To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a dissertation written by Ila Phillip Young entitled "The Effects of Interpersonal Performance in a Simulated Selection Interview." I recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education, with a major in Educational Administration and Supervision.

C. Kenneth Tanner

C. Kenneth Tanner, Major Professor

We have read this dissertation
and recommend its acceptance:

Robert K. Rose

John W. Lounsbury

John H. Philpot

Accepted for the Council:

L. Evans Beck

Vice Chancellor
Graduate Studies and Research

Thesis
T7b
Y463
cop. 2

THE EFFECTS OF INTERPERSONAL PERFORMANCE IN A SIMULATED SELECTION INTERVIEW

A Dissertation

Presented for the

Doctor of Education

Degree

The University of Tennessee, Knoxville

Ila Phillip Young

December 1977

1347033

DEDICATION

This dissertation is dedicated to my parents, Pete and Lynda Young. Many times the lessons of life that are taught to a son by his father and mother are not acknowledged, appreciated, or even understood until the son grows into manhood and starts to live his own life. Often by the time the wisdom of these teachings is realized, it is too late to say thank you. Fortunately for me it is not too late.

I sincerely hope that this tribute can, in some small way, help to repay the many years of patience, teaching, leadership, counsel, support and love which you both have given me. Thank you.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

My sincere appreciation appreciation is expressed to the members of my doctoral committee, Dr. C. Kenneth Tanner, chairman, Dr. Robert Roney, Dr. John Phelpot, and Dr. John Lounsbury. The efforts, comments, suggestions, and guidance of these four men were invaluable in making the pursuit of the doctorate a pleasant, stimulating and intellectually rewarding experience.

Special thanks is expressed to my wife, Karen, for her clerical assistance, editing and typing of this dissertation and moral support throughout the course of my doctoral program.

ABSTRACT

This laboratory study examined the effects of interpersonal performance within the selection interview. College students (n = 72) who were classified as either a "p" or "r" type person according to Goffman's theory of interpersonal performance role-played the part of an interviewee or interviewer. The interpersonal performance styles were systematicly varied in a 2 × 2 factorial design and an analysis of variance was performed on a composite interview rating. The results indicated that "r" type interviewees received significantly higher mean composite ratings than did "p" type interviewees regardless of the interpersonal performance style of the interviewer ($p < .01$). Implications for future research concerning the interpersonal performance styles within the selection interview context are discussed.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
I.	STATEMENT OF THE PURPOSE	1
	Introduction to the Problem	1
	Hypotheses	1
	Definition of Terms	2
	Limitations and Delimitations	3
	Organization of the Study	3
II.	LITERATURE REVIEW	5
III.	METHODOLOGY	16
	Subjects	16
	Preexperimental Test and Subject-Selection Criteria	16
	Experimental Procedure	17
	Design	18
	Analysis	19
IV.	RESULTS	21
V.	DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS	28
	Discussion	28
	Conclusions	31
BIBLIOGRAPHY		33
APPENDIXES		36
	Appendix A	37
	Appendix B	40
	Appendix C	46
	Appendix D	47
VITA		48

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
1.	The "p" and "r" Scale and Their Correlation with Machiavellianism and Social Desirability	10
2.	A Crosstabulation of Scale Point by Response Item	22
3.	Intercorrelations among the Four Scales that Were Summed to Form the Composite Interview Score	22
4.	The Overall Analysis of Variance Model for the Composite Interview Score	23
5.	Sources of Variation within the Overall Analysis of Variance Model for the Composite Interview Score	24
6.	All Pairwise Comparisons among the Different Interviewer-Interviewee Combinations	25
7.	Means and Marginal Means for the Interpersonal Performance Style Interviewers-Interviewee Combinations	26
8.	The Number of "p" and "r" Subjects Recommended and Not Recommended for Hire	27

CHAPTER I

STATEMENT OF THE PURPOSE

The primary purpose of the study was to examine the effects of interpersonal performance within a simulated selection interview. In order to accomplish this purpose, subjects were administered an interpersonal performance style instrument and selected on the basis of their scores. A secondary purpose of the study was to measure the effects of interpersonal performance styles on a composite interview score. These effects were assessed by an analysis of variance.

I. INTRODUCTION TO THE PROBLEM

Based on an analysis of present research, the major problem discovered was that a lack of studies existed which dealt with the effects of interpersonal performance in the selection interview. The literature has indicated that this may well be an unsystematic variable affecting both the reliability and validity of the interview. However, a further investigation of this proposed source of unsystematic variation may provide information that will enable researchers to understand and better predict the outcome of the decision process in the selection interview.

II. HYPOTHESES

The following hypotheses represented the major considerations of this study.

1. Interpersonal performance style "r" interviewees will receive a significantly higher mean interview composite score than interpersonal performance style "p" interviewees.

2. The interpersonal performance style "p" interviewees and interpersonal performance style "p" interviewers will receive significantly lower mean interview composite scores than any other combination in the study.

3. Significantly more "r" type interpersonal performance styles will be recommended to be hired than "p" type interpersonal performance styles.

The 5 percent (.05) level of significance was used as the criterion for rejection of the null hypotheses in all cases.

III. DEFINITION OF TERMS

"p" type interpersonal performance style is typically defined as an interpersonal performance style that lacks social agility. These persons are generally not motivated to perform well in situations that require interpersonal behaviors. They seldom possess the skill and knowledge factors that are necessary to project themselves in a favorable manner.

"r" type interpersonal performance style is typically defined as an interpersonal performance style that exhibits much social agility. These persons generally find interpersonal relationships very gratifiable. They seem to know many roles and can adopt these roles to the situation at hand in a manner that is almost uncanny. Therefore, when they are involved in any type of interpersonal relations, they generally project a very favorable image of themselves.

