2021

Faculty Candidates' Lived Experiences During the Preemployment Hiring Process

Janet Grayson Chappell
Walden University

Walden University

College of Social and Behavioral Sciences

This is to certify that the doctoral dissertation by

Janet Grayson Chappell

has been found to be complete and satisfactory in all respects,
and that any and all revisions required by
the review committee have been made.

Review Committee
Dr. Amin Asfari, Committee Chairperson,
Public Policy and Administration Faculty

Dr. Kristin Dailey, Committee Member,
Public Policy and Administration Faculty

Dr. Ian Cole, University Reviewer,
Public Policy and Administration Faculty

Chief Academic Officer and Provost
Sue Subocz, Ph.D.

Walden University
2021

Abstract

Faculty Candidates' Lived Experiences During the Preemployment Hiring Process

by

Janet Grayson Chappell

MPhil-PPA, Walden University, 2020

MS, Troy State University, 2004

BS, Alabama A&M University, 1996

Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Public Policy and Administration

Walden University

May 2021

Abstract

The lack of touch points of interaction during the preemployment hiring process for faculty candidates at public and/or for-profit institutions raised social quality concerns. The purpose of this qualitative phenomenological study was to discover the lived experiences of faculty candidates regarding the preemployment hiring process and the social quality. Schuler's social validity theory provided the framework for the study aiding to identify and address if there is adequate information, participation, transparency, and communication with the four mechanisms. The research questions helped discover and explore the faculty candidates' perceptions toward the preemployment hiring process and incorporate specific suggested enhancements for a better preemployment hiring process, organizational effectiveness, and candidate experience. Data were collected from semi structured interviews and surveys with six participants who had recent experiences with the preemployment process. Data were transcribed and analyzed using the four mechanisms from social validity theory and the Atlas.ti software. The findings indicated a lack of social touch points of interaction during the preemployment hiring process in the following areas: including helpful information, practicing inclusion efforts, and providing effective feedback during the process. Per the findings, they may be used to improve the preemployment hiring process, organizational effectiveness, and enhance the candidates' experience. The results added to the positive social change through knowledge and ability. As a social change agent, the results will be used to impact the profession, communities, and society.

Faculty Candidates' Lived Experiences During the Preemployment Hiring Process

by

Janet Grayson Chappell

MPhil-PPA, Walden University, 2020

MS, Troy State University, 2004

BS, Alabama A&M University, 1996

Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Public Policy and Administration

Walden University

May 2021

Dedication

This is dedicated to those before me, my ancestors with the wildest *DREAMs*. And, dedicated to those that are coming into their *DREAMs*. Generations of *DREAMs* have taken place and will continue! *Dreams* of achievement and education, what no one can take from you. *Dream* on….

I was once told I was being very *Ambitious*, and that I am….

Acknowledgment

Where do I start? Acknowledgments go out to so many family members, friends, and committee members; and, you know who you are. Much love to you for the continued support and direction. Especially to my family, The Graysons, just the mere being … was the drive all along; the first Doctor, Ph.D. of the family. The *DREAMs* …! Also, I must acknowledge my loving husband Eric D. Chappell and daughter Saiban J. Chappell who labored with me during those long sleepless nights and foggy days but with their continued patience, love, and support, my completion was accomplished; without you it would not have been possible. And last but not least, I must thank my Lord and Savior, without him none of this definitely would not have been possible. I thank him for the needed grace, mercy, and faith to endure the entire process. As it is said, *to whom much is given, much will be required*; Luke 12:48.

Table of Contents

ii

List of Tables

List of Figures

Chapter 1: Introduction to the Study

Social quality consists of fair, equitable, appropriate, and accepted interactions, which include the four main touch points derived from the four mechanisms of Schuler (1993) during the preemployment hiring process: participative, informative, communicative, and transparency. Examples of social quality interactions during the process include helpful information, inclusion, fairness, and effective feedback. During a candidate's experience of any industry, they experience different touch points of interaction. However, there was a need to identify with the specific touch points of interaction for faculty candidates within public and/or for-profit institutions.

Biswas (2019) identified the candidate experience as a key component of the preemployment hiring process, which can lead to social quality concerns if not appropriately handled. The key components of the candidate experience were the job search, job application, communication/feedback, interview, and onboarding efforts, which were the touch points used to identify social quality during the process. Social concerns included the candidate's lack of participation in the process, not being effectively informed throughout the process, lack of fairness in the process, and ineffective communication efforts (Schuler, 1993). In the 2-year, 4-year, public, private, and for-profit institutions of higher learning, the hiring process influences the faculty candidates' perception of the process and experience. Experiences range from poor communication to the lack of inclusion in the process, and the two are opportunities to share knowledge and be included in the decision-making efforts.

