was mailed to each of the respondents to acknowledge the effort. A detailed record of all survey correspondence was maintained for follow-up purposes.

Table 1
Response to Mail Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Returned</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It was evident that many of the respondents had spent time completing the questionnaire. Comments received along with the survey revealed their interest. One respondent remarked that "...I found your topic and your survey to be of interest as both a CSAO and Higher Ed professor."
The Method

Descriptive statistics were used to present the data gathered by the survey. Responses to each question under individual criterion were compared to determine if a significant agreement existed among the chief student affairs officers.

Comments from respondents were incorporated into the reporting of the results to reflect external thoughts on the survey.

The Presentation of the Data

In order to clearly present the data collected, tables were used to illustrate the responses received. Individual tables presented the results compiled for all criteria. As stated before, five criteria were specified in the survey to gather information on interviews. Under each criterion various numbers of questions were listed. Respondents were asked to rate each question 'a', 'b' or 'c' according to its usage and level of relevance in the final interview. Rating 'a' denoted that the question was always asked; rating 'b', sometimes asked and; rating 'c', never asked. When results were discussed, the percentages calculated for each category were used for comparisons.

Table 2 outlines labeling of the questions during the presentation of the data. Survey sections F, G and H were not listed in Table 2 due to their different structures.
Section F is respondents-dependent. There were no questions specified under F; rather, it provided a forum for the respondents to list any additional criteria addressed and their related questions. The findings for Section F are reported later in this chapter. Responses to both Survey sections G and H were yes or no. Therefore a tabulation of the total numbers on each answer sufficed and the results are addressed later in this chapter.

Table 2
Labeling of the Questions Listed in the Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Listed in the Survey As</th>
<th>Labeled As</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Criterion A, Questions 1-13</td>
<td>A1-A13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion B, Questions 1-16</td>
<td>B1-B16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion C, Questions 1-16</td>
<td>C1-C16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion D, Questions 1-13</td>
<td>D1-D13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion E, Questions 1-5</td>
<td>E1-E5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Criterion A addressed the issue of job knowledge which includes academic preparation and work experiences. Comments from respondents indicated some of the information could have been obtained from a person’s vita which was required of all applicants vying for positions. However the high percentage shown under the Always Asked category belied the fact that these questions were consistently
asked during final interviews. One explanation for this is that the vita allowed a glimpse into a person's background which would then necessitate closer investigation during the interview process. Table 3 summarized the responses to Criterion A.
Table 3

Comparisons of Responses to Questions A1-A13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>No Answer</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>76.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>70.6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>52.9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>52.9</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>52.9</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>43.1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A7</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>43.1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>52.9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A8</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>58.8</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A10</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>54.9</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>43.1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>52.9</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Those questions that had over 50% support in the **always asked** category were:

1. A1: What is your academic background? (76.5%)
2. A2: What is your area of specialization? (52.5%)
3. A3: How long have you been in this particular field? Describe each significant phase or position you have held. (70.6%)
4. A6: Have you ever initiated any programs? What are they? (52.95%)
5. A8: What would you consider to be the primary responsibility of this position? Why? (66.7%)
6. A10: What would be your long-term goals if you were given the position? & How would you go about accomplishing them? (54.9%)

As suggested by the results in Table 3, the following questions received very little support for their consistent usage in the final interviews:

1. A4: "What other specialized training have you had that we should know about?"
2. A5: "How would you go about enhancing your job expertise?"
3. A7: "What experiences have you had with budgeting?"
4. A9: "Based on what you have learned about the position, what kinds of changes would you make immediately? why and how?"
5. All: "How would you conceptualize the field of student affairs in the next decade? What might it be like?"

6. A12: "Situational questions (job and criterion specific)"

However, the percentages would indicate that, with the exception of question A12, these questions were sometimes asked by more than 50% of the respondents.

Equally significant is that 29%, 27.5% and 23% respectively indicated that questions A5, A9 and All were never asked by the respondents.

Question A13 was dictated by the respondents as any additional questions assessing the same criterion. These questions were as follows (no attempt was made to re-word the questions as proposed):

1. What attracts you to the position?
2. What transferable skills do you have from 'non-traditional' positions?
3. What do you do for fun, to sweat, to relax?
4. To what extent, and if so how, are you involved in one of our professional associations?
5. What are your thoughts on diversity?
6. What was your most enjoyable position?

Based on the responses, a miscommunication between the survey itself and the respondents could be assumed since some of the questions listed could have been attributed to
other criteria instead of "job knowledge."

Criterion B addressed professional attitudes and administrative skills. Questions B1 through B16 specifically dealt with job-related skills such as leadership and organizational abilities. However, as revealed surprisingly by Table 4, the questions listed on the survey were not commonly asked during the interview.
Table 4
Comparisons of Responses to Questions B1-B16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>No Answer</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>8 15.7</td>
<td>32 62.7</td>
<td>10 19.6</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>51 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>23 45.1</td>
<td>18 35.3</td>
<td>10 19.6</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>51 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3</td>
<td>6 11.8</td>
<td>23 45.1</td>
<td>21 41.2</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>51 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4</td>
<td>21 41.2</td>
<td>20 39.2</td>
<td>9 17.6</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>51 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B5</td>
<td>19 37.3</td>
<td>25 49</td>
<td>6 11.8</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>51 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B6</td>
<td>10 19.6</td>
<td>21 41.2</td>
<td>19 37.3</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>51 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B7</td>
<td>5 9.8</td>
<td>24 47.1</td>
<td>21 41.2</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>51 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B8</td>
<td>10 19.6</td>
<td>29 56.9</td>
<td>12 23.5</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>51 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B9</td>
<td>2 3.9</td>
<td>24 47.1</td>
<td>25 49.0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>51 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B10</td>
<td>24 47.1</td>
<td>22 43.1</td>
<td>4 7.8</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>51 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B11</td>
<td>11 21.6</td>
<td>20 39.2</td>
<td>20 39.2</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>51 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B12</td>
<td>36 70.6</td>
<td>12 23.5</td>
<td>3 5.9</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>51 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B13</td>
<td>23 45.1</td>
<td>24 47.1</td>
<td>4 7.8</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>51 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B14</td>
<td>24 47.1</td>
<td>26 51</td>
<td>1 2.0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>51 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B15</td>
<td>16 31.4</td>
<td>20 39.2</td>
<td>6 11.8</td>
<td>9 17.6</td>
<td>51 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B16</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>2 3.9</td>
<td>2 3.9</td>
<td>47 92.2</td>
<td>51 100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Only one question, B12, "What is considered your strongest administrative skill and what is the weakest? Explain," was indicated by the majority of the respondents (70.6%) as one that was regularly asked during final interviews.

