A CORRELATION OF FINAL SELECTION WITH SELECTED HUMAN CHARACTERISTICS RATINGS IN THE EXECUTIVE CAREER BOARD AT TINKER AIR FORCE BASE

By

CLAUDIA JEAN VALENZUELA GRANEWICH

Bachelor of Arts

Park College

Parkville, Missouri

1979

Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate College
of the Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the Degree of
MASTER OF SCIENCE
May, 1983

A CORRELATION OF FINAL SELECTION WITH SELECTED HUMAN CHARACTERISTICS RATINGS IN THE EXECUTIVE CAREER BOARD AT TINKER AIR FORCE BASE

Thesis Approved:

Wayne B. James
Thesis Adviser

H. Dene Smith

Jerry G. Davis

Norman N. Durham
Dean of Graduate College

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Much appreciation and gratitude is extended to all who encouraged and assisted in this study.

A special appreciation of thanks to Dr. Waynne James, my adviser, is warranted for her continual support, encouragement and suggestions. Appreciation is also extended to the other members of my committee, Dr. Jerry Davis and Dr. Gene Smith.

Special appreciation is extended to Major John Hall for his continual support, assistance, and friendship. Another special thanks to Mrs. Stella Bledsoe for her generous assistance in obtaining the required data for this study.

To my families, Mr. and Mrs. Alfred Q. Valenzuela and Mr. and Mrs. William R. Granewich, for their continual interest and encouragement.

My greatest thanks goes to my husband, Michael. Only through his total support, constant encouragement, unselfishness and love was this study possible.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Many employers rely on the interview for selecting their prospective employees. Ulrich and Trumbo (1965) reported that approximately 99 percent of surveyed companies made use of the interview in the initial selection process. Asher (1970) cites a study by Munday in which 90 percent of the surveyed personnel officers held more confidence in the interview than any other source of information. Despite its high use, several researchers (e.g., Mayfield, 1964; Ulrich and Trumbo, 1965) have concluded that the interview is probably the least reliable of all selection devices.

The interview does have certain benefits which causes the employer to regard it with favor (Mento, 1980; Arvey, 1982). The interview affords the employer the opportunity to assess the individual in person and explore factors that determine how well the applicant will be successful on the job. It also provides an opportunity to obtain information about the candidate that might not be obtained otherwise. An interview, by its nature, personalizes the organization and assists in maintaining good public relations.

This study was undertaken to provide an assessment of the Air Force Logistics Center Executive Career Board program at Tinker Air Force Base, Oklahoma. The Career Boards' primary objectives are:

> (a) systematic identification of quantitative and qualitative personnel requirements; (b) identification of the most appropriate means of acquiring and placing the personnel needed to satisfy projected requirements; (c) identification of personnel who are most likely to succeed in managerial assignments; and (d) providing a method for considering, evaluating, and ranking employees which assures that the best qualified employees are available for managerial assignments (Headquarters Air Logistics Commany, 1982, p. 1-1).

The Executive Career Boards are governed by the Air Force Executive Development Program (Headquarters Air Logistics Command, 1982). However, the Air Force Logistics Command specifies that boards will be used to evaluate and rank candidates in the grades GS-12 and above and to identify the best qualified candidates for future career assignments.

As assessment of the program would determine the correlation of selected human characteristics scores on the overall ratings and final selection process. It would also provide an understanding of the overall effectiveness of the program.

Statement of the Problem

There have been no known studies conducted on the correlation of selected human characteristics and the Executive Career Board selection interviews.

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to select certain human characteristics and to determine what correlations exist between these characteristics and the overall composite rankings of the selection interview.

Research Questions

To accomplish this purpose, the following research questions were investigated:

1. What is the correlation between the composite ranking of each candidate with ratings received in the area of prior job experience?

2. What is the correlation between the composite ranking of each candidate with ratings received in the areas of managerial skills?

3. What is the correlation between the composite ranking of each candidate with ratings received in the area of decision-making abilities?

4. What is the correlation between the composite rankings of each candidate with ratings received in the area of written communication skills?

5. What is the correlation between the composite ranking of each candidate with ratings received in the area of human relation skills?

6. What is the correlation between the composite ranking of each candidate with ratings received in the area of educational background?

7. What is the correlation between the composite ranking of each candidate with ratings received in the area of oral communicative skills?

Hypotheses

To test the research questions, the following specific null hypotheses were developed:

1. There is no correlation between the candidates' rating on prior job experience and composite ranking.

2. There is no correlation between the candidates' rating on managerial skills and composite ranking.

3. There is no correlation between the candidates' rating on decision-making abilities and composite ranking.

4. There is no correlation between the candidates' rating on written communicative skills and composite rankings.

5. There is no correlation between the candidates' rating on human relations skills and composite rankings.

6. There is no correlation between the candidates' rating on educational background and composite rankings.

7. There is no correlation between the candidates' rating on oral communicativeskills and composite rankings.

Assumptions of the Study

The study reflected the following assumptions:

1. The interviewers maintained the same style and manner with all interviewees.

2. The job description was accurate.

3. The original computer listing was valid.

4. The screening process was accurate and valid.

Scope

The scope of the study included:

1. The Air Force Logistic Center located at Tinker Air Force Base, Oklahoma.

2. One interview setting.

3. Seven human characteristics as outlined by the job analysis process.

Limitations

The following limitations applied to this study:

1. Limitations inherent in an interview situation.
2. Access only to interview statistics.

Definition of Terms

These terms, as used in this study, are defined as follows:

Decision-Making Abilities - Ability to make a sound judgement or conclusion.

Educational Background - Possession of unique and specialized information normally acquired by formal training (Lopez, 1975).

Human Characteristics - Behavioral traits that were rated during the interview.

Human Relations Skills - Ability to work effectively with people in situations where actions are interdependent (Lopez, 1975).

Interview - A specialized form of oral, face-to-face communication between people in an interpersonal relationship that is entered into for a specific task-related purpose associated with a particular subject matter (Downs, 1980).

Job Analysis - Process of determining major job requirements and list necessary knowledge, skills and abilities (KSA's).

Job Analysis Committee - Select number of specialized individuals gathered together to perform a job analysis.

Job Experience - Prior employment in or related to the program analysis and career field.

Knowledge, Skills, and Abilities (KSA's) - Those qualities

necessary to perform successfully on the job.

Managerial Skills - Ability to successfully conduct, direct, and control as required.

Oral Communicative Skills - Ability to speak clearly, gramatically, and effectively (Lopez, 1975).

Promotion Evaluation Pattern (PEP) - An objective statement of experience, training, and related qualification requirements (Headquarters Air Logistics Commant, 1982).

Written Communicative Skills - Ability to write clearly and effectively so as others can understand.

