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ABSTRACT

Unlike the academic teacher who has years of teacher training at a university, a teaching practicum, and experiences that lead to the acquisition of a teaching credential, a career and technical education (CTE) teacher typically is hired and placed in the classroom with no pre-service experience or training. Career and technical administrators are faced with hiring CTE teachers who subsequently are placed into an alternative preparation and certification route that recognizes their years of work and trade experience in place of teacher preparation (Walter & Gray, 2002).

School administrators hiring the typical academic teacher use behavioral description interview questions to aid and inform their selection decision (Clement, 2009; Hindman & Stronge, 2009; Stronge & Hindman, 2006). Using behavioral description interview questions enables the teacher applicant to respond to past classroom experiences and provides information that school administrators use to gauge applicant responses related to good educational practice. Career and technical educators may certainly ask behavioral description interview questions to CTE teacher applicants, but linking interview questions to prior teaching knowledge is often not applicable due to a lack of prior classroom experience. Career and technical administrators must rely on other question types and interview strategies to determine an applicant’s fit within the school environment.

One hundred years of organizational and industrial research supports conducting a selection interview using a structured approach that improves the reliability and the validity of the interview and serves as an accurate predictor of future job success (Buckley, Norris, & Wiese, 2000). The research of Campion, Palmer, and Campion
(1997) resulted in a blueprint of 15 components of interview structure that are recommended for today’s organizations, public and private sector alike, for improving hiring and selection decision making. It is this blueprint that served as the theoretical framework for this study.

Through semi-structured, in-depth interviews, this qualitative study explored the interview practices of six CTE administrators to determine the degree to which structure was adopted within their CTE teacher interview and selection process. The study further sought to identify specific interview questions that were perceived as most influential in the selection decision.

The analysis of the data revealed that participants in this study adopted several components of interview structure, yet the findings indicated a gap between knowing about structured interview practices and using these practices. In other words, while the participants in this study may be using components of interview structure, their responses indicated a lack of knowledge or understanding of interview structure and its validity and reliability.

Additionally, this study also discovered that no one question asked during the interview informed and influenced the selection outcome. Instead, a number of candidate characteristics and look-for’s influenced the hiring decision.
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CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

The employment interview continues to be the most important and influential of all selection tools used during the hiring process (Buckley, Norris, & Wiese, 2000; Campion, Palmer, & Campion, 1997; Posthuma, Morgeson, & Campion, 2002). Decades of research have focused on a variety of interview issues including but not limited to applicant and interviewer characteristics, interviewer bias, applicant faking and the use of Impression Management tactics, interview formats and questions, and applicant testing. In other words, the employment interview has thoroughly “been criticized, praised, structured, enlarged, tested, recorded and analyzed” (Buckley et al., 2000, p. 113). Despite its weaknesses, education and industry alike rely on the interview as a vital component of the hiring process.

There are two primary types of interviews, the structured interview and the unstructured interview. “Unstructured interviews tend to emphasize background credentials, personality, and general mental ability. Structured interviews consist of questions related to applied mental skills, direct job knowledge, applied social skills and organizational fit” (Stronge & Hindman, 2006, p. 25). In the 1980s and 1990s, research began to concentrate on employee performance and the job interview as a predictor of that applicant’s future job performance. Campion et al. (1997) conducted an exhaustive examination, summarization, and integration of employment interview research. Based on their study, they made several conclusions. They found that the literature strongly supported structure within the interview to improve overall reliability and validity. “With so many ideas and such a large body of supportive literature, there is no good rationale
for using completely unstructured interviews” (p. 690). They further stated that the interview “be structured in all possible ways within any limits imposed by interviewer and candidate reactions” (p. 690). The structured interview, they found, should include some, many, or all of various components, such as limited interviewer prompting, standardized interview questions with an anchored rating scale, conducting longer interviews, using an interview panel, interviewer note taking, and interviewer training.

Today considerable evidence supports and confirms the findings of Campion et al. (1997). The structured interview is more valid and reliable than the unstructured interview in that it both determines an applicant’s skills and competencies and has been tested to be an accurate predictor of future job success (Campion, Campion, & Hudson, 1994; Conway & Peneno, 1999; Ellis, West, Ryan, & DeShon, 2002; Howard & Johnson, 2010; Huffcut, Weekley, Wiesner, Degroot, & Jones, 2001; Morgeson, Campion & Levashina, 2009; Schmidt & Zimmerman, 2004). Structure implies that “all candidates for the same position should be interviewed using the same set of rules, developed in advance, in order to gather the information needed to evaluate their potential for success” (Howard & Johnson, 2010, p.15).

The interview question, a component of interview structure, has itself been examined and tested over the past 40 years. Historically, organizations have predominantly used general interview questions during the selection process, which yielded information about the applicant’s personality and his or her understanding of the job for which they are applying. Two contemporary interview questions have emerged as “premier formats for conducting modern structured interviews” (Huffcutt, Conway, Roth, & Klehe, 2004, p. 262). These include the situational and behavioral description
interview questions both of which have undergone significant investigation and study (Ellis et al., 2002; Campion et al., 1994; Conway & Peneno, 1999; Huffcutt, et al., 2004; Latham & Saari, 1984; Latham, Saari, Pursell & Campion, 1980; Simola, Tagger, & Smith, 2007; Taylor & Small, 2002). The situational interview question asks an applicant to respond to hypothetical job situations. In contrast, the behavioral description interview question asks the applicant to respond to a past work experience or job knowledge question. Both situational and behavioral description interview questions have produced greater construct validity of the job applicant’s success in the job (Conway & Peneno, 1999) where it is “useful to employ a mix of structured interview questions types.” (p. 504). An interview that contains situational and behavioral description interview questions along with general questions “can increase construct coverage and also potentially result in more positive applicant reactions” (p. 502).

Within the K-12 educational system, the interview is a required practice and is the greatest single factor in determining teacher hiring (Castetter & Young, 2000). Educational researchers such as Stronge and Hindman (2006) have developed interview protocols for schools that are “designed to support interviewers in distinguishing promising teachers from those with less potential to be effective” (p. 30). Interview structure, a hallmark of Stronge and Hindman’s protocol, includes the use of job knowledge, situational, and behavioral description interview questions. For many teacher interviews the behavioral description question enables school leaders to draw upon an applicant’s prior teaching experiences. “Past behavior is the best predictor of future performance, so educators would be wise to craft interview questions that explore past experiences, skills, and behaviors of job candidates” (Clement, 2009, p. 22). The use of
behavioral description questions can challenge both an interviewer and an applicant who possesses no teaching experience on which to draw (Stronge & Hindman, 2006). This study confronts just this challenge by investigating the interview and selection process of career and technical education (CTE) teachers, commonly entering the field of teaching with no prior teaching experiences.

**The Problem**

The purpose of this study was to examine the extent to which research-based interview practices, including structure, are used during the selection of new CTE teachers. This study also sought to identify the interview questions asked by CTE administrators that they perceived most influenced the selection decisions.

Hiring a CTE teacher poses unique challenges. Unlike their traditional teacher counterparts, typically CTE teachers enter the teaching ranks directly from industry without any formal training in pedagogy or any pre-service classroom teaching experience. Career and technical administrators are faced with hiring CTE teachers and placing them directly into classrooms, often immediately upon employment, while coaching them through the alternative preparation and certification route which recognizes their years of work and trade experience over teacher preparation (Walter & Gray, 2002). In short, the teacher’s occupational experiences replace the traditional teacher pre-service preparation program. Career and technical teachers often are employed and considered teacher competent because of their specific industry or occupational expertise (Lynch, 1997).

Alternative preparation and certification refers to a teacher who has “not completed an undergraduate degree in the field of education” (Ruhland & Bremer, 2003,
The lack of pre-service training often results in high teacher attrition rates and dissatisfaction with the teaching experience (Osgood & Self, 2002). Career and technical educators who enter teaching through alternative certification routes are typically more confident in terms of their technical content and expertise but less confident in their teaching and pedagogical skills than their traditionally certified teacher counterparts (Ruhland & Bremer, 2002). “Different strategies for completing licensure requirements may lead to different levels of student achievement, beginning teacher needs, and retention outcomes” (Joerger & Bremer, 2001, p. 5). New CTE teachers are playing catch-up from the time they enter the classroom, not only learning the routines and expectations of a new organization and the educational work setting, but learning the critical skills needed to be a highly effective educator.

Today’s hiring decisions for CTE teachers have a direct and immediate impact on a school’s ability to demonstrate student achievement standards. Career and technical education has until recently been immune from student accountability and the high-stakes testing that now dominates traditional education through the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) PL107 110 Act (US Congress, 2001) which is designed to increase academic rigor (Fletcher, 2006). Not any more; on August 12, 2006, President Bush signed into law the reauthorization of the Perkins IV Act of 2006 PL109-270 (US Congress, 2006), often referred to as Perkins IV. Perkins IV provides an increased focus on the academic achievement of CTE students, strong connections between secondary and postsecondary education, and increased state and local accountability (Associational for Career and Technical Education [ACTE], n.d.). Perkins IV identifies clear accountability measures for student achievement and performance on state academic standards and on technical
skill attainment. Under Perkins IV, business as usual is no longer acceptable where novice CTE teachers have years to learn and grow as educator professionals.

Career and technical education is now immersed in the world of high-stakes testing and accountability. Teachers, incumbent and newly hired alike, must demonstrate student performance improvements immediately, not after years of on-the-job training. Schools must rethink their hiring and selection strategies to ensure high quality instruction and student achievement. The hiring and selection challenge for CTE administrators is discerning whether the industry expert applicant has the skills and abilities to transition into an expert classroom teacher. How do CTE administrators make their hiring decisions when the vast number of applicants has absolutely no classroom experiences? If CTE takes its lead from research-based interview practices and educational research, then administrators should implement components of structured interviewing to include behavioral description interview questions. While structure can be replicated in the CTE employment interview, the use of behavioral description questions poses a problem when CTE teacher applicants have no pre-service training or classroom experiences from which to draw. In this age of accountability, the hiring decisions of career and technical school administrators are especially critical. Administrators need better research-based tools to identify if an applicant will be able to make a successful transition from the workforce to the classroom in this modern age of educational accountability.
Significance of the Study

This study was significant because of the unique hiring and selection challenges for CTE administrators. Career and technical administrators continue to be faced with industry experts seeking a career change and a desire to teach, and there is little or no research to date that explores the employment interview related to CTE. “The wrong hiring decision can result in a drain on the school’s resources when intensive support is placed around the new hire in an effort to encourage improvement and insulate students from the impact of an ineffective teacher” (Hindman & Strong, 2009, p. 6). It was important to begin a body of research specific to the CTE community to identify strategies that lead to successful hiring outcomes. Investigating the degree to which interview structure currently occurs within the CTE teacher interview and the use and type of interview questions that inform the hiring decision has the potential to improve CTE teacher hiring and selection practices.

This study also was important due to the financial costs to the taxpayer associated with hiring a teacher, traditional or CTE, which is substantial.

If we assume a teacher earns, on average, $51,000 annually, plus approximately 33% in benefits, then a teacher’s typical annual cost (not including professional development and other support expenses) is approximately $67,000. And if we further assume that teachers will remain in the teaching field for a 30-year career, then the total expenditure for taxpayer dollars (or tuition or other funding sources in private school settings) is slightly more that $2 million. Unfortunately,
too often we make this $2 million decision over and over with teachers based on a paucity of evidence. (Hindman & Stronge, 2009, p. 1)

With this level of investment from our local taxpayer, it continues to be important to study the employment selection processes, interviewing protocols, and interview questions that inform the hiring decision.

Lastly, this study expanded and added depth to research related to the structured interview and the use and types of questions used during the selection decision. This study expanded the investigation of the structured interview and its components not just within the K-12 educational system, but within a segment of that system, the CTE setting. While research exists related to the traditional education teacher selection interview, this study is one of the first to date that investigated interview structure and interview questions used within the CTE educational system.

**Research Questions**

This study addressed two research questions which guide the acquisition of data needed to satisfy the research problem:

1. To what extent and how is structure used during the CTE teacher interview process?
2. What are the CTE teacher interview questions asked by administrators that are perceived to most influence the selection and hiring decision?

**Limitations**

This qualitative study had several limitations. First, while there is abundant research on the interview, in industry and in education, there is little or no research specifically related to the CTE teacher selection process and specifically the employment
Second, while elements of the structured interview were investigated in this study, the administrators who participated may have reported what they believed to be the most important applicant interview questions based on their perceptions, which were identified from self-reported interviews. Third, while every effort was be made to insure the data would be kept confidential and not linked to the particular participants, only a small number of CTCs are located in the Central Pennsylvania area. Also, social desirability bias may have led the study’s participants to supply information that portrayed their interview practices in a desirable way. Finally, this study was limited to a sample of six part-time career and technical centers located in Central Pennsylvania and cannot be generalized to all CTCs across Pennsylvania or across the nation.

**Definition of Terms**

A few frequently used terms require clarification.

**Structured Interview**: Interviews based on a job analysis, specific and consistent questioning with a rating scale to evaluate applicant answers, an interview committee consisting of same committee members throughout the process who are trained to perform the interview, note taking, and documentation which can be referenced in case of legal challenges (Pursell, Campion, & Gaylord, 1980).

**Unstructured Interview**: Interviews that tend to be highly informal, flexible, and inconsistent with its methods, processes, questions, and applicant selection decisions (Pursell et al., 1980).

**Behavioral Description Interview Question**: Interview questions “asking candidates to describe what they did in past jobs as it relates to requirements of the job they are
seeking” (Campion et al., 1997, p. 667). An applicant may be asked to describe, document, or demonstrate his/her job knowledge.

Situational Interview Question: Interview question that “pose hypothetical situations that may occur on the job, and candidates are asked what they would do” (Campion et al., 1997, p. 667).

Part-Time Career and Technology Center: This term refers to a scheduling pattern in which the center provides the occupational program only and the academic program is provided by the participating school district (Pennsylvania Department of Education, Bureau of Career and Technical Education [PDE-BCTE], 2010).

Comprehensive Career and Technology Center: This term refers to a scheduling pattern in which both the occupational program and the academic program are provided by the career center (PDE-BCTE, 2010).

Career and Technical Education Teachers: Teachers who normally enter the teaching as industry subject matter experts and not expert teachers. Typically teachers in CTCs enter teaching through using an alternative teacher preparation and certification route (Walter & Gray, 2002).

Occupational Advisory Committee: This committee consists of representatives from local business and industry related to a specific occupation for which training is being provided. This committee meets regularly to provide advice and input on the program content, performance objectives, training stations, equipment, curriculum, student placement and labor market information, lab safety, and other facets of the program (PDE-BCTE, 2008).
Assumptions

The researcher assumed that the CTE administrators interviewed for this study properly characterized their selection interview process and answered questions honestly. It also assumed that the CTE administrators participating in this study were committed and motivated to hire the best candidate to teach in the CTE environment. Lastly, the researcher used interview procedures and questions designed to probe and mine for data on the participating career and technology center’s (CTC) interview practices.

Theoretical Framework

This study was based on 15 components of interview structure as identified and defined by Campion et al. (1997, 1998). These 15 components are divided into two broad categories, including the content of the interview and the interview evaluation process. Campion et al. analyzed each component of interview structure for reliability and validity. “Reliability is concerned with the consistency and standardization with which information is elicited across candidates and interviewers, thus facilitating comparison” (Campion et al., 1998, p. 77). Six types of reliability were considered: (a) test-retest reliability, (b) interrater reliability, (c) candidate consistency, (d) interviewer candidate interactions, (e) internal consistency, and (f) inter rater agreement. “Validity is concerned with whether the interview measures what it is supposed to measure, which usually means whether it predicts future job performance” (p. 77). Three aspects of validity were evaluated: (a) job relatedness, (b) reduced deficiency, and (c) reduced contamination.

Table 1 presents an outline of the 15 components of interview structure as defined by Campion et al., 1997. A description of interview content and its component follows.
Table 1

*Components of Interview Structure (Campion, et al., 1997)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Interview Content</td>
<td>A1. Base questions on a job analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A2. Ask identical questions to each candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A3. Limit prompting, follow-up questions, and elaborating on questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A4. Using better types of questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A5. Use longer interview or larger number of questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A6. Control ancillary information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A7. Do not allow questions from candidate until after the interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Interview Evaluation</td>
<td>B1. Rating each answer or use multiple scales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B2. Use of a detailed anchored rating scales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B3. Taking detailed notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B4. Using multiple interviewers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B5. Using the same interviewer(s) across all candidates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B6. Don’t discuss candidates or answers between interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B7. Provide extensive interviewing training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B8. Use statistical rather than clinical prediction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Further explanation is provided for each component of Campion, Palmer, and Campion’s (1997, 1998) seven components of interview *content*.

**Interview Content Components**

**Base questions on a job analysis.** The job analysis is not only required by professional and legal testing guidelines, but interview questions based on the job analysis increases interview “validity by increasing job relatedness and by ensuring that the interview neither includes irrelevant information nor excludes relevant information” (Campion et al., 1998, p. 78).

**Ask identical questions to each candidate.** “This component standardizes the samples of behaviors to be judged by the interviewer, thus enhancing several types of reliability” (Campion et al., 1998, p. 78).
Limit prompting, follow-up questions, and elaborating on questions. Prompting and follow-up questioning can lead to interviewer bias where the interviewer can lead the candidate to the correct, or incorrect answer. “The highest form of structure would be to prohibit follow-up questioning and prompts or to allow only standardized ones” (Campion et al., 1998, p. 78).

Ask better types of questions. According to Campion et al., (1997) “different types of questions cannot be neatly ordered in terms of structure. However, certain types of questions are more structured because they are more frequently used with high levels of structure on other components or because of their focused nature” (p. 667). Campion et al. identify four examples of structured interview questions. These included the situational, behavioral description, background, and the job knowledge question. The decade following this study and conducted in the late 1990’s further examined interview questions with an extensive focus on behavioral description and situational interview questions.

Use longer interview or larger number of questions. “Length is a basic, but overlooked, component of structure” (Campion et, al., 1997, p. 670). Length can be referred to as longer in time or asking more questions. “Using an appropriate interview length increases various forms of reliability, including test-retest reliability, interrater reliability, and internal consistency” (Campion et, al., 1998, p. 80).

Control ancillary information. “A threat to structure is the uncontrolled use of ancillary information. This includes application forms, resumes, test scores, recommendations, previous interviews, transcripts, and so forth” (Campion et al., 1997,
According to the Campion et al., ancillary information can still be considered but should be a separate predictor in order to maintain structure.

**Do not allow questions from candidate until after the interview.** “Structure can be enhanced by not allowing questions during the interview. Instead, time can be allowed outside the interview” (Campion et al., 1997, p. 670-671). Disallowing questions from the applicant during the interview helps to standardize the process, therefore increasing test-retest and interrater reliability. Further explanation is provided of Campion, Palmer, and Campion’s (1997,1998) eight components of interview evaluation.

**Interview Evaluation Components**

**Rating each answer or use multiple scales.** Ratings can be made for each candidate answer or on the entire interview. Also, interviewers can use one scale or use multiple scales “e.g., for rating dimensions such as creativity, decisiveness, and communication ability” (Campion et. al., 1998, p. 80). Structure is increased when each answer is rated and when multiple scales are used because each extends to evaluation process and therefore increases interview reliability because of enhanced consistency.

**Use of detailed anchored rating scales.** “Typically, four types of anchors are used: (a) example answers of illustrations, (b) descriptions of definitions of elements to look for in answers, (c) evaluation adjectives (e.g., “excellent,” “marginal”), and (d) relative comparisons (e.g., top 20% of all candidates)” (Campion et, al., 1998, p. 80). Because anchored rating scales are expected to be objective, higher reliability is produced within the interview.
Taking detailed notes. Taking notes enhances structure by helping to illuminate memory recall issues which increases the consistency of the evaluation and improves interview reliability and validity.

Using multiple interviewers. Also often referred to as panel interviews, the use of more than one interviewer increases a number of factors, including reducing biases, increasing the recall of responses, averaging random errors, and illuminating improper interviewer inferences, thus increasing the validity of the interview.

Using the same interviewer(s) across all candidates. “This component is particularly important when other components are unstructured because different interviewers tend to ask different questions and evaluate answers differently” (Campion et, al., 1998, p. 81).

Don’t discuss candidates or answers between interviews. “Discussing candidates or their answers between interviews may introduce irrelevant information into the decision process or cause the evaluation criteria to change from one interview to the next” (Campion et, al., 1998, p. 81).

Provide extensive interviewing training. “Training is probably the most common step taken by organizations to improve their selection interviews. It is less a component of structure per se than a way to ensure that other components are implemented correctly” (Campion et al., 1998, p. 81).

Use statistical rather than clinical prediction. To enhance structure, the use of statistical procedures to combine interview data is recommended over interviewer judgment. “Statistical procedures may involve combining ratings across questions or dimensions, combining ratings across interviewers, and combining information from the
interview with other information (e.g., test scores) to make final decisions” (Campion et al., 1998, p. 81).

Finally, Campion et al. (1998) identified and suggested the most beneficial and influential components of interview structure. These components included:

- basing questions on a job analysis;
- asking identical questions of each candidate;
- using better types of questions;
- rating each answer or use multiple scales;
- using detailed, anchored rating scales; and
- providing extensive interviewer training.

**Summary of the Study’s Theoretical Framework**

The theoretical framework developed by Campion et al. (2007) includes 15 components of an interview, that when used during the selection interview, increase the reliability and validity of the interview. This framework has been used in several research studies that investigated the structured interview (see, for example, Hindman & Stronge, 2009; Lievens and De Paepe’s, 2004; Morgeson, Campion & Levashina, 2009; Simola, Tagger, and Smith, 2007; van der Zee, Bakker and Bakker, 2002)

A graphic representation of the theoretical framework of this study by Campion et al. (1997) is presented in Figure 1. Each of the 15 components of a structured interview is either linked to an interview’s content or an interview’s evaluation.
Chapter Summary

This study was one of the first to date in which the CTC teacher interview and selection decision was investigated. While a significant body of literature related to structured interviewing exists within organizational and industrial research and the selection interview has been studied in the traditional K-12 educational setting, little to no
research exists related to the hiring of a career and technical teacher. The findings of this study provide a foundation that can be used by the CTE community as a starting point for future research. All students, including CTC students, should have the benefit of a good teacher who can inspire them, motivate them, and help them develop the skills and abilities they need to begin their career aspirations. Hiring the right CTC teacher starts that process and puts students on the right track for success. Borrowing from good interviewing practices identified in the historical research and investigating the current practices used by a small sample of CTC administrators, as was done in this study, begins a focus of study that both impacts today’s students and tomorrow’s workforce.
CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF RELEVANT LITERATURE

The key to a good school is its teachers. Good teachers have the capacity to ignite student interest and learning and thus, increase student achievement (Nye, Konstantopoulos, & Hedges 2004; Stronge & Hindman, 2006; Stronge, Ward, Tucker & Hindman, 2007). Ask anyone who has completed a formal education to identify his or her favorite teacher. The perception is that such individuals would name at least one excellent teacher that inspired them, motivated them, cared for them, and made the learning process come to life. Research suggests that teaching expertise can be broadly categorized by an individual’s content knowledge, pedagogical strategies and techniques, and a set of personal characteristics, all of which is examined during the teacher selection and interview process (Hattie, 2009; Ralph, Kesten, Lang, & Smith, 1998; Torff & Sessions, 2005). “In essence, an effective teacher selection process, beginning with recruiting quality applicants and extending to selecting the most capable candidates, impacts everything we do for improving our schools” (Hindman & Stronge, 2009, p. 1).