Three questions were supported by the majority as those that were sometimes asked during interviews:

1. B1: "What kind of professional responsibilities do you want your professional staff to have? Why?" (62.7%)
2. B8: "What kind of staff would you like to have?" (56.9%)
3. B14: "How would you describe your decision-making process?" (51%)

High percentages under the category never asked were indicated in Table 4 for these three questions:

1. B3: "What is the purpose of evaluation?" (41.2%)
2. B7: "Would you allow your staff to evaluate your performance? Why or why not?" (41.2%)
3. B9: "How would you describe a work environment that is unacceptable to you?" (49%)

Again, question B16 allowed respondents to add other questions that they used during an interview to address the specific criterion of "professional attitude." Even though there were indications that other questions were indeed asked by 2% of the respondents, only one specific example was provided, "What have you read during the past month?"
Professional attitudes or administrative skills are strictly job-related criteria, however little agreement could be found among all respondents concerning the survey questions addressing this issue. As stated by Kinicki and Lockwood (1985), "The 'Uniform Guidelines on Employee Selection Procedures' (1978) stipulate that employment decisions must be based on job-related criteria" (p.117). Yet no clear directions were provided by the respondents as to what other questions could be used to assess candidates' skills in relation to a specific position.

The results in Table 4 also revealed that the following questions received very little support among the respondents for their usage in final interviews.

1. B3: "What is the purpose of evaluation?"
2. B6: "How do you want to be evaluated?"
3. B7: "Would you allow your staff to evaluate your performance? Why and why not?"
4. B9: "How would you describe a work environment that is unacceptable to you?"
5. B11: "In your opinion, what is the core of a well-run organization?"

Criterion C addressed personal qualities, individual involvement and outlook. The questions listed on the survey attempted to assess the unique quality of the individual being interviewed. Table 5 outlined the results.
Of the 16 questions listed under Section C, four were favored to be included in the final interviews by over 50% of the respondents.

1. C5: "How do you handle conflicts?" (60.8%)
2. C8: "What is your philosophy regarding your chosen field? Please elaborate." (52.9%)
3. C9: "What are your future aspirations?" (58.8%)
4. C13: "What are your personal strengths and weaknesses?" (74.5%)
Table 5
Comparisons of Responses to Questions C1-C16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>No Answer</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>39.2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>43.1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C5</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>60.8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C6</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>45.1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C8</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>52.9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C9</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>58.8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>56.9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>52.9</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>54.9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C13</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>74.5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>45.1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Another four questions were endorsed by the majority as questions that were *sometimes asked*:

1. C4: "What kind of leadership positions have you held in any of these organizations?" (51%)
2. C10: "How do you bring about change?" (56.9%)
3. C11: "How do you stay motivated?" (52.9%), and
4. C12: "What was your most rewarding experience in your last position? and why?" (54.9%)

A feeling of ambiguity seemed to be expressed by the respondents when came to the following questions. No clear majorities were indicated in any one category, *always asked, sometimes asked and never asked*.

1. C1: "How do you view your potentials based on the job description?"
2. C2: "Which professional associations or organizations are you a member of? Why?"
3. C7: "What makes you unique?"

C16 solicited any other questions that might have been used by respondents. Only one responded affirmatively; however, no specific questions were provided for reference.

Criterion D addressed interpersonal skills (compatibility) in the organizational setting. The results were presented in Table 6.
Table 6
Comparisons of Responses to Questions D1-D13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>No Answer</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>52.9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>39.2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>52.9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D6</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>43.1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>43.1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D7</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>72.5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>39.2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D10</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>68.6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In reviewing these results, two of the questions were considered by the majority as significant:

1. D7: "How do you view your relationship with students?" (74.5%)

2. D10: "In working with staff, how would you describe your leadership style?" (68.6%)

Three questions were sometimes asked by over 50% of the respondents:

1. D1: "How would you rate your interpersonal skills? Why?" (52.9%)

2. D4: "How do you view your relationship with your peers?" (53.9%)

3. D8: "What are your expectations of your staff? How do you communicate those to them?" (51%)

An almost even split among the always asked, sometimes asked, and never asked categories indicated there were no agreements as to the relevance to the interview of the following questions:

1. D9: "What is the most difficult thing you have to do in dealing with people? Why is it difficult?"

2. D11: "How would you describe yourself as a person?"

Question D13 was used to receive responses about other questions used to assess candidate's interpersonal skills. Only one positive answer was received with no specific questions listed.
Criterion E addressed miscellaneous traits that might be pertinent in providing information about the candidates but did not fall under any particular criterion.

Table 7
Comparisons of Responses to Questions E1-E5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>No Answer</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. %</td>
<td>No. %</td>
<td>No. %</td>
<td>No. %</td>
<td>No. %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>58.8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E2</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>82.4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>52.9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Table 7 two questions stood out.

1. E1: "Why are you leaving your present position?"

and

2. E2: "Why do you want this position?"

At 58.8% and 82.4% respectively, they were overwhelmingly favored by the majority for possible inclusion in interviews. Just as strongly, question E4: "If you were drafting a code of ethics for your chosen profession, what would you include in it? Why?" was never used by 64.7% of the respondents.
Section F provided respondents with an opportunity to address interview criteria and questions not specifically outlined in the questionnaire but always asked. Ten of the respondents (or 20%) elected to share their questions. Interestingly enough, no two respondents' questions were alike. All questions proposed by the respondents are listed with no attempt made to re-word or re-address them.

1. experiences in like positions
2. skills in budgeting
3. skills in leadership
4. follow-up questions for clarification purposes
5. comments from current colleagues and supervisors
6. possession of common sense
7. ability to get along with others
8. adaptability:
   (a) How do you feel you would "fit in" with the current staff? with the immediate supervisor?
   (b) What are your budgetary expectations? Can your expectations be met in "our" situation?
   (c) Would your family, etc. be able/willing to adjust to the new environment?
9. Please share your views on pluralism and multiculturalism.
10. What is your perception of our institutional culture and climate?
11. Tell me about your competencies as a generalist
12. Critique your written and oral communication skills please.

13. greatest success, and why.

14. greatest professional failures - what happened?

15. personal interest and intellectual curiosity. Is the candidate likely to inspire students? How?

16. Assess a person's manner and style in relation to young people.

17. If you have moved a lot, why?

18. Are titles as descriptors important in your organizational scheme?

Based on the information provided, the questions could possibly be grouped under the predetermined criteria: job knowledge, professional attitudes and skills, personal qualities, interpersonal skills and miscellaneous. In an attempt to organize these questions, they were re-assigned to the criteria indicated in Table 8.
Table 8
Assignment of Respondents’ Proposed Questions to Predetermined Criteria

Criterion A: Job Knowledge (Academic Preparation and Work Experiences)

1. experiences in like positions
2. skills in budgeting
3. greatest success, and why?
4. greatest professional failures - what happened?

