Decision in the Selection Interview as a Function of Man and Job Information

Douglas M. Norman

In partial fulfillment of the requirements

for the M.A. Degree

March, 1963

THE UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA ELIZABETH DAFOE LIBRARY

Abstract of the Thesis

This study investigated the role of job information as a variable affecting the decision-making process in the selection interview. In order to provide a standard situation, verbal protocols of interview information were used in lieu of "live" interviews.

The literature indicates that there are two kinds of job information: (1) information about the traits, aptitudes, abilities and characteristics of the man that lead to success on the job (man information); (2) information about the duties, activities and responsibilities of the job (job information).

The experimental groups had varying amounts and kinds of job information about Feed Salesmen. These were: Full information (both man and job information), Man information, Job information and No information. Professional interviewers provided a standard against which the ratings of the experimental groups could be examined.

It was found that varying the amounts and kinds of job information had no significant effect on: (1) the ratings assigned to protocols of interview information; (2) the consistency with which protocols of interview information were ranked; (3) the amount of interview information selected about an applicant that an interviewer perceived to be important for an applicant's suitability.

Incidental findings lent some support to the contention that professional interviewers react more strongly to negative information; also, that the process of selecting relevant information about an applicant does not seem to be related to the over-all ratings assigned. Possible reasons for job information not being a significant variable in this study are presented.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INDEX OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM AND THE INTRODUCTION

I The Problem

The interview, as a means of assessing individuals for a varietyof purposes and tasks, has been frequently studied. Yet, these investigations have rarely concerned themselves with experimentally examining the processes that operate within the interview. Rather, different processes have been hypothesized without any experimental basis.

Numerous studies have shown that interviewers reach widely different conclusions on much the same evidence. Some of this variability has been attributed to such factors as lack of training and experience or bias. When these factors have been eliminated or held constant, it has not been clear to what cause the differences are due.

The purpose of this study was to experimentally examine one factor that might contribute to interviewers' decisions arrived at from identical interview information. The amount and kind of job information given to interviewers was the specific independent variable examined and the dependent variable was the reaction of interviewers in terms of their over-all ratings of protocols of interview information.

II The Introduction

The interview is the most widely used of all personnel selection techniques. Yet, as Bellows (1954) states, it is "the most used and least useful of available personnel tools." Despite its widespread use in business and industry, and the great expenditure of time and money in utilizing this technique, there has been a conspicuous lack of experimental evidence on the processes involved. A review of the literature by Wagner (1949) showed only 106 articles to that date and, of these, less than 25 percent reported any experimentation. All but two ofthe latter were concerned with problems of reliability and/or validity.

A recent review of the current literature by Dunnette (1962) shows that there has been little change in the status of the interview. He states:

> "The continued uncritical use of the selection interview offers a clear illustration of excessive delay in undertaking needed research. Nearly everyone uses this costly, inefficient, and usually invalid selection procedure. Yet, practically no one performs or reports on interviewing research." (p.291)

The lack of research on the interview has often been attributed to the complexity of the processes involved. Berdie (1943), for instance, feels that anyone attempting research on psychological processes in the interview is faced with a monumental task. It is true that studying the interview presents many experimental difficulties. The dynamic interaction between interviewer and applicant, the different situations in which the interview is used, the lack of effective control of interviewers and subjects, the problem of repeating an interview situation, all present impressive problems to overcome. Springbett (1954),

however, contends that a reluctance to investigate this field lies not so much in the problems to be overcome as in the orientation of thinking about the employment interview. The interview has been thought of as a measuring or testing device and, consequently, it is the techniques of this area of psychology which have been applied. Although he acknowledges that reliability and validity are important, he believes their limits cannot be known until the factors contributing to an interviewer's final decision are revealed.

Before considering the area and aims of this present study a review of the literature should be undertaken to place it in its proper context. This historical background will cover two main areas: reliability and validity of the interview and experimental investigations of processes in the interview.

Historical Background

Reliability and validity

As has been indicated, the majority of experimental research on the interview has been concerned with its reliability and validity. Reliability, in the context of these studies, indicates the degree to which different interviewers rank applicants in a similar manner as to their suitability for a position. Validity, on the other hand, measures an interviewer's success in selecting suitable applicants when measured against some outside criterion.

Early work on the reliability of the interview revealed a great deal unreliability in interviewers' judgments about applicants for a position. The classic study is that of Hollinsworth (1922) who found that rankings of interviewers were widely divergent in considering fifty-seven applicants for a sales position. Even earlier studies by Scott and Scott, Bingham and Whipple (as reported by Wagner, 1949) revealed much the same evidence. For many years these studies were cited as support for the rejection of the interview. More recently, these and other early studies on the reliability of the interview have come under severe criticism by McMurray (1947). He concludes that, because no job specifications had been established for the position they were selecting for and, "in view of the almost total absence of any control on the manner in which the interviews were conducted, or the qualifications of the interviewers, it is not at all surprising that the resulting rankings of applicants showed a high degree of unreliability. (p. 265)"

Later investigations were more concerned with testing the interview as a tool for prediction. However, one study by Newman, Bobbitt and Cameron (1946) reported reliability coefficients on 536 candidates, interviewed in the Coast Guard's officer candidate evaluation programme, ranging from .80 to .89.

Because the accuracy of prediction may approach, but cannot surpass, the accuracy of the instrument used in making the prediction, validity coefficients showing the predictive value of the interview are also an indication of the interview's reliability. Investigations on the validity of the interview are contradictory. In come cases the interview has added something to the total selection procedure and in other cases it has not.

In favor of the interview, a study reported by Rundquist (1947) was conducted by the American Adjutant General's Office on evaluating which officers should be retained in the post-war army. It was found that the interview, when confined to measuring social interaction, made a small contribution to the over-all predictive validity of the evaluative process. McMurray (1947), using the patterned interview and criteria of length of service and foremen's ratings, produced validity coefficients ranging from .61 to .68.

Other studies have not been so favorable to the interview. Bloom and Brundage, as reported in Stuit (1947), conducted a study on 37,262 cases in predicting success in Navy technical schools. It was found that using the interview to evaluate experience, interest and personality added little to the use of test scores and possibly reduced the predictability. A recent investigation by Campbell, Prien and Bailey (1960) found that an interview added nothing to the level of prediction achieved by standardized tests.

Factors contributing to interview processes

This section deals with the limited amount of research that has been conducted on processes operating within the interview and factors relating to an interviewer's final decision about an applicant.

Early studies revealed that bias and "halo" effects caused differences between interviewers' decisions as well as deviations from the "true" assessment. Thorndike (1920) first described "halo" effect as the fact that trait ratings tended to intercorrelate higher than one would expect. It was felt that this resulted from an over-all impression that the interviewer had of the applicant.

Rice (1929) demonstrated the effects of contagious bias on survey results. Prohibitionist and socialist interviewers gave widely disparate reports of the effect of liquor and industrial conditions in causing unemployment.

Later investigations concerned themselves more with processes involved in the interview. Analyses of the interview processes were usually conducted in a post facto fashion through the use of tape recordings and verbatim transcripts. Studies of this nature have shed little light on factors contributing to an interviewer's final decision. (Abt, 1949; Uhrbrock, 1932; Daniels and Otis, 1950)

In the past decade, a number of studies, some as yet unpublished, have been conducted at McGill. A definite attempt has been made at investigating variables operating on the decision-making process in the interview. Some of the findings are noted here.

Springbett (1954, 1958) varied the serial order of presentation of information fed into the interview situation. The three portions of information were application form, appearance and interview data proper. He conducted two studies, one using "live" interviews in an industrial setting and the other using written personal histories in an army setting. The results of both studies closely paralleled each other. The main findings of this study indicated that early impressions based on appearance and the application form are dominant in determining the final decision. It was further indicated that the interview becomes primarily a search for negative evidence.

Anderson (1960, 1961) in a study relating verbal behavior to decision making in the interview, found that the favorable or unfavorable nature of an interviewer's decision is

related to the amount he talks as well as other factors. Support was gained for Springbett's findings that the interviewer uses the interview to confirm an impression of the applicant that is initially favorable or unfavorable.

Sydiaha (1958, 1959), using actual Army interviews, compared the best possible statistical decision to enlist or not to enlist an individual with the evaluation by an interviewer having available all the test scores and biographical data included in the statistical evaluation. He concluded that clinical-descriptive operations, i.e., opinions of interviewers, involved the use of more information than is contained in systematically obtained biographical and test data. This infers that the interviewer does make a contribution to the final decision in the interview.

In this same study, Sydiaha also found evidence for another variable that contributes to the decision-making process. He found that interviewers develop a "stereotype" of a good candidate and seek to match men and stereotype. Using actual interviews, Sydiaha had Army examiners check their impressions of applicants on a 120-item descriptive check list. He found that his officers were actually looking for the same characteristics even though they themselves differed considerably in training and background. Sydiaha holds that the popular belief held by interviewers is that each interview is unique and that interviewer stereotypes are not common but highly individualized. His results were contrary to this. Although there may be a wide diversity of applicant behavior the interviewers vary little in what they look for.

Rowe (1960), in conducting a study on individual differences in assessment decisions, also found the existence of "stereotypes". Her investigation, using printed descriptions of

army applicants, indicated that all judges perceive applicants in much the same manner and those with more experience agree more closely as to who should be recruited. It was also found that the stereotypes developed rapidly in interviewers.

A study by Bolster and Springbett (1961), similar to the present study in its use of protocols of interview information rather than "live" interviews, investigated the reactions of interviewers to favorable and unfavorable information within the interview. Previous findings of a sensitivity to negative information by interviewers (e.g., Springbett, 1958) were confirmed. It was further shown that there were primacy effects, i.e., the evaluation attached to an item of information presented first carried more weight than if it was presented later. Those items inducing a rating shift disproportionate to their importance did so only when they were the first to challenge a rating to which the interviewer was committed. As it operates in the interview situation, primacy refers to the first change in the direction of evidence. The magnitude of these effects then become a function of the degree of commitment which is the height of the rating. It is also a function of the weight of the challenging item.