Public and for-profit institutions function the same but are different during the preemployment hiring process. All institutions go through the process of advertising, searching, interviewing, and selecting the best candidates for the positions. However, the specific touch points during the preemployment hiring process raise social quality concerns involving the lack of informative, participative, transparent, and communicative efforts. Concerns in public and private institutions include the following:

- conducted basic advertisement via various media outlets

- searched and screened viable candidates

- conducted interview and assessments

- developed committees for candidate reviews

- assessed and reviewed for final selection

- extended offers of employment

- conducted onboarding efforts

In for-profit institutions, there was a lack of touch points in the following areas of the process (Cret & Musselin, 2010):

- internal recommendations

- teaching demonstrations

- interview phases (i.e., with dean and/or provost)

When there was a lack of touch points in the process, social quality concerns existed as identified for public institutions. Concerns were the lack of opportunities to be informed, inability to actively participate, lack of openness, and inadequate communication efforts.

Cret and Musselin (2010) demonstrated that academic hiring is the process of distinguishing candidates from one another. However, the distinction is obscured by the perceptions of the faculty candidates regarding the quality of the process. If faculty candidates do not experience certain touch points of interaction, there is a possible presence of a lack of social quality (Cret & Musselin, 2010). According to Cret and Musselin (2010), the social quality includes job relatedness, opportunities to perform, consistency and justification for procedures and decisions, warmth and respect, and informative and timely feedback with two-way communication efforts. The current study addressed the lived experiences of faculty candidates from public higher education institutions concerning social quality touch points of interactions experienced during the preemployment hiring process. Findings from the study may provide suggestions for a better candidate experience, and institutions may adopt and implement more effective and efficient social quality change efforts within the hiring process. The implementation of the suggestions for better touch points of interactions within the process may lead to better candidate experiences and an enhanced process. Per each social validity mechanism listed: informative, participative, transparent, and communicative:

- Informative was identified as an opportunity to obtain helpful information.

- Participative was identified as experiencing inclusion.

- Transparency was identified with fairness in the process.

- Communicative was identified as being offered feedback, communication types.

According to Schuler (1993), social quality is seen as open, fair, respectful, civil, appropriate, and acceptable interactions during the selection process for employment. Although there have been social quality concerns from candidates in various industries for a while (Schuler, 1993), there was a need to explore the lived experiences of the faculty candidates. For the faculty candidates, the social quality concerns were related to the preemployment hiring process (Biswas, 2019). The components consisted of the main touch points during the process: job search, job application, communication/feedback, interview, and onboarding.

In Chapter 1, I provide context for the concerns regarding the lack of touch points of interactions in the preemployment hiring process for faculty candidates in public and for-profit institutions. I address the foundation of the study in the following areas: background, problem statement, purpose of study, research question, nature of the study, definitions, assumptions, scope and delimitations, limitations, significance, and summary.

Background

Faculty candidates' experiences are central to the preemployment hiring process, and I explored a concerning lack of social touch points in the faculty candidates' experiences. There were concerns about certain interactions during the process, which led to questions about the preemployment hiring process, including whether appropriate and acceptable social interactions were occurring. From the faculty candidates' perspective, the feedback had an impact on the experiences, the process, and the institutions. Rozario, Venkatraman, and Abbas (2019) noted that continuous improvements and research are needed for the best hiring practices and processes to be produced. Therefore, the current

study was conducted to discover and survey the lived experiences of the faculty candidates and provide enhanced social touch points of interaction within the process. Social touch points of interaction were those suggested by Bauer, McCarthy, J., Anderson, Truxillo, & Salgado (2012), which included providing informative explanations to applicants, giving applicants a chance to show what they know, using job-related material, giving timely and informative feedback, and treating applicants with respect throughout the process. The social implications of the study were the social quality mechanisms of the process: informative, participative, transparent, and communicative, which included discovering new ways to account for more appropriate and acceptable interactions. According to Cret and Musselin (2010), inequalities influenced access to higher education positions, which were linked to the impartiality of the hiring process. Therefore, institutions must conduct fair, unbiased preemployment hiring with effective communication/feedback efforts with opportunities for candidates to participate and be well informed during the process, which may help reduce the concerns identified by the faculty candidates.