Organization of Study

Chapter I introduces the study, presents the problem of the study along with the purpose, research questions, hypotheses, scope, limitations, assumptions and definiton of terms. Chapter II includes a review of literature in the following areas: concerns with interview process, results and concerns with past research, and perceived needs. Chapter III reports the procedures used in the study including the description of subjects and the collection and analysis of data. Chapter IV discusses the findings, and computations of Spearman's Rho correlations. It also gives the researcher's observations. Chapter V includes a summary of the study, conclusions, and recommendations for possible future studies.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This chapter presents a review of selected materials related to areas of the selection interview and is composed of four parts. The divisions are as follows: (1) concerns with the interview process, (2) results of past research, (3) perceived needs for further research, and (4) related government documents.

Concerns with the Interview Process

> Interviewing is very much like piano playing, a fair degree of skill can be acquired without the necessity of formal instruction. But there is a world of difference in craftsmanship, in techniques, and in finesse between the amateur who plays 'by ear' and the accomplished concert pianist.
>
> . . . like the concert artist, an interviewer reaches this point only after frequent, intensive, and diligent practice. As with piano playing, interviewing skill comes so slowly and painfully at first, that the learner experiences frustration and a continual sense of inadequacy.
>
> If the person persists, however, these newly acquired techniques will almost imperceptibly become a part of unreflective behavior until, one day, the interviewer realizes the ultimate satisfaction of knowing that the technique has been mastered (Lopez, 1975, p. 5).

The selection interview, despite its wide use, continues to be the subject of much criticism as indicated by past researchers (e.g., Mayfield, 1964; McMurray, 1947; and Mento, 1980). The majority of the criticism centered on its lack of reliability and validity.

Mento (1980) stated that:

> In theory, the interview must be reliable, valid, and job-related. In practice however, the interview is frequently an unstructured person-to-person verbal exchange without documented job-relatedness, in which minimally trained interviewers attempt to make a global rating of an applicant against some vaguely defined total job performance criterion (p. 1).

Mento (1980) continues to state that these unstructured interviews usually focus on traits such as poise, personality, and resourcefulness; all of which should not be rated during a selection interview.

To echo Mento's concern McMurray (1947, p. 265) stated that "interviews have one major limitation--its value depends wholly on the competence and training of the person who conducts it." He continues by emphasizing the fact that many interviews had no formatted plan to follow, no prior job analysis or stated job specifications. Mayfield (1964) added somewhat of a different concern stating that no two experiments were exactly the same. Some attempted to measure traits, others the effect of time control, environment, bias, and leading questions.

During the past 40 years, many researchers (e.g., McMurray, 1947; Mayfield, 1964; and Wagner, 1949) have voiced their concern over the disagreement and lack of direction of the selection interview. In 1949, Wagner concluded his review of literature with:

> 1. A great deal of confusion exists as to what can and cannot be accomplished by the interview.
> 2. Research on the interview is much needed (p. 42).

In 1960 England and Patterson (cited in Mayfield, 1964) reiterated Wagners concern by suggesting:

> . . . a moritorium on books, articles, and other writings about 'how to interview,' 'do's and don'ts' about interviewing, and the like, until there is sufficient research evidence about the reliability and validity of the interview as an assessment device to warrant its use in such work (p. 241).

Dunnette and Bass (cited in Mayfield, 1964) stated:

> The personnel interview continues to be the most widely used method for selecting employees, despite the fact that it is a costly, inefficient, and usually invalid procedure. It is often used to the exclusion of far more thoroughly researched and validated procedures. Even when the interview is used in conjunction with other procedures, it is almost always treated as the final hurdle in the selection process. In fact, other selection methods (e.g., psychological tests) are often regarded simply as supplements to the interview (p. 241).

Even as recent as 1982, Arvey and Campion (1982) emphasize the importance for books and guidelines concerning interviewing techniques rely more on research results rather than intuitions and beliefs.

Ulrich and Trumbo (1964) questioning the utility of the selection interview by stating:

> It is frequently argued that the interview should not be evaluated in terms of cost, validity, or payoff because it is a multipurpose device. The interview is seen as a recruiting formation-disseminating devise for the company, as well as a selection tool. Therefore, it is frequently contended that, even though as selection device it were shown to have zero validity, there would be good reason to continue its use for the purposes it serves. This position cannot be argued except to point out that the validity of the interview for whatever purpose it is used is accessible to empirical evaluation (p. 114).

Wagner (1949) felt that interviews should be utilized in only three situations: (1) where rough screening is required, (2) where the number of candidates is small and unwarranted of more costly measures, and (3) where certain traits could be most accurately assessed by the interviewer. Wagner also felt that even though interviewers may be able to elicit certain information, they were incapable of effectively measuring and combining it with other pertinent data.

Results of Past Research

Many researchers, (e.g., Wright, 1969 and Ulrich and Tumbo, 1964)

have performed extensive research on experiments that have been conducted concerning the selection interview. In 1969, Wright evaluated, in his opinion, one of the most renown studies ever performed. The study, which was performed by Webster and colleagues (e.g., D. Sydiaha, C. W. Anderson, and A. Crowell) in 1964 at McGill University, undertook the problem of decision-making in the employment interview. Their investigation resulted in the following findings:

> 1. Interviewers developed a stereotype of a good candidate and seek to match interviewees with stereotypes;
> 2. Biases are established by interviewers early in the interview and tend to be followed by favorable or unfavorable decisions;
> 3. Unfavored information is most influential on interviews;
> 4. Interviewers seek data to support or deny hypotheses and, when satisfied, turn their attention elsewhere;
> 5. Empathy relationships are specific to individual interviewers;
> 6. A judge's decision (and, by implication, an interviewer's) is different when fed information piece by piece rather than simultaneously; and
> 7. Experienced interviewers rank applicants in the same order although they differ in the number they will accept (cited in Wright, 1969, p. 393).

Mayfield (1964) also examined numerous studies (e.g., Scott, 1915, and Moss, 1931). Through his research, he developed 15 general statements of the selection interview. Some of the most important of these are:

1. Structured interviews versus unstructured interviews, result in a higher inter-rater reliability.

2. Interview validity is usually of a low magnitude.

3. Answers are affected by the way questions are asked.

4. Decisions made by interviewers seemed to be made early in an unstructured interview.

5. Unfavorable information tends to influence interviewers more.

6. Information is weighted differently by each interviewer.

7. Interviewers tend to talk more than interviewees in an unstructured interview.

8. Interviewer's attitude affects the interviewees' response.

Schmitt (1976) as did Mayfield, developed a list of what he believed to be the best information for personnel officers dealing with the selection interview. Some of Schmitt's main points are as follows:

1. Structured interviews would increase reliability.

2. Interviewer bias could possibly be removed through training.

3. The interview is a good vehicle for public relations.

4. The interview can best evaluate interpersonal skills and motivation.

5. Knowledge of job requirements will help focus on relevant information.

6. Providing the applicant enough time to speak will lessen the chance of first impressions.

Urich and Trumbo (1964) and Wagner (1949) also felt as Schmitt did, in that personal relations and motivation seemed to have the most validity in the selection interview. They also agreed that standardization and wider use of ancillary sources of data should be incorporated into the interview.