Criterion B: Professional Attitudes (Administrative Skills)

Are titles as descriptors important in your organizational scheme?
Criterion C: Personal Qualities (Individual Involvement and Outlook)

1. possession of common sense
2. adaptability:
   (a) How do you feel you would "fit in" with the current staff? with the immediate supervisor?
   (b) What are your budgetary expectations? Can your expectations be met in "our" situation?
   (c) Would your family, etc. be able/willing to adjust to the new environment?
3. Please share your views on pluralism and multiculturalism.
4. What is your perception of our institutional culture and climate?
5. Tell me about your competencies as a generalist educator.
6. Personal interest and intellectual curiosity. Is the candidate likely to inspire students? How?
Criterion D: Interpersonal Skills (Compatibility)

1. skills in leadership
2. ability to get along with others
3. Critique your written and oral communication skills please.
4. Assess a person's manner and style in relation to young people.

Criterion E: Miscellaneous

1. follow-up questions for clarification purposes
2. comments from current colleagues and supervisors
3. If you have moved a lot, why?
Under Section G, Validation of Interview Questions, only three of the 51 respondents, or 5.9%, verified that their interview questions were validated, as shown in Table 9.

Table 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Validation of Interview Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Validated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 9, surprisingly few indicated that the questions used during interview were validated. Of those who did, the collective response was that a search committee would normally be charged in developing a set of questions that would be asked of all the candidates in order to be fair. A couple of respondents interpreted the question "Are all the questions used during your personnel interviews validated?" as meaning the answers given by the candidates were confirmed by another source. To that end, their answers indicated (a) the answers were compared with other interviewers, and (b) the answers were checked with references other than those listed by applicants.

Under Section H, 45.1% reported that some kind of rating forms were used to evaluate candidates. However,
only one sample was sent for reference.

Table 10

Utilization of Candidate Rating Form During Interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No Answer</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 45.1</td>
<td>24 47.1</td>
<td>4 7.8</td>
<td>51 100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section H elicited the most written response; It asked those respondents who did not use an evaluation form to rate candidates to list their reasons why. The following reasons were given for not using a form and, again, no attempt was made to re-word any of the comments as written.

1. The level of job classification and the desires of the hiring office determine whether to use an interview rating form--most often a form is not used.

2. It is difficult, in my opinion, quantify this material.

3. Some departments use a form, I do not. I prefer a written summary as to why or why not a candidate is qualified for the job.

4. We are not sure these complex matters could be reduced to numbers.

5. Concerns about confidentiality--all "ratings" would be public information in our state.
6. No good reason to do so with mid-level professional people.

7. I receive feedback verbally from other evaluators.

8. Such a form gives the impression that numerical values indicate who the successful candidate should be. This is a false impression!


10. Sometimes yes, sometimes no.

11. A rating form such as the one presented assumes that all criteria should be weighted equally. This is seldom the case. Furthermore, many other factors influence the decision-maker such as the way the candidate is dressed, non-verbal behaviors, tact, eye contact, timing, comfort level, etc. I might choose to compare candidates on each criterion, but I would not use a scale as presented.

12. Generally extensive committee discussion is used to identify, validate and confirm perspectives of candidates competence.

13. We use search committee and appropriate institutional groups to interview candidates. These individuals typically write me a note which includes what they see as strengths and weaknesses of the candidates and a recommendation regarding their views on whether or not the candidate should be hired.

14. People involved in the interview process are invited to provide their reactions as they see fit. Major
student services staff would then discuss and provide major
strengths and weaknesses of each candidate interviewed.

15. Numerical ratings provide little substantive
support. The rating form is too simplistic and not
thorough.


These comments were received from those 45.1% who did
use interview evaluation forms, when asked in Section H to
send a copy of their candidate rating form:

1. Specific form was developed for each position.

2. The interview form is designed to fit the
particular position.

3. A form is used but we eliminated quantitative
rating forms for interviews several years ago. Ratings are
used for earlier phases but interview evaluations solicit
written descriptions of the candidate's
knowledge/skills/experience and one final
acceptable/unacceptable check-off.

4. A ranking form is used with an opportunity to make
comments.

Summary

Data were gathered for this study using a survey-
questionnaire designed by the investigator and validated by
a panel of experts. The following summarizations were made
from the data collected:
1. Six questions listed under Job Knowledge were considered by the majority as relevant interview questions.

2. Five questions listed under Job Knowledge were sometimes asked by the majority.

3. Only one question listed under Professional Attitudes was considered significant for inclusion in the final interview.

4. Three questions listed under Professional Attitudes were sometimes asked by the majority.

5. Four questions listed under Personal Qualities had the majority's support for their usage in interviews.

6. An equal number of questions in Personal Qualities were sometimes asked by the majority.

7. Three questions in Personal Qualities had even support in any one of the three answer categories; always asked, sometimes asked, and never asked.

8. Two questions listed under Interpersonal Skills had the majority's endorsement.

9. Three questions in Interpersonal Skills were sometimes asked by the majority.

10. Two questions received even percentage distributions in any one of the three answer categories; always asked, sometimes asked, and never asked.

11. In the Miscellaneous section, two questions had the majority's support for their relevance in the interviews.
12. One question listed under Miscellaneous was sometimes asked by the majority.

13. An overwhelming majority (64.7%) rejected the inclusion of Question E4 in interviews.

14. 18 additional questions were suggested by the respondents to use during interviews.

15. 82.4% confirmed that interview questions used were not validated.

16. An almost equal number of respondents (23 vs. 24) indicated the use or non-use of the candidate rating forms.

17. 16 reasons were given for not using a candidate rating form.

18. Four reasons were given for the use of a candidate rating form.
Chapter 4

Generic Model

Introduction

The purpose of Chapter 4 is to develop a generic model of a set of interview questions.

Proposed Model

In proposing the generic model of a set of interview questions, only those survey questions that have received support from more than 50% of the respondents in the always asked category were included. Questions are listed respectively under each criterion assessed.

1. Criterion Assessed: Job Knowledge (academic preparation and work experiences)
   - What is your academic background?
   - What is your area of specialization?
   - How long have you been in this particular field?

Describe each significant phase or position you have held.

   - Have you ever initiated any programs? What are they?
   - What would you consider to be the primary responsibility of this position? Why?
   - What would be your long-term goals if you were given
the position? & How would you go about accomplishing them?

Other questions as proposed by the respondents for possible inclusion were:

- Share your experiences in like positions.
- Describe your budgeting experiences.
- What is considered your greatest success, and why?
- What is your greatest professional failure, what happened?

2. Criterion Assessed: Professional Attitudes
   (administrative skills)

- What is considered your strongest administrative skill and what is the weakest? Explain.

One other question as proposed by the respondents for possible inclusion was:

- Are titles as descriptors important in your organizational scheme?

3. Criterion Assessed: Personal Qualities (individual involvement and outlook)

- How do you handle conflicts?
- What is your philosophy regarding your chosen field?
  Please elaborate.
- What are your future aspirations?
- What are your personal strengths and weaknesses?