Recently there has been increased interest in the relationship between teacher quality and administrators’ hiring practices. With evidence that variation in teacher quality affects student achievement (Rivkin, Hanushek, & Kain, 2005; Sanders & Horn, 1998), the ways in which teachers are screened and selected is of increasing importance, potentially resulting in long-term gains in student outcomes. Yet the hiring process has been criticized as “bureaucratic” and “inefficient” (DeArmond & Goldhaber, 2005) as well as “late” and “rushed” (Lui & Johnson, 2006). Further, researchers have found that the academically
strongest teachers are often overlooked (Baker & Cooper, 2005; Ballou, 1996; Strauss, Bowes, Marks, & Plesko, 2000). If hiring is as problematic as these findings suggest, then improving the tools and processes of hiring has the potential to improve the quality of teaching and student performance. (Rutledge, Harris, Thompson, & Ingle, 2008, p. 238)

The purpose of this study was to examine the extent to which and how research-based interview practices, including structure, are used during the selection of new career and technical education (CTE) teachers. This study also sought to identify the interview questions asked by CTE administrators that are perceived to most impact their hiring and selection decisions. This chapter provides a review of the related literature associated with this study’s variables and consists of three sections: the structured interview, interview practices within the K-12 educational system, and the chapter summary.

The Structured Interview

The structured employment interview involves the use of standard processes where interview questions are asked and the response is evaluated and benchmarked against duties and responsibilities of the job for which the applicant is applying (Campion, Palmer, & Campion, 1997). Huffcutt and Arthur (1994) define the structured interview as “the reduction of procedural variance across applicants, which can translate into the degree of discretion that an interviewer is allowed in conducting the interview” (p.186).

The concept of interview structure is nothing new. As far back as the late 1920s new interview concepts linking applicant skills to job expectations were explored (Buckley, Norris, & Wiese, 2000; O’Rourke, 1929). The 1940s and 1950s began an era
of investigating the reliability and validity of the interview as a predictor of future job performance but with failed research attempts, the interview met luke-warm response for its predictive powers (Dunlap & Wantman, 1947). “Although the reliability and validity of employment interviews have historically been viewed as suspect”, (Ellis, West, Ryan & DeShon, 2002, p. 1200) the employment interview continued to endure, gained in popularity, and improve (Arvey & Campion, 1982, Buckley et al., 2000). In 1949 Wagner conducted a meta-analysis which supported interview structure where he found structure could be improved with the inclusion of specific content items and procedural variables, thus reducing interview bias (Campion, Pursell & Brown, 1988).

So what is considered to be structure within the interview format? Modern researchers such as Huffcutt and Authur (1994) identified four levels of structure with respect to interview questions and sophisticated rating scales to evaluate an applicant’s responses. Latham, Saari, Pursell, and Campion (1980) along with Weekley and Gier (1987) used situational interviews where applicants responded to hypothetical job situations related to a job analysis. Additionally, each applicant was asked the same identical questions and applicants’ responses were evaluated by a panel of interviewers using anchored rating scales. Campion et al. (1997) extended these methodologies to other research studies on the interview. The results of their analysis divided the structured interview into two broad categories, interview content, and interview evaluation. Within these categories are 15 components of interview structure. The structured interview as defined by Campion et al., 1997 was the theoretical framework for this study and include the following components:
Interview Content

- Base questions on a job analysis
- Ask identical questions to each candidate
- Limit prompting, follow-up questions, and elaborating on questions
- Using better types of questions
- Use longer interview or larger number of questions
- Control ancillary information
- Do not allow questions from candidate until after the interview

Interview Evaluation

- Rating each answer or use multiple scales
- Use of a detailed anchored rating scales
- Taking detailed notes
- Using multiple interviewers
- Using the same interviewer(s) across all candidates
- Don’t discuss candidates or answers between interviews
- Provide extensive interviewing training
- Use statistical rather than clinical prediction

Table 2 presents a comprehensive but not exhaustive coverage of recent literature related to the structured interview. Components of interview structure were coded using the framework developed by Campion et al., (1997) in which the 15 components are identified as variables. All reviewed literature was coded by one of two means: studies in which a component of interview structure was researched and analyzed; or studies in which component of interview structure was associated within the research environment
but where the component was *not* measured or analyzed. It should be noted with respect to coding that while most studies provided sufficient information related to the research intent, if specific finding were not provided, the component of interview structure was identified as associated but not measured or analyzed.
Table 2

Recent Research Studies that Include Components of Interview Structure as Defined by Campion et al., 1997

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview content components</th>
<th>Interview evaluation components</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A1 Job anal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barclay, 1999</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barclay, 2001</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brtek &amp; Motowidlo, 2002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnett et al., 1998</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campion et al., 1994</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campion et al., 1998</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapman &amp; Rowe, 2001</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conway &amp; Peneno, 1999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dixon et al., 2002</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellis et al., 2002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graves &amp; Karren, 1996</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hackett et al., 2004</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindman &amp; Stronge, 2009</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huffcutt &amp; Arthur, 1994</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huffcutt et al., 2004</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huffcutt et al., 2001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huffcutt &amp; Woehr, 1999</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latham &amp; Saari, 1984</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latham et al., 1980</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levashina &amp; Campion, 2006</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lievens &amp; DePaepe, 2004</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maurer &amp; Lee, 2000</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morgenson et al., 2009</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pulakos &amp; Schmitt, 1995</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simola et al., 2007</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stevens, 1998</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor &amp; Small, 2002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van der Zee et al., 2002</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williamson et al., 1997</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: In the table above, the code “X” represents a component of structure researched and analyzed within the study. T code “*” represents a component of structure associated with the study but not measured or analyzed. Descriptions of column items are as follows: A1. Base questions on a job analysis; A2. Ask exact same questions to each candidate; A3. Limit prompting, follow-up questions, and elaborating on questions; A4. Using better types of questions; A5. Use longer interview or larger number of questions; A6. Control ancillary information; A7. Do not allow questions from candidate until after the interview; B1. Rating each answer or use multiple scales; B2. Use of a detailed anchored rating scales; B3. Taking detailed notes; B4. Using multiple interviewers; B5. Using the same interviewer(s) across all candidates; B6. Don’t discuss candidates or answers between interviews; B7. Provide extensive interviewing training; B8. Use statistical rather than clinical prediction.
The next sections of this review of related literature examine the use of the structured verses unstructured interview. Also reviewed is the research related to the various components of the structured interview, including interview questions based on a job analysis, use and type of interview question, rating applicant answers, and anchored scales, interview panels and note taking, and interviewer training.

**Structured Verses Unstructured Interviewing**

While research supports interview structure as a predictor of job success, finding organizations that have embraced it and used it consistently in their hiring processes can be a challenge. The unstructured interview provides the interviewer with greater flexibility but lacks consistency and is susceptible to interview bias (Pursell, Campion, & Gaylord, 1980). Additionally, the informal interview lacks research based validity, often lacks a relationship to the job, and is highly susceptible to legal challenges. Contrary to the informal interview, the structured interview has several advantages. First, questions asked of the applicant are directly aligned to the job for which they are applying. Second, consistent interview questions asked of each applicant allow the evaluator to better compare applicant answers, thus aiding in a uniform evaluation of all candidate. Third, evaluator training increases consistency among interviewers, and finally, a clear, documented process can be referenced in case of legal challenges (Huffcutt & Arthur, 1994; Pursell et al., 1980).

Studies have examined the degree to which interview structure has been adopted as a common practice for employee selection. One recent study which closely followed the framework established by Campion et al. (1997) was conducted by van der Zee, Bakker and Bakker (2002). The researchers investigated human resource (HR)
managers’ intentions and attitudes toward the use of structured versus unstructured interview techniques. van der Zee et al. (2002) collected data and measured 14 of the 15 components of interview structure as defined by Campion et al. (1997). The use of statistical rather than clinical predication, a component of interview evaluation, was not assessed. Their study concluded that HR managers preferred and most used unstructured interview practices. While “performing selection interviews in an intuitive and unstructured way may seem foolish”, (van der Zee et al., 2002, p. 181) respondents in this study favored using an unstructured process. “Science has propagated introducing far-reaching elements of standardization, but HR managers in practice seem to be very reluctant to adopt well-structured procedures” (van der Zee et al., 2002, p. 181).

A second study that investigated the degree to which interview structure techniques were implemented came from a Canadian Study conducted by Simola, Tagger, and Smith (2007). Researchers compared 301 HR professionals’ perceptions of their interview practices against the researched-based practices supported by the Canadian Human Rights Tribunals to identify their level of interviewing expertise. The researchers hypothesized that if HR professionals believed themselves to be effective interviewers, they would be less likely to adopt structured interview techniques or pursue training to improve their practices. Human resource professionals rated their use of questions based on a job analysis, a standardized interview script, consistent scoring of applicant responses and following a process for each applicant. They also rated their use of behavioral description and situational interview questions, note taking, use of interview panels, and interviewer training. Four major patterns of practice emerged from this study. First, less than half of the HR practitioners in this study received interviewer
training. Second, participants placed little emphasis on asking questions based on a formal job analysis for the position. Third, there was little standardization of interviewing questions where 75 percent reported asking new questions or unscripted questions during the interview and only 12 percent reported using a rating scale to evaluate applicant responses. Finally, HR professionals placed high importance and value in the panel interview, and in asking behavioral description and situational interview questions.

Lievens and De Paepe’s (2004) also conducted a qualitative and quantitative study of 76 HR professionals in Belgium. They examined the degree to which the structured interview was used and the factors and concerns of interviewers that prevented them from using structure within the interview. Respondents reported how they asked, rated, and evaluated a candidate during the interview. Respondents also identified the degree to which they asked a consistent script of main and follow-up questions and used a structured assessment of a candidate’s responses during the interview. Lievens and De Paepe identified three factors that discouraged the use of highly structured interviews. These factors included interviewer concerns regarding their personal discretion asking off-script interview questions and scoring candidate answers, a desire to establish personal and informal contact with the job applicant, and the time needed for planning a structured interview versus the ease of preparation for the unstructured interview. This study adds to the existing research on the adoption of structured interview practices and, consistent with other studies, finds that the interviewer contributes to the degree to which interview structured is adopted.
“Despite the fact that structured interviewing may result in better selection decisions and consequently in better employee performance and higher organizational profitability, structured interviews are infrequently used” (van der Zee et al., 2002, p. 176). The research to date illustrates that while advocates tout the benefits of structured interviewing, finding organizations and HR professionals who have embraced the depth and breadth of content elements and evaluation methods of the structured interview is not widespread.

Several research studies have examined the various components of interview structure. These components are reviewed in the remainder of this section of this chapter and include basing questions on the job analysis, interview questions, rating applicant responses, and anchored scales, interview panels, note taking, and interviewer training.

**Base Questions on a Job Analysis**

Prior to developing interview questions and interview assessment criteria, a thorough understanding of the job requirements, including job knowledge, skills, and abilities is needed (Campion et al., 1997; Latham & Saari, 1984; Latham et al., 1980; Morgeson, Campion & Levashina, 2009). The job analysis “is perhaps the most basic design principle that is universally endorsed, in part because it represents a key link to job relatedness” (Morgeson et al., 2009, p. 204).

A recent study that examined and developed a structured interview model beginning with a job analysis was conducted by Morgeson et al. (2009). Their study of 230 auto parts manufacturing employees located in a Midwest United States company focused on developing a structured interview using a performance evaluation for employee promotion. Unlike time-on-the-job or pencil and paper testing, the researchers
aimed to predict the internal candidate’s success in the next work assignment through his or her current work performance. Their model of interview structure included a performance appraisal where the applicant demonstrated job knowledge during the interview. The intent was to use “standardized measures of behavior whose primary objective is to assess the ability to do rather than the ability to know” (Cascio & Phillips, 1979, pp. 751-752).

Morgeson et al. (2009) began their research through an investigation of the development process for a job analysis. Each job analysis was developed by subject matter experts from within the organization who based the analysis on the job knowledge, skills, and abilities. This process occurred over a ten-month period. After validating the job analysis, it later becomes the criteria used for developing interview questions and applicant rating scales. Interviews were conducted in the actual work setting by a three-person panel where the interview process took two to three hours to complete. The process was validated by a sample of 250 current employees where each employee was interviewed and received feedback from the panel. Employees also self-rated their own job performance. A sub-sample of 30 employees was selected to rate and evaluate their perceptions of fairness of the performance interview process. The researchers “found that the performance interview evidenced good criterion-related validity, positive procedural justice perceptions, and no mean differences between men and woman or majority and minority group members” (p. 215). This study supports the use of a detailed job analysis as the starting point for generating interview questions and evaluation instruments, a component of interview structure.
Interview Questions, Rating Applicant Responses, and Anchored Scales

The foundation of the structured interview is rooted in following processes and procedures that are consistent and standardized for each applicant. Huffcutt and Arthur’s (1994) analysis of prior research found that using the same exact questions in the same exact order for each applicant resulted in the highest level of structure. In their model, they identified a second level of structure where interview questions were the same from applicant to applicant but where flexibility enabled the interviewer to “pursue interesting lines of discussion” (Campion et al., 1997, p. 662). The lowest level of structure as identified by Huffcutt and Arthur (1994) is the use of an outline of topics in lieu of interview questions or where the interviewer is free to ask any question during the selection interview. “It was recognized early that standardized questions might ease candidate comparisons and improve validity (Otis, 1944)” (Campion et al., 1997, p. 663).

Two types of structured interview questions, the situational and the behavioral description question have emerged as dominant within the employment interview where a number of individual studies have been published over the past 25 years (Barkely, 1999; Barklay, 2001; Campion, Campion, & Hudson, 1994; Conway & Peneno, 1999; Ellis et al., 2002; Huffcutt, Conway, Roth, & Klehe, 2004; Levaskina & Campion, 2006, Lievens & DePaepe, 2004; Morgeson et al., 2009; Pulakos & Schmitt, 1995; Simola et al., 2007; Taylor & Small, 2002; van der Zee et al., 2002).

Table 3 provides examples of the situational and behavioral description interview question types.
Table 3

*The Situational and Behavioral Description Interview Question*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Type</th>
<th>Sample Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Situational interview question</td>
<td>Suppose you were working with an employee who you knew greatly disliked performing a particular job task. You were in a situation where you needed this task completed, and this employee was the only one available to assist you. What would you do to motivate the employee to perform this task?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral description interview question</td>
<td>Think about a time when you have to motivate an employee to perform a job task that he or she disliked but that you needed the individual to do. How did you handle this situation?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* The situational and behavioral description interview questions are from Pulakos and Schmitt (1995, p. 292).

Connecting interview questions to an interview evaluation system which includes ratings and anchored scales can “reduce ambiguity and semantic differences” (Campion et al., 1997, p. 675) among interviewers and across applicants. To develop “such scales involves collecting example answers, judging the goodness of the answers, and selecting unambiguous answers to illustrate points along the scale” (p. 675). The use of anchored rating scales based on a job analysis and used to evaluate candidate responses can improve objectivity, have higher interrater reliability and interrater agreement, and reduce interview contamination (Campion et al., 1997; Maas, 1965; Vance, Kuhnert, & Farr, 1978).

A significant level of research has examined the situational and behavioral description interview question and applicant response ratings and anchored scales. In the 1980s, Latham and Saari’s (1984) research supported the situational interview as a strong indicator of future job performance where the reliability of the situational interview was tested. They examined the relationship between what an applicant said he or she would
do when answering a situational question and what he or she was observed doing in the work environment. The situational interview “is based on the premise that a person’s intentions and behaviors are related. Using this approach, a job analysis, namely, the critical incident technique, is conducted to identify behaviors critical to effective performance on the job” (Latham and Saari, 1984, p. 569). Their results showed that there was a relationship between what the applicant responded to during the situational interview and the behaviors observed by others of that individual’s performance.

In the 1990s, Campion, Champion, and Hudson (1994) examined the structured interview and its incremental validity related to a series of cognitive ability tests. In addition to a correlation between the interview question and test, the researchers attempted to determine the incremental validity of the situational and behavioral description interview question through research at a southeastern United States pulp mill. In this study, a highly structured interview system used 15 situational questions and 15 behavioral description questions aligned with a job analysis and anchored rating scales. Interviews were conducted by trained manager panels. Applicants also completed nine cognitive ability and other employment tests aligned with the job analysis. The applicant’s current job performance was determined by a six-item anchored measurement system. The researchers concluded that past behavioral description interview questions had a higher validity than hypothetical, situational questions but determined that the difference for the total performance was not significant. “However, past questions had incremental validity beyond future questions in predicting total performance” (Campion et al., 1998, p. 1000) where the situational questions did not have incremental validity.
Also studied in the 1990s was research conducted by Pulakos and Schmitt (1995) to determine whether the situational interview or behavioral description interview questions produced higher levels of validity for future job performance. They also sought to determine the incremental validity of the interview compared to traditional employment testing and determine if subgroups within the sample, including race and gender differences, produced different results for the interview and related rating system used. Pulakos and Schmitt (1995) found that the behavioral description interview question was “superior to their situational counterparts with respect to predictions of performance for the present professional job” (p. 306). In fact, interviews in which applicants were asked the same job-related questions and whose answers were evaluated using specifically designed anchored rating scales were likely to produce higher levels of validity than other types of interviews. In addition, the interview added incrementally to cognitive ability in explaining variance in the performance ratings.” (p. 306). With respect to differences between subgroups in the study, the researchers found very small mean differences. Pulakos and Schmitt’s (1995) research is one of the earlier studies on situational and behavioral description interviews where the researchers recommended further research on question types. “Situational and experience-based interview questions may, in fact, be more or less valid for certain types of jobs or job applicants” (p. 306).

In the late 1990s Conway and Peneno (1999) compared general, situational, and behavioral description interview questions related to construct validity and the job applicant’s reaction to these questions. They concluded that general questions tend to be preferred by the applicant and yield information about the applicant’s personality and his or her understanding of the job opening. The situational and behavioral description
questions proved to produce greater construct validity of the job applicant’s future job performance. The researchers suggested it was “useful to employ a mix of structured interview questions types” (p. 504). Mixing the interview’s content with situational, behavioral description, and general questions “can increase construct coverage and also potentially result in more positive applicant reactions” (p. 502). The researchers’ findings suggested that general questions are more favorably received by the applicant than situational or behavioral description questions. While they have “stronger rationales and criterion-related validity evidence” (p. 501), the researchers suggest that applicant reaction to the interview could be improved through using a variety of questioning types.

The trend toward analysis of the effects of situational and behavioral description interview questions continued into the 21st century. Huffcut, Weekley, Wiesner, Degroot, and Jones (2001) compare situational and behavioral description interview questions to determine if one was more effective than the other to determine validity for higher-level employment positions. They attempted to replicate the study by Pulakos and Schmitt (1995) where it was hypothesized that situational interviews may not be as effective for high-level hiring decisions that for low-level hiring. Their results confirmed the results of Palakos and Schmitt (1995) where they also found that a variance existed between the situational and behavioral description interview questions and applicant ratings related to the level of position interviewed. Their results “show diminished effectiveness for situational interviews and continued effectiveness for behavioral description interviews” (Huffcutt et al., 2001, p. 639).

Taylor and Small (2002) added to the literature related to interview questions and rating scales through their examination of behavioral description and situational interview
questions to determine if one type of question yielded more validity than the other. The researchers gathered interview questions from various studies and literature database searches, coded the interview questions either situational or behavioral description, and also coded the related question-specific anchored rating scales to determine inter-rater reliability. The researchers’ results were consistent with past literature where both question types which offered high predictive validity. Yet they found, contrary to past research, that behavioral description questions had a higher coefficient and more superior validity predicting an applicant’s job performance, regardless of level of position, high or low. Taylor and Small explained that this may be attributed to past behavioral questions assessing an applicant’s motivation on past performance or that the applicant’s exposure to a related, past behavior is measured differently with behaviors and experiences verses future hypothetical situations.

Huffcutt, Conway, Roth, and Klehe (2004) conducted a meta-analysis of 54 studies investigating the validity of situational interviews where applicants responded to hypothetical job situations, verses behavioral description interviews where applicants responded to past behavior or job background questions. This study aimed to determine if either question type determined a candidate’s success on job complexity and job performance. Based on findings, the researchers cautioned the use of situational interview questions for highly complex jobs and found that both types of interview questions were comparable for low and medium complex positions. These finding reinforce the previous studies conducted by Huffcutt et al., 2001 and Small and Taylor 2002.
Interview Panels and Note Taking

Taking notes during the selection interview and organizing a team of multiple interviewers, or a panel, where all members interview each job applicant add to high levels of interview structure in various ways. These strategies may reduce interviewer bias (Burnett, Fan, Molowidlo, & Degroot, 1998; Campion, et al., 1988), cancel out random error (Dipboye, 1992), increase the recall of information (Stasser & Titus, 1987), and when scores are combined produce more reliability (Dixion, Wang, Calvin, Deneen, & Tomlinson, 2002).

Note taking is a widely accepted component of interview structure where it is “perceived as a way to increase a listener’s attention to and understanding of information presented by a speaker” (Burnett et al., 1998, p. 375). Yet, results focused on the validity of note taking are mixed. Burnett et al., (1998) conducted three studies to investigate note taking behaviors and interview validity. They found in one study that voluntary note taking verses those who took no notes resulted in more valid applicant ratings. In the second study they found no “clear differences” (p.391) in validity between the note takers and non-note takers, and in the third study they found that those who did not take notes made ratings that were “just as valid’ (p.391) as the note takers.

A study for Brtek and Motowidlo (2002) further explored note taking. In their study they tested interview procedural accountability where the interviewers were rated on their own overall interviewing performance. In a simulated laboratory environment, 338 undergraduate students watched video tapes and rated 60 manager interviews. Their study found with respect to procedural accountability and note taking that this study “did
not support the hypothesis that note-taking mediates the effect on procedure accountability on validity” (p. 189).

Unlike note taking, the panel interview and use of consistent interviewers for each applicant has yielded more favorable results. Dixon et al., (2002) reviewed studies on the panel interview and describe eight important elements of a panel interview format based on findings related to interview reliability and validity. They recommend that panel interviews perform a job analysis, develop situational, behavioral description, or a mix of both types of interview questions, develop and use anchored rating scales, select interview teams of three to six members, train the panel, conduct the interview, evaluate the candidates using rankings and ratings, and base their interview selection decisions on subsequent employee performance.

These findings are aligned with previous research, namely Huffcutt and Woehr (1999) who compiled 123 interview studies to determine the relationship between training, standardizations, note taking, and interview panels and the validity of the employment interview. Their findings identified that using the same interviewers as a panel across all candidates “appears to improve validity” (p.557).

**Interviewer Training**

“Training is an important element of structure in that it increases the likelihood of using other elements of interview structure” (Simoa et al., 2007, p. 32). Campion, et al., (1997) define interviewer training as less a component of the structured interview yet important to ensure all other elements of interview structure are deployed correctly. While the structured interview has gained support over the past 30 years, several recent studies still report a disconnect of organizations adopting research-based interview
practices (Simola et al., 2007; van der Zee et al., 2002; Williamson, Campion, Malos, Roehling, & Campion, 1997).

Barclay’s (2001) research focused on the implementation of structured interviewing practices in the United Kingdom where interviewer training and adoption of structured interview practices was explored. The majority of the organizations in this study trained their interviewers for one to three days and 80 percent reported they used an external consultant to facilitate this training. Of the 49 companies surveyed, the results identified that 44 percent of the organizations indicated using structured interviewing questions for more than five years, 35 percent indicted the use of interview structure for two to five years, and 21 percent indicted that situational and behavioral description questions had been adopted into their interview practices for less than two years. A few concerns were raised related to training within this study. First, 14 percent of the survey respondents reported that they received no training on structured interview question techniques. Second, reports from respondents indicted that some line managers needed to be persuaded to use structured interview question techniques so concerns with assuring compliance with these strategies were raised. Also, respondents reported the preparation time commitment it takes to develop good situational and behavioral description questions may pose challenges for organizations to fully develop structured interview questions.