Arvey and Campion (1982), unlike past researchers, relayed that:

> Recent research has not been as pessimistic about the validity and reliability as in prior years. Interviews conducted by a board or panel appear to be as promising as a vehicle for enhancing reliability and validity (p. 291).

By their review of the recent investigations (e.g., Reynolds, 1979; Rothstein and Jackson, 1980) Arvey and Campion concluded that the overall theme for the selection interview appears to be that along with an interview panel, the use of a directly related job analysis and other pertinent job information would greatly increase the accuracy of the selection interview.

Perceived Needs for Further Research

Due to the past stated concerns, many researchers, (e.g., Mayfield, 1964; Wright, 1969; and Schmitt, 1976) have developed different possible strategies for future research in the area of the selection interview.

Mayfield (1964) stated that very little knowledge had been gained since Wagner's review of literature in 1949. However, Mayfield did suggest that further research in the decision-making process may produce valuable information that could be utilized in the further refinement of the selection interview.

In his review of literature, Schmitt (1976) agreed with Mayfield by also soliciting further research in the area of decision-making. Schmitt also suggested that research be conducted to determine the interaction of the interviewee-interviewer and determine to what extent, if any, the interview had an affect on the interviewees' decision whether or not to accept a particular job. Schmitt, as did Ulrich and Trumbo (1965) also requested more information concerning the actual utility of the selection interview be sought out.

Wright (1969) also was concerned about the utility of the selection interview. He stated, "a blind faith persists in the efficacy and, too often, the validity of the selection interview" (p. 394).

Wright (1969) suggested two new approaches for further research of the selection interview. He stated:

> A macroanalytic research approach would seem to be most appropriate to study the validity of the interview while a detailed exploration of such problem areas as interviewer bias and the structuring of interview questions would appear most amenable to microanalytic approach, as would other essential laboratory studies which prescribe experimental situations where the use of human subjects is impossible to contrive (p. 395).

Wright favored the macroanalytic approach by emphasizing that more research was needed in that area. He also felt that work in the model-building area seemed in order.

Government Publications

Schmitt (1976) felt that the need to understand the interview was becoming more urgent due to its continued use and the establishment of the EEOC guidelines on employment procedures. Over the past 25 years many new laws have been brought about:

1959 - Labor Management Reporting and Disclosure Act

1963 - Equal Pay Act

1964 - Civil Rights Act

1966 - Fair Labor Standards Act

1967 - Age Discrimination in Employment Act

1972 - Equal Employment Opportunity Act

1972 - Education Amendments to Higher Education Act of 1965

1973 - Rehabilitation Act

1974 - Veterans Readjustment Act.

In order to insure compliance with all established acts and laws, the Air Force Logistics Command has developed regulations that govern its selection interviews. Headquarters Air Logistics Command (1982)

specifically outlines its stated objectives and areas of responsibilities for all who participate in the AFLC Career Management Program. AFLCR 40-11 also provides guidelines on the evaluation and ranking procedures of all GS-12 and above positions and promotions.

The U.S. Department of the Air Force (1980) in its Civilian Personnel Operating Instruction 40-20 states that its main purpose is to:

> Establish procedures and assign responsibility for development and review of promotion evaluation and patterns and to improve quality and secure management participation in assigning progression levels of experience (p. 1).

It fully outlines each step of the selection interview beginning with the assignment of subject matter experts and concluding with the quality control of the job analysis and interview material.

Summary

In this chapter, a review of related material and research studies were investigated. This chapter also attempted to present the perceived needs for further research in the area of selection interview. A selected review of related government publication was also performed.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study was to select certain human characteristics and to determine what correlation existed between these characteristics and the overall composite ranking of the selection interview. To achieve the purpose, these five steps were followed: (1) description of the selection process, (2) description of the population, (3) description of the interview, (4) collection of data, and (5) analysis of data.

Description of Selection Process

The initial step in the selection process was a review of the present position description of the Program Analyst (see Appendix A for a copy of the position description) by a Career Field Board. This board was composed of individuals from the program analyst career field and other related fields.

A job analysis committee comprised of a personnel staffing specialist and the Career Field Board performed a job analysis on the Program Analyst position (see Appendix B for a copy of the Job Analysis Worksheet). The job analysis identified major job requirements and knowledge, skills, and abilities (KSA's) necessary for satisfactory job performance. During this analysis, the relationship between the major job requirements and the appropriate KSA was identified.

The Job Analysis Committee also rated each KSA as to its importance to satisfactory performance on the job. They also determined whether or not each KSA was considered rateable and reasonable.

The next major step was the completion of the Promotion Evaluation Pattern (PEP) Development Worksheet (see Appendix C for a copy of the PEP Development Worksheet). The primary purpose of this process was to determine by what means each KSA was to be evaluated. This worksheet also identified those skill codes meeting the minimum qualifications as outlined by the job analysis.

A Skill Codes Rating Worksheet was then utilized to determine "the relationship between the codes indicative of work experience and KSAs needed for successful performance" (U.S. Department of the Air Force, 1980, p. 7).

This step developed a numerical score used to predict those skill codes most likely to perform effectively as a Program Analyst on the basis of past experience (U.S. Department of the Air Force, 1980).

The final step in the selection process was to develop the Promotion Evaluation Pattern (PEP) worksheet. This worksheet formats all previous data in order to determine which skill codes will more likely produce the best qualified candidates.

Description of the Population

The Air Force Logistic Center Career Management Program is concerned with staffing GS-12 through GS-14 positions (Headquarters Air Logistics Comand, 1982). However, this study will deal strictly with those individuals presently holding a GS-11 position and have been identified by the Promotion Placement Referral Subsystem (PPRS) as being competitive for the position of GS-12 Program Analyst.

A total of 25 individuals were identified as being the best qualified candidates for the program analyst position. However, three candidates declined consideration, leaving 22 to be interviewed. Each of the remaining candidates meet the minimum requirements set forth by the job analysis and the Promotion Evaluation Pattern.

Description of the Interview

A seven-question, structured interview was employed by the board for the selection process. Each question was designed to elicit observable behaviors previously identified by the KSA's (see Appendix D for the interview questions). Also previously identified by the Job Analysis Committee each question was assigned a weight factor correspondent to its level of importance. A rating sheet was provided to assist each panel member in his/her final scoring.