Other points as proposed by the respondents for possible consideration were:
- Assessing possession of common sense
- Adaptability: (a) What are your budgetary expectations? Can your expectations be met in "our" situation? (b) How do you feel you would "fit in" with the current staff? with the immediate supervisor? (c) Would your family, etc. be able/willing to adjust to the new environment?
- Please share your views on pluralism and multiculturalism.
- What is your perception of our institutional culture and climate?
- Tell me about your competencies as a generalist educator.
- Personal interest and intellectual curiosity. Is the candidate likely to inspire students? How?

4. Criterion Assessed: Interpersonal Skills (compatibility)
- How do you view your relationship with students?
- In working with staff, how would you describe your leadership style?

Other points as proposed by the respondents for possible consideration were:
- skills in leadership
- ability to get along with others
- Critique your written and oral communication skills please.
- Assess a person's manner and style in relation to young people.

5. Criterion Assessed: Miscellaneous

- Why are you leaving your present position?
- Why do you want this position?

Other points as proposed by the respondents for possible consideration were:

- follow-up questions for clarification purposes
- comments from current colleagues and supervisors
- If you have moved a lot, why?
Chapter 5

Summary, Conclusions, Recommendations and Recommendations for Further Study

Introduction

It was the purpose of the Chapter 5 to summarize the study, draw conclusions, make recommendations and provide recommendations for further study.

Review of Procedure

It was the intent of this study to analyze and validate interview selection criteria as utilized by the chief student affairs officers of the 72 land grant colleges and universities for successful personnel placement. The second purpose was to develop a generic model that could be used as a base for future personnel selections.

Five steps were taken to accomplish these purposes. First, a literature search was made in the five areas of personnel placement: (a) the federal guidelines concerning employment interviews; (b) screening; (c) the selection interview’s value; (d) variables to be considered during the selection interview; (e) the selection interview’s techniques; and (f) interview evaluation instruments for
decision-making.

Second, a survey-questionnaire was constructed listing all possible selection criteria namely; job knowledge and work experience, administrative skills, personal qualities, interpersonal skills and miscellaneous. Selected questions were listed under each criterion for the respondents' consideration.

Third, the questionnaire was validated by a panel of experts and sent to the chief student affairs officers at all land-grant institutions. Fourth, content analysis was conducted on data gathered to determine if there was general agreement among the respondents. Fifth, a generic model of a set of interview questions was proposed.

Five questions were used as the basis for the collection and analysis of the data:

1. What were the common criteria used for the selection interviews based on the data collected?
2. What techniques or processes were used to validate these criteria?
3. What questions were used to address the criteria?
4. How were the answers evaluated?
5. Were enough validated criteria available to develop a generic model?

The research addressed all questions. However, not enough information was generated to analyze how all the answers were evaluated since there were as many respondents
using a candidate rating form as those not using one.

The conceptual base for the research, as provided by Castetter (1986) and Rebore (1987), suggested that the personnel selection process move from pre-selection to selection to post-selection. Castetter (1986) advocated employing a combination of techniques to hire the best-suited candidate for a position. The literature study conducted supported this concept. The research itself centered on only one aspect of the personnel selection; selection criteria, the related questions and the evaluation instrument.

Summary

Data gathered from the research suggested the following:

1. The survey was delimited to the following:
   (a) similar positions in land-grant institutions and,
   (b) certain selected interview parameters based upon literature review.

2. The key criteria used in the interview process as reported by the respondents were consistent with the ones identified through literature research for this study. These criteria were: (a) job knowledge, (b) administrative skills, (c) personal qualities, and (d) interpersonal skills.

3. During the interview processes, the same questions
were asked of each final candidate in all reporting cases.

4. Evaluations of the candidates were accomplished in two ways. Forty-five percent of the respondents evaluated candidates quantitatively with a rating form. Forty-seven percent of the respondents evaluated candidates qualitatively with discussion among all interviewers. The basic questions asked each candidate served as a format for these discussions.

5. The generic model of interview questions as developed in Chapter Four utilized 15 questions. These items were identified as being those on the original survey that were commonly utilized by the majority of the respondents.

6. Included in the generic model were six questions on job knowledge, one question on administrative skills, four questions on personal qualities, two questions on interpersonal skills and one each, "Why are you leaving your present position?" and "Why do you want this position?"

7. One surprising finding was that as job-relevant as administrative skills were to any given position, only one question was identified by the respondents as the one being consistently used to assess this particular criterion. This question was "What is your strongest administrative skill and what is the weakest?"

8. Other common items as reported being used by the
respondents were:

- four to assess job knowledge,
- one to assess administrative skills,
- six to assess personal qualities,
- four to assess interpersonal skills, and
- three others.

9. Sixteen reasons were reported as to why a quantitative rating form was not used to evaluate candidates. The general consensus was that a quantitative rating form suggested that complex personnel decisions could be reduced to numbers and they did not feel that was possible.

10. Only four institutions explained and defended their use of a structured candidate rating form. Their general consensus was that a specific form should be developed for each position for evaluative consistency.

11. Eighty-two and four tenth percent of the respondents indicated that the interview questions they used were not validated.

Conclusions

The following conclusions were drawn from the data.

1. For reasons not identified very few questions were used to assess administrative skills.

2. The number of institutions using structured candidate's rating form equaled those who do not.
3. A conclusion from the data above indicated that there was little notable difference between the two groups of respondents regarding variables used to employ individuals.

4. Based upon the data in this study and literature research, it was concluded that structured interviews would encourage (a) greater selection consistency and, (b) provide more legal protection because of this consistency.

5. The generic model developed and presented in Chapter Four should provide the basis for both process and legal consistency.

Recommendations

All student affairs departments need to develop guidelines for personnel selection. Search committees need to be established for all professional vacancies. In selecting members for the search committee, conflict of interest should be carefully considered. The selection guidelines should provide a clear indication to the committee on how to conduct a search to fill an open position. Same process, questions asked and evaluation procedure should apply to all candidates. Questions used during interviews should be as job-related as possible to avoid legal complications. The following guidelines, as suggested by Black (1992) can be incorporated into the
instructions given to the search committees:
- understands campus policies,
- understands state and federal non-discrimination standards,
- advertises the position using clear, concise, and consistent language,
- avoids conflicts of interest on the committee,
- reviews all applications equally,
- understands and complies with state open records and meeting laws,
- avoids discriminatory questions, and
- reviews all written materials from the search, including offers, to ensure compliance with campus policies and state and federal laws. (p. 8)

Recommendations for Further Study

Some questions emerged that might provide interest for further study.

1. What is the most widely used schedule of events, from pre-selection through selection to post-selection, in filling a professional vacancy?

2. How are the references checked?

3. What are the questions asked to assess a candidate's administrative skills?

4. Do employee exit interviews have a place in personnel placement process?
5. How does the emphasis on racial diversity affect the work place?