The recent study, as described earlier in this chapter, by Simola et al. (2007) focused on several components of interview structure including an investigation of interviewer training. Of the 301 human resource professionals in this study, 66 percent reported receiving their training in college, 33 percent received training in a session or
workshop conducted by the organization of which they were employed, 40.5 percent received training at a formal workshop conducted by an external consultant, and 5.5 percent reported having received no interviewer training. This study concurs with other research findings where training is linked to the adoption of structured interview practices. If interviewer training is not widely recognized as a need by organizations then the adoption of structured interview practices will continue to find limited application.

**Structured Interview Summary**

“One of the most important functions of the interview is to help interviewers assess the degree to which a candidate has the necessary skills and competencies to be successful on the job” (Howard & Johnson, 2010, p.14). Over the last 100 years the selection interview has yielded a number of repeating themes where the “structure, validity, reliability, and predictive power of the interview have been investigated, analyzed, and reexamined through the eyes of a myriad different researchers” (Buckley et al., 2000, p. 113). While an extensive body of research exists on the interview, study is far from exhausted. In fact, much of today’s research is focused more on reexamining existing evidence than investigating new approaches. For today’s organizations, success is increasingly dependent on the quality of its human capital. “Organizations that fail to take steps to remedy poor interview practices may well endanger their ability to compete in today’s economy” (Graves & Karren, 1996, p. 178). Therefore, it is essential that organizations maximize the effectiveness of their personnel selection interview.
Interview Practices Within K-12 Educational Systems

This section of the review of related literature explores current interview practices found in the K-12 educational system. Selecting the very best teachers is arguably the most important responsibility of a school administrator (Mason & Schroeder, 2010; Stronge & Hindman, 2006). “Crucial hiring can increase growth of students and accelerate change in the culture and dynamics of a school” (Mason & Schroeder, 2010, p. 186). Poor hiring decisions not only are a cost in school system resources, but have an adverse impact on student learning and student achievement (Hindman & Stronge, 2009). Given the high stakes to students and the future costs to taxpayers, it is important to closely scrutinize the teacher interview process and determine the validity of its practices. If good hires lead to good schools then do the current interview practices used in education lead to good hires?

Generally the teacher selection and hiring process consists of two primary functions: pre-screening candidates through review of application tools, such as the job application, resume, letters of recommendation, and Praxis scores; and through the selection interview (Rutledge et al., 2008; Stronge & Hindman, 2003). Pre-screening applicants “serves the general purpose of filtering the initial applicant pool by eliminating those who do not meet set requirements” (Rutledge at al., 2008, p. 239). It is the interview, however that continues to be the most popular and important tool in the teacher selection process (Barclay, 1999; Delli & Vera, 2003; & Rutledge at al., 2008). “Despite a breath of tools available to employers in the screening and selection process, many employers choose not to use them (Rutledge at al., 2008, p. 239).
Additionally, in lieu of using research-based interview practices, several studies indicate that teacher selection decisions are often based on a candidate’s’ personal characteristics, attitudes, and dispositions, all of which have been deemed necessary for teacher effectiveness (DeArmond, Gross, & Goldhaber, 2010; Ebmeier & Ng, 2005; Harris, Rutledge, Ingle, & Thompson 2006; Kersten, 2008). “Hence, school administrators may not use structured interviews if they decrease the ability to ascertain important candidate dispositions such as personality traits” (Delli & Vera, 2003, p. 146).

This area of the review of literature explores various selection and interview practices found in educational research literature and include common K-12 hiring approaches, the role of the principal, the various tools used in the teacher selection decision, and structured interview practices found in the educational literature.

**Common K-12 Hiring Approaches**

“Studies on the process of hiring find that districts and schools differ in how they organize hiring” (Rutledge et al., 2008). Upon investigation, some school administrators use a centralized hiring approach, some a decentralized approach, and for most schools a combination of both centralized and decentralized hiring practices are used (Liu & Johnson, 2006; Wise, Darling-Hammond, & Berry, 1987). “In centralized hiring, administrators at the district office carry out most of the hiring activities and have overall responsibility for assigning new teachers to positions in schools throughout the district” (Liu & Johnson, 2006, p. 332). In contrast, decentralized hiring empowers the in-school administrators, namely the school principal, to conduct the screening, interviewing, and selection of the applicant for the particular teaching position in the principal’s school (Liu & Johnson, 2006; Wise et al., 1987). School systems using a mix of centralized and
decentralized approaches typically have the school’s district office pre-screen applicants and allows the in-school principal to interview and select them (Liu & Johnson, 2006; & Rutledge et al, 2008).

Research illustrates that schools that practice centralized teacher selection are more likely to use components of the structured interview than schools using decentralized teacher selection practices (Lui & Johnson, 2006). School districts that centralize hiring “typically rely on standardized procedures for processing large batches of applications, and they tend to use generic job descriptions, standardized interview protocols, and/or criteria for evaluating candidates” (p. 332). Urban schools often are a model for centralized hiring where “principals of urban schools have, on average, less autonomy than their suburban and rural counterparts (Papa & Baxter, 2008, p. 98). Levin and Quinn (2003) outline the usual selection process that occurs in large urban schools.

Teachers (both new and experienced) apply for a position in the district through the central human resources department (HR). Upon receiving the application, HR staff members screen the submitted materials and decide whether to invite the applicant for a district interview. Typically, central HR staff members conduct the interviews; sometimes principals and teachers participate as well. Candidates who pass the district “prescreen” are considered worthy of hire. They are referred to principals for a school-level interview and a specific school placement. Once a principal has decided to hire a particular candidate, central HR processes the final paperwork, including a background check and contract. (Leven & Quinn, 2003, p. 9)
In contrast, rural schools tend to use decentralized teacher hiring where a variety of interview practices and levels of structure can be observed. Nichols (2004) investigated the recruiting and interviewing practices, including the use of consistent interviewing processes and protocols of 83 rural school districts located between the rural Ozark Plateau and Mississippi River. The results of this study indicated that schools with small student populations of under 500 students were “far less likely to have an identified protocol in place to recruit and interview teachers” (p. 43). Only one third reported having an organized interview protocol. In addition to the school districts surveyed, Nicholas interviewed eight teachers, and all interviewees perceived that there was no consistent or organized interview protocol used during their selection process.

Research conducted by Liu and Johnson (2006) further identified an emphasis on decentralized hiring practices of new teachers in our schools. In their study of teacher hiring practices in the states of California, Florida, Massachusetts, and Michigan they found that the majority of teachers were hired through a decentralized school selection system. The 486 teacher respondents of the study reported their perceptions of their hiring experience. Findings suggested that even though the new hire met and interviewed with the school’s principal, they reported limited interaction with school-based personnel. Respondents in this survey felt unapprised of the expectations and climate of the school and the teacher vacancy for which they would soon fill, a characteristic more often associated with centralized hiring practices then with decentralized hiring.

“How districts structure their hiring practices influences the opportunities schools and candidates have to exchange rich information about each other” (Liu & Johnson, 2006, p. 332). While centralized hiring practices allow for improved levels of school
structure, one consequence is that it does not take into account the specific teaching
vacancies or the overall characteristics or culture of a school. In-school administrators
often take into account the applicant’s fit within the school during the selection interview.

In addition to identifying key teacher qualities, school leaders attempt to match the
“compatibility of a candidate with the culture and values of the organizations” (Rutledge et al, 2008, p. 241). For school systems that are centralized “in many cases, districts hire
new teachers on the basis of their qualifications and only later find a school for them”

“Most school districts fall somewhere between these two extremes and divide
hiring activities between the central office and school site” (Liu & Johnson, 2006, p. 333). Typically, one might find that the initial pre-screening of a teacher applicant’s
qualifications and credentials are performed by the district’s central office where the
interview and final selection decision is conducted by the building principal. Liu and
Kardos’s (2002) study of New Jersey teacher hiring practices found that roughly one
third of teachers were hired under highly centralized processes, one third by highly
decentralized processes, and the remaining third of teachers were hired by moderately
centralized and decentralized processes. Recently, DeArmond, Gross and Goldhaber’s
(2010) qualitative study of 10 elementary schools in a large urban school district
illustrated a mixed approach. In their study they found that each of the 10 principals was
responsible for interviewing and selecting teacher applicants. The principals in this
study, by-in-large, had the responsibility for the final hiring decision. DeArmond et al.
reported using components of interview structured, including district-run interview
training sessions, school-based interview teams, common predetermined interview questions and scoring rubrics between and among the 10 schools in the study.

The Role of the Principal

“Without exception, the single most important task of a principal is to hire highly qualified, exceptional staff” (Mason & Schroeder, 2010, p. 186). The literature on the principal’s role in teacher selection is diverse, yet not extensive where research ranges from hiring practices, to the principal’s attributes, to the qualities that principals have historically looked for in a candidate during the interview (Baker & Cooper, 2005; DeArmond et al., 2010; Harris et al, 2010; Kersten, 2008; Ralph et al., 1998; Rutledge, Harris, Ingle, 2010; Torff & Sessions, 2005; Young, 2005). Historically, the principal has played a key role in the teacher selection interview (Liu & Kardos, 2002) where he or she participates in 94 percent of the teacher interviews conducted (Strauss et al., 2000). With the growing body of research linking good teaching to increased student achievement, the weight of responsibility on the principal to get the decision right virtually impacts all other strategic goals of a school (Hindman & Strong, 2009; Mason & Schroeder, 2010).

A number of studies centering on the principal’s personal attributes and preferences sheds interesting insights on the teacher screening and selection process. In the study by Young (2005) principals’ screening decisions were assessed to determine whether there was a relationship between the gender of the applicant, the gender of the principal, and the type of vacant school position, teacher or school counselor. A total of 236 principals, both male and female participated in this study. The results clearly found that female principals preferred female applicants and male principals preferred male
applicants, regardless of the type of position for which the applicant was applying, teacher or school counselor.

Baker & Cooper (2005) explored the relationship between the principal’s academic preparation in undergraduate schools and the teacher applicants they hire. The researchers hypothesized that principals would be more likely to hire teacher applicants with similar backgrounds and like university training. They found that a principal’s academic background did impact their decision to hire teachers with similar undergraduate school backgrounds. This was especially true in high-poverty schools where principals were more than three times likely to hire teacher applicants with similar education backgrounds. In stark contrast, a study by Wise, Darling-Hammond, and Berry (1988) revealed an “anti-intellectualism” among some administrators where the “most academically able teachers are not necessarily the most likely to be hired” (p. 83). In their study, they found that bias included the perception that highly academic teacher applicants did not possess the ability to connect with students with different academic abilities. Ballou’s (1996) study of recent college graduates who were hired into teaching positions where the study found that graduates of more selective undergraduate universities were no more likely to be hired than those graduates of other universities.

Several studies identify applicant characteristics which are preferred by principals. Communication skills and good English usage during the interview has consistently been reported as a key preferred quality (Braun, Willems, Brown, & Green, 1987; Kersten, 2008; Mason & Schroeder (2010); Ralph et al., 1998; Stronge, & Hindman, 2003). A litany of applicant personal qualities can be listed from the literature that is preferred by principals. These include an applicant who is caring, enthusiastic,
hardworking, self-motivated, and honest, has a pleasant personal appearance, is tactful and positive and the list goes on (Braun et al., 1987; Harris et al., 2010; Kersten, 2008; Mason and Schroeder, 2010). A host of negative applicant qualities has also identified by school principals within the educational literature. Principals have reported off-putting behaviors, such as gum chewing, unprofessional attire, and applicants who are unprepared for the interview, to name a few (Kersten, 2008).

Several teacher professional qualities have been identified by principals that enhance the selection decision. These include applicants that are up-to-date with educational research, trends, and best practices where the applicant is able to transfer and relate these strategies to their classroom experiences (Kersten, 2008). Research has also identified other professional qualities principals look for during the selection interview. These qualities include an applicant who has prior experience working with children, teaching experience, strong content knowledge, knowledge of teaching strategies, classroom management skills, and understanding the special needs of students (Abernathy, Forsyth, & Mitchell, 2001; Braun et al., 1987; DeArmond et al, 2010; Rutledge et al., 2010; Stronge & Hindman, 2003; Torff & Sessions, 2005).

Two studies further illustrate principal perspectives of teacher applicants. The first is a Canadian study by Ralph et al., (1998) which investigated the hiring criteria used by school administrators to assess prospective teachers during the selection process. Sixty-nine administrators indicated the importance of various teacher attributes, including university preparation and teaching skills and abilities. Findings indicated that administrators value the applicant’s preservice teaching internship and believed it to be most important component of the university’s course work. They also found that a
“novices’ ability to establish genuine personal interrelationships with students and others crucial to success in teaching” (p.50) where they rated the human dimension, or the personality of the applicant, higher than the applicant’s subject expertise or teaching pedagogy. The three broad findings of this study are an applicants’ “ability to communicate clearly and positively with all individuals in the educational process, their ability to use instructional skills, and their university-related background and experiences” (p. 54) where the applicant’s university grades were ranked as least important.

Harris et al., (2010) conducted an in-depth study of applicant characteristics preferred by a principals. Results suggested that principals prefer a mix of personal and professional qualities including applicants who were caring, enthusiastic, strong teaching skills and strong content knowledge. Their finding also identified that principals wanted to create an organizational mix where they desired creating a school climate that included differing genders, races, experiences, and skills. Principals indicated a preference for hiring teachers with similar work habits as those already teaching within the school.

Even with the ongoing research examining the selection interview and distinctive applicant qualities, a clear and consistent formula for teacher selection remains elusive for school principals and school interview teams alike. The qualitative study by DeArmond et al., (2010) of principals in ten elementary schools illustrated the frustrations of school leaders as they attempted to recruit and select teachers. Principals expressed having a gut feeling where the principal at one school said:
“You don’t really know [if a candidate will be good]….We have had candidates…who we though were the best, their answers were so good, and thought, yeah, this is the one…and then it didn’t work out” (p. 335).

Another principal explained,

“I look for genuineness. I look for that individual that…has a tone of social justice….That’s kind of a gut and heart feeling. I try to really hone in on that” (p.335).

And in other words,

“I wish we have a way where we could say, “This is exactly what we look for,’ but it’s intangible” (p.335).

**Tools Necessary for Teacher Selection**

Administrators report using a number of tools to ascertain information about an applicant. The two primary tools used in the teacher selection are the job application and its related document and the selection interview itself (Stronge and Hindman, 2003). The job application’s related documents often includes a cover letter, the applicants resume, college transcript, letters of recommendation, and teaching certifications and licenses.

Research demonstrates that positive references that highlight an applicant’s prior teaching experience carries a lot of weight and impacts a principal’s decision to hire. A study of 271 school administrators in Wyoming indicated that letters of recommendation from individuals who have observed the applicants teaching were influential in their hiring decisions. (Braun et al., 1987). The study by Rutledge, et al., (2008) of Florida principals and administrators indicated that letters of reference yielded a very high rating, followed only by the interview and prior teacher experience. In a Pennsylvania study (Strauss et
past performance in teaching and references or recommendations were the most influential factors used to narrow the applicant pool.

An applicant’s college grades are a far less important tool to aid in the selection decision. The study by Ralph et al., (1998) investigating hiring criteria found that while university-related background and experiences, specifically the supervised student teaching experience, were considered important during the selection decision, the applicant’s university grades were ranked as least important. The results of a study by Rutledge et al. (2008) confirm the findings where principals ranked college grades low in importance for their selection decision.

The use of selection decision tools, such as teaching demonstrations during the selection interview and portfolios used to illustrate an applicant’s prior experiences has also been studied. Kersten’s (2008) Illinois study of 298 principals found that there was little use of teaching demonstrations during the selection interview where only 7.4 percent of principals identified its use. In a study of new teachers in New Jersey most cited that they were not asked to teach a demonstration lesson as part of the hiring process (Liu & Kardos, 2002). Mason and Schroeder’s (2010) examination of the hiring practices in 60 public schools located in southeast Wisconsin found that “videos, demonstration teaching or presentations of teaching practice, and portfolios were not used by the principals surveyed” (p.191). While tools such as teaching demonstrations are believed to inform a principal’s selection decision, principals are most often prevented from actually observing a potential teacher because of time constraints (Braun et al., 1987; Kersten, 2008; Liu, 2002). In a study by Papa and Baxter (2008), principals in urban schools reported it unlikely for that applicants to demonstrate teaching a lesson
“during the first interview; and they are less likely to conduct a second interview. In other words, urban schools devote less time to the hiring process” (p. 99-100).

Some schools have turned to commercially designed interview tools and protocols to guide their new teacher selection decisions (Ebmeier & Ng, 2005; Kersten, 2008; Ralph et al., 1998; Rutledge et al., 2008; Rockoff, Jacob, Kane, & Staiger, 2008; Wise et al., 1988; Young & Delli, 2002). While several commercially designed interview tools are available to schools, this review of literature will only review a few current studies.

One such study by Young and Delli (2002) investigated two sets of teachers in two public school districts that used a commercially designed interview tool, the Teacher Perceiver Instrument (TPI), to determine their selection of new teachers during the interview process. The researchers compared teacher job performance against the score received on the TPI. Two variables were measured, the teachers absentee rate and the teachers performance as determined by their supervisor. Young and Delli found a six percent variance between the principal’s evaluation and the teacher’s attendance as compared with the TPI, thus suggesting that schools using the TPI can likely increase the reliability of their teacher selection system.

A second study for Ebmeier and Ng (2005) tested the Interactive Computer Interview System (ICIS) instrument in urban school districts to distinguish between average and exemplary teachers as rated by school administrators. In addition to the ICIS instrument, additional questions were added to the interview tool specific to teaching in urban schools. A total of 30 classroom teachers were selected for this study. Two graduate students, both school administrators and experienced interviewers, conducted the interviews after receiving extensive training. A computer program randomly selected
interview questions from a bank of questions arranged into themes. Applicants verbally answered computer generated questions asked by an interviewer. Each interview response was scored using rubrics and rating scales for both the ICIS and for the additional questions relating to urban teaching. The results found significant correlations between the interview score and teacher effectiveness as defined by school administrators. “Regression analysis indicated a significant amount of variance in teachers’ effectiveness ratings could be predicated from their scores on the interview instrument” (p.201).

Lastly, Rockoff et al.’s, (2008) study of teacher applicant characteristics found that “while use of commercial selection instruments has grown considerably, there is little systematic evidence on the power of these instruments for predicting teacher effectiveness” (p.11). The researchers found that no single metric offered a reliable way to predict teacher effectiveness, yet suggested that when metrics were combined there was a significant relationship to predict student achievement. While the design of commercially developed selection tools has some reported promise, more attention and further research is needed to explore its options for schools.

**Structured Interview Practices Found in Education Literature**

By in large, while there is presence of structured interview practices as defined by Campion et al. (1997) in the K-12 educational literature, studies focusing on the structured interview as a predictor of future job, or teaching performance, are very limited. Educational teacher selection research can claim the use of panel interviewing as one documented strategy (Braun et al., 1987; DeArmond et al., 2010; Kersten, 2008; Mason & Schroeder, 2010; Strauss et al., 2000). In fact, Mason and Schroeder (2010)
found in their study of hiring practices in southeast Wisconsin that 91.7 percent of the time a panel interview occurred. Panels, as they described, were diverse and included the principal, other teachers, special education teachers, parents, and other administrations. This study also found that superintendents participated in the selection interview only 13 percent of the time and indicated that decentralized interview panel teams conducted the interviews.

Commercially developed selection tools are another way schools are conducting interviews using a structured approach. These tools provide highly structured processes including standard interview questions, rating scales, and interviewer training. Examples of these tools, while not exhaustive, include the Interactive Computer Interview System (ICIS), Teacher Quality Index, Ventures for Excellence, and Gallup Teacher Perceiver Instrument (TPI). For example, “each item of the TPI is read to an applicant by a trained assessor, and the trained assessor scored the responses of the applicant on each item of the TPI” (Young and Delli, 2002, p. 599). Young and Delli also reported that using TPI for teacher selection required “more than 100 hours of study and instruction in the administration and scoring of this instrument” (p. 599).

The type of interview questions used during the selection interview is one of the most notable elements of structured interviewing practices found in educational literature. Behavioral description interview questions are prevalent (Clement, D’Amico, & Protheroe, 2000; Ebmeier & Ng, 2005; Stronge & Hindman, 2003; Stronge & Hindman, 2006; Hindman & Stronge, 2009). Clement et al. (2000) designed a guide, based on research, to assist school principals with the tasks of recruiting and selecting teachers. Behavioral description interview questions and techniques are outlined in the guide
where it illustrates the point that a teacher candidate’s past classroom behaviors can predict the candidate’s future successes at the school and in the classroom. The authors provide a variety of behavioral description interview questions related to an applicant’s experiences in planning, developing, and implementing curriculum, classroom management and organization, homework and grading, communicating and interacting with parents, and professional growth.

The work of James Stronge and Jennifer Hindman has been the most comprehensive research to date which bridges the gap between research-based interview practices found in organizational and social science literature and selection decisions unique to the K-12 educational community. Their Teacher Quality Index is a structured interview protocol that links many of the components of interview structure as defined by Campion et al., (1997) with effective teacher qualities (Stronge & Hindman, 2006). Hindman and Stronge’s (2009) study investigated the degree to which principals adopted and used structured interview practices in their hiring of teacher applicants. Results indicated that while they used consistent questioning during the interview, including situational, behavioral description, and job knowledge questions, less than half used anchored rating scales to evaluate teacher applicants. Most alarming was the lack of formal training administrators received related to interviewing. “With so much dependent on the right hiring decisions, it makes both fiscal and common sense to train administrators in teacher interviewing” (p.7).

Stronge and Hindman (2003) identify six broad domains, based on research, which defines the key attributes, behaviors, and attitudes of effective teachers. Table 2-3 outlines the researchers’ six domains which, they explain should be used to guide the
teacher selection interview. Also included in Table 4 are the teacher qualities related to the domain and sample behavioral description interview questions.

Table 4

Domains of Teacher Effectiveness as a Guide to Selecting Teacher Applicants (Stronge & Hindman, 2003, p. 50)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domains</th>
<th>Teacher qualities</th>
<th>Sample interview questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prerequisites of effective teachers</td>
<td>Verbal ability</td>
<td>“Explain how your coursework and/or participating in professional development offerings has been useful in your instruction of students.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knowledge of teaching and learning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Certification status</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Content knowledge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teaching experience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher as a person</td>
<td>Caring</td>
<td>“Share with me an experience dealing with students that student teaching or other professional development opportunities had not prepared you for. What did you do, and what would you do differently now?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fairness and respect</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interaction with students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enthusiasm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dedicated to teaching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reflective practice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom management and organization</td>
<td>Classroom management</td>
<td>“Describe how you establish a positive and productive learning environment in your classroom.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disciplining students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizing for instruction</td>
<td>Importance of instruction</td>
<td>“Tell me about how you plan and organize substitute lesson plans.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time allocation</td>
<td>“Describe the key components of a lesson on the topic of ____ beginning with the lesson planning and moving through student assessment.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teaching expectations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Instructional planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementing instruction</td>
<td>Instructional strategies</td>
<td>“Describe a specific instructional setting in which you differentiated instruction.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Content and expectations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Complicity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Questioning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student engagement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring student progress and potential</td>
<td>Homework</td>
<td>“Tell me about the homework you assign and what you do with the students’ work.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monitoring learning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Differentiation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interview Practices Within K-12 Educational Systems Summary

It can be said that the expert teacher possesses pedagogical content knowledge that is more flexible and innovatively employed in instruction; they are more able to
improvise and to alter instruction in response to contextual features of the classroom situation; they understand at a deeper level the reasons for individual student success and failure on any given academic task; their understanding of students is such that they are more able to provide developmentally appropriate learning tasks that engage, challenge, and even intrigue students, without boring or overwhelming them; they are more able to anticipate and plan for difficulties student are likely to encounter with new concepts; they can more easily improvise when things do not run smoothly; they are more able to generate accurate hypotheses about the causes of student success and failure; and they bring a distinct passion to their work. (Hattie, 2009, p.261)

The teacher hiring decision has broad implications to students, schools, and local communities. Recent research emphasizes that good teaching and good teachers have a positive impact on student achievement (Hindman & Stronge, 2009). Finding good teachers through well-designed, research-based interview and selection practices to teach in our schools is more critical now than ever, yet the research related to clear strategies and methods are mixed. Based on the review of literature, schools deploy some of the interview research-based strategies found in industrial and organizational literature, but there remains ample room for continued study on the topic of teacher selection.