Researchers who studied the preemployment hiring process and practices focused on inefficiencies based on the interview, selection, and assessment touch points (J. M. McCarthy, J. M., Bauer, T. N., Truxillo. Anderson, Costa, & Ahmed, 2017; Rozario et al., 2019; Zibarras, 2018). McCarthy, J. M., Bauer, Truxillo, Campion, and Iddekinge (2018), identified improving the candidates' experience with better hiring interventions for the assessment, which included increased transparency (informational fairness) and respect (social fairness) during the experiences. Rozaris et al., (2019) and Zibarras (2018)

focused on candidates and their experience and perception of the process and/or organization. Others who addressed the candidates' reactions have done so in the process efforts, applying social quality (Bauer et al., 2012; Mahadi, Alias, & Ismail, 2015; J. M. McCarthy et al., 2017; Nikolaou et al., 2015). As a result, there was a gap in the literature regarding the experiences of faculty candidates within colleges and universities, in which social quality was a concern. Researchers have focused on certain areas of the preemployment process using other theoretical frameworks (Mahadi et al., 2015; J. M. McCarthy et al., 2017; J. M. McCarthy et al., 2018; Nikolaou et al., 2015, Rozario et al., 2019; Zibarras, 2018). Prior researchers acknowledged barriers impeding the application of social quality in the process and practices (Bauer et al., 2012; J. M. McCarthy et al., 2018). Barriers were concerns within the process, including informational fairness, social fairness, transparency, and respect (J. M. McCarthy et al., 2018). The current study addressed the faculty candidates' experiences regarding the lack of informative, participative, transparency, and communicative efforts (social quality) in the process.

A comprehensive literature review indicated concerning touch points during the process, which lacked adequately applied social quality efforts: giving the faculty candidates opportunities to participate, making sure candidates are well informed, ensuring candidates are treated fairly, and varying communication efforts and time frames. The current study contributed to the literature through personal accounts of the faculty candidates who experienced preemployment hiring process concerns. The findings may be socially significant for several groups within the hiring process, particularly faculty candidates of all ranks who have experienced concerns within the

process. Knowledge gained may further social quality in the process, creating a more appropriate and acceptable candidate experience.

Problem Statement

There was an identified concern with the lack of touch points of interaction that included a lack of adequate information, inclusion, transparency, and effective communication efforts during the preemployment hiring process for faculty candidates in public higher education institutions. This qualitative phenomenological study addressed faculty candidates' lived experiences regarding the lack of touch points of interaction during the process. Minimal research was available on higher education faculty candidates' lived experiences of the preemployment hiring process. Although faculty candidates' experiences at the colleges and universities varied according to the institution type (i.e., public, private, and for-profit), it was important to explore the concerns of the faculty candidates. Due to the institution type, there were some differences in the process, which led to concerning interactions that limited or altered the touch points during the preemployment process.

Not all institutions follow the same preemployment hiring process. However, there was a need to explore faculty candidates' experiences to identify a more acceptable process that includes helpful information, inclusion, fairness, and effective feedback. Surveying the social quality concerns of faculty candidates may reveal differences in each faculty candidate's experiences (Cret & Musselin, 2010). The findings indicated some differences in the experience of each candidate in the preemployment hiring process.

In this qualitative study, the experiences of the faculty candidates were explored to discover the concerns and address the need for more social quality in the preemployment hiring process. Participants' concerns were addressed within the process to provide suggestions and enhancements to the process. According to faculty candidates from various colleges and universities (4-year, public, and private), there were concerns with the preemployment hiring process (Basham et al., 2009), including a lack of desired touch points of interaction with the candidates.

Zibarras (2018) noted that candidates should have positive experiences about the process and the organization. In some instances, faculty candidates should leave with questions and concerns related to the specifics of the process from the position of individual status and performance. Therefore, there was a need to assess how institutions are conducting basic social interactions during the preemployment hiring process with faculty candidates. According to Nikolaou and Georgiou (2018), the way candidates are treated during the process has not received the attention that is expected. Therefore, the current study addressed these concerns by applying theory mechanisms to determine whether social quality is lacking in the process. Addressing the concerns may reduce the negative impact on faculty candidates who expressed concerns about how the preemployment hiring process is conducted. Negative experiences include lowered organizational attractiveness, reduced referrals to others, and decreased likeliness to accept the positions (J. M. McCarthy et al., 2018). Among faculty candidates who accept the positions, there are concerns regarding the effectiveness and efficiency of appropriate and acceptable interactions. In some instances, the positions are being accepted for

questionable reasons, such as an only offer, financial reasons, tenure track pursuit, and/or appeal of the opportunity.