The Area and Aims of the Present Study

Against a background of widely recognized need for experimental investigation of the interview there is a continuing stream of advice about "how to interview". This has led England and Paterson (as quoted by Dunnette, 1962, p.291) to suggest that there be

> "a moratorium on books, articles and other writings about 'how to interview,' 'do's and don'ts' about interviewing, and the like, until there is sufficient research evidence about the reliability and validity of the interview as an assessment device to warrant its use in such work."

One finds here that manuals and articles on the interview have in recent years increasingly emphasized the importance of an interviewer having adequate knowledge of the job for which he is selecting. (Bellows, 1954; McMurray, 1947; Fear, 1958; Kephart, 1952.) Two reasons for this are usually cited. First, an interviewer must be able to divulge information about the job in answer to questions from a prospective employee. Secondly, and important for this study, the interviewer must be able to assess the applicant in terms of the qualifications for the job.

Kephart (1952) has pointed out that the selection interview is essentially a matching of facts about the applicant with facts about the job. The interviewer must know what the duties of the job are and what abilities are needed by the employee to perform that job adequately.

A recent publication by Fear (1958) is even more specific. He believes that "intelligent selection is predicated on the knowledge of <u>what to look for</u> in the applicant. (P.16)" To do this, the interviewer must possess two kinds of information about the job. The first of these constitutes the usual job description encompassing the activities, duties and responsibilities of the position. This is insufficient without the addition of information about the "man specifications." This provides a list of those traits and abilities that are required for successful job performance.

For the purposes of this study, we have taken the two variables "job information" and "man information" as constituting the knowledge of the job necessary for an interviewer to successfully select applicants. Undoubtedly, the two variables overlap to some extent but a dichotomy has been arbitrarily established.

"Job information" is comparable to the usual job description existing in most companies. For the most part, it provides a description of the activities and duties that must be performed by an individual engaged in this position as well as an outline of responsibilities, physical strength, effort, hazards and conditions that form a part of the job. In other words, it is concerned with the "job content" rather than the man performing the job. These descriptions are arrived at in various ways. In more sophisticated companies this usually takes some sort of job analysis which is a method of analytically determining the components of a job. In other companies, the job description may be written by the incumbent occupying the position or by his supervisor or by the personnel department.

"Man information", on the other hand, is a description of the characteristics that would lead to an individual's success on the job. Some job descriptions either infer these man characteristics or even list them. It is not unusual to find these two treated separately; in one place a description of the job and in another the qualifications necessary to perform that job. The characteristics included under "man information" are personality traits such as gregariousness, industriousness or ambition, level of academic or job training, aptitudes, interests and abilities, etc.. For example, say a company was considering applicants for the job of instrument mechanic. They had decided that the successful applicant must be a senior matriculant with several years' training in the trade and must possess a reasonable level of intelligence and have an aptitude for, and an ability in, this area of mechanics. Besides this, the applicant must be a cooperative individual capable of carrying out work assignments with a minimum amount of direction.

All these qualifications are subsumed under "man information". This company had found out, by one means or another, that these characteristics were necessary to successfully perform the job.

The way in which most companies arrive at these man characteristics is not too refined. Usually experience and trial-and-error are relied upon. Job appraisals and exit interviews are also sources of information. The more objective the man characteristics are, such as academic level, the more easily their validity as "true" man characteristics for the job may be determined. This, of course, may be determined statistically by computing validity coefficients between the characteristics and some criterion of performance. Where the man characteristics are more of a subjective nature, such as personality traits, a greater difficulty is encountered in assessing their validity as man characteristic for the job. It would be true to say that the higher a job is in the organization of a company, and the more supervisory or managerial functions it contains, the more difficult it would be to arrive at the man characteristics for that job.

The aim of the present study is to make a beginning in the problem of experimentally assessing the contribution made by man and job information to the process of decision making in the employment interview. It is acknowledged that the experimental design presents an artificial situation but, nevertheless, it does provide a test, albeit in a limited situation, of the hypothesis that the interviewer's "grasp" of job and man information makes a difference to the kind of decision he makes.

What has been done is to select a job about which the personnel men, in a number of plants of a large meat-packing firm, felt they had best identified the man and job specifications related to successful performance. In the experiment, the performance of

these professionals served as a standard. All remaining subjects who served as "interviewers" were equated for interviewing experience in that they had none. Different groups of these subjects were then given varying amounts and kinds of information about the job and man specifications for the job. If such information affects the decision, one would expect varying degrees of agreement, amongst these experimental groups, with the standard professional group.

There is no direct experimental support for these contentions, although indirectly, the work of Sydiaha (1958),(1959), Rowe (1960) and McMurray (1947) lend substance to the claim that interviewing is a process of matching applicant and job.

The final outcome of an employment interview is a decision about the applicant in terms of his suitability for a job. The process of the interview itself may be conceived of as being mainly one of selecting relevant information about the applicant and evaluating it in terms of the requirements for the job. The results of these, and undoubtedly other processes, would be a final decision about the applicant.

Incidental to the main investigation, an attempt was made in this study to examine the relative contribution of each of these processes to the final decision in the interview. In order to accomplish this, the selection process had to be eliminated. Only information that was highly relevant to an applicant's suitability for the job was given to the interviewer. As they no longer had to determine which information was relevant, their judgments about the applicants would be determined by the evaluative process. It would be expected that there would be greater agreement between their ratings of applicants and those of the standard group than if they had to first select the relevant information and then evaluate it.

Before considering the methods and procedures of this study, its limitations should be made clear. In selecting one variable for study in isolation any interaction effects it may have with other variables in the dynamic process of interviewing is lost. There is also no denying the artificiality of using written items of information about applicants in lieu of a "live" interview situation and subjects with no interviewing experience as interviewers. It may be argued as well that the method of communicating the job information variable to the interviewers in this experiment does not have the same educative impact open to professional interviewers by direct experience. Before any generalizations to actual interview situations may be made, these limitations must be taken into consideration.

With this general statement of the rationale and limitations of the thesis, we may proceed to consider the details of the methods and procedures.

CHAPTER II

THE INVESTIGATION: METHODS AND PROCEDURE

General Requirements

In this experimental setting the general problem, as outlined in the preceding section, is reduced to assessing the relationships between information about man and job characteristics supplied to interviewers (independent variable) and ratings assigned to "applicants" by the interviewers (dependent variable). Some general considerations must be taken into account to ensure as much validity in the final experimental setting as possible.

Logically, the first step is that of selecting the job for which the applicants are to be rated. Ideally this should be a job for which the man and job characteristics have been clearly identified and shown, empirically, to be significantly related. The best practical approximation of this was to appeal to a large corporation with a well-established personnel service and have them choose a job which, in their opinions, best met the above requirements.

Secondly, some sort of standard is required with which the ratings of the experimental groups can be compared. This was achieved by having a group of the personnel officers in the above mentioned firm carry out the experimental tasks. As these men were presumed to know from their experience and training what the man and job characteristics are for the job in question, it is a reasonable expectation that the experimental groups with the fullest information would approximate the "standard ratings" more closely than those with lesser information.

Finally, a clear picture of the relationship between dependent and independent variables can be secured only if the "interview" is standard for all experimental groups. This was achieved by using written protocols. The loss in realism is acknowledged but, while the dynamics of the interviewing situation are not present, nevertheless the factors of selecting and evaluating information are present in such a way as to test the hypothesis. Previous studies lend some support for this method of presentation. (Springbett, 1958; Rowe, 1960; Bolster and Springbett, 1961)

The details of how each of these general requirements was met follows:

The job

The interview setting selected was that of assessing the suitability of applicants for the position of Feed Salesman. This is an actual job in the Feed Division of a large meat-packing firm. It was the job within the company for which the Personnel Department felt they best "knew the answers." Personnel officers willing to cooperate in the study were available both at the local plant and other vicinities.

As outlined in preceding sections there are two different kinds of job information. The first of these, hereafter referred to as "job information", constitutes a comprehensive description of the duties, activities and responsibilities of the position. The second, which will be referred to as "man information", comprises information about personality traits, characteristics and aptitudes of Feed Salesmen that lead to their success on the job.

For the former, a job description was available in the files of the company. Through discussions with Personnel officers and Feed Salesmen, as well as time spent watching a Feed Salesman perform his duties, this job description was elaborated upon and translated into terms readily understandable to those lacking acquaintance with the position. (See Appendix A)

The latter, man information, was arrived at through consultation with members of the Personnel Department. The characteristics, traits and aptitudes that they had found to lead to success in the job of Feed Salesman had been arrived at over a number of years through the testing of preconceived ideas, job appraisals, and exit interviews. (See Appendix A)

The "standard group"

This group was composed of seven personnel officers who, in the normal course of their duties, interview applicants for the position of Feed Salesman. Their ratings of the "applicants" provided a standard against which the ratings by the experimental groups could be compared. None of the interviewers in this group took part in the scaling of the items of information to be used in the protocols.

In having personnel officers perform the experimental task and comprising the "standard", several assumptions were made. First of all, for the purpose of this study, it was assumed that they represent the pinnacle of information about the job. This was true in that they had previously selected applicants for the job and supposedly their information about the job formed a basis for their judgments about these applicants. Secondly, it was

assumed that they would use their knowledge of the job in assigning ratings to the pseudo-applicants used in this study. On the basis of these assumptions, it would be expected that there would be greater agreement amongst them as to which "applicants" were suitable or not and which information was relevant to an applicant's suitability when compared with the experimental groups. If these expectations do not hold true, the deviations of the experimental groups from this standard would still provide a measure of the effect of the independent variable, information about the job, in the experimental groups. However, the professional interviewers' knowledge of the job, or whether they were using it as a basis for their judgments about the applicants used in this study, would be open to question.