6. What motivates people to accept job offers?
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Appendix A

Letters of Endorsement
October 18, 1990

Ms. Theresa Chiang  
Director  
Moyer Student Union  
University of Nevada, Las Vegas  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89154

Dear Theresa:

The study you plan for your dissertation strikes me as not only an intellectually challenging research project, but also as one that could be very useful to people in the profession. I would find it helpful to know exactly how student affairs chiefs do go about assessing candidates for the various jobs they must fill in their area. I am also certain, given your performance in my class, EDA 745, that you will do an excellent job in conducting such a study. I endorse your project enthusiastically, and look forward to reading it when you've completed it.

Good luck, Theresa!

Sincerely,

Robert C. Maxson  
President

RCM:ds
MEMORANDUM

TO: THERESA CHIANG
FROM: R. ACKERMAN
DATE: OCTOBER 22, 1990
SUBJECT: DISSERTATION PROSPECTUS

As someone who has frequently been challenged by staff hiring decisions, I would encourage you to pursue your proposed topic. It would be helpful to know what kind of assessment instruments are available to assist with these important decisions. My guess would be that no such instrument exists but that there is a need for one. Perhaps your research will enable you to develop a helpful tool.

My only caution would be that the use of the term "assessment instrument" might be confusing to those colleagues of mine who comprise your sample. Assessment has come to have a specific meaning in higher education, particularly to student personnel types. To the extent that is true, you may risk developing an unwanted mind set if the respondents believe they are dealing with the broad issue of assessment.

My best wishes as you pursue this phase of your program. You will, no doubt, be offered more free advice than you need but if I can be of assistance, please let me know.
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List of 72 Land-Grant Institutions
List of the 72 Land-Grant Institutions
(as provided by the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges)

1. Alabama A&M University
   P. O. Box 285
   Normal, AL 35762

2. Auburn University
   Auburn University, AL 36849-3501

3. University of Alaska Statewide System
   Fairbanks, AK 99775

4. University of Arizona
   Tucson, AZ 85711

5. University of Arkansas, Fayetteville
   Fayetteville, AR 72701

6. University of Arkansas at Pine Bluff
   Pine Bluff, AR 71601

7. University of California Systemwide
   Oakland, CA 94612-9167

8. Colorado State University
   Fort Collins, CO 80523

9. Connecticut Agricultural Experiment Station
   New Haven, CT 06504

10. University of Connecticut
    Storrs, CT 06269

11. Delaware State College
    Dover, DE 19901

12. University of Delaware
    Newark, DE 19716

13. University of the District of Columbia
    4200 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
    Washington, DC 20008

14. Florida A&M University
    Tallahassee, FL 32307

15. University of Florida
    Gainesville, FL 32611
16. Fort Valley State College  
1005 State College Drive  
Fort Valley, GA 31030-3298

17. University of Georgia  
Athens, GA 30602

18. University of Guam  
Mangilao, Guam 96923

19. University of Hawaii  
2444 Dole Street  
Honolulu, HI 96822

20. University of Idaho  
Moscow, ID 83843

21. University of Illinois  
Urbana, IL 61801

22. Purdue University  
West Lafayette, IN 47907

23. Iowa State University  
Ames, IA 50011

24. Kansas State University  
Manhattan, KS 66506

25. Kentucky State University  
Frankfort, KY 40601

26. University of Kentucky  
Lexington, KY 40506

27. Louisiana State University System  
Baton Rouge, LA 70813

28. Southern University System  
Baton Rouge, LA 70813

29. University of Maine  
Orono, ME 04473

30. University of Maryland, Central Administration  
Adelphi, MD 20783

31. University of Maryland, Eastern Shore  
Princess Anne, MD 21853
32. Massachusetts Institute of Technology  
    77 Massachusetts Avenue  
    Cambridge, MA 02139

33. University of Massachusetts  
    Boston, MA 02116

34. Michigan State University  
    East Lansing, MI 48824-1046

35. University of Minnesota  
    Minneapolis, MN 55455

36. Alcorn State University  
    Lorman, MS 39096

37. Mississippi State University  
    Mississippi State, MS 39762

38. Lincoln University  
    Jefferson City, MO 65101

39. University of Missouri  
    Columbia, MO 65211

40. Montana State University  
    Bozeman, MT 59715

41. University of Nebraska  
    Lincoln, NE 68588

42. University of Nevada, Reno  
    Reno, NV 89557-0095

43. University of New Hampshire  
    Durham, NH 03824

44. Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey  
    New Brunswick, NJ 08903

45. New Mexico State University  
    Box 3Z  
    Las Cruces, NM 88003

46. Cornell University  
    Ithaca, NY 14853-2801

47. North Carolina A&T State University  
    1601 East Market Street  
    Greensboro, NC 27411
48. North Carolina State University  
   Raleigh, NC  27650

49. North Dakota State University  
   Fargo, ND  58105

50. Ohio State University  
   Columbus, OH  43210-1358

51. Langston University  
   Langston, OK  73050

52. Oklahoma State University  
   Stillwater, OK  74078

53. Oregon State University  
   Corvallis, OR  97331

54. Pennsylvania State University  
   201 Old Main  
   University Park, PA  16802

55. University of Puerto Rico  
   San Juan, Puerto Rico  00936

56. University of Rhode Island  
   Kingston, RI  02881-0806

57. Clemson University  
   201 Sikes Hall  
   Clemson, SC  29634

58. South Carolina State College  
   Orangeburg, SC  29117

59. South Dakota State University  
   Brookings, SD  57007-2298

60. Tennessee State University  
   3500 John A. Merritt Boulevard  
   Nashville, TN  37203

61. University of Tennessee  
   Knoxville, TN  37996

62. Prairie View A&M University  
   Prairie View, TX  77446

63. Texas A&M University  
   College Station, TX  77843-1246
64. Utah State University
   Logan, UT  84322

65. University of Vermont
    Burlington, VT  05405-0160

66. University of Virgin Islands
    St. Thomas, VI  00802

67. VPI & State University
    Blacksburg, VA  24061

68. Virginia State University
    Petersburg, VA  23803

69. Washington State University
    Pullman, WA  99164

70. West Virginia University
    Morgantown, WV  26506

71. University of Wisconsin-Madison
    500 Lincoln Drive
    Madison, WI  53706

72. University of Wyoming
    Box 3434 University Station
    Laramie, WY  82071
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List of Land-Grant Institutions Surveyed
List of the Land-Grant Institutions Surveyed

1. Alabama A&M University  
   Dr. Leon Frazier  
   Vice President for Student Affairs & Operations  
   P. O. Box 1328  
   Normal, AL  35762

2. Auburn University  
   Dr. Pat H. Barnes  
   Vice President, Student Affairs  
   Auburn, AL  36849

3. University of Alaska, Anchorage  
   Mr. Larry Kingry  
   Vice Chancellor, Student Services  
   3211 Providence Drive  
   Anchorage, AK  99508