IV. LIMITATIONS AND DELIMITATIONS

1. The population of this study was limited to students in a medium size southern city.

2. The sample of subjects who participated in this study consisted of only males.

3. The subjects who participated in this study did so on a voluntary basis.

4. The sample of subjects contained relatively pure "p" and "r" type interpersonal performance styles and therefore suffers from a range restriction of interpersonal performance styles.

5. Job qualifications were not varied thus limiting the generalizability to a specific type of job.

6. Interviewers interviewed only one applicant each, thus, providing them no opportunity to distinguish between the interpersonal performance styles.

V. ORGANIZATION OF THE STUDY

Chapter I stated the purpose, introduced the problem, stated the hypotheses, defined the terms, and pointed out limitations and delimitations of the study.

Chapter II presents a review of related literature and research to the study.

Chapter III describes the procedures used in subject selection, collecting the data, experimental design, and statistical methodology used to analyze the data.

Chapter IV presents the results of the statistical analysis performed with the data.

Chapter V contains the discussion on the findings along with the conclusions drawn from the study.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

It appears the selection interview is here to stay despite little empirical evidence supporting its continued use as a selection tool. Although empirically better tools for selection have been developed, it is not likely that the use of the interview will be discontinued. Therefore, it is not surprising that researchers have devoted a great deal of effort to its improvement.

Early investigators of the interview primarily addressed the question of interview validity by correlating some interview score with some criteria of job performance. However, results generated by such investigations did not facilitate the improvement of the interview. Due to their design, they failed to provide an answer to the important question of why the interview was valid or invalid, and simply supplied information that was limited to a situation. Therefore, Mayfield and Carlson (1966) suggested that the ultimate objective of interview validity be postponed and more attention be directed to investigating the issue of why the interview proves valid or invalid. Thus, by understanding why the interview is valid or invalid, the experimenters would be able to generalize their findings to other settings, which in turn would bring research a step closer to the ultimate goal of establishing interview validity (Wright, 1968).

In an effort to investigate why an interview is valid or invalid, researchers have generally followed one of two research strategies. One

method involves the use of hypothetical applicants created from photographs and written data supplied by the experimenter (Dipboye, Fromkin, and Wiback, 1975; Carlson, 1967; Rowe, 1967), while the other method involves the use of a subject posing as an interviewee in a role-playing situation (Maier, 1966). Even though the hypothetical applicants provide excellent experimental control and may very well contribute to understanding the processes that take place in a laboratory experiment, Springbett (1958) has implied that perhaps hypothetical applicants may not supply the necessary information about the interview because the measuring instrument in the interview is the interviewee and not a hypothetical applicant. He further elaborates and compares the decision reached in a selection interview to that of a final score on a test and proposes that sources of unsystematic variance in the interview be isolated and examined to determine their effects on the outcome of the interview.

There is some indication that one source of unsystematic variance in the interview is the interviewee's actual physical presence in the interview. This point was supported by Maier and Thurber's (1968) study where the actual presence of the interviewee in an interview yielded different results than when the same interview transcript was read or heard from a tape recorder. Thus, the evidence suggests that the interviewee's presence or absence (depending on your point of view) in the interview could be a source of variance that warrants further examination.

Part of the variance attributed to the interviewer's decision by the interviewee's presence can be explained by the "interpersonal

performance" that takes place within an interview. This topic was examined by Barocas and Vance (1973) to determine the effects, if any, of interpersonal performance on the outcome of an interview. They concluded that those interviewees who could accurately estimate the interviewer's impressions via post hoc questionnaire were identified by the interviewer as managing the interview well. Also, those same interviewees were seen by the interviewers as more suitable for the job than those who were less accurate in estimating the interviewer's impressions.

The capacity to estimate the interviewer's impression and respond in the appropriate way has been described as impression management by Goffman (1959). With a heavy reliance on the language of the theater, Goffman explains interpersonal behavior as "performance giving" because the individual attempts to convey to people a certain image of one's self is possessed in varying amounts by different individuals. Thus, Goffman coined the phrase "Art of Impression Management."

A further refinement of impression management was suggested by Ring, Braginsky, and Braginsky (1966). Their approach allowed the investigation of impression management by identifying styles of interpersonal performance. These styles of interpersonal performance are governed by three classes of variables: "(1) attributes of the actor; (2) attributes of the audience; and (3) the attributes of the setting in which the performance takes place" (p. 206). However, they restrict their analysis to those attributes of the actor and define the actor's attributes as consisting of three components: (1) motivational factors, (2) knowledge factors, and (3) skill factors. Thus, a person must be motivated to

perform, have the necessary knowledge of what to perform, and have the capacity to perform an act before a performance is given.

Using these components the writers suggest three different styles of interpersonal performance. These styles were labeled "p" "r" and "c." However, since these styles represent points along a single dimension with the c style falling between the p and r style, this discussion will be limited to the p and r styles of interpersonal performance.

The "p" type person is described as one who lacks the ability to estimate the impressions of others. He generally finds situations that involve interpersonal behavior to be very difficult, and therefore avoids such situations. When a "p" type person is forced into a situation that involves interpersonal behavior, the outcome is likely to be less than desirable due to his lack of ability in impression management. The reasons given by Ring et al. (1966) for this lack of ability in impression management are: "(1) a "p" is characterized by a set of needs which are not gratifiable in such personal contexts; (2) a "p" lacks the social agility required for successful performance giving; (3) a "p" does not know many scripts (the only script he knows is how to be himself)" (p. 210).

