Level of Evidence: The realistic job preview/interview has the highest level of evidence being tested through random assignment of subjects to experimental and control groups. The effect was positive but small. The research on other selection methods has a nearly 100 year history and is well regarded. In addition to the realistic job preview/interview that has shown positive results for recruitment, selection and retention there are several commonly used selection procedures: general mental ability testing, work sample tests, integrity tests, structured and unstructured interviews, peer ratings, behavioral methods, job experience, biographical data, resumes or curriculum vitae, job interests, job-personal fit and job-organization fit, age of applicant, among others. The use of effective selection methods increases employee performance, monetary value and job skills (Schmidt & Hunter, 1998).

Current Best Evidence

- Realistic job preview (RJP) is a highly recommended selection strategy that provides applicants with balanced information about the job to facilitate a better fit between the needs of applicants and demands of the workplace (Graef, 2002). An RJP includes information on both the positive and the negative aspects of the job thereby allowing applicants to make informed decisions about whether they wish to accept a job offer (Larson & Hewitt, 2005).
  - RJP has a positive effect on job acceptance mainly when applicants do not have prior exposure to the job. Realistic job information and met expectations have been associated with greater job satisfaction and job survival of new recruits (Meglino, Ravlin & DeNisi, 2000).
- The selection procedures that best predict job effectiveness and job-related learning in medium to high complexity jobs (such as child welfare) are general mental ability tests and structured interviews (which use the same questions for every applicant and score responses using a standardized scoring guide) (Hermelin & Robertson, 2001).
  - Medium to low effective selection methods include unstructured interviews, biographical data, personality tests, integrity tests (measures of desirable behavior), work sample tests or assessment centers, and personality scales such as the “Big Five” (measures of conscientiousness, emotional and extraversion, agreeableness and openness) (Hermelin & Robertson, 2001).
- Structured interviews, regardless of content, are better predictors of job performance than unstructured interviews (McDaniel, Whetzel, Schmidt & Maurer, 1994; Schmidt & Hunter, 1998; Conway & Jako, 1995).
Current Best Evidence, continued

- There are mixed research findings about how well individual interviews as compared to group interviews (multiple interviewers providing ratings) predict job performance [See McDaniel and colleagues, 1994; Conway and Jako, 1995]. Results in both studies showed that standardized questions had positive effects for both individual and group interviews but a considerably stronger effect for individual interviews.

- Situational interviews (where work situations are presented and the candidate is asked to respond) are better predictors for job performance than job-related interviews (that were not situational) (McDaniel, Whetzel, Schmidt & Maurer, 1994).

- Interviews with multiple purposes at the same time (e.g. giving information about the organization, accessing applicant fit, doing applicant screening, describing hiring procedures) are difficult to absorb for people with higher levels of anxiety, low cognitive ability or low self-monitoring skills (Barber, Hollenbeck, Tower & Phillips, 1994).

- In general, Black and Hispanic candidates receive lower interview ratings than White candidates. Group differences were higher on average for low-structured interviews than for high-structured interviews (Huffcutt & Roth, 1998).

Practice implications

- Realistic job previews/interviews can be created through videos, brochures, web-based information, structured observations, photograph albums, or lists of frequently asked questions. It is important to involve current employees in the development process and focus on aspects of the job that potential recruits are unlikely to know or are likely to have unrealistic expectations. For more information, [http://portal.cornerstones4kids.org/content61.html](http://portal.cornerstones4kids.org/content61.html)

- It is recommended that recruiters use a combination of general mental ability tests (assessments of intelligence or cognitive ability) and structured interviews as part of their selection process.
  - Since few human services organizations have the capacity to directly assess cognitive ability through intelligence tests, [click here](http://portal.cornerstones4kids.org/content61.html) for ideas about other ways to measure cognitive ability. A note of caution: Although cognitive ability tests are good predictors of job performance, these tests tend to discriminate against racial groups (Huffcutt & Roth, 1998).
  - Structured interviews include behavioral interviews and situational interviews. To learn more about these two types interviews including how to develop and score, [click here](http://portal.cornerstones4kids.org/content61.html).

- It is recommended that recruitment focused interviews and selection focused interviews be conducted separately so that candidates can fully process job related information.

- When designing selection practices, organizations should consider whether a technique results in illegal discrimination against protected groups of people. Illegal discrimination occurs when people are unfairly turned down for employment or treated more favorably during the hiring process based on age, race, ethnicity, gender, disability status, religion, sexual orientation, or other characteristics.
Creative but Untested Selection Ideas

- Include parents in the selection process.
- Use parents in mock interview between client and worker.
- Conduct job tryouts or ‘fit’ interviews