J. M. McCarthy et al., (2017) stated that research efforts should focus on the mechanisms that are relevant to the candidates' experiences. In the current study, the social validity mechanisms (informative, participative, transparent, and communicative) were applied to address the identified concerns from the faculty candidates' experiences. According to Mahadi et al., (2015), research should be conducted using a qualitative method to identify the experiences and address the preemployment hiring concerns of the faculty candidates. A possible cause of the preemployment hiring concerns was a flawed, underdeveloped, and/or underapplied hiring process. In the hiring process, there was a lack of effectively and efficiently developed social quality actions, which contributed to the concerns. Also, there were underapplied social quality actions due to the lack of consistency in the preemployment hiring process application. Therefore, I investigated the faculty candidates' lived experiences through the qualitative study, which highlighted the issue with underdeveloped and underapplied processes in the areas of the four mechanisms. According to J. M. McCarthy et al., (2018), organizations that focus on quality candidate experiences will create a more effective and efficient experience through an enhanced preemployment hiring process.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study was to explore the lived experiences of the faculty candidates regarding the preemployment hiring process. I surveyed faculty candidates at public institutions regarding their touch point interaction concerns. I determined whether

the touch points were applied or not during the process to identify suggestions and

enhancements for the candidates' experience. I also explored whether the social touch

points of interaction during the preemployment hiring process included helpful

information, practice inclusion efforts, fairness, and effective feedback touch points in the

process that were informative, participative, transparent, and communicative (see

Schuler, 1993). The central phenomenon of interest was the faculty candidates' lived

experiences with concerns in the preemployment hiring process. Therefore, the

preemployment hiring concerns were assessed with the mechanisms in identifying and

addressing the following:

- Was there adequate information?

- Did you experience inclusion?

- Was there transparency?

- Were you offered feedback?

The data gathered from the experiences were used to identify the concerns of the

preemployment hiring process. There can be psychological effects that lead to self-

esteem, stress levels, and/or self-worth concerns. According to Schmitt and Ryan (2006),

anxiety and motivation can lead to concerns. Other concerns included applying and never

hearing anything in return, getting an interview but not being selected to move forward,

advancing in the process but failing the assessment without feedback, advancing in the

preemployment process but not being offered the position with no feedback, and

advancing in the process with a lot of ambiguity. In this study, I explored what the faculty

candidates experienced during the preemployment hiring process to better understand their experiences and identify suggestions for improving the process.

Research Questions

To satisfy the study's purpose, I posed the following research questions (RQs):

RQ1: What are the faculty candidates' perceptions toward the preemployment hiring process (i.e., helpful information, inclusion, fairness, and effective feedback)?

RQ2: Per the perceptions, what are specific suggestions to incorporate more touch points of interaction?

Framework for the Study

The framework for this study was based on Schuler's (1993) social validity theory, which focused on the extent to which faculty candidates experience fairness and consistency related to social quality. According to Schuler, the fairness of the process contributes to the candidate's positive or negative experiences. Exploring candidates' lived experiences provided an opportunity to discover whether they were socially appropriate and acceptable. The framework was used to examine the faculty candidates' experiences regarding the lack of social quality during the preemployment hiring process to bring about more consistent, adequate, and positive experiences. Schuler's theory was used to identify and successfully interact with candidates with dignity and respect. According to the four mechanisms of the theory (information, participation, transparency, and communication), I assessed the experiences to identify more effective and efficient social interactions. The specifics of the mechanisms were as follows:

- information (adequate information throughout the process)

- participation (an opportunity to be involved/included)

- transparency (unambiguous process)

- communication (effective feedback provided during and after the interview)

The framework was used to identify with mechanisms relevant to faculty candidates' experiences. Faculty candidates reflected on the process, the impact, and how enhancements can be implemented for a better candidate experience.

Candidates can experience mental and emotional side effects due to the hiring practices and processes, which lead to altered views, interests, and commitment to the process and the institution (J. M. McCarthy et al., 2018). Per J. M. McCarthy et al., (2018), some of the side effects can include lower self-esteem, higher stress levels, and self-worth issues. However, with effective experiences and application, the preemployment hiring process can be developed and better applied, thereby reducing the concerns of the preemployment hiring process. The experiences can be better guided and conducted for more effective hiring that is more informative, participative, transparent, and communicative. The purpose of the study was to identify the candidates' experiences and processes using Schuler's (1993) mechanisms.