In contrast, the "r" seems to thrive in interpersonal relationships that the "p" tries to avoid. Not only are these relationships pleasurable to the "r," they are also usually very pleasing to others. This success in interpersonal relationships for the "r" type person, according to Ring and Wallston (1968), is related to the unique motivational factors

of each style. While the "p" type person is typically described as motivated by self-expressive needs, the "r" type person is often viewed with a Machiavellian tinge and a manipulative interpersonal orientation (Ring et al., 1968). As Ring et al. (1966) stated,

> Specifically we would postulate that a "r": (1) is characterized by a set of needs which are gratifiable in interpersonal context; (2) has the social agility required for successful performance giving (and is truely able to satisfy his needs); (3) "knows" many scripts and may therefore be said to be interpersonally versatile. (p. 212)

In an effort to empirically differentiate the hypothesized typologies, Ring and Wallston (1968) developed the Performance Style Test (PST). The PST is a 35 item true-false paper and pencil test. The items were constructed to reflect the characteristics of the performance styles hypothesized by Ring et al. (1966). The scoring keys were developed by the authors' intuitive judgments of how each item's location on a dimension would be responded to by a person possessing each of the performance styles.

> Some indication of the validity of the keying is provided by items biserials, 77 percent of which range from .20 to .80 over the performance styles while only 4 percent failed to show positive values. (p. 143)

An indication of the stability of the PST was determined by using the test-retest procedure over a two month period with 36 subjects. The test-retest reliability coefficient was found to be .85. However, since the PST is measuring a theoretical construct the next issue is that of construct validity. Evidence for construct validity is supplied by correlations with other tests and by comparing groups of people.

In view of the "r" type person being tinged with a Machiavellianism quality correlations were computed with Christie's Machiavellianism V

test and the Social Desirability measure which is a scale derived from the Machiavellianism V (Ring and Wallston, 1968). The following results were obtained (see Table 1).

Table 1. The "p" and "r" scale and their correlation with Machiavellianism and Social Desirability.

	Mach.	S.D.
"p"	.01	.01
"r"	.15*	-.11*

*A correlation of ± .10 is significantly different from zero (n = 530).

The positive relationship of .15 between the "r" score and Machiavellianism seems to reflect the tinge of Machiavellianism that Ring and Wallston described as somewhat typical of a "r," while the negative relationship of -.11 would also be expected in view of the "r's" exploitive manner or his need to control the relationship in an interpersonal setting rather than appear socially desirable. The almost zero relationships (.01) that are found when the "p" scale is correlated with the Machiavellianism and Social Desirability scale would be as expected due to the "p" type person havin little concern for a power type relationship with people (which is typical of Machiavellian) and the lack of ability and concern for the "p's" to appear socially desirable, but rather only to be himself (the only role he knows is how to be himself regardless of how this role appears). However, due to the magnitude of the correlations found in this study, the evidence suggests,

rather than conclusively demonstrates, construct validity, therefore indicating a need for further construct validation.

Young (1974a) conducted a study designed to provide further evidence of construct validity for the PST by correlating the persuasive scale from the Kuder Preference Record Vocational Form CP with the "p" and "r" scales of the PST. This revealed a negative correlation of -.54 ($p < .01$) between scale "p" and persuasive scale and a positive correlation of .45 ($p < .01$) between scale "r" and persuasive scale of the Kuder. Even though this demonstrates that those scoring high in persuasive also score high on the "r" scale and vice versa, for the "p" scale a case might be made that the Kuder measures interest rather than ability. However, Vroom (1964) has suggested that people tend to be interested in areas for which they have some ability.

Further evidence of construct validity is indicated by a second study by Young (1974b) where performance style ("p" and "r") and ability to fake an interest inventory were correlated. In an effort to select relatively pure performance styles ("p" and "r") and control for an interest factor, Young selected the subjects who were to participate in the actual study on the following criteria: (1) those subjects who received a score at or above the 85th percentile on either the "p" or "r" scale of the PST while receiving a score at or below the 50th percentile on the remaining two scales [percentiles based on Ring and Wallston's (1968) norms using 852 subjects]; (2) those subjects who also received a score at or below the 50th percentile on scale 1 (outdoors) and scale 9 (clerical) of the Kuder Preference Record Vocational Form CP.

Subjects that were selected on the preceding criteria were then administered the Kuder a second time with the directions to fake their answers so that their results would be similar to those of a statistician (scale 9) and a naturalist (scale 1).* The results of scale 9 on the second administration were subtracted from the results of scale from the first administration to yield a remainder. This remainder was then correlated with the "p" and "r" scales of the PST. This revealed a positive correlation of .48 (p .05) for scale "r" and remainder and a negative correlation of -.32 (not significant) between scale "p" and remainder. Even though those persons who were classified as "r" types tended to do better in manipulating their answers than those classified as "p" types, a logical argument might be made that the ability to manipulate the results on a paper and pencil test does not indicate an ability to do so in an interpersonal context. However, there is research by Barocas and Christensen (1968) that indicates otherwise.

Barocas and Christensen accepted Goffman's premise that there were individual differences in the ability to manage impressions in the interpersonal context and designed an experiment to determine if this skill appeared in the context of a printed inventory as well. It was their hypothesis that those individuals who were good in faking on a test should also be good impression managers because both tasks require that the individual project himself in a certain manner. Therefore, they

---

*Even though the naturalist scale (1) was not used in the actual computation it was included to complicate the faking process because Barocas and Christensen (1968) found that faking a single scale alone did not discriminate among good and poor fakers.

operationally defined impression management as the ability to fake well on a pencil and paper test. Those subjects who faked well on the Strong Vocational Interest Blank were considered good impression managers while those subjects less adept in faking were defined as poor impression managers. Once the students were dichotimized according to ability in impression management they were matched in academic ability as assessed by the college board scores. They found that those students who were classified as good impression managers received significantly higher grade point averages after one semester in college than those classified as poor impression managers. Therefore, since good impression managers received higher grades in the classroom even though academic ability was controlled and a post hoc examination revealed no difference in the curriculum of good and poor impression managers, there is suggestive evidence of a relationship between ability to manipulate the outcomes of a printed inventory and the ability to manage the impressions of others. This being the case it further suggests construct validity for the PST based on Young's study.