The rating sheet includes the final questions and the point ratings (see Appendix D).

Collection of Data

Prior to the actual interviewing, an interview schedule was set up to encompass two days. Each interview session was allocated 20 minutes (see Appendix E for a copy of the interview schedule).

The interview panel consisted of seven members; six raters and one recorder. After each interview the panel members collaborated and gave each candidate a consensus rating on each question.

The recorder annotated each rating on the Interview Worksheet (see Appendix F for a sample of the Interview Worksheet). The recorder also multiplied each raw rating with its KSA importance factor to

arrive at all final ratings. Also at that time, all final ratings were added together to determine each candidate's total score. All Interview Worksheets were reviewed and retotaled for accuracy by the researcher.

Analysis of Data

In reporting the data, the researcher divided each interview question to correspond to its selected human characteristics. The categories were: (1) job experience-question one; (2) managerial skills-question two; (3) decision-making abilities-question three; (4) written communicative skills-question four; (5) human relations-question five; (6) educational background-question six; and (7) oral communicative skills-question seven. These divisions were based on the seven research questions that served as the focus of this study.

Descriptive statistics were performed to determine existing correlation. In order to assess the degree of correlation between the composite ranking of each candidate and the rating received in each of the specified areas, the Spearman Rank-Order Correlation Coefficient was calculated. This computation involved subtracting the smaller of the two ranks with the difference being placed in a separate column "d" (Champion, 1970). Each of these differences were then squared and placed in a separate column "d^2". The squares of the differences were then summed and the following formula applied:

$$r^s = 1 - \frac{6 \ d^2}{N \ (n^2 - 1)} .$$

In determining the significance of r_s when the sample size is greater than 10 the following formula was applied:

$$t = r^s \sqrt{\frac{N - 2}{1 - (r^s)^2}} .$$

CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION OF FINDINGS

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to determine the correlation between the composite ranking of each candidate with the rating received in each of the seven selected human characteristics questions. The selected abilities were in the area of prior job experience, managerial skills, decision-making abilities, written communicative skills, human relation skills, educational background, and oral communicative skills. This chapter presents the findings of the study in this order: (1) initial selection of candidates, (2) results of the interview, (3) composite scoring results, (4) correlation of the interview areas and composite ranking, and (5) observation of the process.

Initial Selection of Candidates

The initial process of selecting candidates began with a position description outlining the required major duties and factors of a program analyst. A listing of the knowledge, skills, and abilities was then formulated and compared to the major duties.

From resulting analysis and comparison of potential candidates, a computer roster of 25 acceptable candidates was provided. After verification of interest and eligibility, the 22 remaining candidates were

interviewed. The ranking of these 22 candidates is presented in Table I. Promotions and Placement Referral Subsystem (PPRS) scores were assigned to candidate's placement on the rank listing. Candidates one through five received 100 points, candidates six through 10 received 95 points, candidates 11 through 20 received 90 points and candidates 21 through 22 received 85 points. Each candidate is identified by an alphabetical code to prevent any disclosure of true identity.

Results of Interview

At the conclusion of each interview, the candidates were rated on each of the following areas: (1) job experience, (2) managerial skills, (3) decision-making abilities, (4) written communicative skills, (5) human relations skills, (6) educational background, and (7) oral communicative skills. The composite score was obtained by combining the interview score and the PPRS score.

The data in Table II presents the total results of the selection interview. Candidates are listed in rank order by their interview score. The range of interview scores was 41.5 to 15.97 with an average of 28.61.

Composite Scoring Results

The interview scores were then added to the PPRS score to determine the candidate's composite score. The calculations and final ranking are presented in Table III. Candidates are listed in rank order by their composite score. The range of composite scores was from 136.98 to 105.97 with an average of 121.56.

TABLE I

RANK AND PPRS SCORES OF ACCEPTABLE CANDIDATES AFTER VERIFICATION

Candidate	PPRS Rank	PPRS Score
OKD	1	100
UNY	2	100
IBM	3	100
LWS	4	100
LHA	5	100
YRC	6	95
VQB	7	95
JCN	8	95
PLE	9	95
GRN	10	95
DZS	11	90
TWP	12	90
RKV	13	90
XTM	14	90
FYJ	15	90
UQJ	16	90
MFQ	17	90
WHD	18	90
ITP	19	90
QZY	20	90
ZKG	21	85
SOH	22	85

TABLE II

INTERVIEW SCORE AND RANK
ORDER OF CANDIDATES

Candidates	Interview Score	Interview Rank
ITP	41.5	1
VQB	40.0	2
XTM	39.49	3
OKD	36.98	4
LHA	35.98	5
DZS	35.65	6
TWP	35.15	7
UNY	31.22	8
GRN	30.30	9
RKV	29.81	10
IBM	29.15	11
ZKG	28.63	12
PLE	27.65	13
LWS	26.14	14
MFQ	24.98	15
QZY	24.65	16
YRC	21.15	17
SOH	20.98	18
UQJ	18.99	19
JCN	18.48	20
WHD	16.64	21
FYJ	15.97	22

TABLE III

COMPOSITE SCORES AND RANKING
OF JOB CANDIDATES

Candidates	Interview Score	PPRS Score	Composite Score	Final Ranking
OKD	36.98	100	136.98	1
LHA	35.98	100	135.98	2
VQB	40.00	95	135.00	3
ITP	41.50	90	131.50	4
UNY	31.22	100	131.22	5
XTM	39.49	90	129.49	6
IBM	29.15	100	129.15	7
LWS	26.14	100	126.14	8
DZS	35.65	90	125.65	9
GRN	30.30	95	125.30	10
TWP	35.15	90	125.15	11
PLE	27.65	95	122.65	12
RKV	29.81	90	119.81	13
YRC	21.15	95	116.15	14
MFQ	24.98	90	114.98	15
QZY	24.65	90	114.65	16
ZKG	28.63	85	113.63	17
JCN	18.48	95	113.48	18
UQJ	18.99	90	108.99	19
WHD	16.64	90	106.64	20
SOH	20.98	85	105.98	21
FYJ	15.97	90	105.97	22

Correlation of the Selected Human Characteristics Ranking and Composite Ranking

This section considers the selection interview by each of the seven human characteristics: (1) job experience, (2) managerial skills, (3) decision-making abilities, (4) written communicative skills, (5) human relations skills, (6) educational background, and (7) oral communicative skills.

In order to assess the degree of correlation between the composite ranking of each candidate and the rating received in each of the specified areas, the Spearman's Rank Order Correlation Coefficient was calculated.