During the hiring process, the institutions assess the candidates for the right fit and best-qualified individual, and the candidates assess the institutions for social quality, including whether the interactions and engagement were open, transparent, inclusive, and fair (Burgess, A., Roberts, C., Tyler, C., & Mossman, K., 2014). Other researchers identified reactions from other areas (i.e., technology), which altered the candidate's experience during the interview, assessment, and final selection (Anderson, 2003). The

experiences can have an influence on how effectively and efficiently the process is viewed. The research gap was identifying the lived experiences of the faculty candidates, addressing social validity/quality during the experiences, and identifying the reasons for the concerns with the preemployment hiring process. According to Nikolaou et al., (2015), the characteristics of the selection methods can lead to various types of mental and emotional experiences. The characteristics were needed to lead to the truths of the candidates. According to Eichelberger (1989), candidates have unique experiences, which are to be treated as truths. Truths as reflected in the candidates' experiences helped fill a gap in the research by addressing the social validity concerns of the experiences and the lack of social quality. I applied the social validity theory to assess the interactions the faculty candidates experienced according to the four mechanisms: informative, participative, transparent, and communicative. A better understanding of the experiences may help improve the process by building a more high-quality workforce with the best possible hiring process and candidate experiences.

Through exploration of the experiences, the institutional hiring process can be enhanced and applied, leading to more positive experiences and reduced concerns with the preemployment process. According to Mahadi et al., (2015), candidates' reactions are important to the hiring practices and processes applied. The reactions contributed to the needed data and enhancements. The focus of this study was the faculty candidates' experiences, the quality of the applied hiring process, and the social validity of the experiences.

Nature of the Study

This study was a phenomenological descriptive qualitative study. The research approach was appropriate to examine the faculty candidates' experiences. The faculty candidates in the study all had shared lived experiences related to the preemployment hiring process (job search, job applications, communications, feedback, interviews, onboarding, and analysis) and were left with uncertainty and process concerns (see Biswas, 2019). The experiences allowed for patterns and relationships to be developed. According to Patton (2015), qualitative research focuses on collecting data and reporting findings by identifying patterns and themes. The data were used to address concerns with the process (see Patton, 2015). This included an improved preemployment hiring process, civil treatment of the faculty candidates, and process appropriateness and acceptability per the social validity theory (see Schuler, 1993). According to Farago et al., (2013), incorporating warmth can help create positive and fair hiring processes of the institutions for better candidate experiences. Ali et al., (2016) found that candidates experience incivility during the process, which leads to negative effects.

The data were gathered from the faculty candidates' interviews in which candidates reported their lived experiences. Data were coded and analyzed to answer the research questions. Significant statements and themes were identified in the data analysis. These themes and statements were used to write descriptions of what the faculty candidates experienced and the context in which the faculty candidates experienced the phenomenon. From the experiences and themes, an overall description of common experiences was presented (see Burgess et al., 2014).

Definitions

Definitions of terms relevant to this study were as follows:

Candidate experiences: The perception of a job seeker pertaining to the employer and process interaction (Biswas, 2019).

Concerns: The socially unacceptable quality issues (Schuler, 1993).

Institutions: Public, private, and for-profit colleges and universities that offer 2-year and 4-year programs.

Mechanisms: The physical phenomena identified in unique events and through regularities (K. McCarthy & Cheng, 2015; Patton, 2015).

Preemployment hiring process: A series of actions to gainful employment: job search, job application, interview/assessments, selection, onboarding, and communication/feedback efforts (Biswas, 2019).

Social quality: Socially acceptable interactions (Schuler, 1993). Social is the understanding of the nature of human beings, including the interaction between people (Herrman & Lin, 2015).

Social validity: A model that makes selection situations socially acceptable (Schuler, 1993) as measured through social appropriateness of procedures (Ferguson & Cihon, 2017). Components of the social validity theory (Schuler, 1993) include information (the interaction pertaining to task requirements and characteristics of the organization), participation (the development and execution of assessment programs), transparency (the judgmental evaluation and assessment tools), and communication (the interaction of provided feedback/results that are honest, considerable, and

understandable). According to Bauer et al. (2012), informative means the information is

perceived to be useful, participative is the feeling of involvement, transparency is the

unambiguous selection methods/processes, and feedback is the amount of information

provided.

Touch points: All points of contact during a candidates' experience, which include

informative, participative, transparency, and communicative areas (Biswas, 2019).

Assumptions

The assumptions of the social validity theory are fairness, consistency,

appropriateness, and acceptability. Assumptions were necessary and were applied to the

faculty candidates in the preemployment hiring process by discovering and surveying the

experiences to identify social quality during the process. In the study, I assumed all touch

points of the interaction were present during the preemployment hiring process.

Therefore, the collected data were used to assess the touch points.