**Chapter Summary**

The interview remains an integral component of the hiring process in both the public and private sectors of our workforce (Buckley et al., 2000; Castetter & Young, 2000). Studies dating from the 1920s until the present have analyzed the interview process, types of questions and their validity in predicting the effectiveness of new hires.
The interview process has been refined and redefined in the process but the basic tenants and reliance on the selection interview remains (Buckley et al., 2000).

Studies have focused on the impact of the structured verses unstructured interview. Does a scripted, controlled interview environment with applicant ratings, and anchored scales yield more reliable data in which to base hiring decisions? Many current studies conclude that the answer is yes and suggest that structured interviewing techniques result in more consistent, unbiased decisions (Campion et al., 1997; Pursell et al., 1980).

Organizations that use a job analysis focused on employee performance benchmarks to develop interview questions begin the validation process for the selection interview (Morgeson et al., 2009). Much of the current research that analyzed the interview process focuses on interview questioning; specifically situational verses behavioral description questions. A mixture of both types of questions is recommended, but behavioral description questions have been identified as a more valid and reliable indicator of future job performance (Huffcutt et al., 2004; Taylor & Small, 2002). Note taking during the interview resulted in mixed conclusions (Brtek & Motowidlo, 2002). Diverse training and evaluation tools were variables that added to the lack of clarity for structured interview practices in many studies that were investigated.

The literature review of interview practices in education fall behind industrial and social science literature regarding the adoption of interview structure principles but added to the field of interview practices in categories and characteristics unique to educators. Unique to education was analysis on the role of the principal, centralized verses decentralized hiring systems, and the role of pre-screening documents. Studies on the
interviewer’s role in hiring practices in education tended to be recent and limited in scope. There is a great deal of future study still needed to investigate this area.

Educational studies demonstrated a wide degree of variance on how schools hire and what qualities they look for in successful candidates. All agree on qualities of ideal teachers, but many educator interviewers had little or no interview training to help guide their selection decisions (Baker & Cooper, 2005; DeArmond et al., 2010; Harris et al, 2010; Hindman & Stronge, 2009). Principals tended to hire like-minded, teacher applicants for their schools and often hired based on a gut feeling (Young, 2005; DeArmond et al., 2010). Structured interview practices were more the norm in large, urban schools (Levin & Quinn, 2003; Papa & Baxter, 2008) where far less interview structure was found in small, rural schools (Nichols, 2004).

Now add in the complications facing CTE hiring. Key structured interview educational components used to select the typical CTE teacher applicants are non-existent. Career and technical educators come from industry, not universities. Career and technical educators do not have transcripts, or student teaching reports; they do not take a Praxis exam. Behavioral description interview questions must be tailored to experiences in the workforce, not in the classroom. How does a CTE administrator know and determine if a good welder will make a good teacher? Most importantly, what are the best practices for the selection interview as they are applied to the unique CTE hiring process?

The purpose of this study was to examine the extent to which research-based interview practices, including structure, are used during the selection of new CTE teachers. This study also sought to identify interview questions asked by CTE
administrators that they perceived most influenced the selection and hiring decisions.

Campion et al.’s., (1997) 15 components of interview structure was used as the theoretical framework in this qualitative analysis.
CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

This chapter discusses the methodology that was used to pursue this research study. This chapter restates the problem and the purpose of the study including the research questions. This chapter also discusses the researcher’s identity, research design, including the sampling strategy and participant selection, instrumentation, data collection, and data analysis. Additionally, the issues of verification, ethical issues, and the chapter summary are presented.

The Problem and Purpose of the Study

Unlike the academic teacher who has years of teacher training at a university, a teaching practicum, and experiences that lead to an individual earning a teaching credential, a career and technical education (CTE) teacher typically is hired and placed in the classroom with no pre-service experience or training. Career and technical administrators are faced with hiring CTE teachers who have little or no formal teaching experience and placing them directly into classrooms, often immediately upon employment. New CTE teachers are then coached and placed in an alternative preparation and certification route, that recognizes their years of work and trade experience in place of pre-service teacher preparation (Walter & Gray, 2002).

School administrators hiring the typical academic teacher use behavioral description interview questions during the selection process which aid and inform their selection decision (Clement, 2009; Hindman & Stronge, 2009; Stronge & Hindman, 2006). Using behavioral description interview questions enables the teacher applicant to respond using their past classroom experiences and provides information that school
administrators use to gauge applicant responses related to good educational practice. Career and technical educators may certainly ask behavioral description interview questions of CTE teacher applicants during the hiring interview. But linking interview questions to prior teaching knowledge is often not applicable due to a lack of prior classroom experience. Career and technical administrators must seek other strategies during the selection interview to determine an applicant’s fit within the school environment.

One hundred years of organizational and industrial research supports that conducting a selection interview using a structured approach improves the reliability and the validity of the interview and serves as an accurate predictor of future job success (Buckley, Norris, & Wiese, 2000). The research of Campion, Palmer, and Campion (1997) resulted in a blueprint of 15 components of interview structure that are recommended for today’s organizations, public and private sector alike, for improving hiring and selection decision making.

The purpose of this study was to examine the extent to which research-based interview practices, including structure, are used during the selection of new CTE teachers. This study also sought to identify interview questions asked by CTE administrators that are perceived to most impact the selection decision.

Research Questions

This study addressed two research questions which guided the acquisition of data needed to address the research problem:

1. To what extent and how is structure used during the CTE teacher interview process?
2. What are the CTE teacher interview questions asked by administrators that are perceived to most influence the selection and hiring decision?

**Researcher Identify**

Prior to describing the methodology of this study, it is important to describe the researcher and her motives for undertaking this study. The researcher has been fascinated with the CTE teacher selection and preparation process since her entry into a career and technical center, then referred to as Vo-Tech, as a social studies teacher over 15 years ago. As a traditionally certified social studies teacher, she started at an area career and technical center (CTC) with all of the traditional pre-service training that is typically afforded to aspiring teachers. As an academic teacher, she had practical and theoretical training not typical of her CTE counterparts.

In the early 2000s she became a CTC administrator in Pennsylvania, and in January 2009, the researcher accepted an assistant director position. This role required her to interview and assist with the selection of all new teachers. In an effort to improve her own interview practices, she began to research interview strategies specifically related to CTE and found little or no information on this field of study. What she did discover was literature and models relevant to hiring and selecting academic teachers who followed a traditional career path into education (Clement, 2009; Hindman & Stronge, 2009; Stronge & Hindman, 2006). She also found a substantial body of research within the industrial and social science literature that posits the use of a structured interview process aids in predicting an applicant’s future work performance (Campion, Campion, & Hudson, 1994; Conway & Peneno, 1999; Ellis, West, Ryan, & DeShon,
The researcher’s interest in the topic and the lack of research-based interview practices unique to CTE satisfied many of the epistemological interests of the researcher and the desire to pursue an in-depth qualitative inquiry. It is important to note that due to the small pool of eligible candidates for the study and the researcher’s career history in CTE, the researcher had varying levels of professional contact with the participants in this study.

**Research Design**

“Research design is the plan, structure and strategy of investigation conceived so as to obtain answers to research questions and to control variance” (Lincoln & Guba, 1985, p. 221). Lincoln and Guba’s control of variance really refers to understanding or describing variance in some phenomenon (Silverman, 2010; Maxwell, 2005). For the purpose of this study, the researcher conducted qualitative inquiry on a purposeful (criterion based) sample where the “logic and power of purposeful sampling lie in selecting information-rich cases for study in-depth” (Patton, 2002, p.230). Qualitative inquiry was selected due to the researcher’s curiosity for the research problem and research questions and a desire for “real-world observations, emerging from the interplay of the researcher’s direct experience, tacit theories, political commitments, interests in practice, and growing scholarly interests” (Marshall & Rossman, 1999, p. 25). Additionally, a qualitative research approach was selected for its application to the discovery of unfamiliar areas of inquiry and to allow the researcher to obtain a “thick description necessary to enable someone interested in making a transfer to reach a
conclusion about whether transfer can be contemplated as a possibility” (Lincoln & Guba, 1986, p. 316).

A qualitative approach enabled the researcher to examine data/information from multiple participants in this case study to more completely understand via rich descriptions that provides significant and meaningful information and tentative answers related to the phenomena (Yin, 2003).

This qualitative study included in-depth, semi-structured interviews using participants (administrators) from multiple settings (CTC schools). In addition, documents from the CTE schools were obtained for review. This study used strategies typically associated with phenomenology studies, although the study itself is more accurately characterized as a case study. Before detailing the specific elements of this study, it is useful to outline the fundamental qualitative design of this study and the strategies of phenomenology and case study design.

According to Patton (2002) “phenomenology has become so popular and has been so widely embraced that its meaning has become confused and diluted” (p. 104). Yet, with its varied descriptions Patton (2002) further states there is universal agreement that phenomenology is a “focus on exploring how human beings make sense of experience and transform experience into consciousness, both individually and as shared meaning” (p. 104). Morse and Field (1996) describe phenomenology as more than a research method, “but also as a philosophy and an approach” (p. 124). Morse and Field describe phenomenology as a method for the researcher to seek “deeper and fuller meaning of the experiences of the participants of a particular experience” (p. 124). Phenomenology
allows the researcher to gain in-depth, reflective descriptions of the experience *lived* by the participants through in-depth conversations (typically multiple conversations).

In a phenomenological study the method is to “carefully and thoughtfully describe how people experience, perceive, describe, feel, judge, remember, make sense of, and discuss an experience” (Patton, 2002). Therefore, sample size tends to be small, where with six participants the researcher sought to gather saturated information about the lived experience (Morse, 1994). “To gather such data, one must undertake in-depth interviews with people who have directly experienced the phenomenon of interest; that is, they have ‘lived experience’ as opposed to secondhand experience” (Patton, 2002, p. 104). With phenomenology, the experiences are “bracketed, analyzed, and compared to identify the essence of the phenomenon” (p. 107).

“Case study research has become increasingly popular as a form of qualitative inquiry in education and other disciplines. The design excels in examining complex phenomena through a detailed contextual analysis” (Mulenga, 2001, pp. 129-130). According to Mulenga, (2001) the case study conjures many meanings, yet there is an agreement that the case study’s purpose is to gain understanding of a “particular, unique, and bounded system” (p. 131). In other words, the case study “refers to the collection, analysis, and presentation of detailed information about a specific phenomenon” (p. 131).

Yin (2009) outlined three key features of the case study which include the examination of a situation’s variables, examination of multiple sources of evidence where triangulation of data legitimizes the information, and where a theoretical framework guides the data collection and analysis. Use of the case study method is reliant on
research questions that seek to explain the *how* or *why* of a social phenomena and requires the researcher to use extensive and in-depth descriptions of the phenomenon.

Case studies, according the Yin, (2009) may include “both single- and multiple-case studies” (p. 19). “Case studies can cover multiple cases and then draw a single set of ‘cross-case’ conclusions” (p.20). Yin defines five components of a research design for the case study. These five components are as follows:

For case studies, five components of a research design are especially important:

1. a study’s questions;
2. its propositions, if any;
3. its units of analysis;
4. the logic linking the data to the propositions; and
5. the criteria for interpreting the findings. (Yin, 2009, p. 27)

These five components require further description. The first component, the study’s questions, outline the *who*, *what*, and *why* of the study. The second component, its propositions, outlines the scope of the study where Yin, (2009) states that “only if you are focused to state some proposition will you move in the right direction” (p. 28). Third, the unit(s) of analysis identifies the case or cases that will be examined. “Information about the relevant individual would be collected, and several such individuals or ‘cases’ might be included in a multiple-case study” (p. 29). The fourth component, linking the data to the proposition, foreshadows the data analysis step through “pattern matching, explanation building, time-series analysis, logic models, and cross-case synthesis” (p. 34). The last component includes the criteria for interpreting findings. As Yin (2009)
explains, “much case study analysis will not rely on the use of statistics and therefore calls attention to other ways of thinking about such criteria” (p. 34).

The researcher of this study established credibility, applicability, dependability, and conformability (Lincoln & Guba, 1985) through examination of six cases/sites, or a multi-case/site study, which uses phenomenology strategies. Only through a qualitative approach was the researcher able to explore the ideas and fulfill the purpose of this study. Phenomenology enabled the researcher to seek a deeper and fuller investigation of teacher interview practices and processes used by a small number of CTC administrators who have firsthand, lived experiences of the selection process and fully understand the repercussions of their selection decisions. A multiple-case/site study approach using the components of interview structure by Campion et al., 1997 as the data collection framework and using selected strategies to assess trustworthiness enabled the researcher to establish cross-case conclusions (Yin, 2009).

This study included the following steps:

1) Developed and refined instrumentation. Specifically an open-ended, in-depth interview guide and a list of artifacts collected from participating CTCs was developed. The study’s theoretical framework and related research informed the development of these items.

2) Conducted pilot study using interview guide with subject matter experts to determine content validity.

3) Modified interview guide.

4) Selected participants via a purposeful sample (criterion based).

5) Interviewed participants and collected artifacts.
6) Analyzed data.
7) Thematic hand coding.
8) Peer reviewed themes and results.
9) Thematic member checking.

The pilot study was conducted in April 2011 and the interview guide was modified. The selection of participants via purposeful, criterion based sampling was also conducted in April 2011. Data collection occurred from May through June 2011. Data analysis and a description of findings occurred from July through September 2011.

**Sampling Strategy**

“The logic and power of purposeful sampling lie in selecting *information-rich cases* for study in depth” (Patton, 2002, p. 230). This study does not aim to generalize to all CTCs but seeks to gather and evaluate information through interactions with a homogeneous sample of CTC administrators who provided the researcher with a deep understanding of their CTC teacher interview process and selection decision. A homogeneous sample strategy allowed the researcher to describe, in depth, the interview and selection phenomenon of a small sample of CTCs (Patton, 2002).

**Participant Selection**

Six career and technical centers were purposefully selected for this study. This sample included part-time area CTCs located in East and Central Pennsylvania. Specifically, the CTCs instructional delivery and accountability measures associated with Perkins IV were common to each school in this study in order to gather and analyze homogeneity that will increase the study’s focus, reduce variation, and simplify the analysis (Patton, 2002). Furthermore, all six part-time area CTCs in this study provide
the occupational program at their schools to students for a half day (part time criterion). Students return to their traditional comprehensive education high school for their academic classes the other half of the day. Some schools located in this geographic area of Pennsylvania were purposefully excluded from the study because of their lack of homogeneity, such as comprehensive CTCs or CTCs that have any different delivery models (second criterion).

Through written permission, the following participants and their schools agreed to be listed in this study, however their particular responses and any data collected remain confidential, and no response or data is associated with them or their school.

Ms. Mary Rodman, Cumberland Perry Area Vocational Technical School,
Mr. Walter Slauch, Central Montco Technical High School,
Mr. Joseph Greb, Western Montgomery Career and Technology Center,
Mr. Gerald Witmer, Reading Muhlenburg Career and Technology Center,
Dr. Robert Lees, Berks Career and Technology Center,
Dr. Clyde Hornberger, Lehigh Career and Technical Institute.

Also involved in this study were two CTE directors who participated in the pilot study and provided feedback on the survey instruments and collection of artifacts. The pilot study Directors and their schools included:

Mr. Michael Lucas, North Montco Technical Career Center,
Mr. David Warren, Lancaster County Career and Technology Center.

Each director of the selected CTC participated in an open-ended, in-depth interview for this study. Additional criteria used for the selection of the CTCs was that the director of the CTC had at least one year of experience at the school as the director
and all selected possessed a minimum of a Pennsylvania Department of Education, Vocational Director Certification. Additionally, they all had the primary responsibility for teacher selection at their school.

**Instrumentation**

The primary instrument used for this study was an open-ended, in-depth interview guide supplemented with artifacts used by the CTC that directly relate to the selection interview. The interview protocol included questions that probed and gathered detailed information to better understand the process. Interview questions were based on the theoretical framework of this study, the 15 components of interview structure as defined by Campion, Palmer, and Campion (1997), and used as a guide for interview questions and artifact discovery. Table 5 identifies this study’s research questions and the open-ended, in-depth interview question.

**Table 5**

*Research Questions and Open-Ended, In-Depth Interview Questions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question</th>
<th>Related Question from Interview Guide</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research question 1. To what extent and how is structure used during the CTE teacher interview process?</td>
<td>Structured interview <em>content</em> questions:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• When interviewing for a full-time CTC instructor position, to what extent are interview questions based on a job analysis. Do you use a job description to determine interview questions?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Describe the types of questions asked during the interview, for example, what type, if any, general questions do you ask; what type, if any, past behavior description questions do you ask; what type, if any, situational or hypothetical questions do you ask; and what other types of questions do you ask the CTC teacher applicant?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• To what extent do all applicants receive the same exact interview questions?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• To what extent are follow-up questions used, and if used, when are they asked? If follow-up questions are used, are they standardized for each interview?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• To what extent are candidates allowed to ask questions during the interview? When do you allow these questions to be asked?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Do you conduct one or multiple interviews with teacher</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
applicants and what is the format of your interview(s). If you have multiple interviews, do the interview formats change? If so, how are they different?

- How much time does the typical interview last, and how many questions are typically asked of an applicant?
- What interview and applicant materials, if any, are given to the interviewer(s) to use, refer to, and/or review during the interview process?
- To what extent is ancillary information, such as recommendations, resume, portfolio, etc. included in the discussion or questions asked of the applicant during the interview?

**Structured interview evaluation questions:**

- To what extent is the applicant evaluated? Is each response evaluated? Does the applicant receive a global evaluation?
- To what extent are applicant responses rated using an anchored scale or rubric? To what degree is the evaluation multidimensional?
- How many interviewers typically interview teacher applicants? If you have multiple interviews, do the interviewers/team members change? If so, how do they differ? What process is used to establish your interview team?
- To what extent are the same interviewers used across all candidates?
- To what extent do interviewers take notes? If notes are taken, are they recorded for each applicant response? What is done with the notes after the conclusion of the interview?
- Do interviewers discuss the candidates after each candidate?
- To what degree are interviewers trained? If training occurs, please describe the type and duration? Have you ever received training on properly interviewing and selection techniques? If so, please describe this training.
- After completion of the interview, how is the final candidate selected?

**Research question 2.**

**What are the major CTE teacher interview questions used by CTE administrators during the interview process and how do responses to those questions impact and inform administrators’ selection decisions?**

- What question do you ask during the selection interview that you believe most informs your decision to hire or not hire the candidate?
In addition to the interview questions, background information of the participating schools and CTC directors was collected. This information includes:

- The current number of sending school district participants.
- The number of part-time students attending the CTC.
- The number of CTC teachers currently employed at the school.
- The number of years the CTC director has been the director at the school.
- The total number of years the CTC director has been a CTC director.
- The number of years the CTC director has been a school administrator.
- The number of years the CTC director has held the Pennsylvania Vocational Director Certification.

The interviewer also collected and analyzed artifacts that relate to the participating CTC’s teacher interview practices. Once participants were selected and agreed to participate in the study, information regarding the study, privacy and confidentially, and informed consent was secured by each participant. A research study letter also was provided to the participants by email which outlined details of their participation. This research study letter restated the purpose of the study, the time commitments of the participants, interview time, date, and location, and an outline of artifacts requested by the researcher. An outline of the interview guide was forwarded to participants prior to the face-to-face interview with the researcher. Artifacts requested and listed in the guide included the CTC teacher job analysis, interview questions, scoring guides and rubrics, and any other items used by the CTC’s during the selection interview. The interview questions and research study letter were reviewed by the
researcher’s committee and pilot study participants for content validity by subject matter experts.

**Pilot Study**

Prior to initiating data collection, a pilot test using the interview guide, including interview questions, background information, and collection of artifacts was conducted to ensure that the interview questions and request for artifacts were clear and understandable. The researcher solicited the assistance of two CTC directors who were not part of the survey sample to conduct the pilot study. The two Directors served as subject matter experts and provided information to assess content validity for the instrumentation and design of this study. The pilot study participants were contacted via telephone and email to request their participation in the pilot study. Upon their acceptance, they were provided an electronic implied consent form, the research study letter, and interview guide.

After the pilot interview and artifact collection, the two directors were asked to respond to the following questions related to the interview guide:

1. Were the interview questions clearly stated and easy to understand? If not, which questions were unclear? Do you have any recommendations to improve the researcher’s interview questions?

2. Was the research study letter describing the interview process and the requested artifacts clearly stated and easy to understand? Do you have any recommendation to improve the letter?
3. Was the researcher’s interview of acceptable format and length? Were the transitions smooth from question to question? What recommendations would you make to improve the process?

4. Please provide any additional comments that you feel would help the researcher to provide an understandable and fluid survey process.

The feedback from the pilot study was used to improve the interview guide, research study letter, and the research process used to facilitate the collection of data. Both participants felt that the questions were easy to understand and were clearly stated. The interview took each of them approximately thirty-five minutes to complete. They recommended adding a few follow-up questions to further probe for information and recommended adding one additional question to the study. The additional question was related to asking the participants if they conducted one or multiple interviews when hiring a teacher and for the participants to describe the format of their interview(s). The interview guide was changed to allow for these modifications and allow for additional responses.

**Data Collection**

The methods of data collection were based on the research questions and theoretical framework of this study. The collection of data and use of multiple data sources served to enhance the credibility of this study.

Data were collected through face-to-face interviews and collection of school interview and selection artifacts with six CTC directors. Also during the interviews, the researcher collected information regarding the size of the school and CTC director background information. All face-to-face interviews were scheduled for a 45 minute block of time at the CTC directors’ school. A standardized, open-ended interview instrument, the interview guide, was used as a starting point to elicit responses and
acquire information regarding the CTC teacher interview experiences of the participants. All interviews were audio-taped with two digital recorders to ensure collection of the interview.

Field notes were kept to record additional observations and comments related to the study. The researcher also took notes during the interviews. A journal was maintained by the researcher of the research experience. Field notes, documented in the journal, captured the intricacies of the interviews, the behavior of the participants, the environment, the researcher’s thoughts and perceptions, research process steps, and other details related to the study.

Transcriptions of the interviews included all actual words used by the participants. Following the interviews, the researcher personally transcribed the recordings and emailed the participants the transcripts for review and verification. The resulting themes were member checked for comments and clarification and returned to the researcher. Participants were asked to participate in a follow-up phone interview to allow the participant to reflect on the face-to-face interview and provide additional information if needed. Upon reflection, one participant provided additional information to the researcher. This information was transcribed and verified by the participant. Additionally, artifacts were collected at the time of the face-to-face interview by the researcher. These artifacts were reviewed during the face-to-face interview where the participants provided a description of the artifacts’ intended use.

A peer review process was also used for this study. One peer, who is in an academic position at the Pennsylvania State University, reviewed and commented on the
results of the data analysis. The themes and concepts generated from the study were shared with the peer reviewer and comments were reviewed and discussed for clarity.