Job Experience

Spearman's Rho (r_s) was calculated on the rank order of the composite score and the job experience score. The ranks are listed in Table IV. The difference between larger and smaller ranks for the composite and job experience scores were determined. The resulting r_2 value was 0.81. To interpret the relationship of the Spearman coefficient at the .01 level on a one-tailed test a .508 is required for 22 candidates. Using the procedure for testing the significance of r_s when sample size is greater than 10 a t value of 6.17 was obtained. Since a t of 2.528 is needed for significance at the 0.01 level, t is significant. There was a significant correlation between job experience and the composite score.

TABLE IV

CORRELATION OF COMPOSITE RANKING AND
JOB EXPERIENCE RANKING
FOR JOB CANDIDATES

Candidates	Composite Ranking	Job Experience Score	Job Experience Ranking	d	d^2
OKD	1	9	3.5	- 2.5	6.25
LHA	2	9	3.5	- 1.5	2.25
VQB	3	8.5	6.5	- 3.5	12.25
ITP	4	9	3.5	.5	.25
UNY	5	6.5	10	- 5	25
XTM	6	9.5	1	5	25
IBM	7	6.5	10	- 3	9
LWS	8	5	15	- 7	49
DZS	9	9	3.5	5.5	30.25
GRN	10	6	13.5	- 3.5	12.25
TWP	11	8.5	6.5	4.5	20.25
PLE	12	6	13.5	- 1.5	2.25
RKV	13	6.5	10	3	9
YRC	14	3.5	17.5	- 3.5	12.25
MFQ	15	6.5	10	5	25
QZY	16	3.5	17.5	- 1.5	2.25
ZKG	17	6.5	10	7	49
JCN	18	2.5	21.5	- 3.5	12.25
UQJ	19	3	19.5	- .5	.25
WHD	20	3	19.5	.5	.25
SOH	21	4	16	5	25
FYJ	22	2.5	21.5	.5	.25
				d^2	= 329.50

$r_s = 0.81$

$t = 6.17$*

*Significant at the 0.01 level

Managerial Skills

The composite and managerial ranking for each candidate are presented in Table V. Utilizing the Spearman's Rho formula the value of $r_s = 0.84$ was obtained. In determining the significance of r_s, a t value of 6.92 was obtained. There was a significant correlation between the managerial skills and the composite scores.

Decision-Making Abilities

The composite and decision-making abilities ranking for each candidate are presented in Table VI. A Spearman Rho (r_s) value of 0.74 was obtained. A t value of 4.92 was obtained to determine the significance of r_s. There was a significant correlatlion between the decision-making abilities and the composite scores.

Written Communicative Skills

The data listed in Table VII presents the composite and written communicative skills ranking for each candidate. Utilizing the Spearman Rho formula the value of r_s was 0.56. In determining the significance of r_s, a t value of 3.02 was obtained. There was a significant correlation between the written communicative skills and the composite scores.

Human Relations Skills

Data in Table VIII list the composite and human relations skills ranking for each candidate. A Spearman Rho (r_s) value of .70 was obtained. A t value of 4.38 was obtained to determine the significance of r_s. There was a significant correlation between the human relation

TABLE V

CORRELATION OF COMPOSITE RANKING AND
MANAGERIAL SKILLS RANKING
FOR JOB CANDIDATES

Candidates	Composite Ranking	Managerial Skills Score	Managerial Skills Ranking	d	d^2
OKD	1	4.66	5	- 4	16
LHA	2	4.33	8	- 6	36
VQB	3	6	1.5	1.5	2.25
ITP	4	6	1.5	2.5	6.25
UNY	5	4.66	5	0	0
XTM	6	5	3	3	9
IBM	7	4.33	8	- 1	1
LWS	8	3.32	17.5	- 9.5	90.25
DZS	9	4	12	- 3	9
GRN	10	4	12	- 2	4
TWP	11	4.66	5	6	36
PLE	12	4.33	8	4	16
RKV	13	4	12	1	1
YRC	14	4	12	2	4
MFQ	15	3.66	15	0	0
QZY	16	3.32	17.5	- 1.5	2.25
ZKG	17	4	12	5	25
JCN	18	3.32	17.5	.5	.25
UQJ	19	2	20.5	- 1.5	2.25
WHD	20	1.66	22	- 2	4
SOH	21	3.32	17.5	3.5	12.25
FYJ	22	2	20.5	1.5	2.25
				d^2	= 279.00

$r_s = 0.84$

$t = 6.92$*

*Significant at the 0.01 level

TABLE VI

CORRELATION OF COMPOSITE RANKING AND DECISION-MAKING ABILITIES RANKING FOR JOB CANDIDATES

Candidates	Composite Ranking	Decision-Making Abilities Score	Decision-Making Abilities Ranking	d	d^2
OKD	1	4.66	9.5	- 8.5	72.25
LHA	2	5.66	4	- 2	4
VQB	3	6	2.5	.5	.25
ITP	4	6	2.5	1.5	2.25
UNY	5	5.32	5.5	- .5	.25
XTM	6	6.32	1	5	25
IBM	7	3.32	14.5	- 7.5	56.25
LWS	8	4.66	9.5	- 1.5	2.25
DZS	9	5	7.5	1.5	2.25
GRN	10	5.32	5.5	4.5	20.25
TWP	11	5	7.5	3.5	12.25
PLE	12	1.62	21	- 9	81
RKV	13	3.66	12.5	.5	.25
YRC	14	2.66	18.5	- 4.5	20.25
MFQ	15	3	16	- 1	1
QZY	16	4.32	11	5	25
ZKG	17	3	16	1	1
JCN	18	2.66	18.5	- .5	.25
UQJ	19	2	20	- 1	1
WHD	20	3.66	12.5	7.5	56.25
SOH	21	3	16	5	25
FYJ	22	3.32	14.5	7.5	56.25
					d^2= 464.50

r_s = 0.74

t = 4.92*

*Significant at the 0.01 level

TABLE VII

CORRELATION OF COMPOSITE RANKING AND
WRITTEN COMMUNICATIVE SKILLS RANK
FOR JOB CANDIDATES

Candidates	Composite Rank	Written Communicative Score	Written Communicative Rank	d	d^2
OKD	1	2.5	8	- 7	49
LHA	2	2.83	3	- 1	1
VQB	3	3	1.5	1.5	2.25
ITP	4	2.5	8	- 4	16
UNY	5	2.16	11.5	- 6.5	42.25
XTM	6	3	1.5	4.5	20.25
IBM	7	1.83	17	-10	100
LWS	8	1.83	17	- 9	81
DZS	9	1.83	17	- 8	64
GRN	10	2.66	5	5	25
TWP	11	2.5	8	3	9
PLE	12	2.66	5	7	29
RKV	13	2.66	5	8	64
YRC	14	1.66	20.5	- 6.5	42.25
MFQ	15	1.83	17	- 2	4
QZY	16	2	13.5	2.5	6.25
ZKG	17	2.33	10	7	49
JCN	18	1.66	20.5	- 2.5	6.25
UQJ	19	2.16	11.5	7.5	56.25
WHD	20	1.33	22	- 2	4
SOH	21	1.83	17	4	16
FYJ	22	2	13.5	8.5	72.25
				d^2=	779.00