4. University of Alaska, Fairbanks  
   Dr. Harris Shelton  
   Vice Chancellor, Student Affairs  
   Fairbanks, AK  99775-0500

5. University of Arizona  
   Dr. Dudley B. Woodard, Jr.  
   Vice President, Student Relations  
   Tucson, AZ  85711

6. University of Arkansas, Fayetteville  
   Dr. Lyle A. Gohn  
   Vice Chancellor, Student Services  
   Fayetteville, AR  72701

7. University of Arkansas at Pine Bluff  
   Dr. Benjamin Young  
   Vice Chancellor, Student Affairs  
   Pine Bluff, AR  71601

8. University of California, Berkeley  
   Dr. Francisco W. Hernandez  
   Dean of Student Life  
   297 Golden Bear Ctr.  
   Berkeley, CA  94720

9. University of California, Davis  
   Dr. Thomas B. Dutton  
   Sr. Advisor to the Chancellor  
   476 Mark Hall  
   Davis, CA  95616
10. University of California, Irvine  
   Dr. Horace Mitchell  
   Vice Chancellor, Student Affairs  
   Campus Drive  
   Irvine, CA  92717

11. University of California, Los Angeles  
   Dr. Winston C. Doby  
   Vice Chancellor, Student Affairs  
   405 Hilgard Avenue  
   Los Angeles, CA  90024

12. University of California, Santa Barbara  
   Dr. Leslie G. Lawson  
   Dean of Students  
   Santa Barbara, CA  93106

13. Colorado State University  
   Ms. Cheryl Presley  
   Assistant Vice President for Student Affairs  
   201 Administration  
   Fort Collins, CO  80523

14. University of Connecticut  
   Dr. Carol A. Wiggins  
   Vice President for Student Affairs  
   U-121  
   Storrs, CT  06268

15. Delaware State College  
   Dr. Gladys D. W. Motley  
   Vice President, Student Affairs  
   Dover, DE  19901

16. University of Delaware  
   Mr. Stuart J. Sharkey  
   Vice President, Student Affairs  
   Newark, DE  19716

17. University of the District of Columbia  
   Mr. James E. McIver  
   Vice President, Student Affairs  
   4200 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.  
   Washington, DC  20008

18. Florida A&M University  
   Dr. Richard E. Flamer  
   Vice President, Student Affairs  
   Tallahassee, FL  32307
19. University of Florida  
   Dr. C. A. Sandeen  
   Vice President for Student Affairs  
   238A Tigert Hall  
   Gainesville, FL 32611

20. Fort Valley State College  
   Mr. Thomas J. Palmer  
   Vice President for Student Affairs  
   1005 State College Drive  
   Fort Valley, GA 31030-3298

21. University of Georgia  
   Dr. S. Eugene Younts  
   Vice President for Services  
   300 Old College  
   Athens, GA 30602

22. University of Guam  
   Dr. Franklin Cruz  
   Dean, Student Affairs  
   UOG Station  
   Mangilao, Guam 96923

23. University of Hawaii  
   Dr. Doris M. Ching  
   Vice President for Student Affairs  
   2444 Dole Street  
   Honolulu, HI 96822

24. University of Idaho  
   Dr. Terry R. Armstrong  
   Former Executive Assistant to the President  
   Moscow, ID 83843

25. University of Illinois  
   Dr. Stanley R. Levy  
   Vice Chancellor, Student Affairs  
   601 East John Street  
   Urbana, IL 61801

26. Purdue University  
   Dr. Marvin R. Schlatter  
   Assistant Vice President for Student Services  
   Schleman Hall  
   West Lafayette, IN 47907

27. Iowa State University  
   Dr. Thomas B. Thielen  
   Vice President, Student Affairs  
   Ames, IA 50011
28. Kansas State University  
Dr. Pat Bosco  
Associate Vice President, Institutional Advancement  
& Dean of Students  
Anderson Hall  
Manhattan, KS  66506

29. Kentucky State University  
Ms. Betty Gibson  
Acting Vice President, Student Affairs  
Frankfort, KY 40601

30. University of Kentucky  
Dr. James M. Kuder  
Vice Chancellor, Student Affairs  
529 Patterson Office Tower  
Lexington, KY  40506

31. Louisiana State University &  
Agricultural and Mechanical College  
Dr. Thomas J. Risch  
Dean of Students  
114 D. Boyd Hall  
Baton Rouge, LA  70803

32. Southern University and  
Agricultural and Mechanical College  
at Baton Rouge  
Dr. Marvin L. Yates  
Vice Chancellor, Student Affairs  
Baton Rouge, LA  70813

33. University of Maine  
Dr. John R. Halstead  
Vice President for Student Affairs  
Orono, ME  04473

34. University of Maryland, College Park  
Dr. William L. Thomas, Jr.  
Vice President, Student Affairs  
College Park, MD  20742

35. University of Maryland, Eastern Shore  
Dr. Herman Franklin  
Vice President, Student Affairs  
Princess Anne, MD  21853

36. Massachusetts Institute of Technology  
Dr. Shirley M. McBay  
Dean for Student Affairs  
77 Massachusetts Avenue  
Cambridge, MA  02139
37. University of Massachusetts at Amherst
   Dr. Dennis L. Madson
   Vice Chancellor, Student Affairs
   Amherst, MA 01003

38. Michigan State University
   Dr. Moses Turner
   Vice President, Student Affairs & Service
   East Lansing, MI 48824-1046

39. University of Minnesota, Twin Cities
   Ms. Jane W. Canney
   Assistant to the Vice President for Student Affairs
   9 Morrill Hall, 100 Church St. S. E.
   Minneapolis, MN 55455

40. Alcorn State University
   Mr. Emanuel Barnes
   Dean of Students
   Lorman, MS 39096

41. Mississippi State University
   Dr. Roy H. Ruby
   Vice President for Student Affairs
   P.O. Drawer DS
   Mississippi State, MS 39762

42. Lincoln University
   Dr. O. C. Bobby Daniels
   Vice President for Student Affairs
   Jefferson City, MO 65101

43. University of Missouri
   Dr. Dave McIntire
   Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs
   Columbia, MO 65205

44. Montana State University
   Dr. Rolf Groseth
   Acting Vice President for Student Affairs
   120 SUB, MSU
   Bozeman, MT 59715

45. University of Nebraska
   Dr. James V. Griesen
   Vice Chancellor, Student Affairs
   Lincoln, NE 68588
46. University of Nevada, Reno  
   Dr. Patricia Miltenberger  
   Vice President for Student Services  
   Reno, NV 89557-0095

47. University of New Hampshire  
   Dr. Daniel A. DiBiasio  
   Interim Vice President for Student Affairs  
   102 Thompson Hall  
   Durham, NH 03824

48. Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey  
   Dr. Jack E. Creeden  
   Associate Provost, Student Affairs  
   New Brunswick, NJ 08903