**Data Analysis**

During the data analysis phase, the descriptions of the lived experiences was interpreted using the data collected from open-ended interviews and artifacts that include the schools’ CTC teacher job analysis or job description, applicant interview questions, scoring guides, rubrics, and other protocols used by the participating CTCs. It was important for the interviewer to be open to understanding and exploring the phenomenon of study in order to bracket, analyze and compare the heart of the phenomenon (Patton, 2002).

Once interviews were conducted with the participants in this study, the audio tape recordings of the interviews were reviewed in their entirety two times in order to develop a richer understanding of the information. Interviews were then transcribed, hand coded, and analyzed to identify emerging themes. The 15 components of interview structure by Campion et al., (1997) the theoretical framework of this study; served as the blueprint for data analysis and coding interview transcriptions into themes or components.

During the coding process, open coding was used for the initial stage of the “analytic process through which concepts are identified” (Strauss & Corbin, 1998, p. 119). It is important to note that because of a small sample size and a decision to apply a rigorous adoption criteria, a simple majority of four to six participant responses was not used when coding and linking the data to each of the 15 components of interview structure. Instead, data were linked (or not linked) to the each component when five or all participant responses occurred.
Interview transcripts, field notes, researcher’s journal including memos, and artifacts were important to the data analysis process. Common themes emerged through this analysis.

**Issues of Verification**

Several strategies were used to enhance the validity, reliability, and objectivity of the data collection and analysis. Rather than seeking generalizability, this qualitative study sought to establish the trustworthiness of the work. Lincoln and Guba (1985) present four questions that are found useful to the researcher related to trustworthiness.

1. ‘Truth value’: How can one establish confidence in the ‘truth’ of the findings of a particular inquiry for the subjects (respondents) with which and the context in which the inquiry was carried out?

2. Applicability: How can one determine the extent to which the findings of a particular inquiry have applicability in other contexts or with other subjects (respondents)?

3. Consistency: How can one determine whether the findings of an inquiry would be repeated if the inquiry were replicated with the same (or similar) subjects (respondents) in the same (or similar) context?

4. Neutrality: How can one establish the degree to which the findings of an inquiry are determined by the subjects (respondents) and conditions of the inquiry and not by the biases, motivations, interests, or perspectives of the inquirer? (Lincoln & Guba, 1985, p. 290)

The researcher utilized various strategies to enhance the rigor of the qualitative discovery, including engagement in the field, reflexive field journals, triangulation,
member and peer checking, rich descriptions, code-recode procedures, and an audit trail.

Table 6 outlines the research step, researcher’s process, and strategy the researcher pursued to legitimize the information gathered in this study and assure research quality.

Table 6

Strategies Planned to Enhance the Research Quality and Legitimize Research Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Step</th>
<th>Researcher’s Process</th>
<th>Strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engagement in field</td>
<td>On site interviews and data gathering at six CTCs.</td>
<td>Credibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflexivity</td>
<td>Field journals and notes for all contact points with respondents, including telephone calls, emails, face-to-face meetings and interviews, data analysis and researcher’s reflections.</td>
<td>Credibility &amp; Conformability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triangulation</td>
<td>Triangulate themes and results of data across six cases, used artifacts and interview data, journal.</td>
<td>Credibility, Dependability, &amp; Conformability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homogeneous sample of six cases</td>
<td>Study does not generalize to all CTCs across PA or nationally. Researcher identified what was common specific to the sample population.</td>
<td>Transferability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member checks</td>
<td>Respondents provided the data gathered from the interview for further comment and clarification.</td>
<td>Credibility &amp; Validity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer checking and examination</td>
<td>One peer who was knowledgeable about the research topic and on staff at Penn State University examined the data, themes, and results.</td>
<td>Credibility &amp; Dependability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit trail</td>
<td>Researcher maintained audio taped interviews and transcripts, field notes, and reflexive journal that outline research steps and evolution.</td>
<td>Dependability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detailed description of the methods</td>
<td>Researcher provided a detailed description of the research methods and processes used in this study.</td>
<td>Dependability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rich descriptions</td>
<td>The researcher acquired rich descriptions of the phenomenon by the participant’s experiences via interviews and artifacts.</td>
<td>Transferability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code-recode procedures</td>
<td>Researcher reviewed transcripts and artifacts and hand code. The study’s theoretical framework served as a guide for coding data into themes.</td>
<td>Dependability &amp; Reliability</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ethical Issues

Within this chapter it is important to emphasize the ethical considerations when researching subjects that impact human beings. The researcher ensured the participants’ informed consent, right to confidentiality and privacy, and protection from harm. Prior to any formal or informal interviewing for the pilot study or research study the researcher complied with all requirements outlined by the Office of Research Protections at the Pennsylvania State University.

Through written permission, all six career and technology center (CTC) Directors agreed to be identified in this study. Their particular responses and the data collected remain confidential, and no responses or data are associated with them or their schools. It is important to note that although it is standard practice to identify each participant by number or letter when results of a study are presented, this practice is not used here. Because of the small sample size and because participants agreed to be named, following this practice would sacrifice confidentiality.

Chapter Summary

The methodology that supports this study is a qualitative investigation through in-depth, semi-structured interviews and artifact collection using multiple-case, cross-case analysis. This study borrowed from strategies typically associated with phenomenology where the researcher’s aim was to “focus on descriptions of what people experience and how it is that they experience what they experience” (Patton, 2002, p. 107). It was the intent of the researcher to use an approach that provides a rich picture of the CTC teacher selection interview phenomenon. The approach outlined in this chapter facilitated the
research questions of this study and furthered the study of the career and technical education community and structured interview practices.
CHAPTER FOUR
DATA ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

This chapter contains the framework and results of this study. Discussed in this chapter is the purpose of the study, research questions, and methodology. Also discussed is a report of the results of the pilot study and the findings of the data collection and analysis of six in-depth interviews by the study’s participants as connected to the study’s theoretical framework and research questions. A summary of the findings concludes the chapter.

Review of the Study

The purpose of this study was to examine the extent to which research-based interview practices, including structure, are used during the selection of new CTE teachers. This study also sought to identify the interview questions asked by CTE administrators that they perceived as having the most impact on their hiring decisions.

Unlike the academic teacher who has years of teacher training at a university, a teaching practicum, and experiences that lead to an individual earning a teaching credential, a career and technical education (CTE) teacher typically is hired and placed in the classroom with no pre-service experience or training. Career and technical administrators are faced with hiring CTE teachers that have little or no formal teaching experience and placing them directly into classrooms, often immediately upon employment. New CTE teachers are then coached and placed in an alternative preparation and certification route which recognizes their years of work and trade experience in place of teacher preparation (Walter & Gray, 2002).

School administrators hiring the typical academic teacher use behavioral
description interview questions during the selection process which aid and inform their selection decision (Clement, 2009; Hindman & Stronge, 2009; Stronge & Hindman, 2006). Using behavioral description interview questions enables the teacher applicant to draw upon their past classroom experiences and provides information that school administrators use to gauge applicant responses related to good educational practice. Career and technical educators may certainly ask behavioral description interview questions of CTE teacher applicants during the hiring interview. But linking interview questions to prior teaching knowledge is often not applicable due to a lack of prior classroom experience. Career and technical administrators must seek other strategies during the selection interview to determine an applicant’s fit and capacity to transition from technician to high-performing CTC teacher.

One hundred years of organizational and industrial research provides support for the structured interview (Buckley, Norris, & Wiese, 2000). Conducting a selection interview using a structured approach improves the reliability and the validity of the interview and serves as a more accurate predictor of future job success. The research of Campion, Palmer, and Campion (1997) resulted in a blueprint of 15 components of interview structure that are recommended for today’s organizations for improving hiring and selection decision making and provided the theoretical framework for this study.

This study addressed two research questions which guided the acquisition of data needed to address the research problem:

1. To what extent and how is structure used during the CTE teacher interview process?
2. What are the CTE teacher interview questions asked by administrators that are perceived to most influence the selection and hiring decision?

The data collected and analyzed for this study used a qualitative methodology with a purposeful (criterion based) sample where the “logic and power of purposeful sampling lie in selecting information-rich cases for study in-depth” (Patton, 2002, p.230). Semi-structured, in-depth face-to-face interviews and school artifacts were collected and analyzed by the researcher from six Southeast and Central Pennsylvania Career and Technical Education (CTE) Directors. Descriptive statistics were used to provide demographic information regarding the Directors and their school. Data from the interviews were analyzed using open hand-coding, aligned with the study’s theoretical framework, and themes identified. Because of the small number of respondents and a decision to apply rigorous adoption criteria, data were classified as linked (or not linked) to each of the 15 components of interview structure only when at least five participant responses could be linked to a component. Artifacts related to the study were collected and analyzed using open hand-coding. The artifacts were analyzed in order to triangulate the interview data collected and legitimize the data collected during the face-to-face interview.

**Demographic Information**

This study surveyed a small sampling of CTC Directors in May and June 2011. The following section identifies demographic information on the study’s participants and the schools involved.
Profile of the Participants

Six career and technical center Directors were purposefully selected for this study. This sample included part-time area CTCs located in East and Central Pennsylvania. The Directors were selected based on the CTCs instructional delivery model and common accountability measures associated with Perkins IV in order to gather and analyze homogeneity that increased the study’s focus, reduce variation, and simplify the analysis (Patton, 2002). Specifically all six part-time area CTCs in this study provide the occupational program at their schools to students for a half day (part time criterion). Students return to their traditional comprehensive education high school for their academic classes the other half of the day. Some schools located in the study’s geographic area of Pennsylvania were purposefully excluded from the study because of their lack of homogeneity, such as comprehensive CTCs or CTCs that have any different delivery models (second criterion).

Through written permission, all six career and technology center (CTC) Directors agreed to be identified in this study. Their particular responses and the data collected remain confidential, and no responses or data are associated directly with them or their schools. It is important to note that although it is standard practice to identify each participant by number or letter when results of a study are presented, this practice is not used here. Because of the small sample size and because participants agreed to be named, following this practice would sacrifice confidentiality. Also, while the researcher attempted to use actual quotes from the participants, if segments of a quote might have identified a participant or their school, brackets have been used for the deleted material. Table 7 lists this study’s participants and the institutions.
Each CTC Director participant completed an open-ended, in-depth interview and submitted school artifacts used during their teacher selection interview to the researcher.

Criteria used for the selection of the Director and their perspective school included a tenure of at least one year as Director at the school, at least one year holding Pennsylvania Department of Education Vocational Director Certification, and having the primary responsibility for their school’s teacher interview and selection process.

Additionally, each of the schools selected for this study use a part-time (half-day) delivery model of instruction for their students.

Two additional CTC Directors participated in this study by assisting in the pilot. These participants provided feedback to the researcher on the survey design, survey instruments, and collection of artifacts. The pilot study participates and the school’s they direct are identified on Table 8.

Table 8

Pilot Study Participant Names and the Career and Technical Center They Direct

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CTE Director Participant Name</th>
<th>Career &amp; Technology Center Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Michael Lucas</td>
<td>North Montco Technical Career Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. David Warren</td>
<td>Lancaster County Career and Technology Center</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Director participants provided information about the total number of years as a CTC Director, number of years as the Director at the CTC location, total number of years as a school administrator, and total number of years holding a Pennsylvania Vocational Director Certification. All Directors in this study reported being the Director at the current CTC for five years or more. Three Directors reported being the director at the school for nine to fifteen years. All participants reported experience as a school administrator for eleven to twenty seven years. Participants also reported holding the Pennsylvania Vocational Director Certification from five to twenty-five years. Table 9 presents an outline of participant administrative experience.

Table 9

**Administrative Experience of the Study’s Participants**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of experience</th>
<th>Count of Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Years as Director at the current CTC</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-19</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total years as a Director</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-19</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total years as an administrator</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-19</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-29</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Years PA Vocational Director Certification held</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-14</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-19</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-35</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Profile of the Schools

The six Directors selected for this study identified the size of their school in terms of number of participating school districts, number of part-time students that attend the CTC, and number of CTE teachers on staff. Participating school districts ranged from two to sixteen sending school districts and the number of students served at the CTCs ranged from approximately 480 to 2,350. Four Directors reported employing 19 to 34 CTE teachers and two Directors reported having 75 to 78 CTE teachers on staff. Table 10 presents an outline of participating school district, number of part time students, and CTE teachers on staff at the schools.

Table 10

Participant School Demographic Information for Each of Six Sites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participating School Districts</th>
<th>Part-time Student Population</th>
<th>Number of CTC Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1,800 (approx.)</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>900 (approx.)</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2,350 (approx.)</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>480 (approx.)</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>600 (approx.)</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,325 (approx.)</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research Findings

The following section identifies the findings of this study. Described in this section are the results of the pilot study, the Interview Guide information, and demographic information related to the CTCs and participants in this study.

Pilot Study

To prepare for the study, a pilot test of the interview guide including the process, interview questions, and collection of school artifacts was conducted with two CTC Directors. The purpose of the pilot was to assure efficiency of the interview process, determine the time needed to conduct the interview, ensure the interview questions were
clear and concise, assure the interview guide aligned with the study’s research questions, and to provide the interviewer with an opportunity to practice collection of data prior to implementation of the study.

The pilot participants provided valuable feedback used to improve the process and collection of data. In advance of the face-to-face interview, both Directors received, via email, a draft of the research study letter describing the interview process, informed consent form, interview agenda, interview questions, and requested artifacts. Neither director recommended any changes to the email and stated that the information was straightforward, and clearly communicated the intent of the study and expectations of the participants.

Face-to-face interviews were scheduled for a 45-minute block of time and were conducted in the participant’s school office. Prior to the collection of data and during the interview meeting, the researcher provided each director with an agenda that was used to facilitate the interview meeting. Agenda items included a review of the study, signature and collection of the informed consent form, review of the interview guide, use of audio tape technology, the interview, review of artifacts, and follow-up after the interview meeting. The Directors provided feedback to the researcher that they liked the use of an agenda to facilitate the interview meeting. They cited that it was a good practice and felt it helped inform the participants of expectations and further answered questions about the study and the researcher’s process.

Once the agenda was reviewed and informed consent forms signed and collected, the researcher started two digital voice recorders to document the interviews. Each question was asked and answered in the order listed in the guide. Each Director
answered the questions as the researcher took notes. At the end of the interviews, both Directors were asked to react to the length of the interview, flow and pacing of interview questions, and overall impression of the experience. The Directors and researcher also reviewed each interview question, one-by-one, and discussed strategies to improve each question for improved clarity and greater potential for the quality of data collection.

Individual interviews with the pilot sites were conducted within 27 to 32 minutes. During both interviews one of the two digital recorders stopped working. Using two recorders was critical and insured a back-up system for collection of the data. Feedback from the participants indicated that the questions were clearly stated, yet both participants suggested including additional questions to the guide in order to gain additional information they believed would add value to the study. Specifically, both Directors suggested that the researcher ask the participants whether their interview process consisted of one interview or multiple interviews. Both stated their process was a two-tiered interview process, not just one interview. They believed that other Directors use the same selection strategy. They also suggested the researcher ask the participants to describe, in detail, each interview within the selection process, including format, number and composition of the interview panel, type of interview questions or activities used during the interview, and length of time for each interview. Lastly, one pilot Director suggested asking a question related to the Director’s overall administrative experience, not just his or her experience as a CTC Director. All of these recommendations were adopted and used to improve the interview guide.
Following the pilot face-to-face interviews, school artifacts were reviewed and provided to the researcher from both pilot Directors. Artifacts included the teacher/instructor job description, interview questions, and applicant rating forms.

Critical components of the pilot included testing the process and questions and gaining feedback from the participants. The use of the agenda helped to better inform and facilitate the face-to-face interview meeting, pilot testing the process enabled the researcher to test the process and gain important feedback not initially considered by the researcher.

The Interviews

An Interview Guide was used to conduct the in-depth, semi-structured interviews. The intent was threefold: 1) to gather demographic data about the six schools and Directors who participated in the study; 2) to obtain school documents used during the selection interview; and 3) to probe into the CTE teacher interview and selection process.

All six interviews, one per participant, were conducted in the school offices. The length of time of the interviews ranged from 35 to 55 minutes. Participants had the opportunity to provide follow-up information after the interview where one CTC Director contacted the researcher by phone to provide additional feedback and clarification on the interview questions.

Results for Research Question One

To what extent and how is structure used during the CTE teacher interview process? Questions 3 to 20 in the Interview Guide were designed to investigate interview structure as defined by Campion et al. (1997) related to the participant’s CTE teacher interview and selection process. The data discussed by the participants as aligned with
the 15 elements of interview structure are summarized in Table 11 and described in
further detail in the text following the table.

Table 11

*The Study’s Findings Related to 15 Components of Interview Structure (Campion, et al., 1997)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component A. Interview Content</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A3. Limit prompting, follow-up questions, and elaborating on questions.</td>
<td>A2. All six participants ask identical questions to each candidate.</td>
<td>A2. All six participants ask identical questions to each candidate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4. Ask better types of questions.</td>
<td>A3. Two participants limit prompting, follow-up questions, or elaborate on questions; three participants allow rephrasing or restating questions and some follow-up questions; one participant allowed follow-up questions at any time.</td>
<td>A3. Two participants limit prompting, follow-up questions, or elaborate on questions; three participants allow rephrasing or restating questions and some follow-up questions; one participant allowed follow-up questions at any time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A5. Use longer interview or larger number of questions.</td>
<td>A4.1. All six participants use various types of questions including general questions and technical knowledge questions.</td>
<td>A4.1. All six participants use various types of questions including general questions and technical knowledge questions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A7. Do not allow questions from candidate until after the interview.</td>
<td>A4.3. Five of six participants use situational questions.</td>
<td>A4.3. Five of six participants use situational questions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A5. One participant consistently conducts a three interview process of approximately two hours total; two participants consistently conducted a two interview selection process of approximately two hours total; three participants usually conduct a two interview selection process of approximately 45 minutes to one hour per interview unless certain variables are present, i.e. limited number of applicants, time constraints; clear consensus of panel members. Five of the six participants use other activities in addition to interview questions.</td>
<td>A5. One participant consistently conducts a three interview process of approximately two hours total; two participants consistently conducted a two interview selection process of approximately two hours total; three participants usually conduct a two interview selection process of approximately 45 minutes to one hour per interview unless certain variables are present, i.e. limited number of applicants, time constraints; clear consensus of panel members. Five of the six participants use other activities in addition to interview questions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A6. Two of six participants control ancillary information; four participants allow ancillary information.</td>
<td>A6. Two of six participants control ancillary information; four participants allow ancillary information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A7. Four of six participants do not allow candidate questions until the end of the interview.</td>
<td>A7. Four of six participants do not allow candidate questions until the end of the interview.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B. Interview Evaluation

B1. Rating each answer or use multiple scales.
B2. Use of a detailed anchored rating scales.
B3. Taking detailed notes.
B5. Use the same interviewer(s) across all candidates.
B6. Don’t discuss candidates or answers between interviews.
B7. Provide extensive interviewing training.
B8. Use statistical rather than clinical prediction.

Base questions on a job analysis. The CTCs job description for a CTE teacher was generally referred to as the basis for interview questions. Of the six CTC Directors, five stated that their interview questions are directly connected to the CTE teacher job description. One study participant stated:

The entire first interview our questions are based on the job description. The job description has everything from the essential duties to the physical requirements needed so we base the questioning around that description and we add to the questions different scenarios.

Another participant described a similar experience:
We have a pre-established set of questions that we select from. Those questions are driven by the position description and the responsibilities of the position.

One participant stated that their school’s interview questions were not based on the teacher job description and that the job description was used as a guide for interview questions. This participant stated:

We don’t necessarily use the job description to build our questions. We are looking for information which highlights interactions the individual has had with high school age students. We are trying to bring out the personality of the individual. We are trying to determine their level of intelligence, how they manage people, and how they interact with people. Even though some of those things may be defined within the job description, we do not work from it to create our questions.

Participants in this study described their schools as having a general job description for the CTC instructor/teacher, not individual instructor/teacher job descriptions for each technical curriculum area offered at the school. In other words, the job description was defined in the broad term of instructor/teacher, and not by a specific discipline, such as welding, cosmetology, or culinary arts. One participant stated:

Our job description says “Career and Technical Instructor”.. In our mind it doesn’t matter whether you are interviewing for a plumbing instructor, or a carpentry instructor, or an auto instructor. The difference comes in when you look at the applicant’s resume and the application [to determine] the candidate [has the prerequisite industry experience for the position opening].

Ask identical questions to each candidate. Participants were asked to describe their practice of asking identical interview questions to each candidate. All six participants indicated preselected interview questions were asked for all applicants. One participant stated:

Typically our interview teams are set up prior to the interviews. We ask each of our interviewees to select two to three questions from our list of questions that have been predetermined. Once they have selected these questions, these questions are asked to all candidates. As we ask our series of questions, all the candidates are receiving the same questions.
Another participant commented:

To keep it fair we keep the questions exactly the same.

**Limit prompting, follow-up questions, and elaborating on questions.**

Participants were asked to describe the degree to which, if at all, response prompting, follow-up questions, or restating interview questions occurred during their selection interviews. Responses from the six participants were mixed.

Two participants indicated that the practice of interview question prompting, restating, or follow-up was discouraged at their school, yet at times the practice occurred.

One CTC Director stated:

I discourage the practice unless we do not understand the answer [from the applicant]. For example if they say something and it doesn’t come anywhere close to them answering the question, I would make a note of it. But if it is something that I think they were trying to answer, and I am not understanding I might rephrase it. We try to discourage that practice because sometimes it leads people off on a tangent and either you don’t get through your interview questions in the time you have allocated or you end up with distinctly different interviews.

The second CTC Director stated that rephrasing may occur because the applicant may not understand educational term(s) or educational jargon and stated:

We try to keep the questions to those that are written before the interview. The only time I would follow-up is if a candidate does not understand the question, so I might rephrase it. I try to keep it to the same questions we have written beforehand. There are times when the candidate might not really understand the question such as when we lapse into some school lingo or curriculum, so I might rephrase it or break it down into smaller chunks so they can understand it. A lot of times that happens because they don’t understand the broad picture of education and because they have not been in teaching before.

Three of the study’s participants responded that prompting, rephrasing, and follow-up questions were permitted and occurred during the selection interviews often to
help the applicant understand the question or to elicit more information from the candidate. One participant stated:

If a person responds in a way that does not necessarily get at the information we are seeking there could be a follow-up question. If their response was vague, we will check to see if there is not a depth of knowledge or if they didn’t understand the question. Also, anytime someone responds to something and it generates a question or a concern in the mind of the person asking the question, there could be a follow-up question asked in order to delve deeper into that particular issue or subject. Anyone can ask a follow-up question, but typically the person asking the interview question usually asks the follow-up question.

One participant stated that follow-up questions and prompting was permitted in their selection interview. Furthermore, the participant indicated that the use of follow-up questions could result in distinctly different interviews across the candidates. The participant stated:

We don’t conduct interviews that are absolutely asking questions one, two, three, four. At any given point in time, anyone on that interview committee is allowed to follow up and ask another question that comes to mind. So to that extent, one interview could be different from another.

**Ask better types of questions.** Participants discussed the specific types of interview questions used in their school’s selection interview. All six CTC Directors indicated asking general and other types of questions, such as trade-specific, technical questions related to the CTE teacher vacancy, and questions related to the applicant’s personality and disposition. Five of the six participants stated that their processes included asking the candidates behavioral description and situational interview questions.