Ridder and Hoon (2009) stated that qualitative research can be understood as a

complex, changing, and contested field. The assumptions helped me recognize whether

the techniques were working, including being able to take heed of the strengths and

support the weaknesses (Rubin & Rubin, 2012). My qualitative study was designed to

explore the faculty candidates' lived experiences and assess the lack of social quality,

including touch points of interaction, in the preemployment hiring process. The social

change implications of the study were to improve faculty candidates' experiences of the

process and provide institutions with suggested enhancements to improve candidates'

experiences. I assumed the faculty candidates were truthful about their experiences

during the process, about suggested enhancements for better candidate experiences, about reasons for participating in the study, and in their responses to the interview questions (see Appendix E). The participants were expected to identify as faculty candidates of public and/or for-profit institutions as volunteers to share their experiences regarding social quality concerns with the hiring process.

Scope and Delimitations

The scope of a study is to the research area explored within specified operating parameters. The purpose of the current study was to interview the faculty candidates of public and/or for-profit institutions to discover the concerns they experienced during the preemployment hiring process in which there was a lack of social quality. The scope of the study was the faculty candidates preemployment hiring experiences that led to the concerns during the process. The focus was on the experiences of the process to determine whether there was a lack of social quality per the four mechanisms of Schuler's (1993) social validity theory.

Delimitations of the study included six to 10 faculty candidates who had a preemployment hiring experience within the last 3 to 5 years. The experience was open to all public and for-profit (2-year/4-year) institutions. The requirements excluded several viable candidates for the research due to the timeframe of the preemployment hiring experience and institution type. I intended to discover, survey, and address the concerns for transferability. According to Patton (2015), transferability is similar to external validity in a case-to-case transfer of information. Social validity theory helped me determine whether there was a lack of social quality and provided insight into how to

incorporate more social quality. The research provided rich descriptive data to help in determining the results of the study (see Kamenski, 2004).

Limitations

I explored the experiences of the candidates using the social validity theory to identify the reasons for the social quality concerns during the preemployment hiring process, which led to several challenges and limitations. The potential challenges consisted of recruiting candidates to participate in the interviews, obtaining an accurate account of the experiences, fear of backlash, fear of association with the study, and future effects on employment opportunities. Other limitations pertained to the interview type, interview questions, interview guide, and evaluation of the data gathered. According to Patton (2015), making the interview guide clear in advance of data collection by identifying what questions will be asked will mitigate the limitations of the data (the data being known and discussed before being gathered). The interview type (standard open-ended interview approach) had a weakness that did not allow me to pursue nonrecorded topics or issues. There were no other limitations due to the candidates being protected and freely volunteering to participate in the study.

Significance

This study filled a gap in understanding the faculty candidates' experiences and improving the preemployment hiring process within higher education. According to J. M. McCarthy et al., (2017), the field of study on the candidates' experiences has increased because human resources departments are operating more strategically. The current study may aid faculty candidates and institutions in improving preemployment hiring best

practices for more social quality. The research was unique because it addressed the need

for qualitative research on faculty candidates' experiences (see Mahadi et al., 2015).

Also, this study addressed the mechanisms that were applied and was relevant to the

faculty candidates' experiences according to the four mechanisms: information,

participation, transparency, and communication (see Schuler, 1993). The results may lead

to more favorable faculty candidates' experiences and a better applied preemployment

hiring process within institutions. According to Raupp (2018), there should be an aim to

understand the importance of the process and perception by members of the

organizations.

Social change within the preemployment hiring process may occur as a result of

the four mechanisms of the social validity theory, including appropriate and acceptable

actions, behaviors, and basic interactions. Social change may involve improving the

preemployment hiring process that brings about concerns from the faculty candidates.

According to Fuestman and Lavertu (2005), more exposure in the academic hiring

process was needed to bring about change and allow for a better plan for preparing for the

preemployment hiring process. Overall, the objective was to increase appropriate and

acceptable actions during the process. Therefore, strategies were needed to address the

concerns provided by the faculty candidates. According to Bhalla (2019), strategies can

increase equity in faculty candidates' hiring. When strategies and/or basic enhancements

are identified on behalf of the hiring process, equity and inclusion can take place (Bhalla,

2019).