Even though all the previous findings are suggestive of the construct validity of the PST the literature has revealed one study using the PST in an experimental validation of the performance styles hypothesized by Ring et al. In this experiment the PST was used to select the subjects who were to participate in the actual experiment. The criteria for subject selection was a score at the 85th percentile or above on one scale while not receiving higher than the 55th percentile on the remaining two scales. Therefore, only relatively pure "p," "r," and "c"

performance styles were used in the experiment. The subjects selected were then asked to role-play the part of an encyclopedia salesman. However, the content from which they were to make their sales presentation was also varied three ways: very favorable, favorable, and unfavorable. Their findings, which were based on both self-ratings and observer ratings, were that the "r" type person was rated as more effective than the "c" who in turn was rated more effective than the "p" type person regardless of the type of information from which they had to make their sales presentation. These findings suggest further construct validity for the PST along with a situational context where performance styles may make a difference in the perceived effectiveness of an individual.

In view of the evidence of construct validity for the PST and the empirical evidence of the effects of performance styles in the laboratory and academic setting, it seems logical that interpersonal performance would have a significant effect in other settings. One setting that provides optimal opportunity for interpersonal performance is the selection interview. If reference is made to Byrne's (1964) theory of interpersonal attraction which implies that those who perceive another as similar to himself will perceive that person as more favorable than a person who is not perceived as similar, then the "r" type person would have a definite advantage due to his ability to project himself in a manner that would be similar to the interviewer.

This advantage that the "r" type person experiences by being able to assume just the "right" role by projecting himself as a qualified applicant would not seem to become less of an advantage even when

considering the performance style of the interviewer. If the interviewer is a "r" type the "r" type interviewee would project the image that the "r" type interviewer is seeking, while if the interviewer is a "p" type who knows only one role the "r" type interviewee would fulfill this role equally as well. However, in the case of a "p" type person who knows only one role (himself) it is very unlikely that this role will coincide with the expectations of either the "p" or "r" type interviewer which would result in the "p" type interviewee being viewed as an unsuitable applicant.

The above deductions imply that it may very well be an applicant's style of interpersonal performance that enables him to secure a job via selection interview rather than his actual qualification. This may very well be satisfactory in certain occupations where verbal skills are the qualification and therefore require a "r" type person to be successful. However, in many technical occupations very little interpersonal performance is required of an employee to be successful. Therefore, if the "r" type person has the advantage in the selection interview, which in turn results in his being selected more frequently, then it is not surprising that low validity coefficients are often obtained when the interview score is correlated with some criteria of job performance.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

I. SUBJECTS

Seventy-two male subjects from two different educational settings during the spring of 1977 participated in this study. Forty of the subjects were veterans attending night school at a business college in a large southern city. Thirty-two of the subjects were undergraduates residing in a residence hall at a large southern university located in the same city as the business college.

II. PREEXPERIMENTAL TEST AND SUBJECT-SELECTION CRITERIA

The students were asked to complete the Performance Style Test (PST) (Appendix A). The items on the PST were scored with three separate keys that yielded a score for each of the performance styles previously mentioned ("p," "r," and "c"). Thus, each person received three scores that were used to determine his performance style.

However, this study was limited to only types "p" and "r." In order to select relatively pure performance styles of "p" and "r," only 36 "p" and 36 "r" subjects who met the following criteria were selected to take part in the actual experiment.

1. Having a "p" or "r" score in the upper 20th percentile based on norms developed by Ring and Wallston (1968).

2. Having also received a score on the remaining two scales no higher than the 50th percentile based on norms developed by Ring and Wallston (1968).

Therefore, in order to be eligible for selection, one must have scored above the 80th percentile on either the "p" or "r" scale and no higher than the 50th percentile on the remaining two scales ("p" $\geq$ 80, "r" $\leq$ 50, and "c" $\leq$ 50, or "r" $\geq$ 80, "p" $\leq$ 50, and "c" $\leq$ 50).

III. EXPERIMENTAL PROCEDURE

When the subjects arrived at the designated rooms allotted for this study they were taken into separate rooms where they were briefed on the role that they were to play in the experiment.

Once the interviewer was seated behind a table in the interviewing room the following instructions were read aloud by the experimenter.

> In this study we are attempting to simulate a selection interview that is typical of the interview that most applicants go through before they are hired on a job. You have been chosen on the basis of your test score to be the interviewer. Your task will be to interview an applicant for the job of a computer operator. Then you will be asked to rate him on a number of scales. The rating scales (Appendix B) that you will use are on the left-hand side of the desk. Please turn them over and read the instructions and each scale to see if you have any questions. On your right is a job description (Appendix C) of a computer operator that will aid you in the interview. Please read the job description. The interview will last 10 minutes. The timer is in front of you. I will give you a few minutes to become familiar with the material and then I will return to answer any questions that you may have. Once this stage is finished I will bring the applicant in and introduce him and turn the session over to you. Please be serious about this experiment and evaluate the applicant the best you can. Even though the applicant will never know how you rate him, please wait until he has left the room before filling out the scales.

Once the interviewee has been seated in a separate room the following instructions were read aloud by the experimenter:

> In this study we are attempting to simulate a selection interview that is typical of most selection interviews that most applicants go through before they are hired. The job that you will be interviewing for is that of a computer operator. Have you ever worked as a computer operator or around a computer?*
>
> In front of you there is a brief description of a computer operator (Appendix D). Please read the job description so that you will have an idea of what a computer operator does. Although the description is not very detailed and you may not know exactly what all the requirements for the job are, let me assure you that you are as qualified as any of the other applicants. I will give you some time to familiarize yourself with the description and return to answer any questions that you may have. In order to make this experiment as real as possible, pretend that acquiring the job is a very important factor in your future. When we enter the interview room I will introduce you as John Smith and leave the rest up to you and the interviewer. Are there any questions?

After all questions are answered the experimenter brought the interviewee into the interviewing room and introduced him as John Smith to the interviewer. The experimenter will then set the timer for ten minutes and leave the room. Once the interview session has been completed and rated by the interviewer, the subjects will be debriefed and asked not to discuss the matter with their friends.