49. New Mexico State University  
   Dr. Patricia Wolf  
   Vice President for Student Affairs  
   Box 30001, Dept. 3923  
   Las Cruces, NM 88003

50. Cornell University  
   Dr. Howard Kramer  
   Dean of Students  
   103 Barnes  
   Ithaca, NY 14853-2801

51. North Carolina A&T State University  
   Dr. Sullivan A. Welborne, Jr.  
   Vice Chancellor, Student Affairs  
   1601 East Market Street  
   Greensboro, NC 27411

52. North Carolina State University  
   Dr. Thomas H. Stafford, Jr.  
   Vice Chancellor, Student Affairs  
   Raleigh, NC 27650

53. North Dakota State University  
   Dr. F. Leslie Pavek  
   Retired Vice President for Student Affairs  
   Fargo, ND 58105

54. The Ohio State University  
   Dr. Russell J. Spillman  
   Vice President for Student Affairs  
   201 Ohio Union, 1739 North High Street  
   Columbus, OH 43210-1392
55. Langston University  
   Dr. Elbert L. Jones  
   Vice President for Student Affairs  
   Langston, OK  73050

56. Oklahoma State University  
   Dr. Ronald S. Beer  
   Vice President, Student Services  
   201 Whithurst  
   Stillwater, OK  74078

57. Oregon State University  
   Dr. Jo Anne J. Trow  
   Vice President for Student Affairs  
   Corvallis, OR  97331

58. Pennsylvania State University  
   Mr. William W. Asbury  
   Vice President, Student Services  
   201 Old Main  
   University Park, PA  16802

59. University of Puerto Rico  
   Rio Piedras Campus  
   Mrs. Alicia Ekuina  
   Dean of Students  
   Rio Piedras, PR  00931

60. University of Rhode Island  
   Dr. John McCray  
   Vice President, Student Development  
   Kingston, RI  02881-0806

61. Clemson University  
   Mr. Manning N. Lomax  
   Vice President for Student Affairs  
   202 Sikes Hall  
   Clemson, SC  29634-4001

62. South Carolina State College  
   Dr. Oscar P. Butler, Jr.  
   Vice President of Student Affairs  
   300 College Street, N.E.  
   Orangeburg, SC  29117

63. South Dakota State University  
   Dr. Michael P. Reger  
   Dean of Student Affairs  
   Adm. 318, SDSU  
   Brookings, SD  57007-2298
64. Tennessee State University  
Dr. James Hefner  
Vice President, Student Affairs  
3500 John A. Merritt Boulevard  
Nashville, TN 37203

65. University of Tennessee  
Mr. Phil Scheurer  
Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs  
Suite 523 Andy Holt Tower  
Knoxville, TN 37996

66. Prairie View A&M University  
Dr. Elaine P. Adams  
Vice President for Student Affairs  
Prairie View, TX 77446

67. Texas A&M University  
Dr. John J. Koldus  
Vice President for Student Services  
College Station, TX 77843-1246

68. Utah State University  
Dr. Val R. Christensen  
Vice President, Student Services  
Logan, UT 84322

69. University of Vermont  
Dr. Rosalind Andreas  
Vice President, Student Affairs  
Burlington, VT 05405-0160

70. University of Virgin Islands  
Dr. Ronald Jarrogam  
Director of Student Affairs  
St. Thomas, VI 00802

71. VPI & State University  
Dr. Thomas G. Goodale  
Vice President for Student Affairs  
112 Burruss Hall  
Blacksburg, VA 24061

72. Virginia State University  
Dr. James W. Smith  
Vice President, Student Affairs  
Petersburg, VA 23803

73. Washington State University  
Dr. Maureen M. Anderson  
Vice Provost, Student Affairs  
Pullman, WA 99164
74. West Virginia University
Dr. Marion F. Dearnley
Associate Provost for Student Affairs
206 E. Moore Hall
Morgantown, WV 26506

75. University of Wisconsin-Madison
Dr. Mary Rouse
Dean of Students
500 Lincoln Drive
Madison, WI 53706

76. University of Wyoming
Dr. James Hurst
Associate Provost for Student Affairs
Box 3302 University Station
Laramie, WY 82071
Appendix D

Letters from Panel of Experts
TO: Theresa Chiang
FROM: R. Ackerman
SUBJECT: Research Project

I appreciate your including me as a member of the panel that reviewed your proposed questionnaire. I found the concept of your study very interesting and because of it I realized that, as an employer, I do not always approach interviews with potential employees with as much thoughtfulness as the situation requires. The results of your study will, I believe, serve to focus on the need that both interview participants have to prepare for the interaction. I was impressed with the thought that you put into both the content of the questions and the process of the interview and I look forward to the opportunity to review your results.

Continued best wishes.
September 25, 1991

Theresa Chiang
Doctoral Student
Department of Educational Administration
and Higher Education
c/o Moyer Student Union
University Campus

Dear Ms. Chiang:

This is to acknowledge that I have reviewed the survey instrument to be utilized in your dissertation research. With some modest alterations I believe the survey is a sound instrument for the dissertation project you are undertaking.

If you have any questions or concerns, don't hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

Paul E. Burns
Executive Assistant to the
Sr. Vice President and Provost

PEB\ch
September 19, 1991

Theresa Chiang  
Doctoral Student  
Department of Educational Administration  
and Higher Education  
C/O Moyer Student Union  
University Campus  

Dear Ms. Chiang:  

First of all, it was a pleasure working with you on your survey. I believe that the survey is a sound instrument and will yield useful data for your dissertation research.  

When the data are complete, please send me a copy of your findings. Should you need any further assistance, please feel free to stop by my office.  

Sincerely,  

Elaine Jarchow  
Associate Dean  

EJ:kd
September 25, 1991

Dr. Anthony Saville
Educational Administration and
Higher Education
University of Nevada, Las Vegas
Las Vegas, NV 89154

Dear Dr. Saville,

Please accept this as my endorsement to the study currently being conducted by Ms. Theresa Chiang for partial fulfillment of her doctorate degree through the Department of Educational Administration and Higher Education. From what I observed in her survey questionnaire, I deem it to be a well timed and appropriate study for her profession. The list of questions outlined in the instrument are typical not only to higher education but for all segments of the work force.

It is far too often that as educators we must always be in defense of qualifying our credentials only to find that regardless of your talents, academic qualifications and experience, there is someone ready to challenge you with questions demonstrated in Theresa's survey.

Please know that I fully support Ms. Chiang's study and will gladly respond further should you deem it necessary.

Sincerely,

James R. Kitchen, Ed.D.
Associate Dean of Students

JRK:ps
Appendix E

Survey-Questionnaire
INTERVIEW QUESTIONS SURVEY

Respondent's
Name_______________________________________________________

Title______________________________________________________

Name of the
University _________________________________________________

Address ____________________________________________________

The following assistance is requested:

1. In reviewing the interview questions listed below, please check the ones applicable to your SUCCESSFUL personnel interviews to fill mid-level managerial positions in the past five years.
   i. Circle a if the question is always asked.
   ii. Circle b if the question is sometimes asked.
   iii. Circle c if the question is never asked.