Summary

In Chapter 1, I introduced the study and provided context for the faculty candidates' experiences of the preemployment hiring process. I presented the problem statement, purpose, framework, and research question. In Chapter 2, I review the literature that supported the current study. Topics include social validity theory, informative mechanism (organizational effectiveness), participative mechanism (effective and efficient interactions), transparency mechanism (preemployment hiring process), communicative mechanism (hiring practices per institution), and phenomenon under investigation.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

There was an identified concern with the lack of touch points of interaction that included a lack of adequate information, inclusion, transparency, and effective communication efforts during the preemployment hiring process per faculty candidates of public higher education institutions. The problem was supported by data from researchers focused on the concerns of the process and the need to examine the experiences of the faculty candidates for possible improvements (Basham, 2009). Research efforts focused on the mechanisms that were relevant to faculty candidates' experiences.

The purpose of the current study was to discover the lived experiences of the faculty by surveying the faculty candidates' recall of the preemployment hiring process. Using the social validity mechanisms, I analyzed the experiences for the effectiveness and efficiency of the hiring process. In this study, several mechanisms of Schuler's (1993) social validity theory were explored to address the social quality concerns with the hiring process:

- informative mechanism
- participative mechanism
- transparency mechanism
- communicative mechanism

Each topic was explored to enhance the preemployment hiring process with the use of the social validity theory.

Literature Search Strategy

The online library research databases of Walden University served as the primary sources for scholarly literature related to the study. Sources of review and inclusion came from the following search engines and databases used to search the material included: ResearchGate, Google Scholar, Ebsco, ProQuest, and SAGE. The interactive search process included the following keywords: *social validity theory*, *candidate experiences*, and *selection*. Other key terms included *selection methods*, *reactions*, *hiring process*, *college/universities*, and *faculty candidates*.

Conceptual Framework

The conceptual framework was Schuler's (1993) social validity theory, focusing on the mechanisms used to identify the touch points of interaction from an equitable and social standpoint (see Table 1). The interactions were based on the experiences from the faculty candidates addressing whether the experiences during the preemployment hiring process were consistently applied with social quality efforts. The application of the theory was focusing on the mechanisms to address equitable and social interactions through experiences discovered and surveyed. The four mechanisms were applied to analyze and survey the results of the experiences: determining informative, participative, transparent, and communicative efforts. This was a qualitative study focusing on the faculty candidates' experiences during the preemployment hiring process with social quality concerns.

Table 1

Conceptual Framework

Specific purpose	Assessing social validity per lived: Experiences and Perceptions from the preemployment hiring process.		
INFORMATION	**PARTICIPATION**	**TRANSPARENCY**	**FEEDBACK**
Respect	Involvement/development	See/deduce objectives	Open
Honest	Task domain	Decision process	Face value
Supportive	Task requirements		
Comprehensive	Organizational Culture		

Description of Intent			
Identify amount of Information	Identify received information is useful	Identify the feeling of inclusion, involvement	Identify fairness unambiguous process

Table 2 shows the literature used to support the social validity theory.

Table 2

Mechanisms, Meanings, and Supporting Literature

Mechanisms	Meanings and supporting literature
Information	Providing informative updates, feedback, and explanations. Per van Ruler (2018), listening to each other shows respect, which enhances the quality.
Participation	Allowing opportunity to demonstrate teaching experience and expert knowledge. Per Parker & Richards (2020), candidates should be scheduled an amount of time to showcase his/her teaching and highlight academic and work experience.
Transparency	Providing process information before, during, and after the process. Per J.M. McCarthy (2018), the fairness of information helps increase the transparency of the process.
Communication	Providing continuous and simultaneous interaction with meaning; discussions together. Per van Ruler (2018), requiring feedback to be adjustable purposeful, and have a particular effect.

The phenomenon of interest was addressed from an individual perspective (i.e.,

selections, interviews, assessments, and/or behaviors) compared to the phenomenon

overall, which was the preemployment hiring process consisting of job search,

application, interview, selection, onboarding, and communication/feedback efforts.

Previous qualitative and quantitative research focused on the framework including

procedural and distributive justice rules, uncertainty reduction, social fairness, and

informational fairness. The current study focused on discovering and surveying the

experiences of faculty candidates who found themselves experiencing social quality

concerns during the preemployment hiring process at public and/or for-profit institutions (see Schuler, 1993).

Literature Review

A review of the literature revealed that researchers had not investigated social quality in the preemployment hiring process for faculty candidates pursuing positions in public and for-profit institutions. The candidates' experiences consisted of the job search, job application, communication/feedback, interviews/assessments, and onboarding efforts (Biswas, 2019). Exploring faculty candidates' experiences helped me determine whether there was a lack of social quality in the process. How the process was experienced had a direct effect on the candidates' outlook on the process. The research was insufficient regarding the phenomenon of faculty experiences in the preemployment process in higher education. Some research indicated that the process lacked social quality and led to concerns presented by employees from any industry, not only higher education (Brown, P. M., Rice, A. H., Angell, G. B., & Kurz, B., 2000). The intent of the current study was to discover the social quality concerns identified in the lived experiences of the faculty candidates. According to Brown et al., (2000), a systematic analysis of the hiring process can lead to better outcomes in faculty candidates' experiences and hiring.