IV. DESIGN

A 2 × 2 factorial design was employed where the variables of interviewee performance style "p" and "r" and the interaction of these

---

*If the subject has had experience with computers he was dismissed after being thanked for his willingness to participate along with any explanation of the contamination effects his experience would induce in the experiment.

factors were considered. The interviewee and interviewer designations were randomly determined. These groups and their designations are as follows.

		Interviewer: p	Interviewer: r
Interviewee	p	A n = 9	B n = 9
	r	C n = 9	D n = 9

1. Group A—Interviewer "p," interviewee "p" (p-p)
2. Group B—Interviewer "p," interviewee "r" (p-r)
3. Group C—Interviewer "r," interviewee "p" (r-p)
4. Group D—Interviewer "r," interviewee "r" (r-r)

V. ANALYSIS

The interviewer's ratings of scales 1 through 4 (ability to communicate, dependability, compatability, and expected effectiveness) were summed to yield a composite score of each interview session. These data were analyzed by employing the analysis of variance to determine the main effects of type of interviewer, type of interviewee, and the interaction of these variables in interviewee impression management. The Scheffe's S method was employed to make all possible comparisons among means.

The data obtained from question 5 which required the interviewers to categorize the interviewees' responses into a hire or reject category,

was analyzed by a chi square one-sample test to determine if significantly more "r" than "p" interviewees were recommended to be hired.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

The frequencies of each scale point (1 through 7) by each scale item (ability to communicate, dependability, compatability, and expected effectiveness) are presented in Table 2. An examination of these frequencies revealed that most applicants were rated extremely high on all scales. Therefore, since the interviewers generally restricted their ratings to the upper portion of the scales, this added some support to summing the scales into a composite score for an overall interview rating. By summing these scores into a composite score, the normality assumptions for the analysis of variance was more likely to be met.

Further empirical support for summing the interviewers' ratings of the four scales (ability to communicate, dependability, compatability, and expected effectiveness) to form a composite interview score was evident by an examination of Table 3. These intercorrelations suggest a high degree of interrelationship which lends some credence to the notion of an overall score as a means of evaluating an interviewee's performance within a selection interview.

The results of the overall model for the analysis of variance on the composite interview score is presented in Table 4. These results ($F(3, 32) = 5.12$, $p \leq .005$) indicated that the sources of variation within the model account for more of the variation in the composite interview score than would be expected by chance alone.

Table 2. A crosstabulation of scale point by response item.

Scales	Scale Points 1.0	1.5	2.0	2.5	3.0	3.5	4.0	4.5	5.0	5.5	6.0	6.5	7.0
Communication				1	1	1	2	1	11	6	10	3	
Dependability	1		1	1	1	1	1	1	7	5	10	4	3
Compatibility	1				1	2	2	2	6	5	9	4	4
Effectiveness				1	3		2	3	6	7	9	2	3

Table 3. Intercorrelations among the four scales that were summed to form the composite interview score.

	Communication	Dependability	Compatability	Effectiveness
Communication	1.00	.55	.55	.57
Dependability	.55	1.00	.89	.77
Compatibility	.55	.89	1.00	.72
Effectiveness	.57	.77	.72	1.00

*All correlations have a $p > .005$ ($n = 36$).

Table 4. The overall analysis of variance model for the composite interview score.

Source	DF	SS	MS	F	P > F
Model	3	199.854	66.618	5.12	.0052
Error	32	416.222	13.007		
Total	35	616.076			

The sources of variation in the overall model are presented in Table 5. These results indicated that the main effects of interviewer and the interaction of the interviewer × interviewee have little systematic effect on the composite interview score. However, the significant main effect of interviewee ($F(1,32) = 15.25$, $p \leq .005$) indicated that the type of interviewee being interviewed does have a systematic effect on the composite interview score.

Table 5. Sources of variation within the overall analysis of variance model for the composite interview score.

Sources	DF	SS	F	PR > F
Interviewer	1	1.174	0.09	0.7658
Interviewee	1	198.340	15.25	0.0005
Interviewer × Interviewee	1	.349	0.03	0.8725
Error	32			

In order to provide an interpretation of the interviewee main effect, a Scheffe's test was employed (see Table 6). These results suggested that "r" type interviewees received a significantly higher mean composite interview score than did "p" type interviewees (see Table 7). This data is consistent with the first hypothesis which advocated that "r" type interviewees would receive a significantly higher interview rating than would "p" type interviewees.

A further examination of Table 6 did not reveal any empirical support for hypothesis 2 which implied that the mean composite interview score would be lower for interpersonal performance style "p" interviewee-

Table 6. All pairwise comparisons among the different interviewer-interviewee combinations.

	pp ΣX_1 172	rp ΣX_2 167	pr ΣX_3 212	rr ΣX_4 211	Σai	Di	Di^2	MSDi	F´
A vs B	1	-1	0	0	2	5	25	1.38	.106
A vs C	1	0	-1	0	2	40	1600	88.88	6.830
A vs D	1	0	0	-1	2	39	1521	84.50	6.490
B vs C	0	1	-1	0	2	45	2025	112.50	8.650
B vs D	0	1	0	-1	2	44	1936	107.55	8.260
C vs D	0	0	1	-1	2	1	1	0.06	1.000
A vs B+C	2	-1	-1	0	6	35	1225	22.69	1.740
A vs B+D	2	-1	0	-1	6	34	1156	21.40	1.640
A vs C+D	2	0	-1	-1	6	79	6241	115.57	8.880
B vs A+C	-1	2	-1	0	6	50	2500	46.30	3.560
B vs A+D	-1	2	0	-1	6	49	2401	44.46	3.420
B vs C+D	0	2	-1	-1	6	89	7921	146.69	11.270
C vs A+B	-1	-1	2	0	6	85	7225	133.70	10.290
C vs A+D	-1	0	2	-1	6	41	1681	31.12	2.390
C vs B+D	0	-1	2	-1	6	-46	2116	39.19	3.010
D vs A+B	-1	-1	0	2	6	83	6889	127.50	9.800
D vs A+C	-1	0	-1	2	6	38	1444	26.74	2.390
D vs B+C	0	-1	-1	2	6	43	1849	34.24	2.630
A+B vs C+D	1	1	-1	-1	4	84	7056	196.00	15.060
A+C vs B+D	1	-1	1	-1	4	6	36	36.00	1.000
A+D vs B+C	1	-1	-1	1	4	-4	16	00.44	<1.000
A vs B+C+D	3	-1	-1	-1	12	-74	5476	50.70	3.900
B vs A+C+D	-1	3	-1	-1	12	94	8836	81.81	6.290
C vs A+B+D	-1	-1	3	-1	12	-86	7896	68.48	5.270
D vs A+B+C	-1	-1	-1	3	12	-82	6724	62.26	4.790