The protocols

In order that the protocols should be representative of information that might be obtained in an interview, the first task was to have relevant and irrelevant items that were both favorable and unfavorable with regard to an applicant's suitability for the position. Relevant or irrelevant information refers to whether this information would affect an interviewer's decision about an applicant. If it does, it is relevant; if it does not, it is irrelevant. A positive item is one that contains information favorable to an applicant's suitability and a negative item is one that contains information unfavorable to an applicant's suitability. Each protocol would contain relevant and irrelevant items with each having the same number of items but differing in their combination of positive and

negative items in such a fashion that the protocols would be theoretically scaled from best to worst applicant. The "validity" of this theoretical scaling could be determined by examining the "ratings" assigned to the protocols in the experiment. This scaling was achieved by determining relevancy weights for items (positive and negative) and combining items in each of the eight protocols so that the algebraic weights of the item combinations yielded protocol weights ranging from high to low.

Collecting and scaling the items

Items of information about possible applicants for the position of Feed Salesman were constructed. Many items were made up on the basis of knowledge of the job and others were adapted or borrowed from an article by Uhrbrock (1950) containing rating scale statements. A rough editing was carried out to check for repetition, clarity, ambiguity, and that only one item of information was contained in each statement. Care was taken that items would cover areas that might conceivably be examined in an interview situation. An attempt was made to provide an equal number of positive and negative items. Items of information that were irrelevant to an applicant's suitability for the job were also included. An a priori judgment was made by the experimenter as to whether items were relevant, irrelevant, positive or negative. The purpose of this was to include as wide a range of items as possible which fell into these classifications. However, this prior judgment in no way affects the ratings assigned to the items by the professional interviewers. The total number of items was three hundred and forty-one.

The items were typewritten on individual pieces of paper along with an identifying number. The items were randomly distributed within each bundle of 341 items. Three interviewers who, in the course of their duties, interview applicants for the position of Feed Salesman were selected as raters of the items. (See Appendix B) These raters, working independently, first sorted the bundles of items into two piles, one relevant and the other irrelevant, with respect to suitability for the job. An item that appeared ambiguous or, would of itself, eliminate an applicant from further consideration was placed in an envelope for that purpose. The items retained in the relevant pile were further divided into whether they contained positive or negative information about the applicant. From the positive items of information they picked out the item that would best favor an applicant and the item that would least favor an applicant. They were told to think of these items as existing on opposite ends of an 11-point scale with the least positive at point 1 on the scale and the most positive at point 11 on the scale. The raters then decided for each positive item what position it should occupy on the scale in relation to the highest and lowest items at the ends. They were allowed to change the position of items on the scale after comparing them with others in the pile at that point. The same procedure was followed, separately, for the items in the negative information pile with the items ranging from low negative at point 1 on the scale to high negative at point 11 on the scale. Each pile at each point on each of the scales was clipped together and marked as to positive or negative and position on the scale.

From the foregoing procedure it can be seen that each rater placed an item into a category of positive, negative or irrelevant. Positive and negative items are relevant items but differing in whether they are favorable to an applicant or not. The degree of positiveness or negativeness is indicated by the position on the scale. The continuum of favorableness of information runs from an extreme negative at a scale position of 11 for negative items to extreme positive at a scale position of 11 for positive items. The mid-point of the continuum is between scale position 1 for negative items and scale position 1 for positive items. With those items rated at low scale positions, there would not always be agreement between all three raters as to the category of that item. For example, one rater may assign an item to negative scale position 1 and the other two raters assign the same item to positive scale position 2. To retain these items, the criterion for inclusion in the study was agreement between two of the three interviewers as to category. However, items were eliminated which met this criterion yet were highly disparate in the ratings assigned. For instance, if an item was rated positive scale position 4 and 5, respectively, by two of the raters, and the third rater assigned a negative scale position of 3, this item would be eliminated.

For each item a weight was computed by taking the arithmetic mean of the three ratings. This would be either a negative or positive weight depending on which of the two categories the raters had placed the item. In cases where two interviewers agreed to a category and the third classified the item as irrelevant, the irrelevant item was counted as having a value of zero and the mean weighting computed accordingly.

A similar procedure was carried out if one rater marked an item as eliminating except his rating was counted as minus eleven. An item was counted as an irrelevant item if it had a mean weighting of less than one with a mean deviation of one or less. The following examples are illustrations of how items received the various weights assigned to them:

Example 1:	Weight and Category of Item #
Rater A	+ 2
Rater B	+ 5
Rater C	+ 3
Item weight	+ 3.3

+ refers to positive category, - refers to negative category, "Irr." means that the item was classified as irrelevant, and "Elim." means that the item was marked as eliminating.

Example 2:	Weight and Category of Item
Rater A	- 5
Rater B	- 7
Rater C	- 6
Item Weight	- 6.0

Example 3:	Weight and Category of Item
Rater A	- 2
Rater B	+ 8
Rater C	+ 9
Item Weight	Discarded

Example 4:

	Weight and Category of Item
Rater A	+ 1
Rater B	- 2
Rater C	- 3
Item weight	- 1.3

Example 5:

	Weight and Category of Item
Rater A	- 1
Rater B	0 (Irr.)
Rater C	0 (Irr.)
Item weight	Irrelevant

Example 6:

	Weight and Category of Item
Rater A	- 8
Rater B	- 10
Rater C	- 11 (Elim.)
Item weight	- 9.7

By this process, thirty items were discarded outright. Of the remaining items, 135 were positive, 96 of which there was agreement by all interviewers as to category; 147 negative items, 90 of which there was agreement by all interviewers as to category, and 29 irrelevant items. Both the negative and positive items were divided into high and low relevant groups. The greater weight an item has, regardless of sign, the more relevant that item is. A weighting of 6.3 and below put an item in the low relevant group and weighting of 6.7 and over

in the high relevant group. There was approximately an equal number of items in each of the two groups.

Construction of the protocols

Using the items and item weights from the foregoing procedure, eight protocols of interview information were constructed, each containing twenty-two items of information. (See Appendix C) The protocols were designed to range in scaled steps from favorable to unfavorable. The scaling was done on the basis of the algebraic sum of the weights (positive and negative) of the items included in each protocol.

Because the item ratings produced so few irrelevant items, the protocols were composed of ten items of high relevant information, ten items of low relevant information, and two items of irrelevant information. An effort was made to use only those items of information on which there had been full agreement as to category by the raters, i.e., whether an item was positive, negative or irrelevant. The number of items lacking this agreement was usually four in each protocol, practically all of which were low relevant. No item was repeated in a protocol and no item was used more than three times with most being used only once. The weight as well as congruity with the rest of the items determined whether an item would be used in a protocol. After twenty-two items had been selected for each protocol the order was randomly arranged, with the limitation that two negative items were not allowed together except in the highly unfavorable protocols in which it was impossible to do otherwise.

The algebraic weighting of each of the protocols is presented in Table I. The deviations from this ideal weighting are only in one instance greater than 2.0, and in that case, 3.9. It can be seen from the table that in the weightings of high relevant, low relevant and total weight an effort was made to provide equal-appearing intervals between the protocols. This algebraic composition imposed limitations on the amount of manipulation that could be done with items in the protocols. Hence, the majority of negative information had to be confined to low relevant items. The items in each protocol described a hypothetical applicant and, as far as possible, without contradiction or inconsistencies.

TABLE I

ALGEBRAIC COMPOSITION OF EIGHT PROTOCOLS OF INTERVIEW INFORMATION (10 HIGH RELEVANT ITEMS, 10 LOW RELEVANT ITEMS AND 2 IRRELEVANT ITEMS)

	Protocols							
Items	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
High relevant	100	90	80	70	60	50	40	30
Low relevant	50	35	20	5	-10	-25	-40	-55
Irrelevant	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	150	125	100	75	50	25	0	-25

The second experiment - protocol construction

The purpose of the second experiment, as mentioned previously, was to examine the relative contribution of the selective and evaluative processes to the final decision in the interview. This is accomplished by simulating an interview situation where only the evaluative process is present and comparing

it to an interview situation where both processes are present. In this study, the written protocols constructed for the first experiment were used except that only items having a high relevant weighting were retained, i.e., ten items. This means that the interviewers no longer had to make a distinction between which information was relevant or not. The ratings of these protocols by the interviewers could then be compared with their previous ratings on the protocols which contained high relevant, low relevant and irrelevant information. A problem was encountered due to the limiting features of the algebraic composition of the protocols. In order to conform to the ideal weighting of each protocol, the majority of negative information was low relevant. This means that, in the protocols used in the second experiment, there would be, proportionately, less negative information. Because of this, a shift in the ratings of the protocols in a favorable direction might be expected and would tend to obscure any objective comparison with the first experiment's ratings.

The subjects

The subjects in this study, with the exception of the professional interviewers, were forty males, age 20 or over, and senior, graduate or graduated university students. These qualifications were set up to ensure a reasonable level of intelligence and maturity. The subjects were all acquaintances or friends of the experimenter and the only criterion for inclusion in the study, other than as above, was a willingness to participate in the experiments. The ages ranged from 20 to 27 with the average being approximately 23.

There were five interviewing groups taking part in the study. Each of these groups contained ten subjects except the professional group in which there was only seven. With the exception of the professional group, the subjects were randomly distributed into the four groups.

(1) Professional interviewers - employment interviewers normally accustomed to selecting Feed Salesmen in the course of their duties. These interviewers were separate from those used in the rating of the items.

(2) Job information - given only information about the job.

(3) Man information - given only information about the man.

(4) Full information - given both information about the man and the job.

(5) No information - given no information except that the position was a Feed Salesman.

Procedure

1. The job information variable.

With the exception of the professional interviewing group, the subjects were randomly distributed into four groups of ten each. Each subject in each group was given typewritten sheets containing information about the position of Feed Salesman according to the kind or amount of information to which his group had been designated. The No information and Professional groups received no information. This was done individually for each subject approximately five days before the interview session. They were told that the sheets contained information about the job of Feed Salesman and to read over the sheets as many times as possible before arriving for the experiment. Attempts to memorize the material verbatim were discouraged

and that rather, only a clear idea of what the information consisted of was required.