r_s = 0.56

t = 3.024*

*Significant at the 0.01 level

TABLE VIII

CORRELATION OF COMPOSITE RANKING AND HUMAN RELATIONS SKILLS RANKING FOR JOB CANDIDATES

Candidates	Composite Ranking	Human Relations Skills Score	Human Relations Skill Ranking	d	d^2
OKD	1	4.66	8	- 7	49
LHA	2	5	4	- 2	4
VQB	3	5	4	- 1	1
ITP	4	5	4	0	0
UNY	5	2.82	17	-12	144
XTM	6	4.66	8	- 2	4
IBM	7	4.66	8	- 1	1
LWS	8	4.66	8	0	0
DZS	9	5.32	1.5	7.5	56.25
GRN	10	5.32	1.5	8.5	72.25
TWP	11	3.66	13.5	- 2.5	6.25
PLE	12	4	12	0	0
RKV	13	3.66	13.5	- .5	.25
YRC	14	2.32	21.5	- 1.5	56.25
MFQ	15	3.32	15	0	0
QZY	16	4.32	11	5	25
ZKG	17	4.66	8	9	81
JCN	18	3	16	2	4
UQJ	19	2.32	21.5	- 2.5	6.25
WHD	20	2.66	19	1	1
SOH	21	2.66	19	2	4
FYJ	22	2.66	19	3	9
					d^2 524.50

$r_s = .70$

$t = 4.38$*

*Significant at the 0.01 level

skills and the composite scores.

Educational Background

The composite and educational background ranking of each candidate are listed in Table IX. Utilizing the Spearman Rho (r_s) formula, the value of r_s was 0.52. A t value of 2.72 was obtained when determining the significance of r_s. There was a significant correlation between the educational background scores and the composite scores.

Oral Communicative Skills

The data in Table X list the composite ranking and oral communicative skills ranking for each candidate. A r_s of 0.87 was obtained using the Spearman Rho formula. In determining the significance of the r_s value a t value of 7.89 was obtained. There was a significant correlation of the composite and oral communicative score.

A comparison summary of all seven human characteristic ratings found to have a positive correlation to the composite ranking is presented in Table XI. Oral communicative skills (t = 7.89) had the strongest correlation followed by managerial skills (t = 6.92). The weakest correlations were found to be written communicative skills (t = 3.02) and educational background (t = 2.72).

Observations

The following observations were made by the researcher during the course of this study:

1. There were numerous errors that were found when the recorder's figures were rechecked for accuracy.

TABLE IX

CORRELATION OF COMPOSITE RANKING AND
EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND RANKING
FOR JOB CANDIDATES

Candidate	Composite Ranking	Educational Background Score	Educational Background Ranking	d	d^2
OKD	1	2	10	- 9	81
LHA	2	1.16	14.5	12.5	156.25
VQB	3	3	2	1	1
ITP	4	3	2	2	4
UNY	5	2.16	6.5	- 1.5	2.25
XTM	6	3	2	4	16
IBM	7	2	10	- 3	9
LWS	8	.66	20	-12	144
DZS	9	2	10	- 1	1
GRN	10	1	16.5	- 6.5	42.25
TWP	11	2.33	5	6	36
PLE	12	2	10	2	4
RKV	13	2.83	4	9	81
YRC	14	1	16.5	- 2.5	6.25
MFQ	15	.66	20	- 5	25
QZY	16	1.16	14.5	1.5	2.25
ZKG	17	2.16	6.5	10.5	110.25
JCN	18	.83	18	0	0
UQJ	19	2	10	9	81
WHD	20	1.33	13	7	49
SOH	21	.66	20	1	1
FYJ	22	.5	22	0	0
				d^2	852.50

$r_s = 52$

$t = 2.72$*

*Significant at the 0.01 level

TABLE X

CORRELATION OF COMPOSITE RANKING AND ORAL COMMUNICATIVE SKILLS RANKING FOR JOB CANDIDATES

Candidates	Composite	Oral Communicative Score	Oral Communicative Skills Ranking	d	d^2
OKD	1	9.5	2	-1	1
LHA	2	8	6.5	-4.5	20.25
VQB	3	8.5	4	-1	1
ITP	4	10	1	3	9
UNY	5	7.5	8	-3	9
XTM	6	8	6.5	- .5	.25
IBM	7	6.5	10.5	-3.5	12.25
LWS	8	6	14.5	-6.5	42.25
DZS	9	8.5	4	6	25
GRN	10	6	14.5	-4.5	20.25
TWP	11	8.5	4	7	49
PLE	12	7	9	3	9
RKV	13	6.5	10.5	2.5	6.25
YRC	14	6	14.5	- .5	.25
MFQ	15	6	14.5	.5	.25
QZY	16	6	14.5	1.5	2.25
ZKG	17	6	14.5	2.5	6.25
JCN	18	4.5	20	-2	4
UQJ	19	5.5	18.5	.5	.25
WHD	20	3	21.5	-1.5	2.25
SOH	21	5.5	18.5	2.5	6.25
FYJ	22	3	21.5	.5	.25
				$\sum d^2$	226.50

$r_s = .87$

$t = 7.89$*

*Significant at the 0.01 level

TABLE XI

CORRELATION SCORES FOR THE SEVEN
HUMAN CHARACTERISTICS AREAS

AREA	r_s	t
Job Experience	.81	6.17*
Managerial Skills	.84	6.92*
Decision-Making Abilities	.74	4.92*
Written Communicative	.56	3.02*
Human Relations	.70	4.38*
Educational Background	.52	2.72*
Oral Communicative	.87	7.89*

*Significant at the .01 level

2. There appeared to be no set system on how or when to round off ratings.

3. Regulations appeared vague as to why the PPRS score was utilized as the final determinant.

4. Panel members appeared to be inconsistent in ratings given.

5. Panel members rated considerably higher on the second day.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter summarizes and discusses the results of the study. A summary of the study is first presented, followed by the researcher's conclusions based on these findings. Recommendations for research and practice are discussed in the final part of the chapter.

Summary

The problem of the study was that there had been no known studies conducted on the correlation of selected human characteristics and the Executive Career Board selection interviews. The purpose of this study was to select certain human characteristics and to determine what correlations existed between these characteristics and the overall composite ranking of the selection interview.