*$p \geq .05$

Table 7. Means and marginal means for the interpersonal performance style interviewers-interviewee combinations.

Interviewee Style	Interviewer Style P	R	
P	19.11	18.56	18.84
R	23.55	23.45	23.50

interviewer combination. What the data did indicate was that the mean composite interview score for the interpersonal performance style "p" interviewee-"p" interviewer was lower than any interpersonal performance style "r" interviewee regardless of the interpersonal performance style of the interviewer (see Table 7). However, the mean composite interview score for the interpersonal performance style "p" interviewee-"p" interviewer was not statistically different from the interpersonal performance style "p" interviewee-"r" interviewer.

Presented in Table 8 are the data pertinent to hypothesis 3 which suggested that significantly more interpersonal performance style "r" interviewees than "p" interviewees would be recommended for hire. These data do not lend any support to the third hypothesis. In fact, over 90 percent of all interviewees were recommended for employment. While this finding may seem contradictory to the differences found with respect to the mean composite interview scores for the interpersonal performance style "p" and "r" interviewees, a further elaboration in the discussion will address this possible inconsistency.

Table 8. The number of "p" and "r" subjects recommended and not recommended for hire.

	P	R	Total
		*	
Recommended	16	17	33
Not Recommended	2	1	3
	18	18	36

*$x^2 < 1$, DF = 1.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

I. DISCUSSION

The results of the present study certainly add validity to the assertion that "It is not what you know but how you present yourself that really counts in the interview situation." This was evident by the interpersonal performance style "r" interviewees receiving a much higher mean interview composite score than did the interpersonal performance style "p" interviewees, even though both types of interviewees were exposed to the same factual information prior to the interview. Furthermore, if consideration is given to the "high" intercorrelations among the four scales summed to form the interview composite score, it appears as if the interpersonal performance style "r" interviewees were able to project themselves more favorably in all areas than were the interpersonal performance style "p" interviewees. Also, the lack of statistical interaction between the different interviewee-interviewer combinations seems to offer support to Goffman's theory which suggested that interpersonal performance style "r" persons possess capabilities to respond in a more favorable manner within an interpersonal context than do the interpersonal performance style "p" persons. While one might question the above statement on the grounds that the model employed did not fit the data due to the F-ratios for the main effect of interviewer and interaction of interviewer-interviewee being less than unity, a further analysis suggested by Ostle (1963) suggests otherwise.

Ostle has suggested that when a F-ratio is obtained that is less than unity the assumptions underlying the analysis of variance model may not have been met. He further suggested that in order to reject the null hypothesis without further elaboration on the suitability of the model the inverse of the F-ratio should not be significant. The inverse for the F-ratios ($F' = 1/.09$ and $F' = 1/.04$ with 32 and 1 D.F.) that were less than unity in this study were not significant.

Even though the interviewers did make a differentiation between the interpersonal performance style "p" and "r" interviewees on the composite interview score they did not make such a differentiation with their recommendations in hiring. While this finding may appear inconsistent, i.e., higher composite ratings but no difference in hiring recommendation this may very well be an artifact of the design, subject selection, type of subjects, and/or scale employed in the present investigation.

The design of the study was somewhat inadequate in the respect that no manipulation check was taken from the subjects. Thus, there is no evidence that the interviewers were aware of whether the person they were interviewing was a good or poor impression manager. Without such information it was impossible to determine if the recommendation for hiring or rejecting the interviewee was related in any way to interpersonal performance style of the interviewee. Also the design could have been improved in that it did not provide the interviewer any opportunity to discriminate among the different interpersonal performance styles. Thus, if each interviewer had interviewed both "p" and "r" type persons the proportions of "p" and "r" type persons recommended for employment may have been different from that observed.

Another conceptual aspect not to be overlooked concerns the method of subject selection. Even though the subjects were selected from a well defined population only those meeting certain criteria actually participated in the experiment. Furthermore, the use of this criteria may well have resulted in a restriction of range within the defined limits. In the event that this did occur the power of the statistical test was weakened.

Not only was there concern for the design and subject selection but type of subject employed was a constraint. Even though the subjects employed in this study were somewhat heterogeneous, i.e., drawn from two different institutions which serve two different types of educational needs, they were students.

The literature contains numerous studies addressing the selection interview which have employed students as well as professional interviewers. These studies have indicated that there is no difference between student subjects and professional interviewers in terms of their evaluations of: applicant's background histories (Rowe, 1967), applicant's resumé (Hake, Ohnesorge, and Dunnette, 1970), applicant's job qualifications (Chlopak, 1970), and favorability and order of applicant ranking (Haccoun, 1970). In fact, Bernstein, Hankel, and Harlan (1975) suggested that the only difference between student and professional interviewers is that students tend to be more lenient in their ratings relative to the professional interviewers. They further pointed out that the variances, intercorrelations, and reliability appear to be unrelated to the interviewer's group membership.