2. The experiment proper.

The subjects were given the group of protocols attached to a sheet of instructions. They were asked to read over the instructions carefully and then they were read out aloud by the experimenter. (See Appendix D) Questions raised at this point were answered.

The subjects were instructed to consider the information about each applicant as information that might be obtained in an interview with a company representative. They were told that the information might be thought of as being one of three kinds: (1) factual information about the applicant; (2) descriptions of the interview behavior; and (3) opinions formed of the applicant by the interviewer. The subjects were required to proceed through each of the protocols separately from Applicant A to Applicant H. The order of appearance of the protocols had previously been randomized. For each hypothetical applicant the subject read over all the items of information then went back and put an "X" beside each of those items he felt to be important with regard to the applicant's suitability for the job. He then made an over-all rating of the applicant on a five-point scale: (1) Excellent, (2) Above average, (3) Average, (4) Below average, (5) Definitely not suited. After finishing all eight of the protocols he was required to place them in rank order. This was carried out by having him decide which applicant was best, second best, etc., of those applicants which he

had placed at each scale position. The seven professional interviewers carried out this experiment separately by mail. Procedure was the same as for the other groups.

3. The second experiment.

The second experiment was done by mail one week after the first experiment. Each subject received the same protocols as before except that only the ten high relevant items were retained for each protocol. They were told that in this experiment only information which had been found to be highly relevant to the position of Feed Salesman was included and that they should disregard their previous ratings. The over-all rating and ranking procedures were carried out as before. The Professional and No information groups did not participate in this experiment.

4. Scoring.

(a) The ratings. A rating of each protocol by each subject was computed by assigning a weight of 1 to an over-all rating of Excellent and corresponding weights for each scale point up to a weight of 5 for Definitely not suited.

(b) Relevancy index. A relevancy index was computed for each subject by adding up the absolute weight of each item marked off with an "X" for all eight of the protocols.

(c) The rankings. Each protocol received a ranking of from 1 to 8 by each subject. (See Appendix D) If a subject had rated two applicants as Excellent, the one that he had ranked as the best of the two was given a ranking of 1 and the other of 2. The same procedure was carried out at the next scale point by assigning the next highest number to that protocol rated as the best of those rated above average.

CHAPTER III

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

I Results

On the assumption that the interview is a matching of characteristics found in the applicant against generalizations about the job and man characteristics required, the following outcomes are the logical expectations:

(1) Differences between the standard group and the experimental groups should vary inversely with the amounts of job and man information communicated to the experimental groups.

(2) Variability within groups should vary inversely with the amounts of information.

(3) The amounts of relevant information checked by the experimental groups should vary directly with the amounts of information.

(4) As highly relevant information alone is supplied (Experiment 2), all groups should produce ratings closer to the standard groups.

Experiment 1

(a) Rating of the protocols. In order to test the hypothesis that the differences between the standard group and the experimental groups should vary inversely with amounts of job information communicated to the experimental groups a treatments x levels analysis of variance (Lindquist, 1953) was carried out on the data. In this analysis the average ratings of each protocol by the professional interviewers were used as a base (levels). Deviation scores from these ratings by each subject in each of the Full, Man, Job and No Information groups were computed (treatments). A summary of the analysis appears in Table II. The detailed analysis appears in Table III.

TABLE II

SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF THE DEVIATION SCORES OF THE FULL, MAN, JOB AND NO INFORMATION GROUPS FROM THE AVERAGE RATINGS OF 8 PROTOCOLS OF INTERVIEW INFORMATION BY PROFESSIONAL INTERVIEWERS (N=40)

Source of Variation	Sums of Squares	Degrees of freedom	Variance Estimate
Levels	3.93	7	.56
Treatments	1.45	3	.48
Interaction	4.79	21	.22
Within	88.72	288	.30
Total	98.89	319	

F ratios:

Levels F = .56/.30 = 1.86 F of 2.05 required for .05 level.
Treatments F = .48/.30 = 1.60 F of 3.04 required for .05 level.
Interaction F = .22/.30 = .73

From Tables II and III it can be determined that no support was found for the hypothesis that the differences in ratings between the standard group and the experimental groups would vary inversely with the amounts of job information communicated to the experimental groups. No significant differences were found between the average mean rating deviations of the experimental groups. No significant levels effect was found in the average ratings of each protocol by the Professional interviewers. The Man information group, rather than deviating less as would be supposed, deviated more than either the Job or No information groups. In complete contradiction to the hypothesis, the No information group deviated less from the Professional interviewers than any other group.

TABLE III

MEAN RATING DEVIATIONS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE IN TABLE II

Protocols	Full		Man		Job		No		Row means
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	
A	.48	.42	.62	.71	.56	.42	.48	.42	.53
B	.78	.46	.58	.28	.64	.30	.78	.41	.69
C	.60	.41	.58	.28	.54	.40	.44	.32	.54
D	.66	.36	.76	.52	.52	.58	.80	.67	.68
E	.64	.44	.96	.66	.90	.50	.76	.51	.81
F	.64	.45	1.24	.66	.78	.63	.54	.60	.80
G	.68	.42	.78	.45	.94	.64	.54	.60	.73
H	.94	.65	1.02	.79	.66	.58	.76	.62	.84
Column means	.68		.81		.69		.63		

(b) Variability of rankings. A treatments x levels analysis of variance was carried out to test the hypothesis that variability within groups should vary inversely with the amounts of information. For each protocol the average ranking of the group was computed. Then, to obtain a measure of variability, the deviation from the average ranking by each interviewer in that group was computed. The levels in this analysis were the protocols themselves and the different interviewing groups were the treatment conditions. Table IV provides a summary of this analysis. A more detailed table appears in Table V.

TABLE IV

SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF DEVIATION SCORES FROM THE AVERAGE RANKINGS OF 8 PROTOCOLS OF INTERVIEW INFORMATION BY THE PROFESSIONAL, FULL, MAN, JOB AND NO INFORMATION GROUPS (N=47)

Source of Variation	Sums of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Variance Estimate
Levels	16.74	7	2.39*
Treatments	5.12	4	1.28
Interaction	22.34	28	.79
Within	216.50	336	.64
Total	260.70	375	

F ratios:

Levels $F = 2.39/.64 = 3.73$. F of 2.69 required at .01 level.
Treatments $F = 1.28/.64 = 2.00$. F of 2.39 required at .05 level.
Interaction $F = .79/.64 = 1.23$. F of 1.42 required at .05 level.

* Significant at the .01 level.

The hypothesis that the variability in ranking the protocols would vary inversely with the amount of job information was not borne out by the analysis. There were no significant differences between the means of the treatment conditions. The trend of the means did correspond to the hypothesis in that there was less

TABLE V

MEAN RANKINGS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS
FOR ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE IN TABLE IV

Protocols	Professional		Full		Man		Job		No		Row means
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	
A	.00	.00	.48	.41	1.26	.95	.60	.30	.80	.90	.62
B	.99	.54	1.48	.81	1.20	.77	1.16	.70	.92	.66	1.15
C	1.05	.76	.90	.49	1.10	.66	.80	.45	.70	.40	.91
D	.61	.35	1.06	.57	1.10	.77	1.38	.85	1.50	.98	1.13
E	1.84	.57	.86	.82	1.70	1.23	1.60	1.00	1.34	.68	1.46
F	1.01	.59	.74	.58	1.48	1.02	1.02	.75	.80	.46	.99
G	1.19	.46	.80	.57	.72	.80	1.40	.66	1.20	1.15	1.06
H	.90	.50	1.34	1.14	1.50	.89	1.04	.69	1.20	.89	1.19
Column means	.94		.95		1.25		1.13		1.05		

variability in the Professional and Full information groups than the other groups. However, the No information group was less variable in its rankings than the Man and Job information groups. The analysis of variance revealed a levels effect significant at the .01 level. The levels in this analysis were the variability of rankings for each protocol. It appears then, that there was significantly greater difficulty by the groups in consistently ranking some of the protocols.

(c) Relevancy index. A simple randomized analysis of variance (Lindquist, 1953) was computed to test the hypothesis that amounts of relevant information checked by the experimental groups vary directly with amounts of information. The data was arrived at by computing a relevancy index for each subject (interviewer) in the study. This simply means the total weight of items, regardless of sign, that were checked off by the interviewer as being important with regard to the applicant's suitability for the job. A summary of the analysis of variance appears in Table VI with a more detailed analysis in Table VII.

TABLE VI

SUMMARY OF THE ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF RELEVANCY INDICES FOR THE PROFESSIONAL, FULL, MAN, JOB AND NO INFORMATION GROUPS (N=47)

Source of Variation	Sums of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Variance Estimate
Between	149,375.68	4	37,343.92
Within	1,447,846.49	42	34,472.44
Total	1,597,222.17	46	

$F = 37,343.92/34,472.44 = 1.08$

F ratio of 2.59 required for significance at the .05 level.

Logically, one would expect that the more information an interviewer had about the job, the more relevant information he would be able to select. Such a trend does appear in the means but the differences are not significant. The Job information group has a higher mean index than any other group except the Professional.

TABLE VII

RELEVANCY INDICES AND MEANS FOR ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE IN TABLE VI

Interviewers	Professional	Full	Man	Job	No
1	933.5	499.8	340.0	687.6	490.3
2	738.6	915.8	380.1	686.7	872.9
3	771.9	818.4	425.3	546.7	310.8
4	695.3	430.6	137.6	857.0	479.6
5	425.7	535.1	723.2	854.8	646.8
6	719.3	638.9	742.3	787.7	492.7
7	663.6	760.9	837.3	418.7	552.2
8	--	609.2	845.7	526.4	892.1
9	--	916.5	737.4	691.4	364.6
10	--	538.9	588.1	716.6	538.4
Column means	706.84	666.41	575.70	677.36	564.04

Experiment 2

The second experiment was conducted with protocols containing only high relevant information. The Professional and No information groups did not participate. The same statistical procedures used in the first experiment for the rating deviations and variability of rankings were carried out on the data. Summaries of the results of the analysis appear in Tables VIII and IX. The more detailed results are in Tables X and XI. It should be noted that in Tables VIII and X the rating deviations were computed from the average ratings of the protocols by the Professional group in the first experiment.