**General questions.** All six directors discussed asking general questions and assessing applicant personality and disposition in order to get to know the applicants background and temperament, the applicant’s professional background, personality, and reasons for applying for the position. One participant stated:
We want to know about their work experience within the field they are applying for. General questions include their experience working with young adults, whether it be formal or informal, such as with a church group or some sort of class work they might have done. We want to know about educational experience. We always ask them about what they know about career and technical education to see if they know what they are getting into. We ask them about their educational background to see where they would be related to all the requirements they would need for certification. General questions would include how to handle certain situations like a discipline issue, especially if they are not used to dealing with fifteen-year-olds or sixteen-year-olds. We ask them about how they have dealt with other co-workers.

All six participants indicated that their school’s selection interviews each begin by asking general questions regarding the candidate’s background and work history. One participant stated:

General questions are our lead in questions.

One participant stated that general interview questions used at the beginning of the interview were also designed to put the applicant at ease. The participant stated:

Our number one goal when we interview is to try to make the candidates as comfortable as possible. We want to take the nervousness out of the interview. We want to get them to be calm as quickly as we can because we firmly believe that we will discover more about that person if they are calm, cool, and collected as opposed to them being nervous. We start the interview asking [the candidates] questions that we know they know the answers too. It also gives them an opportunity to calm down and to get used to the setting. That way we feel that before we start to get into some of the meat and potatoes of the interview, we have them to a point that they are not nervous anymore.

*Other question types.* All six participants described asking technical knowledge questions during their selection interviews. These questions are specific to the trade or occupational area for which they are hiring. Four of the six participants also described the importance of their school’s occupational advisory committee (OAC) members and included these individuals on the interview panels. The OAC member was described as a critical resource for both developing technical interview questions and evaluating a
candidate’s technical competence during the interview process. Participants in this study indicated a lack of technical expertise for some of the career areas at their schools and relied on the OACs to provide that expertise. One participant stated:

At times, not every time, depending on the nature of our occupational advisory committees, we will try to involve a member in the interview process. It is that person who typically is asked to pose several questions in order to get at the breadth and depth of the applicant’s understanding of the technical or career area. If we don’t have an advisory committee member, then we will ask the technical questions, but most of our administrators are not experts in that technical area.

Another participant described the OAC member’s contribution to developing and evaluating technical knowledge interview questions:

We ask [the OAC member] to come with three to five questions depending on how many people from the OAC are going to be on the interview committee. We share with them our questions, and we ask them to ask questions that someone having the requisite knowledge of the trade would or should be able to answer.

One participant described their process for involving the OAC in their interview and selection process. The participant stated:

I cannot over emphasize how important our advisory committees are. Sometimes the applicant will give us an answer that sounds good to us but it’s not accurate. For the technical part, we really use our advisory members.

In addition to technical knowledge questions, all participants stated asking other questions focused on the applicant’s attitudes, motivations, and opinions regarding students and the schools for which they were applying. One participant stated:

A lot of the questions that you will find us asking, at least fifty percent of our questions, are questions getting at the applicant’s attitude and work ethic. Those, to us, are critically important. During the interview process we look at those characteristics as they respond to our questions.

Another participant stated:

We ask questions to get an idea about any of their preconceived ideas regarding [students]. We’re looking at [the] values of the [candidate].
Behavioral description interview questions. Participants were asked to describe, if used, behavioral description interview questions. Five of the six participants described using this type of questioning and provided examples of questions and scenarios posed to applicants. It is important to note that all six participants indicated that behavioral description questions asked on a candidate are not based on prior classroom and teaching experience. One participant described the limitation of behavioral description questions based on the lack of teaching experience of their applicants and stated:

That [type of] question does not necessarily come up in our various questions that we ask. Nine times out of ten we are hiring people who come out of industry. That type of question works better when they are coming from one high school to another and they have some teaching experience, but more than likely the candidate … hasn’t had any teaching experience.

One participant identified typical behavioral description asked of their candidates and stated:

Other questions that we would ask involve, “Tell us about an experience you have had and how you dealt with that particular experience.” We will paint a situation and ask them if they have had that experience and ask them to describe how they dealt with it.

Another participant provided additional behavioral description questions asked during their selection interview and stated:

One example would be, “Have you had to make a difficult decision in your previous work experience? Explain that situation and how you resolved it.” [or] “Have you ever had a conflict with a coworker and if so, how did you resolve it?” Another one would be, “Did you ever have a conflict with your boss and how did you personally handle the situation?”

Situational interview questions. Five of the six participants indicated asking situational interview questions, often through scenarios. Participants stated the use of situational questions was used in order to ascertain the candidate’s thoughts and attitudes towards students and the career of teaching. Participants stated that CTC teacher
candidates applying for positions often had no teaching experience. Participants stated that the use of situational questions was often used in place of behavior based questions in order to ascertain a candidates perceptions related to students, the classroom, and teaching. One participant stated:

There are a lot of hypothetical questions because of the nature of bringing in people who do not have previous teaching experience. If [candidates] have previous teaching experience [they] would be basing [responses] on past experience but since we don’t take people from [industry that have] previous teaching experience there are a lot of hypothetical [questions].

Another participant reiterated the use of situational questions used in place of behavioral description questions because of the typical applicant’s lack of teaching or classroom experience. The participant stated:

We know they are not educators but we want to understand their thought process, and did they do their homework [about being a teacher and the job requirements]? I don’t expect them to be able to teach us, but the second round we will ask them to teach a lesson. Sometimes they will come in prepared to teach a lesson and we will stop them and ask them why they used a particular strategy. We want to know why they are using a technique. We will ask them to teach a twenty minute lesson. Some will come with beautiful handouts, all prepared, but if they can’t answer why they’re doing certain things then we know they were coached through it. We want them to understand [the role of a teacher and the] interaction with children.

Participants also stated that situational questions were also asked to determine the applicant decision-making skills. One participant stated:

We ask questions …. to see their ability to make a decision, right or wrong, and to determine if they are capable of making a decision.

One participant indicated that the school’s interview process did not typically use situational questions due to the applicant’s lack of teaching and classroom experience. The participant stated:
Nine times out of ten … you are talking to someone who is coming out of industry and they want to be a teacher, so it’s tough to ask them a question that is situational or past experience.

*Use longer interview or larger number of questions.* Participants were asked to describe, in terms of length, format, and number of questions or activities, their selection interview process. Of the six participants, one participant described the school’s practice of consistently using a three interview selection process, two described consistently conducting a two interview process, and three described typically conducting a two interview process unless certain variables occurred, such as a limited number of applicants for a vacancy, clear consensus among panel members, and time constraints such as a vacancy during the school year. Five participants also described using various activities in addition to interview questions during the selection interview, such as teaching of a lesson, a writing exercise, reflection exercise, and touring the building and classroom/instructional lab.

The participant that stated the school’s use of a three-interview selection interview stated the full process occurred over approximately a two-and-a-half hour time period. The participant described the first interview as a screening interview. The participant stated:

> We will conduct a screening or mini interview. We will bring in anywhere from ten to twelve people and conduct a fifteen-minute interview where we ask three to four questions, and we will give them a chance to ask questions. We do this screening interview as a way of further narrowing the pool of candidates that are most serious and have the greatest fit for the position. Often times, two people are conducting that first interview. The applicants are told that they were selected for a screening interview and that it will be a fifteen to twenty minute interview. They know right up front, even before they choose to come in, that it is not only a screening interview but that it will be very short. We will inform them of the salary range for the position at that time. We try to make sure that the people who advance to the second interview are serious candidates.
The same participant further described the second and third interview in the school’s selection process and stated that both of these interviews use a question and answer interview format. The participant stated:

The second interview typically involves four to five candidates and includes more [panel members]. [The second] interview is about an hour for each candidate. The final interview consists of typically two candidates, sometimes three candidates. Rarely [is it] just one candidate. The third interview lasts about an hour. This interview is more in depth than the second interview where we use a different series of questions. We want to see how the candidate responds in order to see if they are consistent in their responses and if there is more substance. This interview is a validation of the second interview, and we are trying to make a choice between the two [or three final] candidates. We are weighing the pros and cons and the strengths and weaknesses that each candidate brings to the position and trying to make a decision on who is the best fit.

The two participants whose schools consistently use a two-interview selection process described a complete process ranging from approximately two to three hours in length with formats that included a standard question and answer format along with other interview activities, such as the applicant teaching a lesson, preparing a writing sample, visiting the classroom, and providing the interview committee with a written reflection.

One participant described the process and stated:

At the first interview, we are asking [several] questions. We decide on the top candidates … and ask them to [return for a second interview]. [When the second interview is scheduled] we will ask them to teach a lesson and give them a topic. It can be a very simple lesson on safety, or measurement, or taking blood pressure. It’s a small lesson, but we want them to go through the process.

A second participant described the school used a two-interview selection process in terms of a three-hour process with various interview activities other than interview questioning. The participant stated:

We use a two-interview format. The first interview is strictly a question and answer interview process. We use a rubric to rate all of the candidates given an initial interview and then we conduct a final interview with the top three. That interview involves five components: additional questions, presentation of a
lesson, a classroom visitation with the opportunity to meet students if they are present, a written reflection of the visit and, a response to a scenario where the teacher is having a problem with a student and writes a letter to the parent regarding that problem.

Three participants described a process that may include either a one or a two interview process occurring approximately 45 minutes to two hours in length. Participants indicated that the number of applicants often determined the school’s practice of determining the number of interviews in their selection process. One participant stated:

I like to do two interviews, but it all depends. For example, we had [a CTC teacher vacancy]. The pool was so small period. We advertised for months and months and we only had three applicants. The process was…a first interview and a phone discussion regarding the position. In other cases, we narrow [the candidate pool] down and have a first and a second interview.

Another determination for conducting a one or two interview process described by a participant was lack of consensus of the panel conducting the interview. The participant stated:

We usually conduct a one-interview process unless we cannot come to clear consensus, and that has happened where the interview team has been ambivalent. If it’s not clear-cut that we have the same top candidate, then we will bring back the top two candidates [for a second interview].

All six participants in this study indicated that they personally participant in their school selection interview for each new teacher/instructor hired. One participant stated that a second sometimes occurs in order to ensure the director’s participation. The participant stated:

There are also times when I do not sit on a first interview and when that happened, the committee gives me a recommendation [and a second interview will be scheduled with the finalists].
Two of the participants that stated their school conducted either a one or two interview process and regardless of number of interviews, their school’s process included standard interview questions and the candidate teaching a lesson. Both participants also stated that the applicants were informed of the lesson prior to the interview. One participant described the interview process and stated:

We budget one hour and fifteen minutes for the first interview. We allow about fifteen minutes for the teaching of the lesson and about an hour for the interview questions, with about eighteen questions. After the candidate has been introduced to the panel, we tell them we have a series of questions related to the position they have applied to, and we ask them to teach a fifteen minute lesson. When they teach the lesson we tell them to pretend we are students and that they have fifteen minutes to go through the lesson.

The other participant described the teaching of a lesson during the interview could occur at either the first of second interview, but teaching the lesson was a consistent component of the school’s interview process. The participant stated:

Teaching a lesson can be either …be part of the first interview or during a second interview. We will never ask them to teach a lesson without warning them about it. We are not interested in surprises. We tell the candidates up front to be prepared to teach us something, and this can happen for a first interview or a second interview.

Control ancillary information. Participants were asked to discuss applicant ancillary information given to the interview panel members and their use of these materials during the selection interview. Participants were asked to describe the materials and asked if interview questions were based on these materials. All six participants indicated that interview panel members received a packet of information on the candidates including the resume and standard application. Participants also indicated that other materials may appear in their packets, including reference letters, industry certifications, and/or the applicant’s cover letter.
The use of these materials to form interview questions generated a mix of responses from the participants. Two participants stated that the materials were not used to ask interview questions. Four participants indicated ancillary information, such as the resume or candidate application may generate an interview question added to the scripted questions or follow-up questions. One participant described the process where ancillary information was used for follow-up questions and stated:

The information isn’t used for questions, but as we look at the candidates it might result in a follow-up question or a specific question. For example, if I have a candidate that has indicated that they have been dismissed from a position, we are not going to ask that question of all candidates. But if someone has been terminated and they have advanced through our interview process, we are going to ask them very specifically questions about it. That type of question would be generated by the [information provided on the] application itself.

Another participant described the ancillary information provided to the panel and interview questions asked based on this information. The participant stated:

Every interviewer will have a packet that includes the resume, the application, and a blank question sheet where they make notes. At any given point in time [during the interview], someone will read the resume and develop a question based on it.

The third participant described how ancillary information brought into the interview from the candidate might generate interview questions. The participant stated:

A lot of times [a candidate] will come [to the interview] with a portfolio. We will give them time at the end [of the interview] to review what they brought.

The fourth participant described asking questions based on ancillary information. The participant stated:

While questions are scripted, during the second interview at times I will ask about their [application] essay or their resume.

Do not allow questions from candidate until after the interview. As a common practice, all participants stated that their school’s selection interview begins with
providing the candidate with an overview of the interview process. Four of the six participants stated that candidates are informed that candidate questions are only permitted at the conclusion of the interview while two participants stated that candidate questions are permitted throughout the interview. The two participants that stated candidate questions are permitted throughout the interview encouraged this practice in order to create a dialogue with the candidates. One participant stated:

We give [the candidate] the opportunity [to ask questions] after we explain the process of the interview and before we starting asking them questions. We assure them that throughout the interview process they are free to ask a question at any time. At the end of the interview we also give them the opportunity to ask questions. We keep it very open. We …tell them that this process should involve us interviewing them and them interviewing us. It has to be a joint match, and they need to feel as good about the decision …. as we do.

Another participant stated:

We tell the candidate when they come in that this is as much a dialogue as it is us [asking] questions at them. We [state] that [the candidate] should interpret the question the way that they see fit, but at any given time they should feel free to dialogue back with us.

**Rating each answer or use multiple scales.** Participants were asked to discuss and review their interview rating materials. Five of the six participants stated that their school’s interview process included rating each answer or used multiple scales to evaluate the candidates. Of the five participants, two indicated that their process included both rating each answer and used multiple scales. The three other participants indicated that they did not rate each answer as a standard practice but consistently used multiple scales. One participant described the candidate rating process and stated:

We evaluate every response. Each question has a zero to ten [point] value. We have a place [on the rating sheet] where we can take notes relative to their answer and [rate] their answer. Each person on the interview committee completes their own rating sheet. We have a master sheet for each candidate. Once everyone is done scoring, their individual ratings are tallied and the average tally score is
placed on the master rating sheet. All those individual rating sheets provide back up to the master sheet which becomes part of their file.

The five participants described the process of evaluation using multiple scales or dimensions of the participants’ interview responses. All five participants discussed various attributes and characteristics that were evaluated during their selection interviews. Common characteristics discussed included professional qualities, such as technical competence, level of education, industry experience, and earned industry certifications. Participants also identified personal and interpersonal qualities that were evaluated and rated. These personal qualities included personality, demeanor that connects with youth, attire, verbal communications, listening skills, poise, confidence, responsibility, teamwork, flexibility, enthusiasm, and organizational fit. One participant described the component of the evaluation process and stated:

The rating scale is broken into two sections. One section is the teaching discipline, such as technical expertise, knowledge of technology, knowledge of curriculum, instruction, assessments, and knowledge of teaching in order for us to get their background in teaching and their ability to teach. The second section is affect [where we rate] their interpersonal skills, including communication skills, sense of humor, professional presentation, appearance, and professionalism. Those are some of the criteria that we judge the candidate against. We evaluate them according to the criteria, not by each response to each question. Based on their response to the question, we determine, based on the criteria, how well they scored. We will not necessarily rate the quality of their response, but how that response fits into various dimensions. If a person is not responding succinctly, to the point, and in depth under the category called, Communication Skills, that category might be adversely affected, but we are looking at other dimensions too. So a person’s response to one question could be evaluated across several dimensions.

Another participant discussed the various characteristics evaluated during the selection interview and stated:

We try to look for everything from their communication skills to their job knowledge.
One participant stated that the school’s selection process does not include the rating of each answer or use of multiple scales. The participant summarized the evaluation process and stated:

We don’t have a rubric, so there is no standard means by which we evaluate the candidates. Each person uses their own system and at the end of the interviews …. we attempt to find consensus among the committee members.

Use of detailed anchored rating scales. Five of the six participants reported the use of an anchored rating scale to evaluate the candidates. Rating scales ranged from a one to ten point scale to a one to four point rating scale. The same participant that stated that the process did not evaluate each answer of use multiple scales also indicated not using an anchored rating scale. One participant described the rating scale used in both the first and second interview and stated:

We have a rubric for the questions. There is a separate …. rubric for their personal characteristics, which is also on a zero to ten scale. The two are added together to get a total point value. When we are done interviewing all the candidates, we look at the top three [candidates] who scored the most points for a second interview. During the second interview, we do the same type of rating.

Taking detailed notes. All six participants indicated that their interview panel members typically take notes and that the level of detail of note taking was at the discretion of the panel members. Participants described interview notes as comments and reflections related to either specific individual interview questions or notations related to various criteria on the school’s rating form. One participant described typical note taking activities that occur during the selection interview and stated:

We jot down anecdotal notes all the time. Some people on the panel are very detailed and others are not. Some will wait and write notes in the block at the bottom of the form, and at the end of the interview will fill it out at that time. Some people will write notes for every question. It’s up to the individual.
Participants were asked to describe the use and purpose of interview notes and the status of these notes at the conclusion of the interview. All six participants stated that they personally took notes in order to recall details of the interview. Five of the six participants stated that interview notes were collected and placed in the human resource files at the conclusion of the interviews. One participant stated that interview notes were collected and destroyed.

**Using multiple interviewers.** All six participants stated interview panels consisting of the school’s administrators, conduct the school’s teacher/instructor selection interviews. Five participants also discussed including a content or industry expert related with the vacancy on the panel to assist with the selection process. Two participants indicated that their school consistently included the a member of the program occupational advisory committee (OAC) while one indicated intermittent use of an OAC member. Five of the school’s indicated intermittent use of a related program instructor or retired instructor to participate on the panel. Only one school indicated that the school’s process did not use an OAC, related program teacher/instructor, or industry content expert either consistently or intermittently.

Of the five participants that used industry content experts to participate on the panel, all five indicated that the expert was there to advise on the technical competence of the candidate and assist with the selection of the candidate, but they did not receive a vote toward the final selected candidate. Related to OAC involvement on the panel, one participant stated:

Sometimes the applicant will give us an answer that sounds good to us but it’s not accurate. For the technical part, we really use our advisory members. I tell the candidates who our industry people are when they come in [to the interview]. I tell them that [the OAC members] help us with the technical program. They don’t
get a vote. I don’t want to put [the OAC member] on the spot. Sometimes they know the applicant. They don’t get a vote but they are here to help us make a recommendation to the board.

Another participant commented about having a former instructor participate on the panel and stated:

We really lean on them to determine the candidate’s level of expertise within the trade. We value their opinion but we don’t want them to be part of that final decision. We don’t want to put them in that position.

Another participant cited the use of a teacher on the panel for the purpose of having and industry expertise but that the teacher will not have a vote in the process. The participant stated:

I make it clear that at the end of the process the teacher will tell us their choice, and then they can leave. I’m not going to let them pick their peers, nor do I want them to think they are picking them. I tell them that we will be making the final decision, and we want them there to help us [determine the candidate’s technical competence].

Using the same interviewer(s) across all candidates. All six participants stated that their selection interview panel members remained consistent across candidates for each round of interviews. Variations occurred with panel members from first to second interviews, but did not vary across candidates for first, second, or third rounds. One participant stated:

We keep the panel intact across each of the interviews. For example, the panel [members] who conduct the first screening interview [will] interview all the applicants and make a determination for the second interview. That process happens for the second and the third interviews too.

Another participant reiterated the importance of a consistent interview panel and stated:

We will not allow someone to interview some and not all of the candidates. If that happens, I will throw out their ratings. I’m not going to have them influence the decision.
**Don’t discuss candidates or answers between interviews.** Two participants indicated that panel members were to rate and score candidates prior to discussion, and four participants stated that informal discussion may or may not occur between interviews depending on time constraints between scheduled interviews. Of the two participants that required their panel members first score the candidate prior to discussion, fairness and the influence of others was cited as the reasons for not discussing the candidates. One participant stated:

> [Discussing candidates between interviews] is something that I don’t like to do. If we do it at all, it’s after everyone has completed the rating. I don’t want anyone to be talking about the candidate until they finish the rating. I don’t even like to do it then, unless there is something really significant that needs to be brought up. I think everyone has the expectations of what we are looking for, and I don’t think it’s appropriate to try to sway people from one place to the other. In particular, in my position I try to say nothing at all because I don’t want to influence anybody.

The other participant stated that panel members were required to rate candidates prior to any discussion:

> We fill out our rating sheets first before we talk about [the candidate]. I want to make sure no one influences anyone else on the committee.

Four participants stated that informal discussion was permitted and often occurred between interviews where panel members expressed their appraisal of the candidates. Only time constraints between candidate interviews was cited as the reason discussion may not occurred. One participant stated:

> Typically between each interview we will go around and discuss our general response and the strengths and weaknesses of each of the candidates. We don’t have a lot of time between interviews so that is a relatively short, informal discussion.

Another participant stated:
It depends on the time frame. If we have someone waiting, that came in early or we ran late, we go into the next and start the interview. If there is a gap and there is time we will discuss them.

**Provide extensive interviewing training.** Participants were asked to describe the interview training that was provided to panel members. All six participants described in-house or on-the-job training activities. Three participants described a practice of internal training for panel members. One participant described the internal training process occurred when a new administrator joined the school organization. The participant stated:

For [any] new administrator, they are given guidance before we do the first couple of interviews. [They are provided] a copy of the hiring procedure so that they know what their responsibilities are for hiring. I go over with them the process, what we are looking for, and the evaluation rubric. I explain that they will get the materials on the candidate in advance and it’s their responsibility to review them. I contact the OAC members [who will be on our panel interview team] myself. I try to get a cross section from the membership list. I explain to them the process, and I send them the documents in advance through email.

Another participant described their training of panel members as follows:

Usually about a half hour before the interviews start we review the schedule and set the parameters for the interviews. We talk about, in general terms, the kind of questions we can ask and the questions that have been selected from our list. There are times when someone will want to ask a question that is not on the list. We will allow this to occur, but the panelist must prepare the question up front and in writing. There are no surprises during the interview. We spend time [prior to the interviews] and identify which person will ask which questions. We do not permit random question to be asked, unless it’s a follow-up question. Also, we discuss [interview questions that] can and cannot be asked and who will [facilitate] the interview process. We then know who will meet and greet the candidate, bring them in, start the interview, keep track of time, and keeps the pace of the interview moving. We do all of the orientation and training before we start the whole process. We also talk about the confidentiality of the process and maintaining the confidentiality of the candidates, their background, and their responses.

One participant discussed the interview training that occurred for OAC members who participate on the interview panel. The participant stated:
We will do some training for our industry people. We will talk to them about our process and their role. They are shop owners and managers, so interviewing is not new to them. We will talk about what you can ask and what you cannot ask, how notes will be taken, and [provide them with the application materials for] each candidate.

Three participants described an on-the-job model used to train panel members of the selection interview. One participant stated:

We do so much [interviewing], which results in us getting good at it. We don’t do any formal outside training.

Another participant stated that time on-the-job has been the model for forming the panel members interview practices and stated:

Some of us have been doing this for a long time, but there is no formal training.

Participants were also asked to describe their own training and professional development activities to conduct properly interviewing and selection techniques.

Participants described various activities, including attending workshops, taking college courses within the degree or certification program, consulting with colleagues or legal experts, acquiring resource materials, and training through the job experience. One participant stated:

Most of my training has been on-the-job. Some of my training came from the [college degree program] where I took a course [that included] personnel management and interviewing. It was also part of the Director’s and Supervisor’s Certificate where there were courses related to interviewing. I also have attended a lot of workshops and seminars on human resources and personnel. In my role as Director, I am ultimately responsible for all our HR functions, so I attend seminars and workshops on the employment process from advertising the position to the orientation of the individual.