The seven selected human characteristics were: (1) job experience, (2) managerial skills, (3) decision-making abilities, (4) written communicative skills, (5) human relation skills, (6) educational background, and (7) oral communicative skills. This study would then be helpful in assessing the overall effectiveness of the Executive Career Board selection interview program at Tinker Air Force Base.

In this study, 22 individuals were interviewed for a predetermined 20 minute time period. Seven questions were used to ellicit observable behavior in each of the selected human characteristics.

After each interview, ratings were separated into each of the seven research areas. The Spearman Rank-Order Correlation equation was then utilized to determine the correlation that existed between the composite ranking of each candidate with the rating received in each of the previous stated areas. All previously stated research questions were determined to have a positive correlation thus proving all hypotheses false. Oral communicative skill was found to have the highest correlation, while educational background received the lowest. Candidate ITP received the highest interview score, however, candidate OKD received the highest composite score and was selected for the position of Program Analyst.

Conclusions

The conclusions drawn from this study were as follows:

1. There was a direct positive correlation between each of the seven selected human characteristics and the overall composite ranking of the selection interview.

2. Oral communicative skills was found to have the highest correlation.

3. Educational background was found to have the lowest correlation.

4. The PPRS score was the final determinant of which candidate got the job.

5. The weighted factors of each question was relevant to the correlation with the exception of job experience.

6. The candidate receiving the highest interview score was not the one who was selected for the job.

7. Scores on the second day were considerably higher than the scores of the first day.

Recommendations

The following recommendations are made based on the results of this study:

1. A replication of this study should be conducted at other Air Force bases hosting an Air Force Logistic Center.

2. A method should be developed that would ensure all calculations are checked for accuracy prior to the final selection.

3. A replication of this study should be conducted to evaluate other human characteristics.

4. Research should be conducted to determine how valid the PPRS score is.

5. Research should be conducted on the training provided for the interviewers.

A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Arvey, R. D. and J. E. Campion. "The Employment Interview: A Summary and Review of Recent Research." Personnel Psychology, Vol. 35, No. 2 (Summer, 1982), pp. 281-322.

Asher, J. J. "Reliability of a Novel Format for the Selection Interview." Psychological Reports, Vol. 26, (1970), pp. 451-456.

Blackeney, R. N. and J. F. MacNaughton. "Effects of Temporal Placement of Information on Decision Making During the Selection Interview." Journal of Applied Psychology, Vol. 55 (1971), pp. 138-142.

Carlson, R. E., D. P. Schwab and H. G. Henneman, III. "Agreement Among Selection Interviews Styles." Journal of Industrial Psychology, Vol. 5 (1970), pp. 8-17.

Carlson, R. E. "Selection Interview Decisions: The Effect of Mode of Applicant Presentation of Some Outcome Measures." Personnel Psychology, Vol. 21 (1968), pp. 193-207.

Champion, Dean J. Basic Statistics for Social Research. Scranton, PA: Chandler Publishing Company, 1970.

Downs, Cal W., G. P. Smeyak and E. Martin. Professional Interviewing. New York, NY: Harper and Row Publishers, 1980.

Grant, D. L. and D. W. Bray. "Contributions of the Interview to Assessment of Management Potential." Journal of Applied Psychology, Vol. 53 (1969), pp. 24-34.

Headquarters Air Logistics Command. "AFLC Career Management Program." AFLCR 40-11. Ohio: Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, 1982.

Lopez, Felix M. Personnel Interviewing: Theory and Practice. 2nd Ed. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1975.

Mayfield, Eugene C. "The Selection Interview - A Re-Evaluation of Published Research." Personnel Psychology, Vol. 17, No. 1 (Spring, 1964), pp. 239-260.

McMurray, R. N. "Validating the Patterned Interview." Personnel, Vol. XXIII (1947), pp. 263-272.

Mento, Anthony J. Suggestions for Structuring and Conducting Selection Interviews. Washington, DC: U.S. Office of Personnel Management, 1980.

Phillips, Bernard S. Social Research: Strategy and Tactics. 2nd Ed. New York, NY: The MacMillian Company, 1971.

Popham, J. W. and K. A. Sirotnik. Educational Statistics: Use and Interpretation. 2nd Ed. New York, NY: Harper and Row Publishers, 1973.

Schmitt, Neal. "Social and Situational Determinants of Interview Decisions: Implications for the Employment Interview." Personnel Psychology, Vol. 29, No. 1 (Spring, 1976), pp. 79-100.

Ulrich, L. and D. Trumbo. "The Selection Interview Since 1949." Psychological Bulletin, Vol. 63, No. 2 (1965), pp. 100-116.

U.S. Department of the Air Force. "Civilian Personnel." DOI 40-20. Oklahoma: Tinker Air Force Base, 1980.

Wagner, R. "The Employment Interview: A Critical Review." Personnel Psychology, Vol. 2 (1949), pp. 17-46.

Wright, Orman R. Jr. "Summary of Research on the Selection Interview Since 1964." Personnel Psychology, Vol. 22, No. 1 (1969), pp. 391-413.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

POSITION DESCRIPTION

I. INTRODUCTION:

Approved functional statements are in the Classified Section and the operating official's office. The purpose of this position is to provide direction, coordination and evaluation for elements of the ALC Productivity Program

II. MAJOR DUTIES:

-Facilitates various behavioral management approaches to employee motivation and utilization, including job enrichment, quality circles, matrix management, management by objectives, etc.

-Conduct analytical studies of organizations to determine and report to management the most critical areas for productivity improvement efforts; recommends the most appropriate improvement technique for each situation; and assists in the implementation of that technique.

-Designs productivity measurement schemes that will permit assessments of progress and provide feedback to management and employees.

-Establishes and implements reporting procedures to provide the ALC Commander and higher headquarters with an integrated overview of the status of the ALC's productivity index.

-Conducts studies to identify regulations, policies, directives, etc., which cause unnecessary expenditures of manhours or materials; prepares necessary rationale and paperwork to seek change or deletion of the counter-productive requirements.

-Collects from internal and external sources information on productivity enhancement, measurement, evaluation and disseminates for potential application.