TABLE VIII

SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF THE DEVIATION SCORES OF THE FULL, MAN AND JOB INFORMATION GROUPS OF RATINGS OF THE 8 PROTOCOLS OF HIGH RELEVANT INFORMATION FROM THE AVERAGE RATINGS OF PROFESSIONAL INTERVIEWERS* (N = 30)

Source of Variation	Sums of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Variance Estimate
Levels	34.75	7	4.96 **
Treatments	.64	2	.32
Interaction	2.91	14	.20
Within	71.96	216	.33
Total	110.06	239	

F ratios:

Levels	F = 4.96/.33 = 15.03	F of 2.73 required at .01 level.
Treatments	F = .32/.33 = .96	
Interaction	F = .20/.33 = .60	

* The average ratings of the professional interviewers were the same as for the first experiment.

** Significant at .01 level.

TABLE IX

SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF DEVIATION SCORES FROM THE AVERAGE RANKINGS OF THE PROFESSIONAL*, FULL, MAN AND JOB INFORMATION GROUPS ON HIGH RELEVANT INTERVIEW INFORMATION (N = 37)

Source of Variation	Sums of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Variance Estimate
Levels	9.39	7	1.34
Treatments	1.37	3	.45
Interaction	18.08	21	.86
Within	180.80	265	.68
Total	209.64	296	

F ratios:

Levels $F = 1.34/.68 = 1.97$ Not significant.
Treatments $F = .45/.68 = .66$ Not significant.
Interaction $F = .86/.68 = 1.26$ Not significant.

* Data for the Professional group was that used in the first experiment.

Logically, the same hypotheses submitted in the first experiment for the rating deviations and variability of rankings would hold true when only high relevant information is retained in the protocols. These were: that the rating deviations of the experimental groups from the standard group should vary inversely with the amount of information about the job and that the variability of rankings should vary inversely with the amount of information. As in the first experiment, these hypotheses were not borne out by the statistical analysis. In both analyses, there were no significant differences between the means of the treatment conditions. In the analysis of the rating deviations, the hypothesized trend was reversed with the Job information group deviating least from the Professional interviewers. A levels effect, significant at the .01 level, was found. Examination of the levels' means shows low deviations for

TABLE X

MEAN RATING DEVIATIONS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE IN TABLE VIII*

Protocols	Full		Man		Job		Row means
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	
A	.38	.17	.50	.20	.50	.20	.46
B	.68	.37	.70	.46	.66	.37	.68
C	.74	.47	.70	.49	.66	.46	.68
D	1.22	.60	1.02	.50	.76	.52	1.00
E	.72	.45	.80	.65	.82	.66	.78
F	1.90	.49	1.90	.80	1.40	.54	1.73
G	1.18	.73	1.20	.54	1.40	.54	1.26
H	1.20	.87	1.20	.60	1.00	.80	1.13
Column means	1.00		1.00		.89		

* The average ratings of the professional interviewers were the same as for the first experiment.

TABLE XI

MEAN RANKINGS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE IN TABLE IX

Protocols	Professional*		Full		Man		Job		Row means
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	
A	.00	.00	.84	.85	1.12	.58	.96	.20	.73
B	.99	.54	.51	.66	1.08	.77	1.22	.72	.95
C	1.05	.76	.96	.54	.84	.36	.80	.75	.91
D	.61	.35	1.32	.95	1.50	.77	1.32	.55	1.18
E	1.84	.57	1.04	.73	1.20	1.40	1.40	1.00	1.37
F	1.01	.59	1.00	.73	1.70	1.10	.96	.72	1.14
G	1.19	.46	1.16	.93	1.00	.50	1.04	.69	1.10
H	.90	.50	1.18	1.64	.54	.45	.84	.55	.89
Column means	.94		1.00		1.12		1.06		

* Data for the Professional group was that used in the first experiment.

protocols algebraically favorable and higher deviations for protocols not so favorable.

In the analysis of the variability of rankings, a trend corresponding somewhat to the expectations does appear for the means of the treatment conditions. The Full information group was closest to the rankings of the Professional interviewers. However, Man information deviated more than did Job information. The levels in this analysis were the protocols themselves. Although there were no significant differences between the means, it appears that the groups as a whole could more consistently place favorable protocols than they could unfavorable ones.

When high relevant information alone is supplied to interviewers it would be expected that all groups would produce ratings closer to the standard group. The comparison of the means for the Full, Man and Job information groups in the two experiments is shown in Table XII.

As mentioned previously in the discussion on the construction of the protocols to be used in Experiment 2, certain difficulties were encountered. These protocols were the same ones used in the first experiment except that only the ten high relevant items were retained. In order to conform to the ideal algebraic composition for the first experiment protocols, most of the negative items were in the low relevant group. When these items were eliminated in the second experiment, there would be proportionately much less negative information retained in each protocol. It is not unlikely that when these protocols were rated they would be rated more favorably than in the first experiment because of the lack of negative information. This would give rise to an artificial shift in the ratings and make it difficult to interpret the comparison of the

rating deviations from the Professional interviewers by the experimental groups in the two experiments.

It was hypothesized that when the selective process was eliminated, there would be less deviation from the Professional interviewers. However, on comparing the means of the rating deviations in the two experiments, it is clear that the opposite is true. It will be explained in the discussion of the results that this is more likely due to the protocol construction than the elimination of the selective process.

TABLE XII

A COMPARISON OF THE MEANS OF RATING DEVIATIONS IN EXPERIMENTS 1 AND 2 FOR THE FULL, MAN AND JOB INFORMATION GROUPS

	Experiment 1	Experiment 2
Full	.70	1.00
Man	.82	1.00
Job	.68	.89

Reliability of protocol construction

The "reliability" of the method of protocol construction was examined by computing Pearson product-moment coefficients of correlation (Ferguson, 1959) between the theoretical ranking of the protocols (from 1 to 8) and the average ratings of the protocols by each of the interviewing groups. The average ratings and mean deviations appear in Table XIII.

The correlation coefficients between the theoretical ranking and the average ratings of the Professional, Full, Man, Job and No information groups were .92, .92, .94, .92 and .96, respectively. All coefficients were significant at greater than the .01 level.

TABLE XIII

THE AVERAGE RATINGS AND MEAN DEVIATIONS OF 8 PROTOCOLS OF INTERVIEW INFORMATION BY THE INTERVIEWING GROUPS

Protocols	Profes-sional		Full Infor-mation		Man Infor-mation		Job Infor-mation		No Infor-mation	
	A.R.	M.D.	A.R.	M.D.	A.R.	M.D.	A.R.	M.D.	A.R.	M.D.
A	1.3	.41	1.3	.48	1.5	.70	1.5	.60	1.3	.48
B	2.4	.46	2.3	.76	2.3	.56	2.6	.72	2.1	.72
C	2.3	.41	2.6	.60	2.2	.52	1.9	.36	2.0	.28
D	2.9	.21	2.3	.42	2.2	.48	2.5	.60	2.4	.80
E	3.4	.94	3.2	.54	2.8	.88	3.4	.88	3.3	.72
F	4.3	.56	3.8	.48	3.2	.68	3.8	.68	3.9	.38
G	4.3	.76	3.9	.54	3.8	.64	3.5	.70	3.9	.38
H	4.4	.66	3.7	.76	3.5	.80	4.1	.54	4.0	.60

These results lend substantial support to this method of protocol construction. They are in agreement with Bolster and Springbett's (1961) results. They found a close relation between the "abstract" ratings of item values and the amount of shift produced by the item in the actual rating situation.

II Discussion of Results

In discussing the results each of the analyses will be dealt with separately before their significance and implications for the study as a whole will be considered.

Experiment 1

(a) Rating of the protocols. The hypothesis that the rating deviations of the experimental groups should vary inversely with the amount of information they were given was not borne out by the statistical analysis. The literature cited previously contends that the amount of job information given to interviewers is a significant variable in decision making in the interview. No support was found for this in the analysis of the rating deviations. Rather, it was found that the No information group was closer to the average ratings of the Professional interviewers than any of the other experimental groups.

The mean deviation of the Professional interviewers from their own ratings was .55. This may be compared with the mean deviations of the Full, Man, Job and No information groups which were .68, .81, .69 and .63, respectively. The closeness of these various mean deviations seems to indicate that either the amount or kind of job information has no effect on the way in which protocols

of interview information are rated or, possibly, that the job information given to the interviewers in this study was not used as a basis for their judgments. This line of thought will be developed more fully when the study as a whole is considered.

Fear's (1958) contention that the addition of "man specifications" is a necessary prerequisite to good interviewing found no support. Instead, a decrement, as measured by deviation from the professional interviewers, was observed. Both groups who had information about the man characteristics did neither better nor worse than those without.

Although the levels analysis was not significant there seemed to be a definite trend in the means. The experimental groups as a whole deviated less from the professional interviewers with protocols rated as desirable applicants than with those protocols rated as less desirable. The means ranged from .53 for Protocol A to .84 for Protocol H with few reversals.

There are two reasons for this. The Professional interviewers tended to spread their ratings of the protocols over a greater area and also tended to rate the protocols lower on the scale than the experimental groups (cf. Table XIII). Both results fit in with the training and attitudes of professional interviewers. Previous studies (Springbett, 1958; Bolster and Springbett, 1961; Crissy and Regan, 1951; Newman, Bobbitt and Cameron, 1946) have indicated that interviewers react more strongly to negative than positive information. It is quite possible that this reactivity to negative information is acquired during the training of the professional interviewer through "feed-back" on unsuccessful applicants

and exit interviews. There is no comparable process with positive information. Contrary to the previous findings, it was observed in this study that the professional interviewers were in greater agreement on the desirable applicants than they were on those less desirable.