Other participants indicated similar experiences and stated:

I have gone to at least two workshops on hiring. I have a couple books on hiring, [and] I have a video on hiring the right teachers. Both of the seminars were conducted by lawyers about hiring and the importance of having a standard set of interview questions and what you may not ask in an interview.
Another participant discussed attending employment interview workshops focused on legal requirements and stated:

I go to at least two or three legal workshops per year. I get updates that way.

Participants also described learning and using interview practices by doing, rather than extensive training. One participant stated:

I think it’s more experience interviewing people than anything else. I think you make the mistakes and you figure out what to do and not do. So experience becomes more valuable than formal book training.

*Use statistical rather than clinical prediction.* Participants were asked to describe the process used to make the final selection of the candidate. While five of the six participants indicated that rating sheets and rubrics are used to rate and evaluate the candidates, all five stated that these tools were used to as a guide and not used exclusively to determine the final candidate. Each of the six participants stated that a consensus approach was used to determine the final candidate and when consensus was not reached they, as the school’s Director, made the final decision. One participant described the concern regarding the use of the rating and evaluation process to make the final candidate decision and stated:

Our rating scales run from one to four. Based on what the candidates score, we talk about what each candidate brings to the school and their strengths and weaknesses. I suspect that if we added up the numbers, the highest score would go to the selected candidate, but we don’t use the numbers formally. It serves as a tool for us to discuss the candidates, to capture information, and to judge the candidates against, but it is not that formal of a tool. We don’t feel that the tool is precise as a measuring device, and we have four to six people completing the tool. We have not done a tremendous amount of training to ensure interrater reliability as we evaluate the various dimensions. It’s not a precise tool and to use it as if it is, I think, would be tremendously flawed.
One participant described the consensus approach for selecting the final candidate stated:

I ask everybody to add up their numbers and to rank order the candidates. We then go around the room and identify who we have for candidate one, candidate two, candidate three. Most of the time we are all [identifying] the same candidate one or candidate two. But if we are off, I have them look at their rubric and identify why we are different. That is when I really want to talk about the candidates. There is discussion at that point. We are looking at the candidates and deciding if we need to have a second interview. It’s mostly done at this point by consensus. It’s pretty surprising how much we all agree when naming candidate one.

Another participant described the selection decision process and stated:

At the conclusion of the interview, that’s when we have our formal review of all the candidates. Each panelist has the opportunity to talk about the strengths and challenges that person would have and ultimately we try to come to consensus, whether it’s the first, second, or third interview. We talk about their strengths and weaknesses and how they fit with the position. We discuss how the candidates were rated. Interestingly enough, consensus is reached relatively fast. Ultimately, if we can’t come to consensus, I will make the final decision.

**Summary of the results of research question one.** The results of research question one found that either five or all of the study's participants consistently adopted eight of the fifteen components of structure, including basing questions on a job analysis, asking the same exact questions to each candidate, using better types of questions, conducting longer interviews and larger numbers of questions, rating each answer or multiple scales, using anchored rating scales, and using multiple interviewers and consistent interview panels across all candidates.

The findings also indicated three areas in which structured interview practices did not exist nor were adopted by five or all of participants. These areas not adopted and used by the participants were: (1) a practice of consistent and detailed panel member note
taking, (2) a lack of extensive interview training, and (3) not using the statistics obtained on the school’s anchored rating scales to determine the final candidate.

There were four areas in which the participants indicated a mix of responses to the adoption and use of interview structure practices. Mixed responses included: (1) limiting candidate prompting, follow-up questions, and elaboration on questions; (2) the control of ancillary information; (3) allowing candidate questions before the end of the interview; and (4) discussing candidates and/or answers between interviews.

**Results for Research Question Two**

What are the major CTE teacher interview questions used by CTE administrators during the interview process and how do responses to those questions impact and inform administrators’ selection decisions? Question 21 in the Interview Guide was designed to investigate applicant reaction to questions that most inform the participant’s decision to select, or not select, an applicant for a teaching position at their perspective CTCs. All six participants stated that it was not responses to questions that informed their decision to hire, but rather intrinsic, personal, and professional characteristics that emerged during the process. Six characteristics emerged from the participants as important when evaluating the candidate’s answers and reactions during the interview. These characteristics and are summarized in Table 12 and are further described in detail in the text following the table.
### Table 12

*Summary of Findings Related to Candidate Characteristic and Look-for’s During the Interview*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant Characteristics</th>
<th>Descriptive Summary of Look-for’s as Identified by the Study’s Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moral Character and Work Ethic</td>
<td>Six participants described looking for a candidate who displays a positive attitude and is willing to go above and beyond the typical school day, and who is committed to the school, its students, and the community. A candidate who has high expectations for students and self with moral integrity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disposition and Temperament</td>
<td>Six participants described looking for a candidate who is open-minded and able to take criticism; not afraid to ask for help; able to handle stressful situations with students, parents, community members, and the school’s staff in a professional manner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication Skills</td>
<td>Five participants described looking for a candidate who presents strong verbal and written communications skills through the interview (verbal) and in written documents (application materials).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on Students</td>
<td>Four participants described looking for a candidate who has indicated that they want to be an educator, enjoys students and wants to be a role model, and seeks to be a positive influence in a student’s life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Fit</td>
<td>Four participants described looking for a candidate who is adaptable and can be a positive fit within an organization and is committed to making a career change from industry to educator.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Competence</td>
<td>Four participants described looking for a candidate who has the technical competence needed to make teaching a career area and who is willing to stay current with industry trends and skills training.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Participants in this study were asked to identify one or two interview questions perceived as most informing their decision to hire a candidate. Unanimously, all six participants stated that their decision to hire an applicant was based on more than a question or two asked during the selection process. One participant summarized the decision making process and stated:

I don’t think that there is a particular question that we ask. It’s their response that informs our decision. It’s not just one response. It’s not only the substance but the manner in which a person responds to a series of questions that convinces us that they are the right person.
Another participant stated:

There isn’t a moment or a question that we ask. It’s a whole process and the responses to our questions. It’s the way they interact and their personality that is a big part of it. If you can’t communicate then you can’t get the job done, but you can’t teach what you don’t know either.

The participants identified six key look-for’s during the selection interview that inform their selection decision. These look-for’s were identified by at least four of the six participants and comprised a set of applicant characteristics including: (1) possessing moral character and a strong work ethic, (2) disposition and temperament, (3) strong communication skills, (4) a focus on students, (5) organizational fit, and (6) technical competence related to the teaching position.

**Moral character and work ethic.** Six participants discussed candidate look for’s, such as honesty, integrity, teamwork, self-motivation, and enthusiasm as important characteristics evaluated during the selection interview. One participant discussed an interview question designed to discern a candidate’s moral character and work ethic. The participant stated:

The last question that we end every interview with is, “Define character and integrity for me”. One of the things I strongly believe is that if you hire the right people all of your management problems will go away. You want people who are self-motivated, self-learning, self-guided. We want honest people, high character people, and people with integrity. We always ask that question at the end of the interview. It’s interesting, the kind of answers you get, but it tells you something about the person. If they can reflect on what character is and what integrity is, then you know they have at least thought about it.

Another participant stated that the interview questions are also designed to identify a candidate who will go above and beyond for the students and the school. The participant stated:

I also want someone who is willing to work for the school not just for the students but for the school too, where they will get out there and be enthusiastic and
promote the program. Sometimes you can tell that when they say, “What do you mean I need to get out there, speak to people, and promote my program?” That puts me off.

One participant identified negativity by the candidate as a reason to not hire. The participant stated:

One of the biggest turnoffs for me is when you are in the interview and the applicant is complaining about where they work. If they are complaining about where they work, if they aren’t excited about their job then they are part of the problem. If they complain about their boss or complain about [their employer] it’s unprofessional, and I do not want to hear it. Don’t tell me why you want to leave your organization, tell me why you want to work here. I won’t hire anyone who is negative.

**Disposition and temperament.** Six participants described assessing a candidate’s personality to determine if the candidate could adjust to the rigors of teaching and working with youth. One participant indicated that the transition from trades person to teacher required the new teacher to know when they needed to seek out help and support. The participant summarized and stated:

They are not coming with a lot of teaching pedagogy so for me to significantly penalize somebody because they didn’t have the lesson plan in an LFS format; I don’t think that’s fair to the candidate. When we [ask the candidate to explain, in their opinion] the role of administration and how they would use administration, if I don’t hear that they are going to come to administration to ask for guidance or they are going to go to a mentor or someone else for help, than that’s pretty telling to me that they probably not going to accept constructive criticism or ask for advice. Let’s face it. Moving somebody from business and industry to the classroom, if they have too much pride that they can’t ask somebody for help, including their mentor, they are going to be lost.

Another participant stated that some interview questions are focused on the candidate’s personality when dealing with student and classroom issues. The participant stated:

I want to see the temperament of the individual, knowing that the successful technical teachers have to roll with the punches. I don’t want the person who calls every two minutes saying that this student is chewing gum, or a piece of
paper fell on the floor. But I also don’t want the person that lets all [heck] breaks loose and won’t do anything about it.

One participant further discussed the assessment of a candidate’s disposition and temperament and stated:

It’s the ‘affect’ that convinces us that this is the candidate for the job. The good teacher is going to be the person with good interpersonal skills, cares about kids, is focused on wanting to make a difference in the lives of kids, and if going to give us 150 percent.

**Communication skills.** Five participants stated that strong written and verbal communication skills were important applicant skills assessed as a component of the selection. An applicant’s ability to articulate answers to posed interview questions was identified as a look for by the participants. One participant stated:

It’s … their ability to communicate and their interactions and responses to questions.

Another participant simply stated:

If you can’t communicate then you can’t get the job done.

**Focus on students.** Four participants stated that during the selection interview candidates are assessed on their commitment and dedication to students. One participant stated:

I really try to keep note of where students are in their conversation, how important are students? When they talk about the grading situation, are they talking about what’s best for the student? Or the angry parent, how do they portray the student and does it sound like the student is going to be their number one priority?

Another participant reiterated that successful candidates focus the interview responses on a desire to work with students. The participant stated:

I think one of the things we try to focus on or give the candidates an opportunity to say is that they like kids and that they want to work with kids. Kids are the focus of their wanting to be a teacher. We have several questions that give people the opportunity to say that. If they don’t say that they want to work with kids
when they have some of these opportunities, then it tends to have us question whether they are the candidate.

A third participant stated that successful candidates need to be a role model that will care for the students they will teach. The participated stated:

Our kids need more than just a teacher, they need a role model who is going to care about them, who is going to be compassionate about their problems, and who is going to be there and step in to help. We are looking for that kind of person, a person who is going to be more than just a teacher.

**Organizational fit.** Four participants stated that when evaluating a candidate there is a determination about the candidate’s ability to fit within the organization and have the ability to assimilate and add value to school. One participant described organization fit and stated:

After review of all the technical qualifications, compared all the answers and assessed the personality of the person, do they fit the culture of our school? Does this person have the right type of work ethic, are they going to be a good part of the team, are they an introvert, do they match the other personalities of the school?

Another participant reiterated the assessment of a candidate’s fit within the school culture and stated:

When you hear their responses, their enthusiasm, their genuineness, their ability to articulate and communicate, the use of good interpersonal skills, and their focus on the fact that this is a career change that they want to pursue, you know it’s the right fit.

**Technical competence.** Four participants reiterated throughout the interview that technical competence was assessed on interview rating sheets. OAC members were identified as industry experts added to interview panels to assure technical competence of the applicants. One participant described the importance of technical competence of the applicants and stated:
Their technical experience, to me, is paramount. First you have to be technically qualified then they must have communication skills, organizational skills, their general personality, [all of which are assessed during our selection interview].

Another participant simply stated:

You can’t teach what you don’t know.

Summary of the results of research question 2. This study found that there was not a defining interview question that informed the selection decision, but various candidate personal and professional characteristics, attitudes, and behaviors that informed the decision. Six applicant characteristics emerged from the participants as look for’s that helped to determine the final candidate. These included strong communication skills, a focus on students, moral character and work ethic, disposition and temperament, organizational fit, and technical competence. In summary, one participant stated that no one interview question, but a series of candidate characteristics inform the selection decision:

I don’t think that there is a particular question that we ask. It’s their response that informs our decision. It’s not just one response. It’s not only the substance but the manner in which a person responds to a series of questions that convinces us that they are the right person. When you hear their responses, their enthusiasm, their genuineness, their ability to articulate and communicate, the use of good interpersonal skills, and their focus on the fact that this is a career change that they want to pursue, you know it’s the right fit. We want a person who will look at themselves critically, that’s going to be professional, that’s going to work hard, and that cares about kids. That’s the kind of person we want to hire.

Chapter Summary

This chapter presented the results of this study on the CTE teacher interview and selection decision. These results were taken from the analysis of the data including interviews and school selection interview artifacts. The findings included the majority of participants adopted of some structured interview practices. This study also found that no
one interview question informs the selection decision, but rather a series of applicant characteristics are assessed and used to select the final candidate. In the next chapter a discussion of these results and recommendations for further research will be explored.
CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS

Summary

The purpose of this study was to examine the extent to which research-based interview practices, including structure, were used during the selection of new career and technical education (CTE) teachers. This study also sought to identify interview questions asked by CTE administrators that are perceived to most influence the selection and hiring decisions. This study considered the perspectives and practices of six Pennsylvania career and technology center (CTC) Directors. A blueprint for structured interviewing, defined by Campion, Palmer and Campion (1997) served as the theoretical framework for the study. A discussion of the study’s findings are related to this framework and presented in this chapter. One major goal of this chapter is to place the study’s results in context with recent research literature. Also presented are six applicant characteristics, assessed and identified by the study’s participants, that most influenced their hiring decisions. This chapter also identifies implications for future research and implications for CTE practitioners.

The two research questions of this study were to (1) determine the extent and how structure is used during the CTC teacher interview process and (2) determine the most common CTC teacher interview questions used by CTC Directors during the interview process and how the responses to those questions impact and inform administrators’ selection decisions. The analysis of data resulted in the identification of key interview practices used by the participants and benchmarked these practices against 15 components of a structured interview, identified and defined by Campion, et al. (1997).
Also, this study found that various candidate personal and professional characteristics, attitudes, and behaviors, rather than a defining interview question, informed the selection decision. Six applicant characteristics emerged from the participants as look for’s with the intention to help determine the final candidate. These included moral character and work ethic, disposition and temperament, strong communication skills, a focus on students, organizational fit, and technical competence.

For the purpose of this chapter, the correlation of data to the 15 elements of interview structure precedes the six applicant characteristics that emerged as candidate look for’s. The chapter ends with implications for both further research and implications for CTE practitioners.

The Structured Interview and the Study’s Findings

The structured employment interview involves the use of standard procedures in which interview questions are asked and the response is evaluated and benchmarked against duties and responsibilities of the job for which the applicant is applying (Buckley, Norris, & Wiese, 2000; Campion, et al., 1997; Huffcut & Arthur, 1994; O’Rourke, 1929). The structured interview is more valid and reliable than the unstructured interview in that it both determines an applicant’s skills and competencies and has been tested to be an accurate predictor of future job success (Campion, Campion, & Hudson, 1994; Conway & Peneno, 1999; Ellis, West, Ryan, & DeShon, 2002; Howard & Johnson, 2010; Huffcut, Weekley, Wiesner, Degroot, & Jones, 2001; Morgeson, Campion & Levashina, 2009; Schmidt & Zimmerman, 2004). Structure implies that “all candidates for the same position should be interviewed using the same set of rules, developed in advance, in order to gather the information needed to evaluate their potential for success”
(Howard & Johnson, 2010, p.15). The research conducted by Campion, et al. (1997) served as the theoretical framework for this study and divides the structured interview into two broad categories: interview content and interview evaluation. Within these categories are 15 components of interview structure that include the following:

Interview Content

- Base questions on a job analysis.
- Ask identical questions to each candidate.
- Limit prompting, follow-up questions, and elaborating on questions.
- Using better types of questions.
- Use longer interview or larger number of questions.
- Control ancillary information.
- Do not allow questions from candidate until after the interview.

Interview Evaluation

- Rate each answer or use multiple scales.
- Use of a detailed anchored rating scales.
- Take detailed notes.
- Use multiple interviewers.
- Use the same interviewer(s) across all candidates.
- Don’t discuss candidates or answers between interviews.
- Provide extensive interviewing training.
- Use statistical rather than clinical prediction.

This study focused on determining the degree to which interview structure was adopted by the participants using Campion et al. (1997) as the theoretical framework.
Like the research conducted by Hindman and Stronge (2009), Lievens and De Paepe’s (2004), Simola, Tagger, and Smith (2007) and van der Zee, Bakker and Bakker (2002), this study found that the adoption and use of a structured interview process appeared to be inconsistent and even, at times, arbitrary. Results indicated that five or all of the study's participant responses, consistently adopted eight of the fifteen components of structure, including: (1) basing questions on a job analysis; (2) asking identical questions to each candidate; (3) using better types of questions; (4) conducting longer interviews and larger numbers of questions; (5) rating each answer on multiple scales; (6) using anchored rating scales; (7) using multiple interviewers, and (8) consistent interview panels across all candidates. Table 13 identifies the components of interview structure consistently adopted and used by the study's participants in their CTC teacher selection interviews.
Table 13

*Components of Interview Structure Consistently Adopted and Used by the Study’s Participants*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A2. Ask identical questions to each candidate.</td>
<td>A.2. All six participants ask identical questions to each candidate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A4. Ask better types of questions.</td>
<td>A.4.1. All six participants use various types of questions including general questions and technical knowledge questions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A5. Use longer interview or larger number of questions.</td>
<td>A.4.2. Five of six participants use behavior description questions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A.4.3. Five of six participants use situational questions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Interview Evaluation</td>
<td>B1. Rating each answer or use multiple scales.</td>
<td>B1. Five of six participants rate each answer or use multiple scales.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B3. Using multiple interviewers.</td>
<td>B.3. All six participants use multiple interviewers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B4. Using the same interviewer(s) across all candidates.</td>
<td>B.4. All six participants use the same interviewers across all candidates.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The findings also indicated there were three areas in which structured interview practices did not exist nor were adopted by five or all participants. These areas not
adopted nor used by the participants included the following: (1) a consistent practice where panel members took detailed notes; (2) a lack of extensive interview training; (3) and not adopting a practice of using the statistics obtained through the panel member’s evaluation, the anchored rating scales, to determine the final candidate.

Table 14 identifies the components of interview structure consistently not adopted nor used by the study's participants in their CTC teacher selection interviews. 

Table 14

Components of Interview Structure Consistently Not Adopted Nor Used by the Study’s Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B. Interview Evaluation</td>
<td>B1. Taking detailed notes.</td>
<td>B.3. All six participants take notes; but the detail of note taking was at the discretion of the interviewer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B2. Provide extensive interviewing training.</td>
<td>B.7. 1. While all six participants described in-house or on-the-job interview panel member training, none were described as extensive training. B.7.2. While all six participants described their own training in varying degrees from on-the-job to various activities and workshops, none described the training as extensive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B3. Use statistical rather than clinical prediction.</td>
<td>B.8. No participant indicated the use of rating form statistics to determine the final candidate.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There were four areas where the participants indicated a mix of responses to the adoption and use of interview structure practices. Mixed responses included: (1) limiting candidate prompting, follow-up questions, and elaboration on questions; (2) control of ancillary information; (3) allowing candidates to ask questions before the end of the interview; and (4) discussing candidates and responses between interviews. Table 15 identifies the components of interview structure consistently not adopted nor used by the study's participants in their CTC teacher selection interviews.
Table 15

Components of Interview Structure that Yielded a Mixed Response to Use or Adoption by the Study’s Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Interview Content</td>
<td>A3. Limit prompting, follow-up questions, and elaborating on questions.</td>
<td>A.3. Two participants limit prompting, follow-up questions, or elaborate on questions; three participants allow rephrasing or restating questions and some follow-up questions; one participant allowed follow-up questions at any time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A7. Do not allow questions from candidate until after the interview.</td>
<td>A.7. Four of six participants do not allow candidate questions until the end of the interview and two participants permit candidate questions throughout interview.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Interview Evaluation</td>
<td>B6. Don’t discuss candidates or answers between interviews.</td>
<td>B.6. Two of six participants do not allow discussion until candidate is rated; four participants allow discussion of candidates and answers between interviews.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The findings in this study indicate a presence of structured interview practices and adds to the research regarding structured interviewing, especially that conducted within the K-12 environment, which to date is very limited (Hindman & Stronge, 2009). Upon comparison of the results and the documented educational and organizational literature, a few notable findings support and add to the literature, including the length/duration of the interview, interview questions and types, the use of interview panels, and structured interview training.

Of the six participants in this study, all described a multiple interview process ranging from 45 to 60 minutes in length per interview, thus allowing more time to better know the applicant and the skills and abilities he or she would bring to the position. One
participant described the school’s practice of consistently conducting three interviews for their selection process, two described consistently conducting a two interview process, and three described typically conducting a two interview process unless certain variables occurred, such as a limited number of applicants for a vacancy, clear consensus among panel members, and time constraints such as a vacancy during the school year. Five participants also described using various activities in addition to asking interview, such as teaching a lesson, a writing exercise, a reflection exercise, and touring the building and classroom/instructional lab. This practice supports interview structure in that “length is a basic, but overlooked, component of structure” (Campion et al., 1997, p. 670).

All participants of this study also consistently assembled interview panels and used the same panel members across all candidates for a teaching vacancy. The practice of panel members used to select the CTC teacher supports the research by Braun et al. (1987), DeArmond et al. (2010), Kersten (2008), Mason & Schroeder (2010), and Strauss et al. (2000). Panels, as described in the educational literature, often include the principal, other teachers, and other administrators. This study supports panel interviewing and reveals promising practices for the CTE community. Participants in this study reported the practice of including an industry expert, often on the school’s occupational advisory committee (OAC). Participants reported that industry experts assisted the panel by helping to assess the candidate’s technical competence needed for the teaching vacancy. While all participants stated the industry expert did not have a vote toward the final decision, the participants reported the importance of the industry expert to assess the technical competence of the applicants.
One participant described the process of involving the industry expert, an OAC member, on the interview panel and stated:

The [OAC] member does not get a vote. I don’t want to put him or her in that spot, plus many of the times they know the applicants. They are there to advise us on the decision. I cannot over emphasize how important our advisory committees are. Sometimes the applicant will give us an answer that sounds good to us but it’s not accurate. For the technical part, we really use our advisory members.

Prior researchers including Clement, D’Amico, and Protheroe (2000), Ebmeier and Ng (2005), Stronge and Hindman (2003), Stronge and Hindman (2006), and Hindman and Stronge (2009) reported two notable elements of structured interviewing practices in their investigations: better interview questions used during the selection interview and a consistent practice of asking the same questions to each candidate. In the study reported here, these two interview components were consistently adopted by all participants; they reported consistently using the same questions across all candidates and asking various question types, including general, behavioral description, and situational questions. Yet in contrast to the K-12 research in which behavioral description questions typically are asked of the traditional academic teacher applicant, participants in this study stated that they do not ask about a candidate’s prior classroom experiences but instead ask about past industry experiences.

Participants cited the challenges of asking behavioral description questions related to prior teaching because very few, if any, CTC teacher applicants have any prior teaching experience. The participants indicated their interview process must rely on other strategies and questions and not behavioral description questions to inquire about past classroom experiences. Research by Pulakos and Schmitt (1995) found the behavioral description interview question was “superior to their situational counterparts with respect
to predictions of performance for the present professional job” (p. 306). Huffcut, Weekley, Wiesner, Degroot, and Jones (2001) replicated this study and their results confirmed the results of Palakos and Schmitt (1995) in that they also found a variance existed between the situational and behavioral description interview questions and applicant ratings related to the level of the position interviewed. Their results “show diminished effectiveness for situational interviews and continued effectiveness for behavioral description interviews” (Huffcutt et al., 2001, p. 639). For participants in the CTC community, the inability to draw upon an applicant’s past teaching experience poses unique challenges that require administrators to narrow down the candidate pool and ultimately to hire based on other interview question types and selection process activities.