However, since the interviewers in this study were students and students tend to be more lenient it is not surprising that a large number of recommendations for hire were made by the interviewers. In fact, Dipboye, Fromkin and Wiback (1975) suggested that when students rate their peers it is only reasonable to expect a more favorable response to other students like themselves. Therefore, a continuous scale should have been employed rather than the dichotomous scale which forced the interviewers to categorize the interviewees into a hire or reject situation. Thus, the high percentage of recommendations should have been expected in view of the leniency tendency, lack of opportunity for discrimination provided the interviewers, and the dichotomous scale.

II. CONCLUSIONS

The major goal of this study was to determine if Goffman's interpersonal performance styles of "p" and "r" were operative within the selection interview. To this criterion the study could be viewed as a success. However, from an applied standpoint there is much research left to be done in the area of interpersonal performance in the selection interview. While these findings should not be generalized to other settings and populations without further research, they should be useful as an initial step in a series of studies that could go beyond the laboratory setting into a field application.

Even though the different interpersonal performance styles in this study had a measurable effect on the composite interview rating, the design of the study was such that it did not permit any definitive

statements as to why the interviewers rated the interviewees as they did. In order to provide such statements future research should explore possible differences between the interpersonal performance styles of "p" and "r" interviewees in terms of their motivational factors, skill factors, and knowledge factors within the interviewing process.

Also, several cautions should be observed in interpreting the data of the present study. First, students were employed rather than professional interviewers. Although past research supports the use of college students in this type of research caution must still be used in generalizing to other subjects. A second limitation was that the subject pool consisted of male subjects only and the study therefore, failed to take into consideration any effects that sex may have had in conjunction with the interpersonal performance styles on the composite interview rating. Therefore, further research is needed to examine the reliability and generality of these findings to other jobs, interviews, candidates, and settings.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Barocas, R. and Christensen, D. Impression management, fakeability, and academic performance. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1968, 15(6), 559-561.

Barocas, R. and Vance, F. Interpersonal performance and placement interview decisions. Journal of Social Psychology, 1973, 86, 23-28.

Bellows, R. M. and Estep, M. F. Employment Psychology. New York: Rinehart, 1954.

Bernstein, V., Hakel, M. D., and Harlan, A. The college student as interviewer: A threat to generalizability? Journal of Applied Psychology, 1975, 60, 266-268.

Byrne, D. Assessing personality variables and their alteration. Personality Change. New York: Wiley, 1964.

Carlson, R. E. Selection interview decisions: the interviewer's final rating. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1967, 51, 461-468.

Chlopak, D. B. The relative influence of job qualifications and applicant's background fit to the job on interviewer decisions. Unpublished master's thesis, Ohio State University, 1974.

Crissy, W. E. and Regon, J. J. Halo effect in the employment interview. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1951, 35, 338-341.

Dipboye, R. L., Fromkin, H. L., and Wiback, K. Relative importances of applicant sex, attractiveness, and scholastic standing in evaluation of job applicant resumés. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1975, 60, 39-43.

Goffman, D. The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life. New York: Doubleday, 1959.

Haccoun, R. R. Weighting and order of cures as determiners of decisions in a simulated selection interview situation—a reformulation and empirical test of the concept of "gating." Unpublished master's thesis, Ohio State University, 1970.

Hakel, M., Ohnesorge, J., and Dunnette, M. Interviewer evaluations of job applicants' resumés as a function of the qualifications of the immediately preceding applicants: An examination of contrast effects. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1970, 54, 27-30.

Maier, N. R. Sensitivity to attempts at deception in an interview situation. Personnel Psychology, 1966, 19, 55-60.

Maier, N. R. and Thurber, J. A. Accuracy of judgments of deception when an interview is watched, heard, and read. Personnel Psychology, 1968, 21, 23-30.

Mayfield, E. C. and Carlson, R. E. The selection interview decisions: first results from a long-term research project. Personnel Psychology, 1966, 19, 41-53.

Ostle, Bennand. Statistics in Research. Ames, Iowa: Iowa State University Press, 1963.

Ring, K., Braginsky, D., and Braginsky, B. Performance styles in interpersonal relations: a typology. Psychological Reports, 1966, 18, 203-220.

Ring, K., Braginsky, D., Levine, L., and Braginsky, B. Performance styles in interpersonal behavior: an experimental validation of a typology. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 1967, 3, 140-159.

Ring, K. and Wallston, K. A test to measure performance styles in interpersonal relations. Psychological Reports, 1968, 22, 147-154.

Rowe, P. M. Order effects in assessment decision. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1967, 51, 170-173.

Spriegel, W. R. and James, V. A. Trends in recruitment and selection practices. Personnel, 1958, 35, 42-48.

Springbett, B. M. Factors affecting the final decision in the employment interview. Canadian Journal of Psychology, 1958, 12, 13-22.

Ulrich, L. and Trumbo, D. The selection interview since 1949. Psychological Bulletin, 1965, 63, 100-116.

Vroom, V. H. Work and Motivation. New York: Wiley, 1964.

Wright, O. R. Summary of research on the selection interview since 1964. Personnel Psychology, 1969, 22, 391-413.

Younge, K. A. The value of the interview: an orientation and a pilot study. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1956, 40, 25-31.

Young, I. P. Construct validation study I. Unpublished research, 1974a.

Young, I. P. Construct validation study II. Unpublished research, 1974b.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

For each of the statements presented below you are to decide whether it is true as applied to you or false as it is applied to you. You are to mark your answers on the answer sheet provided. If a statement is true or mostly true as applied to you, blacken in the first column space opposite the corresponding item number on the answer sheet. If a statement is false or not usually true as applied to you, blacken in the second column space opposite the corresponding item number. Make sure, in using the answer sheet, that the number of the statement agrees with the number on the answer sheet. Please use No. 2 lead pencil and do not omit any items.