(b) Variability of rankings. Using the same logic as in the previous analysis it was hypothesized that the amount of agreement within interviewing groups should vary inversely with the amounts of information given about the job. The analysis of variance revealed no significant differences between the means of the consistency measures of the interviewing groups. The results closely paralleled those found in the rating of the protocols and the interpretations given there are equally applicable.

There were significant level effects reported in the presentation of the results. This significance seems to be mainly attributable to the high average mean deviation for Protocol E. All groups except the Full information were highly inconsistent in their ranking of this protocol. No interpretation of this finding is readily apparent although it may bear some relation to its position in the theoretical ranking of the protocols or possibly some ambiguity in the items of that protocol.

(c) Relevancy index. The relevancy index reflects the amount of information contained in all eight of the protocols that was perceived by the interviewer to be important with regard to an applicant's suitability. Contrary to our hypothesized expectations, the analysis of variance revealed that interviewers with more information about the job did not select significantly greater amounts

of relevant information.

With the exception of the Job information group, which had the second highest index, the trend of the means corresponds to the hypothesis. Part of the failure to arrive at significant differences in the means is due to the great amount of variability within each group. The Man information group, for instance, varied from an index of 137.6 for one interviewer to 845.7 for another. In all groups the range was over half the value of the mean.

This trend of the means would seem to indicate that job information is being utilized to some extent in judging what items are relevant to an applicant's suitability. If this process is evident to an extent here, it is not apparent why the same trend was not obtained in the two prior analyses. There seems to be some indication that the process of selecting relevant information bears no relation to the over-all rating of the protocols of interview information.

Experiment 2

The analyses carried out on the ratings and rankings of protocols of interview information containing only high relevant information reflect the findings with protocols containing total information. The means of the Full, Man and Job information groups were very close. This indicates that with the removal of the selection process, i.e., when there is no longer a need to discriminate between high and low relevant and irrelevant items, the deviations from the Professional interviewers do not vary inversely with the amount of job information. This was to be expected in terms of the

results of the analyses in Experiment 1. It also lends confirmation to the interpretation presented for the relevancy index in Experiment 1. It was suggested there that the selective process has little bearing on the over-all rating of the protocols.

As evidenced in the presentation of the results, there was a significant levels effect found in the analysis of the deviation scores from the average ratings of the protocols by the Professional interviewers in Experiment 1. This was an artificial effect produced by the method of protocol construction. It was necessary, in order to obtain the desired weighting of the protocols, to include the majority of negative information in the low relevant items. When these were eliminated, the expected result would be an over-all rise in the ratings. The means of the levels in the analysis increase from the theoretically best to worst protocol or applicant. This is partially due to a "ceiling" effect in which the more desirable protocols cannot be rated too much higher and partially due to a higher rating given to all of the protocols. The two combine to give the effect of increasing deviations. This same effect caused the means of the treatment conditions to be somewhat higher than they were in the first experiment.

The above effects, produced by the preponderance of negative information in the low relevant items, eliminated the possibility of interpreting the findings in terms of the relative contributions of the selective and evaluative processes. The expected result, according to the hypothesis, would be for

the mean rating deviations of the experimental groups to shift closer to the average ratings of the professional interviewers. This would give an indication of the contribution of the selective process to the over-all ratings. As already stated, the shift was in the other direction due to the artificial effects. However, some evidence has already been given that there seems to be little relation between the selective process and the over-all ratings. This being the case, no shift would be expected if the selective process was removed.

General Implications

The major outcome of this study is that, within the experimental setting, no support was found for the contention that the knowledge of man and/or job characteristics is a *sine qua none* for the valid interview. Neither the amount nor kind of job information seems to significantly affect the decision-making process in the interview.

Several possibilities may be entertained as to why the variable in this study failed to significantly affect the ratings and rankings of the protocols by the experimental groups. It is conceivable that the job information given to the subjects in this study was not comparable enough to that which actual interviewers gain through direct experience and "feed-back". Two things argue against this: first, the close agreement between the results of the professional and experimental groups and, secondly, many interviewers have only written job descriptions.

Another reason for failure may be that the protocols were not adequate in their representation of information that might be obtained in the interview. Twenty-two items of information is a small amount in comparison to the amount of information transmitted in the actual interview.

Another reason, and one which could be important, was the lack of agreement in both the professional interviewers who took part in the rating of the items and those who took part in the experiment. There was a great deal of variability in the rating of the items and a considerable amount of variability in the ratings of the protocols. This could very well indicate that these interviewers were not as conversant with the real job and man characteristics as had been conveyed to the experimenter. As the information about the man and job characteristics was written from their knowledge of the job, it is possible this affected the "trueness" of the variable.

It is also quite possible that, in actuality, some other basis than information about the job was being used in selecting applicants. If this was consistent for all the groups, it might be an explanation of the similarity of ratings. The findings of a study by Uhrbrock (1960) gives some support for this contention. The purpose of his study was to standardize a large number of rating scale statements. This was done by asking judges in several occupations to rate the statements as they applied to the success of a candidate in their occupation. The groups he used as judges were as varied as teaching and foremanship. Because of the high correlations between different groups as to the position they rated a statement about a candidate, he concluded that these statements might be applicable for

"any employee". This seems to indicate a basis common to all, or at least a good many, jobs for judging whether an applicant would be successful or not.

It is quite possible then, that there may be simply a selection of a "good man" rather than a matching of man and job. This fits in somewhat with Sydiaha's suggestion that there are stereotypes or, at least, commonly shared conceptions of what a good soldier is like. Perhaps there is no picture of the good man as such but rather good qualities are distinguished from poor ones. For instance, the good protocols had a larger number of "good" characteristics, the poor ones few. In other words, there may be no stereotype of a good man. The results could be explained on a quantitative basis with the protocols having the most good qualities representing the best man. This latter interpretation conforms to the results of the experiment in that there were high correlations between the theoretical and actual ratings of the protocols.

There were a few findings incidental to the main investigation. Some support was found for the contention that professional interviewers react more strongly to negative information than they do to positive. In opposition to previous studies, the professional interviewers in this study agreed less on where an undesirable applicant should be ranked than they did on desirable applicants. There was some indication in this study that the process of determining which interview information is relevant to an applicant's suitability is not related to the overall ratings assigned.

The main purpose of this study has been to make a preliminary investigation in an area rarely subjected to experimental

technique. As such, it has raised more questions that it has provided answers. Much more research is required before relationships may be established between the different variables contributing to the decision-making process in the interview.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ABT, L.E. (1949). The analysis of structured interviews. J. Clin. Psych., 5, 364-370.

ANDERSON, C.W. (1960). The relation between speaking times and decision in the employment interview. J. of app. Psych., 44, 207-268.

_____. (1961). The relation of verbal behavior to decision formulation in the employment interview. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, McGill University.

BELLOWS, R.M. & ESTEP, M.F. (1954). Employment psychology: the interview. New York: Rinehart and Co.

BERDIE, R.F. (1943). Psychological processes in the interview. J. of soc. Psych., 18, 3-31.

BLOOM, B.F. & BRUNDAGE, R.G. (1947). Prediction of success in elementary schools for enlisted personnel. In P.M. Stuit (Ed.), Personnel research and test development. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

BOLSTER, B.I. & SPRINGBETT, B.M. (1961). The reaction of interviewers to favourable and unfavourable information. J. of app. Psych., 45, 97-103.

CAMPBELL, J.I., PRIEN, E.P. & BRAILEY, L.G. (1960). Predicting performance evaluation. Personn. Psych., 13, 435-444.

CRISSY, W.J.E. & REGAN, J.J. (1951). Halo in the employment interview. J. of app. Psych., 35, 338-341.

DANIELS, H.W. & OTIS, J.L. (1950). A method for analyzing employment interviews. Personn. Psych., 3, 425-444.

DUNNETTE, M.D. (1962). Personnel management. Ann. Rev. Psychol., 13, 285-314.

FEAR, R.A. (1958). The evaluation interview. New York: McGraw-Hill.

FERGUSON, G.A. (1959). Statistical analysis in psychology and education. New York: McGraw-Hill.

HOLLINWORTH, H.L. (1922). Judging human character. New York: Appleton-Century Crofts.

KEPHART, N.C. (1952). The employment interview in industry. New York: McGraw-Hill.

LINDQUIST, E.F. (1953). Design and analysis of experiments in psychology and education. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

MCMURRAY, R.N. (1947). Validating the patterned interview. Personnel (A.M.A.), 23, 263-271.

NEWMAN, S.H., BOBBITT, J.M. & CAMERON, D.C. (1946). The reliability of the interview in an officer candidate evaluation program. Amer. Psychol., 1, 103-109.

RICE, S.A. (1929). Contagious bias in the interview. Amer. Jour. of Soc., 35, 420-423.

ROWE, PATRICIA M. (1960). Individual differences in assessment decisions. Unpublished doctoral disseration, McGill University.

RUNDQUIST, E.A. (1947). Development of an interview for selection purposes. In G.A. Kelly (Ed.), New methods in applied psychology. College Park: University of Maryland Press.

SPRINGBETT, B.M. (1954). Series effects in the employment interview. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, McGill University.

_____. (1958). Factors affecting the final decision in the employment interview. Can. J. of Psych., 12, 13-23.

SYDIAHA, D. (1958). The relation between actuarial and descriptive methods in personnel appraisal. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, McGill University.

_____. (1959). On the equivalence of clinical and statistical methods. J. of app. Psych., 43, 395-401.

THORNDIKE, E. L. (1920). A constant error in psychological ratings. J. of app. Psych., 4, 25-29.