Interviewer training, as defined by Campion, et al., (1997) is not as much a component of the structured interview, as it is important to ensuring all other elements of interview structure are deployed correctly. This study concurs with other research findings from both educational and organizational literature in which training can be linked to the adoption of structured interview practices (Barclay, 2001; Hindman & Stronge, 2009; Simola, et al., 2007). Participants in this study discussed various in-house and external training sessions on the employment interview, none of which included training or information sessions on structured interview practices. If structured interview training is not widely recognized as a need by organizations, then the adoption of structured interview practices will continue to find limited application (Simola et al., 2007).

Although this study established a relationship between the adoption of several components of interview structure, similar to that found by the researchers van der Zee, et
al. (2002), findings indicated a weak linkage between knowing about structured interview practices and using these practices. In other words, the Directors in this study may be using components of interview structure despite a lack of knowledge or understanding of interview structure and its validity and reliability to determine an applicant’s skills and competencies. The data generated in this study raise important questions about the disconnections between research-based, structured interview practices and those considered by a select group of CTC Directors from Southeast and Central Pennsylvania.

Research supports interview structure as a predictor of job success, yet finding organizations that know about or embrace structured interviewing and use it consistently in their hiring processes can be a challenge. The structured interview has gained support over the past 30 years, however, several recent studies (Simola et al., 2007; van der Zee et al., 2002; Williamson, Campion, Malos, Roehling, & Campion, 1997) still report a disconnect in terms of organizations adopting research-based interview practices. In summary, while elements of structured interviewing were present in this study, about half were consistently adopted while several were used intermittently or not at all.

**Interview Questions that Influence the Selection Decision**

The second research question of this study sought to determine the CTE teacher interview questions asked by administrators that are perceived to most influence the selection and hiring decision. This study found that no one or two questions asked of a candidate informed the selection decision, but rather various candidate look-for’s observed during the selection interview informed the decision and determined the final candidate. Six applicant characteristics were consistently identified by at least four of the six participants and included: (1) moral character and a strong work ethic, (2) disposition
and temperament, (3) strong communication skills, (4) a focus on students, (5) organizational fit, and (6) technical competence related to the teaching position. With the additions of technical competence and a candidate’s fit within the culture of a school, these findings are neither new nor unique to the CTE community. These findings support the educational literature where it was found that teacher selection decisions are often based on a candidate’s personal characteristics, attitudes, and dispositions, all of which have been deemed necessary for teacher effectiveness (DeArmond, Gross, & Goldhaber, 2010; Ebmeier & Ng, 2005; Harris, Rutledge, Ingle, & Thompson 2006; Kersten, 2008).

One of the study’s participants reiterated that it is not a question asked of the candidates that informs the decision; but rather a number of factors related to the candidates’ personal and professional characteristics. The participant summarized these factors and stated:

We try to gather the “affect” within the context of the interview process. We want a person who will look at themselves critically, that’s going to be professional, that’s going to work hard, and that cares about kids.

This study supports the litany of teacher applicant personal qualities preferred by educators and reported in the literature. The findings of this study, like many others, support strong communication skills and good English usage during the interview. Communication skills have consistently been identified as a key preferred quality (Braun, Willems, Brown, & Green, 1987; Kersten, 2008; Mason & Schroeder, 2010; Ralph et al., 1998; Stronge, & Hindman, 2003).

Other applicant characteristics cited in the literature and supported by the findings of this study include an applicant who is caring, enthusiastic, hardworking, self-motivated, honest, has a pleasant personal appearance, and is tactful and positive  (Braun
et al., 1987; Harris, Rutledge, Ingle, & Thompson, 2010; Kersten, 2008; Mason and Schroeder, 2010). This study supports these findings and adds the following to the list of characteristics: one who will fit into the culture of the school and who possess strong technical competence for the vacant teaching position.

A host of negative applicant qualities has also been identified within the educational literature. School administrators have reported off-putting behaviors, such as gum chewing, unprofessional attire, and applicants who are unprepared for the interview, to name a few (Kersten, 2008). This study also supports findings that specific applicant behaviors that occurred during the interview prevented the applicant from being offered the position. In this study one participant described applicant negativity as a reason for not offering a position to an applicant and stated:

One of the biggest turnoffs for me is when you are in the interview and the applicant is complaining about where they work. If they are complaining about where they work [and] if they aren’t excited about their job, then they are part of the problem. Don’t tell me why you want to leave your organization, tell me why you want to work here. I won’t hire anyone who is negative.

This study’s participants discussed the challenges of new teachers who mostly have no prior classroom experience. The aim, as the participants in this study described, is for CTE administrators to hire applicants who have both strong technical knowledge and skills and the skills and attributes to transition into the role of professional educator. Finding the applicant possessing positive personal and professional characteristics is critical to the selection decision and to the success of the school’s students.

Conclusions

One hundred years of organizational and industrial research suggests that conducting a selection interview using a structured approach improves the reliability and
the validity of the interview and serves as an accurate predictor of future job success (Buckley, Norris, & Wiese, 2000). Research also suggests teaching expertise can be broadly categorized by an individual’s content knowledge, pedagogical strategies and techniques, and a set of personal characteristics, all of which are examined during the teacher selection and interview process (Hattie, 2009; Ralph, Kesten, Lang, & Smith, 1998; Torff & Sessions, 2005). This study supports previous studies with one exception, the evaluation of pedagogical skills. Career and technical administrators must discern an applicant’s potential teaching acumen during the selection interview, typically without the benefit of assessing the candidate’s prior teaching experiences.

This study begins a body of research specific to the CTE community to identify strategies that lead to successful hiring outcomes. In addition to investigating the degree to which interview structure is currently used within the CTE teacher interview, this study also attempted to identify the interview questions and applicant responses that most informed the hiring decision. Instead of specific interview questions, the study’s participants identified six applicant characteristics that informed the selection decision: possessing moral character and a strong work ethic, disposition and temperament, strong communication skills, a focus on students, organizational fit, and technical competence related to the teaching position.

In conclusion, the present findings may help CTC Directors as they seek to hire teachers who have the capacity to ignite student interest and learning and, thus, increase student achievement (Nye, Konstantopoulos, & Hedges 2004; Stronge & Hindman, 2006; Stronge, Ward, Tucker & Hindman, 2007). Although the size of the sample in this study was very small and represented only six Directors in Pennsylvania, lessons can be learned
from the strategies and practices used or not used by this sample. As schools look to improve and identify key personnel to fill teaching vacancies, hiring and selection decisions become critical to the school’s success. “In essence, an effective teacher selection process, beginning with recruiting quality applicants and extending to selecting the most capable candidates, impacts everything we do for improving our schools” (Hindman & Stronge, 2009, p. 1).

Implications for Further Research

Results of this study are based on a small, carefully selected sample and serve as a stepping stone for future studies that might explore similar questions with a larger sample of CTC Directors. This study expanded the investigation of the structured interview and its components to include, not just the K-12 educational system, but a segment of that system, the CTE setting. While research exists related to the traditional education teacher selection interview, this study is one of the first to date to investigate interview structure within the CTE setting. Further research specific to CTE regarding the selection interview and the adoption of interview structure is recommended.

By in large, while there is a presence of structured interview practices as defined by Campion et al. (1997) in the K-12 educational literature, studies focusing on the structured interview as a predictor of future job or teaching performance are very limited. One area of structure has infiltrated the educational arena--the use of panel interviewing (Braun et al., 1987; DeArmond et al., 2010; Kersten, 2008; Mason & Schroeder, 2010; Strauss et al., 2000). Panels, as described in the educational literature, include the principal, other teachers, special education teachers, parents, and other administrators. This study further supports panel interviewing and adds industry experts, who are often
members of the school’s OACs, to the interview panel. Further research is needed to
determine the extent to which CTC administrators employ a practice of involving
industry experts on the interview panel. Research is also needed to determine the role
and impact these individuals have on the final selection decision.

This study found that the all of participants conducted a longer duration interview
process that consisted of two or three interviews with the typical interview questions
along with a demonstration lesson conducted by the applicant. Typically one of the
interviews consisted of a question-and-answer interview format and a second interview
included the demonstration lesson. The addition of the demonstration lesson enabled the
panel to assess a candidate’s potential for transitioning from industry to educator and was
cited by the participants as an important variable in their selection decision. The practice,
which was noted as important to this study’s participants, is contrary to the research that
exists in the educational literature. Several studies cite that this practice is unlikely to
occur (Kersten, 2008; Liu & Kardos, 2002; Mason & Schroeder, 2010; Papa & Baxter,
2008). Possibly this practice is deemed more important and accepted within the CTC
community due to the low number of teacher applicants who have any teaching
experience. More research is needed to explore the practice of conducting multiple
interviews and the likelihood and importance of the demonstration lesson as a variable
for selecting new CTC teachers.

Lastly, more research is recommended to determine the degree to which CTC
Directors receive training on structured interview practices. Participants in this study
described on-the-job interview training, attending workshops and seminars related to
legal matters and the employment interview, and completing personnel courses during
their college courses, but did not discuss attending training sessions, workshops, or courses specific to structured interview practices. Further investigation to research training options for CTC administrators is needed and could inform decisions on college and university curriculum.

**Implications for Practitioners**

Even though this study explored CTC teacher interview and selection practices with only a small sample of CTC Directors, the researcher identified some promising practices and strategies that may help the CTE community. These practices and strategies include: (1) longer interviews, a multi-interview selection process, and the use of additional interview strategies beyond traditional interview questioning; (2) the inclusion of occupational advisory committee members or industry experts on the interview panel; and (3) research-based structured interview training.

**Longer Interviews, A Multi-interview Selection Process, and the Use of Additional Interview Strategies Beyond Traditional Interview Questioning**

Length of an interview can be referred to as longer in time or asking more questions and “increases various forms of reliability, including test-retest reliability, interrater reliability, and internal consistency” (Campion et, al., 1998, p. 80). This study found all participants consistently attempted to conduct a two or three interview selection process and spent anywhere from two to three hours getting to know the personality and skills of the applicant. The participants in this study described various multiple interview processes including face-to-face screening interviews to narrow the candidate pool; using longer and more extensive interviews consisting of asking the candidates questions in the traditional interview setting; and including additional interview activities, such as the
demonstration lesson, to enable panel members to better know the candidates and the skills, abilities, and personal attributes. One participant discussed the importance of their selection decision and the commitment made to the process in an effort to select the best candidate as follows:

You are interacting with these people for [several] hours and you’re making a lifetime decision. One of the things I strongly believe is that if you hire the right people all of your management problems will go away. We are trying to find out as much about them, the real them [during our interview process].

Conducting a multiple interview selection process comprised of the traditional interview question-and-answer session and additional applicant activities, such as teaching a demonstration lesson, enables the interview panel to better know the applicant and their qualifications, skills, abilities, and personal characteristics. Most of all, longer interviews with varying interview activities, may enable an interview panel to better determine if the applicant has the skills, abilities, and the personal attributes necessary to transition from industry expert to classroom teacher.

The use of selection decision strategies, such as teaching demonstration used to illustrate an applicant’s prior experiences, has been studied. Researchers, such as Kersten (2008) and Liu & Kardos (2002) found there was little use of teaching demonstrations during the selection interview. Mason and Schroeder’s (2010) further examination of the use of videos, demonstration teaching, or presentations of teaching practice found that the principals they surveyed did not use these interview strategies. This study contradicts recent educational literature; five of the six participants here said their interview process included the applicant’s demonstration of a lesson to the interview panel. Because applicants have no previous teaching experience, the demonstration lesson may have more relevance to the CTC community. The demonstration lesson allows the panel to
visualize the applicants’ interactions with students, their ability to plan and prepare a
lesson, and their ability to motivate and evaluate student learning. The participants in this
study stated that longer interviews with varying activities, such as the demonstration
lesson, were valuable and necessary to inform their selection decision.

*The Inclusion of Occupational Advisory Committee Members or Industry
Experts on the Interview Panel.*

The use of an interview panel to conduct and evaluate interviews is not unique to
the selection process. Studies on the structured interview have found this practice may
reduce interviewer bias (Burnett, Fan, Molowidlo, & Degroot, 1998; Campion, et al.,
1988), cancel out random error (Dipboye, 1992), and when scores are combined produce
more reliability (Dixion, Wang, Calvin, Deneen, & Tomlinson, 2002). Educational
teacher selection research can claim the use of panel interviewing as one documented
strategy (Braun et al., 1987; DeArmonde et al., 2010; Kersten, 2008; Mason & Schroeder,
2010; Strauss et al., 2000). In fact, Mason and Schroeder (2010) found in their study of
hiring practices in southeast Wisconsin that 91.7 percent of the time a panel interview
occurred. Panels, as they described, were diverse and included the principal, other
teachers, special education teachers, parents, and other administrators.

Whereas panel interviewing is not a new concept, this study further supports the
adoption of this process and adds a unique dimension specific to CTE. This study finds
support for the addition of an industry expert, often a member of school’s occupational
advisory committee (OAC), on the interview panel. Four of the six participants in this
study expressed the importance of their OAC members where they were cited as a
resource for developing technical competence interview questions and determine an
applicant’s technical capability for the teaching vacancy. Participants indicated a reliance on the industry expert. One participant reiterated their importance and stated:

It is [the occupational advisory committee member] who typically is asked to pose several questions in order to get at the breathe and depth of the applicant’s understanding of the technical of career area.

Another participant stated:

We ask [the OAC member] to come with three to five questions depending on how many people from the OAC are going to be on the interview committee. We ask [the OAC member] to ask questions [of the candidate] that someone having the requisite knowledge of the trade would or should be able to answer.

As CTCs explore the promising practice of adding an industry expert to the interview panel, administrators should consider the expert’s familiarity with the program’s curriculum and goals. While many OAC members may be knowledgeable about such things, others may possess only limited, and perhaps dated, information. The development of relevant technical interview questions by industry experts is essential and is facilitated when CTC administrators provide them with the program and school goals, program task list, and other curriculum materials. Under such circumstances, industry advisors may prove to be another key ingredient to the CTC instructor selection interview process.

**Interview Training**

While the structured interview has gained support over the past 30 years, several recent studies still report a disconnect in terms of organizations adopting research-based interview practices (by Simola, Tagger, & Smith, 2007; van der Zee, Bakker & Bakker, 2002; Williamson, Campion, Malos, Roehling, & Campion, 1997). Hindman and Stronge’s (2009) study investigated the degree to which school principals adopted and used structured interview practices when hiring new teachers. Results of this study
indicated while some components of structured interviewing existed, many components were not adopted. Of these components, most alarming was the lack of formal training of administrators related to interviewing. “With so much dependent on the right hiring decisions, it makes both fiscal and common sense to train administrators in teacher interviewing” (p.7). This study supports previous research related to interviewer training in which formal and intensive structured interview training did not occur for the CTC Director nor for the interview panel members.

Training described by this study’s participants included attending workshops, taking college courses within the degree or certification program, consulting with colleagues or legal experts, acquiring resource materials, and training through the job experience. Panel member training was described as far less training and included in-house or on-the-job training, often facilitated by the school’s Director.

Some participants in this study indicated experience conducting the interview often became more important and more relevant than formal structured interview training. One participant made the following statements regarding formal training.

[Our interview training has occurred from] on-the-job training. We do so much of it, which results in us getting good at it.

Another participant made similar statements:

I think [the interview training I have received was] more experience interviewing people than anything else.

“Training is an important element of structure in that it increases the likelihood of using other elements of interview structure” (Simoa et al., 2007, p. 32). Yet, if interviewer training is not widely recognized as a need by organizations then the adoption of structured interview practices will continue to find limited application.
Chapter Summary

In summary, the employment interview has been a topic of study for over 100 years. Research supports that the interview continue to be the most important and influential of all selection tools used during the hiring process (Buckley, Norris, & Wiese, 2000; Campion, Palmer, & Campion, 1997; Posthuma, Morgeson, & Campion, 2002). Within the educational system, the teacher has the most direct contact with students and has the capacity to shape a young person’s life, ambitions, and career goals (Nye, Konstantopoulos, & Hedges 2004; Stronge & Hindman, 2006; Stronge, Ward, Tucker & Hindman, 2007). All agree on qualities of ideal teachers, but many educator interviewers had little or no interview training to help guide their selection decisions (Baker & Cooper, 2005; DeArmond et al., 2010; Harris et al, 2010; Hindman & Stronge, 2009). Structured interview practices offers a list of components and template and strategies for CTC educators to consider and adopt, all of which are based on years of research.

Given that a new hire will spend 7 hours a day, 190+ days a year in a school building for a total of 75,600+ minutes, interviewers must get as much information out of the interview as possible to enhance their decision-making ability. This decision will make the difference between being “stuck with” a bad hire of a teacher whose contract will be renewed at the end of the school year. (Hindman & Stronge, 2009, p.8)
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APPENDIX A

The CTE Teacher Selection and Hiring Decision: Practices and Perceptions from Select Pennsylvania CTE Directors

Meeting Interview Agenda

1. Review of Study’s Topic

2. Review and Signature of Informed Consent

3. Review of Artifacts and Interview Guide & Audio Tape

4. The Interview

5. Review of School’s Interview Artifacts

6. Next Steps:
   a. Possible follow-up via telephone
   b. Sending transcript for verification
   c. Coding and data analysis
   d. Sending study’s results.

7. Other Topics/Questions
APPENDIX B

Informed Consent Form for Social Science Research
The Pennsylvania State University

Title of Project: The CTE Teacher Selection and Hiring Decision: Practices and Perceptions from Select Pennsylvania CTE Directors

Principal Investigator: Beth Ann Haas, Doctoral Student
Department of Workforce Education and Development
PO Box 739, Adamstown, PA 19501
Tel: (717) 989-6695, Email: bah295@psu.edu

Advisor: Dr. Judith Kolb
301 Keller Building,
University Park, PA 16802
Tel: (814) 865-1876, Email: jak18@psu.edu

1. Purpose of the Study: The purpose of this study is for research purposes where the researcher will examine the extent to which research-based interview practices, including structure, are used during the selection of new career and technical education (CTE) teachers. This study also seeks to identify interview questions asked by CTE administrators which they perceive most impact their hiring decisions. Six CTE school directors from Pennsylvania will participate in this study.

2. Procedures to be followed: You will be asked to participate in a one-on-one semi-structured interview consisting of 18 primary questions. The interview will be audio taped. You will also be asked to provide the researcher with documents the school uses during the teacher interview, including items, such as interview questions, applicant rating sheets, teacher job description, and any other document the school uses when interviewing perspective CTE teachers.

3. Benefits: You may learn more about your school’s CTE teacher selection process and may better understand the critical role the selection interview plays in determining future hiring decisions. This research may assist career and technical administrators hire better, more qualified CTE teachers. The information gathered in this study may help administrators identify better interview techniques and more relevant interview questions and strategies that impact the teacher hiring decision.

4. Duration/Time: It will take about 45 to 60 minutes to complete the personal interview.

5. Statement of Confidentiality: With your written permission only, your name will be listed as a participant in this study, however your particular responses and any data collected will remain confidential and no response or data will be associated with you or your school. Only the researcher will know your identify if you deem it so. Only the researcher will have access to the audio tapes and data. The audio tapes and data will be stored and secured at in a locked cabinet in the researcher’s home office and destroyed within three years.

☐ Yes, you may list my name and school in the study but all data collected must be kept confidential and data will not be connected to me or my school.

☐ No, you may not list my name and school in the study.

6. Right to Ask Questions: Please contact Dr. Judith Kolb at (814) 865-1876 or jak18@psu.edu with questions, complaints or concerns about this research.

7. Voluntary Participation: Your decision to be in this research is voluntary. You can stop at any time. You do not have to answer any questions you do not want to answer.
You must be 18 years of age or older to consent to take part in this research study. If you agree to take part in this research study and the information outlined above, please sign your name and indicate the date below.

You will be given a copy of this consent form for your records.

_____________________________________________  ______________________
Participant Signature                  Date

_____________________________________________  ______________________
Person Obtaining Consent               Date
APPENDIX C

Artifacts & Interview Guide

Title of Project: The CTE Teacher Selection and Hiring Decision: Practices and Perceptions from Select Pennsylvania CTE Directors

Principal Investigator: Beth Ann Haas
Doctoral Candidate, Penn State University
PO Box 739, 168 West Main Street
Adamstown, PA 19501
(717) 484-2199; bah295@psu.edu

Artifacts: A copy of the following items/artifacts will be requested from each participant’s CTC.
- CTC Instructor Job Description
- Standard Instructor Interview Questions
- Instructor Interview Rating Sheet/Scoring Guide
- Any other CTC instructor interview items the school uses during the selection interview.

Interview: Note: Primary questions are numbered. Potential probes are lettered a, b, c, etc. and are to be used in needed.

Date of Interview: ____________________________

1. Tell me about your CTC?
   a. How many sending school districts do you serve?
   b. What is your total secondary student population?
   c. How many secondary CTC teachers are on staff?

2. Tell me about yourself?
   a. How many years have you been the director of this CTC?
   b. How many years total have you been a CTC director?
   c. How many years total have you been an administrator?
   d. How many years have you held a PA Vocational Director Certification?

3. When interviewing for a full-time CTC instructor position, to what extent are interview questions based on a job analysis.
   a. Do you use a job description to determine interview questions?
4. Describe the types of questions asked during the interview, for example:
   a. What type, if any, general questions do you ask?
   b. What type, if any, past behavior description questions do you ask? For example, tell me about a time when you…..?
   c. What type, if any, situational or hypothetical questions do you ask? For example, tell us what you would do if …..?
   d. What other types of questions do you ask the CTC teacher applicant?

5. To what extent do all applicants receive the same exact interview questions?

6. To what extent are follow-up questions used, and if used, when are they asked?
   a. If follow-up questions are used, are they standardized for each interview?

7. To what extent are candidates allowed to ask questions during the interview?
   a. When do you allow these questions to be asked?

8. Do you conduct one or multiple interviews with teacher applicants and what is the format of your interview(s).
   a. If you have multiple interviews do the interview formats change? If so, how are they different?

9. How much time does the typical interview last and how many questions are typically asked of an applicant?

10. What interview and applicant materials, if any, are given to the interviewer(s) to use, refer to, and/or review during the interview process?

11. To what extent is ancillary information, such as recommendations, resume, portfolio, etc. included in the discussion or questions asked of the applicant during the interview?
12. To what extent is the applicant evaluated?
   a. Is each response evaluated?
   b. Does the applicant receive a global evaluation?
13. To what extent are applicant responses rated using an anchored scale or rubric?
   a. To what degree is the evaluation multidimensional?

14. How many interviewers typically interview teacher applicants?
   a. If you have multiple interviews, do the interviewers/team members change?
      If so, how do they differ?
   b. What process is used to establish your interview team?

15. To what extent are the same interviewers used across all candidates?

16. To what extent do interviewers take notes?
   a. If notes are taken, are they recorded for each applicant response?
   b. What is done with the notes after the conclusion of the interview?

17. Do interviewers discuss the candidates after each candidate?

18. To what degree are interviewers trained?
   a. If training occurs, please describe the type and duration?

19. Have you ever received training on properly interviewing and selection techniques?
   If so, please describe this training.

20. After completion of the interview, how is the final candidate selected?
   a. Who makes the final decision to recommend a candidate to the JOC?

21. What question do you ask during the selection interview that you believe most informs your decision to hire or not hire the candidate?
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