1. I would be uncomfortable in anything other than fairly conventional dress.
2. If given the chance I would make a good leader of people.
3. I have skill in influencing others.
4. I must admit that I enjoy trying to manipulate others for my own purpose.
5. I often find it's difficult to get people to do me favors, even when I have a right to expect them.
6. I like to do things that other people regard as unconventional.
7. When in a group of people I have trouble thinking of the right things to talk about.
8. I find it easy to get along with people.
9. I dislike having to behave according to the rules of etiquette.
10. In most social situations, I feel tense and constrained.
11. I can fit in pretty easily with any group of people.
12. It's usually easy for me to persuade others to my own point of view.
13. I like to conform to custom and to avoid doing things that people I respect might consider unconventional.
14. I think I could be a successful businessman, if I wanted to.
15. I like to avoid situations where I am expected to do things in a conventional way.

16. I usually find it difficult to change someone else's opinions.

17. When serving on a committee, I like to be appointed or elected chairman.

18. I must admit I try to see what others think before I take a stand.

19. I can easily make other people afraid of me, and sometimes do for the fun of it.

20. A person should adapt his ideas and his behavior to the group that happens to be with him at the time.

21. I do not mind meeting strangers.

22. I think I'd enjoy being an actor (or actress).

23. At parties I am more likely to sit by myself or with just one other person than to join in with the crowd.

24. I can usually get people to do what I want.

25. I usually have trouble making myself heard in an argument.

26. I like to be the center of attention in a group.

27. People can pretty easily change me even though I thought my mind was already made up on a subject.

28. Even the idea of giving a talk in public makes me afraid.

29. I think I would enjoy being a salesman.

30. I like to meet new people.

31. I don't like participating in formal ceremonies.

32. If I'm with someone I don't like, I usually don't express my real feelings to him.

33. I like to follow instructions and do what is expected of me.

34. I find it hard to talk when I meet new people.

35. I frequently feel intense sympathy for others.

36. I enjoy being with people who are suave and sophisticated.

37. I think it's important to learn how to obey.

38. I think most people would like to get ahead.

39. When in a new situation, it's best to watch what others do.

40. I enjoy being the host (or hostess) of a party.

41. I feel I can handle myself pretty well in most social situations.

42. I sometimes enjoy misleading people just for the fun of it.

43. I can deceive people, if I have to, without feeling guilty about it.

44. I don't mind pretending to like someone when I really don't if there's a good reason to do so.

45. I like people to notice and to comment upon my appearance when I am out in public.

46. I often feel like telling people what I really think of them.

47. I feel ill at ease with people I don't know.

48. I have no dread of going into a room by myself, where other people have already gathered and are talking.

49. I am a good mixer.

50. I like to go to parties.

51. In general, I find that I dislike nonconformists.

52. I don't like to be too conspicuous at social gatherings.

53. I should like to belong to several clubs or lodges.

54. I often find that my wishes conflict with those of others.

55. I feel guilty whenever I have done something I know is wrong.

APPENDIX B

INTERVIEWER'S RATING BOOKLET

DIRECTIONS

This rating should reflect your assessment of the interviewee's qualities. To aid in the accuracy of your ratings the following suggestions are offered regarding the use of this booklet.

1. Consider only "one" scale at a time.

2. Study each factor and the specifications for each scale.

3. Review upon completion to see that the rating of each factor applies to the interviewee.

4. Comment on the last page any matter which in your opinion needs explanation.

Position: Computer Operator

1. Ability to Communicate with faculty and Students.
   (explain changes in procedures)
   (explain malfunctions of machines)

VERY POOR						EXCELLENT
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Position: Computer Operator

2. Dependability
(punctuality and attendance)

VERY DEPENDABLE						VERY UNDEPENDABLE
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Position: Computer Operator

3. Compatability with other employees

VERY COMPATABLE						VERY UNCOMPATABLE
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Position: Computer Operator

4. Expected overall effectiveness as an employee.

VERY SUITABLE						VERY UNSUITABLE
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Position: Computer Operator

5. Please make a recommendation to HIRE ( ) or REJECT ( ).

APPENDIX C

Job Description

Job Title: Computer Operator

Work Performed: Under the supervision of computer programmer and instructional staff employed by the University Computing Center. Operates key punch, and printer. Prepares equipment for operations according to oral instructions and replaces paper spools on the printer and observes materials for creases, tears, or printing defects. Watches the machines for error lights and other indications of malfunctions. Notifies supervisor of any malfunctions. Load and unload cards in card reader and separates and sorts all printed materials for distribution. Accepts data cards to be processed and offers assistance to faculty and students in the computer center.

Daily Duties:

1. Prepares print-outs for distribution by placing data cards with print-outs and addressing complete package to proper personnel.

2. Continuously monitor the computer center for malfunctions to be reported to the supervisor.

3. Insure that students sign computer log for time they use on the computer.

4. Notify staff and students of machines that are malfunctioning.

5. Supply general information to faculty and students about the operation, time schedule and other pertinent information relating to the computer center.

Experience Required: NONE

Training: On job training. Continual during the period of employment.

APPENDIX D

Job Description

Job Title: Computer Operator

Experience Required: NONE

Training: On job training. Continual during the period of employment.

Duties: Duties include preparing print-outs to be delivered, watch the computer for break-downs, make sure students sign log when using the computers and pass around general information about the computer center.

VITA

Ila Phillip Young, son of Ila Wilson (Pete) and Lynda Travis Young, was born on July 29, 1947 in Evansville, Indiana. He graduated from Sturgis High School in Sturgis, Kentucky, in June of 1965.

In the fall of 1965 he entered Western Kentucky University where in June 1970 he received a Bachelor of Arts degree with a major in psychology. Following his graduation in the fall of 1970 he entered the University of Evansville and was granted a Master of Arts degree in the spring of 1973.

In the fall of 1975 he entered the University of Tennessee. In December 1977 he received the Doctor of Education degree.