UHRBROCK, R.S. (1933). Analysis of employment interviews. Personn. Jour., 12, 98-101.

_____. (1950). Standardization of 724 rating scale statements. Personn. Psych., 3, 285-316.

WAGNER, R. (1949). The employment interview: a critical summary. Personn. Psych., 2, 17-46.

A P P E N D I C E S

A P P E N D I X A

a) Job Information

b) Man Information

Job Information - Feed Salesman

Description of Duties and Activities of Feed Salesman

General

1. Responsibility for the promotion and sale of SHUR-GAIN Feeds through SHUR-GAIN Feed Service Mills.

   Within the territory of each salesman there are a number of feed mills. These feed mills sell different types of feed to the farmers for use in feeding their livestock and poultry. Mixed in with the feed are "concentrates" or chemicals that provide for the maximum in growth and nutrition. The livestock and poultry producers may either buy the feed from the feed mill or bring in his own feed to be mixed with the proper amount of chemicals. The SHUR-GAIN Feed Mills are usually run by private operators and contracted to the SHUR-GAIN Feed Division of Canada Packers to sell their feed products.

   It is the job of the Feed Salesman to encourage livestock and poultry producers to buy or have their feed mixed at the feed mill that is contracted to his company. To do this, he pays frequent visits to them and advises then on their feeding problems such as what feeds are best during particular stages of growth, how mortality rates may be decreased and production rate increased; in other words, he shows them how the latest scientific advances in the knowledge of livestock and poultry feeding, as well as in their care and treatment, will increase their production. Naturally, this is provided as an integral part of the service to regular customers.

2. Responsible for the development of new Feed Service Mills.

   This means that the Feed Salesman must be well acquainted with all operators and owners of Feed mills within his territory and persuade them, if possible, to contract with SHUR-GAIN Feeds. He must also be on the outlook for new feed mills being built. It is his responsibility to explain the advantages of contracting with his company through their special financing, promotion of products, etc.

3. Responsible for the promotion of increased Livestock and Poultry production.

   This is secondary to the establishment of new feed mills. Through contact with the livestock and poultry producers he must try and increase their production by cutting down on mortality rates through the application of his specialized knowledge or by persuading them to plan production on a larger scale. This will increase the amount of feed required.

4. Directly responsible to the Feed Sales Supervisor.

Specific

Sales

1. Assess available business on the territory and forecast sales volume for the Period and the year.

2. Assist Feed Service Mill Operators in the sale and merchandising of their product and in mill management. Keep the mill operators up-to-date on the latest developments in nutrition and husbandry.

   By merchandising is meant the display of their products in the mill office. Quite often these are specialty types of feed that they are trying to promote because the results obtained with them are so good that their use by a producer might lead him to adopt their whole program of feeds.

   When the mill is a new one, the Feed Salesman has to show the operator how to run the whole operation. Assisting in mill management includes such things as making them keep their premises clean, teaching them how to cost their feed, and promoting different kinds of equipment that will facilitate production, provide for the best in feeds and yet keep down operational costs.

   The mill operators are kept up-to-date on the latest developments in nutrition and husbandry through conversations with the Feed Salesman. He tries to give them as much information as possible without overloading them with technical ideas. This will enable the operator to advise customers on their feeding problems when the Feed Salesman is not available.

3. Contact prospective feed mill operators, farmers and feeders.

   In towns situated in good feeding areas, and where there is no feed mill, the Feed Salesman will try to promote to some of the local people, who have the capital, to build a new feed mill. To the farmers and feeders in these areas, he will try to promote the sale of his feed directly to them.

4. Organize farm meetings and feed service meetings.

   Once a year the Feed Division sales staff has a feed school for all the operators from the surrounding territories.

   The feed service meetings of a territory are run by the Feed Salesman with the assistance of the sales staff. This is held for all the mill operators in the territory. They discuss how things are going, markets, prices, etc. The main idea is to keep the operators enthusiastic.

The farm meetings are held by the Feed Salesman in conjunction with the feed mill. It is run on the basis of an open house and the farmers from the surrounding area drop in any time during the day. The purpose is mainly an educational one in explaining feeding advances to the farmers and feeders. They usually have somebody from the government or the university present and films about SHUR-GAIN Feeds are shown plus informal conversation with the farmers after.

5. Submit daily reports showing business transacted and people contacted to Sales Supervisor.

Standards of Performance

This job is well done when:

1. Forecasts of sales volume are realistic and these are being reached.

2. A minimum of one good mill is signed up each year.

3. Feed mills on territories are showing volume increase in keeping with increases in livestock and poultry production and feeding in the area.

4. Daily reports are submitted punctually and represent an accurate picture of conditions on the territory.

Man Information - Feed Salesman

In the following paragraphs will be found an enumeration of the personality traits, characteristics and aptitudes that are, for the most part, possessed by Feed Salesmen who are successful in their job.

The Feed Salesman possesses a degree in Agriculture with a major in animal husbandry. His marks were in the "B's".

He is a person who, while attending university, was involved in student affairs although not overly so. Quite often he ran the Aggie Fair or was an active participant in it. He may also have been a member of the student council and participated in such other activities as sports, UMSU, etc.

Usually he is of a rural background having come from a farm or a town in a farming area. It is not unusual for there to be older brothers in the family who will inherit or maintain the farm when the father retires or dies.

He possesses a good knowledge of farming conditions and how the farmer thinks and acts. If he was not raised on a farm he has acquired extensive acquaintance with farming and farm life.

He has a sincere desire to get into this field, possessing good reasons for wishing to do so, and already has some knowledge of what a Feed Salesman does before applying for the position. He also demonstrates a willingness to travel.

The Feed Salesman is practical and realistic. On coming into the Company his level of expectations regarding salary and promotion are generally in line with what the job will provide. His past record has shown a picture of general financial responsibility.

He is mature and comes from a stable home background. Quite often he is married and settled. His manner is outgoing and expresses confidence. He is a person with organizing abilities who can also speak effectively.

A P P E N D I X B

Information for Item Raters

Information for Raters

READ OVER INSTRUCTIONS CAREFULLY BEFORE PROCEEDING TO RATE ITEMS

The pile of items that you will be given are separate items of information that might possibly be obtained about prospective applicants for the job of Feed Salesman. Once you begin to work with the items you will notice that they are of several different types. It might safely be said that the items, for the most part, may be classified into the following three categories:

(1) Factual type information, e.g., married.
(2) Information that describes behavior of applicant during the interview.
(3) Information that describes personality traits or characteristics of the individual. This information may be thought of as a conclusion arrived at by an interviewer on the basis of other information. For instance, if an item says that the applicant is stingy, the interviewer has observed several things about the applicant that have led him to this conclusion. Naturally, an item of information of this kind is dependent on the interviewer's ability to make this kind of judgment.

It might be added that a number of the items will fall somewhere between these rather arbitrary classifications.

PROCEDURE

Part I

The first thing that must be stressed is, that in doing the various rating procedures, each item must be thought of as separate and apart from all other items.

Part I consists of deciding whether each item is a piece of information that is relevant or irrelevant to the job of Feed Salesman. By Relevant we mean any item of information that would make you move more in the direction of, or farther away from, hiring an applicant for the position of Feed Salesman; in other words, an item that would influence your decision. Any item that is not Relevant is Irrelevant except in the special circumstances following. There may be the odd item that, because of the wording or something else, you cannot understand. If this is the case, mark Ambiguous on it and put it into the special envelope provided. If any item of itself would eliminate a candidate from further consideration mark Eliminate on it and put it into the envelope provided.

After sorting the items into Relevant and Irrelevant piles, place the Irrelevant items into the envelope provided and seal it.

Part II

The second phase of the rating procedure consists of taking those items that have already been classified by you as Relevant and deciding whether each item is in an applicant's favor or, on the contrary, would hinder his chances. Each item, then, will be put either into a Positive (favorable) pile or a Negative (unfavorable) pile.

Part III

The third phase decides how negative or how positive an item is. Taking the Positive pile first, pick out the item of information that would best favor an applicant about whom it could be said. Then, pick out the item that is least positive about an applicant. These items may then be thought to exist at opposite ends of an 11-point scale with the least positive at point 1 on the scale and the most positive at point 11 on the scale. Go through each of the items in the Positive pile and decide on what point it should be placed on the scale in relation to the highest and lowest items at the ends. You may find it necessary to change the position of an item when you compare it with other items that you have placed.

The same procedure is to be followed for the Negative pile with items ranging from low negative at point 1 on the scale to high negative at point 11 on the scale. The scaling for positive and negative piles are to be done separately.

Make sure that each of the piles on the 11 points on the positive and negative scales are stapled or clipped together. Be sure to number the piles according to the position it had on the scale. Write the numbers on the back of the pile.

Note: A reasonable estimate for the time of the total operation is two hours. While the whole operation need not necessarily be performed at one time, each separate phase should be performed without interruption. The first two phases should take one half-hour each and the last phase an hour.

A P P E N D I X C

Protocols of Interview Information

Protocol A

(0.0) Is an only child.

(10.0) Looks facts in the face.

(10.3) Seems to be an individual on whom one could count.

(10.3) Has a good many worthwhile ideas.

(4.0) Is a good listener.

(10.3) Seems to weigh the "pros and cons" in a realistic fashion.

(3.3) Has carried on a $5000. life insurance policy on his own.

(9.3) Is keenly interested in this field.

(4.3) Dresses conservatively.

(5.3) Maintains a good balance in his concepts of right and wrong.

(6.3) Has a knack of appearing interested and alert.

(4.7) Financed his own way through school.

(10.7) Is very industrious.

(6.3) Expects to advance on merit alone.

(5.0) Was senior stick of Agriculture.

(9.0) Has made a point of finding out a lot about the job before the interview.

(10.3) Has an ideal combination of aggressiveness and good judgment.

(10.0) Academic record is somewhat above average.

(3.7) Appears to be well-bred.

(6.3) Knows what he wants and is determined to get it.