APPENDIX B

JOB ANALYSIS WORKSHEET

JOB ANALYSIS WORKSHEET

Job title, series, and grade: Program Analyst GS-345-12

Location: Tinker AFB, Oklahoma

Column 1	Column 2
A. What are the four or five major job requirements to be performed on this position?	B. What KSAs are required to perform these major job requirements?
1. Conducts analyical studies of organizations to determine and report to management the most critical areas for improvement efforts; recommends the most appropriate improvement technique for each situation; assists in the implementation of that technique.	A. Ability to analyze the objectives, policies, work operations and progress, resources estimates and utilization and other related aspects of operating programs. B. Ability to identify actual problem areas, trends, significant program accomplishments, merit and deficiency situations, areas of imbalance, and/or similar factors in the programs involved. C. Ability to evaluate alternative or corrective actions in terms of effort on the program under consideration, on interrelated programs and on overall utilization or resources. D. Ability to develop and recommend program objectives and operations and resources utilization for new programs. E. Ability to develop and recommend changes in program objectives and operations and adjustment in resources utilization to resolve problems. F. Ability to present recommendations and conclusions based on analysis and evaluation to operating or management officials for their use in insuring efficiency, economy, and balance in the development and execution of operating programs. G. Substantive knowledge of operating programs. H. Knowledge of pertinent statistical, accounting, budget, and economic principles and techniques.
2. Establish and implement reporting procedures to provide ALC Commander and higher headquarters with an integrated overview of the status of the ALC's.	
3. Conducts studies to identify unnecessary expenditures manhours or materials.	
	G.

Rating Scale
1 - Moderately Important
2 - Very Important
3 - Extremely Important
4 - Critically Important

JOB ANALYSIS WORKSHEET

Column 3	Column 4	Column 5	Column 6
KSAs	Importance	Rateable	Reasonable
A	4	YES	YES
B	4	YES	YES
C	4	YES	YES
D	4	YES	YES
E	4	YES	YES
F	4	YES	YES
G	3	YES	YES
H	2	YES	YES

APPENDIX C

PEP DEVELOPMENT WORKSHEET

PEP DEVELOPMENT WORKSHEET

I KSAs	II Skills Codes	III Other* Indicator	IV Grade Level	V Length* of Experience	VI Recency	VII Scope/ Environment*	VIII Measurement Method
1	ARL ARG		GS-11				INTERVIEW
2	CDD DWS FJG						INTERVIEW
3	APK APM APS						INTERVIEW
4	BAK AKT						INTERVIEW
5	ARN ARC AXX						INTERVIEW
6	BAB BAD BAF BAH						INTERVIEW
7	BAM BAP BCU						INTERVIEW
8	BCW CDB						INTERVIEW

TEST FORM *Not required for KSAs.

APPENDIX D

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

PROGRAM OR MANAGEMENT ANALYST - GS-343/345
11 January 1983

Question	Element	Weight Factor
Job Experience		
1. Describe to us your past job assignments which involved analytical functions.	G/H	3

Element Rating:
3 points- explanation of analyst duties in three or more functions.
2 points- explanation of analyst duties in two or more functions.
1 point - knowledge of analyst functions.

Managerial Skills

2. Describe your involvement in programs or projects which require planning, organizing, or policy development. — A/D — 2

Element Rating:
3 points- one or more major programs involving a full range of planning, organizing, or policy development.
2 points- program responsibility for either planning, organizing, or policy development.
1 point - participation in a program.

Decision-Making Abilities

3. If you were assigned as team leader of a complex analysis project, what responsibilities would be expected of you. — C — 2

Element Rating:
3 points- guidance and control are clearly indicated as the major responsibilities of a team leader with referral to management principles.
2 points- only guidance and control are discussed with reference to management principles.
1 point - any management principle is discussed.

Question	Element	Weight Factor
Written Communicative Skills		
4. Describe what types of writing you do and what steps you take to insure acceptance.	E	1
Element Rating: 3 points- variety of written products with organized approach. 2 points- routine correspondence. 1 point - written correspondence within the organization.		
Human Relations Skills		
5. You are assigned a difficult and unpleasant task which will require the help of others. How will you gain their help?	B	2
Element Rating: 3 points- accomplish task through other people 2 points- jointly participate with others. 1 point - recognize importance of personal relationships.		
Educational Background		
6. Describe your formal education and off the job activities which contribute to your job performance.		1
Element Rating: 3 points- Master degree. 2 points- Bachelor degree. 1 point - continuing college or outside activity shown to be job related.		
Oral Communicative Skills	F	3
7. Rate Oral Communicative Skills		
Element Rating: 3 points- clear, concise interview with minimal hesitation in the answer. 2 points- answers must pertain to questions. 1 point - choppy, unclear, hesitation during answers, lengthy and verbose.		

APPENDIX E

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

DATE	ORDER	CANDIDATES
Day 1	1st	GRN
	2nd	WHD
	3rd	DZS
	4th	FYJ
	5th	ZKG
BREAK	BREAK	BREAK
	6th	LHA
	7th	IBM
	8th	JCN
	9th	OKD
	10th	MFQ
	11th	PLE
	12th	QZY
		UNY
Day 2	1st	SOH
	2nd	ITP
	3rd	UQJ
	4th	RKV
	5th	TWP
BREAK	BREAK	BREAK
	6th	XTM
	7th	
	8th	YRC
	9th	LWS
	10th	VQB

APPENDIX F

INTERVIEW WORKSHEET

INTERVIEW WORKSHEET

NAME OF CANDIDATE

POSITION TITLE	SERIES	GRADE	LOCATION

QUESTIONS (Anchors with point values indicated for each question should be attached to this form.)	KSA NO	RATING		KSA IMPORTANCE		RATING
1			X		=	
			X		=	
			X		=	
			X		=	
			X		=	
2			X		=	
			X		=	
			X		=	
			X		=	
			X		=	
3			X		=	
			X		=	
			X		=	
			X		=	
			X		=	
4			X		=	
			X		=	
			X		=	
			X		=	
			X		=	
5			X		=	
			X		=	
			X		=	
			X		=	
			X		=	
6			X		=	
			X		=	
			X		=	
			X		=	
			X		=	

COMMENTS/NOTES (Use reverse if more space is needed)

TOTAL SCORE

RATING OFFICIAL

DATE OF INTERVIEW

AFLC FORM SEP 81 303

PREVIOUS EDITION IS OBSOLETE

VITA

Claudia Jean Valezuela Granewich

Candidate for the Degree of

Master of Science

Thesis: A CORRELATION OF FINAL SELECTION WITH SELECTED HUMAN CHARACTERISTICS RATINGS IN THE EXECUTIVE CAREER BOARD AT TINKER AIR FORCE BASE

Major Field: Occupational and Adult Education

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in San Antonio, Texas, April 8, 1954, the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. A. Q. Valenzuela.

Education: Graduated from Providence High School, San Antonio, Texas, in May, 1972; received a Bachelor of Arts degree from Park College in 1979; completed requirements for the Master of Science degree, with a major in Occupational and Adult Education, emphasis in Human Resources Development, at Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma, in May, 1983.

Professional Experience: Enlisted in the United States Air Force in June, 1973; commissioned as Second Lieutinant in the United States Air Force in April, 1980; attended Maintenance Officer Training Course in May, 1980; Maintenance Officer in E-3A aircraft, 1980-1981; Officer-in-Charge of Programs and Mobility, 1981-1982; Chief, Maintenance Training Division, 1982-1983.