2. In the space provided, please list criteria assessed and the accompanying questions addressed in your interview process, if they are not listed in this questionnaire.

A. Criterion Assessed: Job Knowledge (academic preparation and work experiences)

a  b  c  1. What is your academic background?

a  b  c  2. What is your area of specialization?

a  b  c  3. How long have you been in this particular field? Describe each significant phase or position you have held.

a  b  c  4. What other specialized training have you had that we should know about?

a  b  c  5. How would you go about enhancing your job expertise?

a  b  c  6. Have you ever initiated any programs? What are they?

a  b  c  7. What experiences have you had with budgeting?
a b c 8. What would you consider to be the primary responsibility of this position? Why?

a b c 9. Based on what you have learned about the position, what kinds of changes would you make immediately? Why and how?

a b c 10. What would be your long-term goals if you were given the position? & How would you go about accomplishing them?

a b c 11. How would you conceptualize the field of student affairs in the next decade? What might it be like?

a b c 12. Situational questions (job and criterion specific)

a b c 13. Others (Please specify)

B. Criterion Assessed: Professional Attitudes
(administrative skills)

a b c 1. What kind of professional responsibilities do you want your professional staff to have? Why?

a b c 2. Do you believe in delegating authority? Why or why not?

a b c 3. What is the purpose of evaluation?

a b c 4. How do you evaluate your staff?

a b c 5. How do you evaluate your own performance?

a b c 6. How do you want to be evaluated?

a b c 7. Would you allow your staff to evaluate your performance? Why or why not?

a b c 8. What kind of staff would you like to have?

a b c 9. How would you describe a work environment that is unacceptable to you?

a b c 10. How do you view your role within your own department and within the division of student affairs? and why?
In your opinion, what is the core of a well-run organization?

What is considered your strongest administrative skill and what is the weakest? Explain.

What are some examples of your organizational abilities? and How would you describe them?

How would you describe your decision-making process?

Situational questions. (job and criterion specific)

Others (please specify)

C. Criterion Assessed: Personal Qualities (individual involvement and outlook)

How do you view your potentials based on the job description?

Which professional associations or organizations are you a member of? Why?

What professional meetings do you regularly attend?

What kind of leadership positions have you held in any of these organizations?

How do you handle conflicts?

How do you handle stress?

What makes you unique?

What is your philosophy regarding your chosen field? Please elaborate.

What are your future aspirations?

How do you bring about change?

How do you stay motivated?
12. What was your most rewarding experience in your last position? and why?

13. What are your personal strengths and weaknesses?

14. If there is one thing you could change about yourself, what would that be? Why?

15. Situational questions. (job and criterion specific)

16. Others (please specify)

---

D. Criterion Assessed: Interpersonal Skills (compatibility)

1. How would you rate your interpersonal skills? Why?

2. How would you describe your communication style?

3. How do you motivate people?

4. How do you view your relationship with your supervisor?

5. How do you view your relationship with your peers?

6. How do you view your relationship with your staff?

7. How do you view your relationship with students?

8. What are your expectations of your staff? How do you communicate those to them?

9. What is the most difficult thing you have to do in dealing with people? Why is it difficult?

10. In working with staff, how would you describe your leadership style?

11. How would you describe yourself as a person?

12. Situational questions. (job and criterion specific)
E. Criterion Assessed: Miscellaneous

1. Why are you leaving your present position?
2. Why do you want this position?
3. Why should you be chosen for the position?
4. If you were drafting a code of ethics for your chosen profession, what would you include in it? Why?
5. Others (please specify)

F. Other Criteria Always Assessed and Their Accompanying Questions (Please list)

G. Are all the questions used during your personnel interviews validated?

_____ yes
_____ no

If the answer is yes, please share the process of validation below:
H. Please review the Rating Form on page 7 before answering the following questions.

_____ Yes, a similar interview rating form is used. A copy of our sample form is attached for your reference.

_____ No, an interview rating form is not used.

If the answer is no, please share the reasons below:

=================================

If a copy of the survey results is desired, please indicate below:

_____ yes, I would like to have a copy of the results.

The completed survey should be returned to the following address:

Theresa Chiang
1586 Bridgetown Lane
Las Vegas, NV 89123

(A stamped, self-addressed envelope has been provided for your convenience.)

THANKS FOR YOUR ASSISTANCE!
CANDIDATE'S INTERVIEW RATING FORM

Candidate's
Name ________________________________________________________________

Position Applied
for __________________________________________________________________

Date of the
Interview ____________________________________________________________

Based on the responses received during the interview, please rate the candidate's qualifications according to the criteria assessed.

Please use the rating scale 1 to 5 for each criterion; 1 being the lowest, 5 being the highest. The highest possible score for a candidate will be 5 times the number of criteria assessed.

Criterion A _____
Criterion B _____
Criterion C _____
Criterion D _____
Criterion E _____
Criterion F _____
Total ______

RANKING OF THE CANDIDATE

____ th of the total number of final candidates interviewed.
Appendix F

Cover Letter for the Survey-Questionnaire
September 12, 1991

Chief Student Affairs Officer
University
Address

Dear Dr.

I am a doctoral candidate pursuing a degree in Higher Education at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas. The research of my dissertation involves the comparison of questions commonly used during interviews for professional-level positions, directors and above, in student affairs.

Since successful personnel placement is an essential component of any well-run organization. It is my intent to compile the data collected and propose a generic model, if possible, to be used in future student affairs personnel interviews.

I have taken the liberty of sending you a copy of my survey. I am eager to obtain your responses because your experience in personnel selection will contribute significantly to this particular project. It is my hope that you will share my enthusiasm and assist me in my attempt to collect information by completing the attached survey. The average time required to complete the survey is 15 minutes.

It will be very much appreciated if you will complete the attached survey prior to September 30, 1991 and return it in the enclosed, self-stamped envelope. I would also welcome any comments that you may have concerning personnel selection that is not addressed in the attached survey.

Your consideration and assistance in this research project is very much appreciated.

Sincerely,

Theresa Chiang
Doctoral Candidate
Department of Educational Administration & Higher Education

Approved:
Dr. Anthony Saville
Advisor, Department of Educational Administration & Higher Education
Appendix G

Post-card Follow-up
September 20, 1991

Dear

On September 12, 1991, I sent an interview Questions Survey to you. Would you be kind enough to complete the survey and return it to me by September 30, 1991? Since I am only soliciting responses from a few selected administrators, I am anxious to receive your response. Thank you for your assistance!

Sincerely,

Theresa Chiang
Doctoral Candidate
University of Nevada, Las Vegas