(0.0) Will be getting married as soon as he graduates.

(9.3) Mixes easily.

(Excellent)	(Above average)	(Average)	(Below average)	(Definitely not suited)

Protocol B

(3.3) Is not a puritan but has a high moral sense.

(-5.0) No clear idea of why he wishes to enter the field.

(6.0) Knows how to put best foot forward.

(6.3) Is steady, solid individual - dependable yet not brilliant.

(5.0) Was student union representative from his faculty.

(10.3) Takes work seriously.

(9.7) Shows considerable initiative.

(10.7) Is very industrious.

(0.0) Lives in city with parents although born on the farm.

(3.7) Seems average in appearance and dress.

(9.3) Is personally ambitious but not unduly so.

(6.3) Expects to advance on merit alone.

(-2.0) Spends most of his spare time playing sports.

(4.0) Is patient.

(9.0) Has pleasing personality.

(7.0) Talks easily.

(0.0) No debts and no savings.

(8.7) Gets along well with other people.

(10.0) Is unusually well-balanced in his opinions.

(6.7) Impresses others as being earnest.

(8.7) Has always carried things through to the finish.

(6.3) Asks pertinent, intelligent questions.

(Excellent)	(Above average)	(Average)	(Below average)	(Definitely not suited)

Protocol C

(-4.7) Expects too rapid advancement.

(5.3) Had charge over one section of the exhibits at the Aggie Fair.

(9.7) Possesses considerable initiative.

(4.7) Has his eye on the president's chair.

(6.7) Can talk to people of any sort.

(7.0) Has excellent business sense.

(0.0) Doubt whether this applicant has done very much dating with girls.

(-4.3) Does not appear to be very robust.

(-4.0) Has lived in the city all of his life.

(7.7) Sizes people up well.

(6.0) Has a pleasant voice.

(6.0) Shows foresight.

(0.0) Has had a different type of job every summer - from laborer to clerk.

(6.7) Is a fluent talker.

(7.7) Likes job because of opportunity to meet people.

(6.3) Has a realistic approach to life.

(10.3) Seems to have a fund of common sense.

(6.3) Asks pertinent, intelligent questions.

(7.0) Has good command of English.

(7.0) Is Chairman of the Debating Club.

(10.7) Is conscientious and hard working.

(-1.0) Has three older and two younger sisters - no brothers.

(Excellent)	(Above average)	(Average)	(Below average)	(Definitely not suited)

Protocol D

(6.0) Is dressed neatly.

(0.0) Parents have given up farm recently and moved to the city.

(6.0) Knows something of the job through contact with Feed Salesman in his home town.

(9.3) Is not easily discouraged.

(-6.0) Expresses no hobbies or interests outside of school.

(7.0) Respects seriousness of interview situation, but has well-developed sense of humor.

(9.3) Does not appear to be afraid of work.

(10.0) Academic record is somewhat above average.

(6.0) Is courteous.

(-6.3) Does not participate much in the student affairs of his faculty.

(7.7) Feels job is in line with his interests.

(6.7) Is a very practical person.

(8.7) Has always carried things through to the finish.

(-1.3) Nothing outstanding in his past history.

(4.7) Is a clean-cut young man.

(-4.7) Is too rigid in his code of morals and ethics.

(7.7) Is a careful and systematic thinker.

(0.0) Has been married for two years while going to school.

(6.7) Seems to be self-assured.

(-6.0) Has too many definite ideas for his age.

(5.7) Average stability for a person his age.

(6.7) Has self well figured out.

(Excellent)	(Above average)	(Average)	(Below average)	(Definitely not suited)

Protocol E

(0.0) Has become active in theatre groups around the city.

(-5.7) Appears not to be interested in promotion.

(9.0) Makes friends with others easily.

(6.7) Would probably cooperate well.

(-6.0) Asks thoughtless questions.

(6.0) Knows something of the job through contact with Feed Salesmen in his home town.

(8.0) Is sufficiently critical of own decisions.

(7.3) Has a "nose" for business.

(-8.7) Frequently misuses words.

(7.7) Is unselfish.

(7.3) Speaks confidently.

(1.0) Has spent most of his summers working on road gangs out of town.

(-6.3) Is outspoken in his opinions.

(6.0) Father owns large, progressive farm.

(-6.3) Did not participate much in the student affairs of his faculty.

(6.7) Has a definite conception of what he wishes to do.

(-5.3) Looks as if he leads a very active social life.

(0.0) Is the eldest son of a large family.

(8.0) Has an excellent "public contact" personality.

(2.0) Is an active member of a fraternity.

(5.7) Is interested in this job.

(8.0) Has lots of pep.

(Excellent)	(Above average)	(Average)	(Below average)	(Definitely not suited)

Protocol F

(-4.7) Has no outstanding interest.

(8.0) Ambitious, but not overly so.

(1.3) Has a pleasant voice.

(-6.0) Neglects looking ahead.

(7.7) Has spent most of his life on the farm.

(8.7) Seems to have a genuine desire to work.

(-6.3) Is cocky.

(2.3) Received partial assistance in university expenses from parents.

(7.3) Has been a good "B" student.

(-7.3) Is a solo performer.

(4.7) Knows own abilities well.

(-5.0) Past record indicates that he may be impractical.

(7.7) Imparts information to others clearly.

(-6.7) Tends to be over-emotional.

(7.7) Has strong desire to adapt himself to any set of conditions.

(-1.7) Main outside interest is in reading.

(7.3) Talks about what he knows better than the average man.

(-5.7) Has no good reason for wanting to get into this field.

(0.0) Comes from a very large family of which he is the youngest.

(-4.7) Has difficulty making up mind about things.

(9.3) Is very energetic.

(0.0) Has rarely had opportunity to travel.

(Excellent)	(Above average)	(Average)	(Below average)	(Definitely not suited)

Protocol G

(7.0) Looks one squarely in the eye.

(-5.7) Has done very little original thinking.

(8.7) Gets along well with people.

(-3.0) Says that several members of the faculty have encouraged him to continue his studies.

(9.0) Has a pleasant, frank manner.

(-5.0) No clear idea of why he wishes to enter the field.

(5.7) Likes to make decisions.

(-6.3) Has tended to drift in and out of things.

(0.0) Father just recently deceased.

(-5.7) Apparently has his ups and downs in moods.

(7.3) Expresses himself well.

(-3.3) Knows less than average about this type of job.

(8.3) Always views the practical side of things.

(-9.7) Overestimates own ability.

(5.0) "Grows" on you during the interview.

(-5.0) Slumps in chair.

(4.3) Was year president in his Freshman Year.

(-8.3) Cleanliness of person is not his best feature.

(0.0) Is now engaged and plans to marry in a year or so.

(-6.0) Expresses no hobbies or interests outside of school.

(7.3) Able to put ideas across in a concise fashion.

(-4.3) Most summer vacations were spent travelling.

(Excellent)	(Above average)	(Average)	(Below average)	(Definitely not suited)

Protocol H

(10.0) Looks facts in the face.

(-4.7) Is too rigid in his code of morals and ethics.

(9.3) Is keenly interested in this field.

(-9.3) Is somewhat of a braggart.

(9.3) Is not easily discouraged.

(-6.3) Is cocky.

(-6.3) Did not participate much in the student affairs of his faculty.

(8.0) Is well poised.

(-5.7) Manner during interview expresses extreme self-confidence.

(0.0) Wishes to travel a lot to see different parts of the country.

(-4.7) Somewhat dissatisfied with starting salary.

(6.7) Is a fluent talker.

(-8.3) Is inclined to be impatient with others.

(-4.0) Likes to spend a lot of time with his family.

(7.0) Has excellent business sense.

(-6.3) Is outspoken in his opinions.

(-4.3) Does not appear to be very robust.

(9.0) Has made a point of finding out a lot about the job before the interview.

(-6.0) Is moody.

(-6.0) Has too many definite ideas for his age.

(0.0) Single and intends to remain so until firmly established in the business world.

(-10.7) Likes to argue.

(Excellent)	(Above average)	(Average)	(Below average)	(Definitely not suited)

A P P E N D I X D

Instructions to Experimental Groups

Instructions

In the following pages you will find eight sheets, each containing a number of items of information about an applicant for the job of Feed Salesman. The information is the result of what could be obtained about an applicant through an interview with a company representative. As such, it mainly consists of three types of information: (1) factual information, (2) information concerning the applicant's behavior during the interview, and (3) different impressions that the interviewer has about the applicant. Naturally, this is going to mean that some of the information is going to be more important than others with regard to the applicant's suitability for the job.

Starting at the first sheet, Applicant "A", read over each of the items of information carefully. Then, go back over the items and place an "X" in the left-hand column beside those that you think are important. After doing this, rate the applicant with regard to his suitability for the job of Feed Salesman. Do this on one of the five points at the bottom of the page: Excellent, Above average, Average, Below average, Definitely not suited. Place an "X" above the one that you decide on. Then, go back over the items again and put an asterisk beside those which you felt were most crucial to your decision. Do this for each of the applicants, doing only one at a time, and not going back to ones that you have done previously.

When you have finished each of the eight applicants, read the "Further Instructions" on the last page.

FURTHER INSTRUCTIONS

On the scale underneath, show where each of the applicants was placed. In cases where there is more than one applicant falling at any of the five scale points, place them in order of which was best, second best, and so on.

For example, if two applicants have both been rated as Excellent by you, say Applicants A and B, you would decide which of the two is best and place him in Position 1 beside Excellent. The other one would be placed in Position 2.

Excellent 1. B 2. A 3. _____ 4. _____

Excellent 1. ____ 2. _____ 3. _____ 4. _____

Above Average 1. ____ 2. _____ 3. _____ 4. _____

Average 1. ____ 2. _____ 3. _____ 4. _____

Below Average 1. ____ 2. _____ 3. _____ 4. _____

Definitely not Suited 1. ____ 2. ____ 3. _____ 4. _____