Seven studies addressed this concern and were in direct alignment with the current study (Bauer et al., 2012; Biswas, 2019; Brandon Hall Group, 2017; J.M. McCarthy, 2017 et al.; J. M. McCarthy, 2018 et al.; Nduagho, 2018; Schuler, 1993). Bauer et al., (2012) researched the gap between job candidates' attitudes and behavior with applied practices. Bauer et al. highlighted why candidates' reactions matter and what

best practices were used to help with employee selection. Candidates' experiences played

an important role in discovering and understanding the social concerns that developed

during the preemployment hiring process. These concerns ranged from the lack of

communication to not showing basic human respect during the process. However, there

was a gap in the literature regarding the experiences of the preemployment hiring process

for faculty candidates at colleges and universities (2-year or 4-year public, private, and/or

for-profit institutions). By analyzing the experiences using social validity theory, I

identified patterns and themes to enhance social quality in the hiring process. Bauer

(2012) provided 10 rules to enhance the fairness experience: ways of thinking about the

process from a candidates' perspective. This study discovered and surveyed the

candidates' experiences of the process and analyzed the social quality within the process

via the social validity theory. Identified below are 10 rules to enhance the experience,

process, and align with the social validity theory, Table 3 (Bauer, 2012):

Table 3

Mechanisms and Rules

Mechanisms	Rules
Informative	Ensure the system is job related.
Participative	Allow candidates to perform.
Transparent	Ensure that procedures are consistent across all candidates.
	Provide explanations and justifications for procedures or decisions.
	Ensure that questions are legal and not discriminatory.
	Ensure that administrators treat candidates with warmth and respect.
Communicative/feedback	Allow candidates to challenge their results.
	Provide candidates with informative and timely feedback.
	Support two-way communication process.
	Ensure that administrators are honest when communicating with candidates.

Therefore, the results of the study led to discovering and surveying the social quality

concerns and analyzing accordingly per the four mechanisms of the theory.

Biswas (2019) defined what was the candidate's experience and discussed how the overall outcome influenced the hiring process. The candidate experience was a series of actions within the preemployment hiring process, which included job search, job application, interviews, assessments, communication/feedback, and onboarding touch points within the process. Touch points where varied interactions took place between the institutions and the faculty candidates. With the touch points assessed via the lived experiences, they aided in identifying where social quality was lacking. This study yielded literature to help bridge the gap in better discovering, surveying, analyzing, and understanding the faculty candidates' experiences; addressing if there was a lack of social quality when it came to the basic touch points of interaction via the preemployment hiring process. And, determining what could be done to enhance the touch points of interaction and identifying could social quality lead to better experiences within the process. Table 4 below illustrates a candidates' experience with social quality (Biswas, 2019):

Table 4

Touch Points and Social Qualities

Touch points	Social quality
Job Search	First interaction/contact Ensuring ease of access to information
Job application	Discoverable Instructions clear and concise
Communication/feedback	Provide more feedback i.e. text, email, or call Regular status updates Keep engaged during the process Automated messaging
Interview	Candidate get to know/learn the organization Convince candidate to join the organization Help the organization make clear decisions Avoid confusion Inform them of the interview process in advance Opportunity to showcase skills and knowledge
Onboarding	Opportunity to deliver (both parties) Set hire up for success
Analysis	Improving candidate experience Looking into insights

Figure 1

Touch Points in Candidate Experience

The Brandon Hall Group (2017), researched the importance of onboarding being one of the touch points in the candidate experience, which was important to address appropriate and efficient social quality during the touch point. Per the Group (2017), technology improved the experience by 82%, improved the management process by 70%, and alleviated manual tasks by 68%. By identifying the importance of the onboarding touch point, it addressed why incorporating more social quality could increase the numbers for better experiences and process outcomes. The lack of interaction and poor treatment during the touch points in the process can bring about social quality concerns if there is a lack of interaction and how candidates are treated via the preemployment hiring

process. Therefore, the study discovered and surveyed the experiences to determine the

level of social quality via each of the experiences; identifying various suggestions to

contribute to more social quality during the hiring process. In addressing this point, there

was a bridge in the gap of literature, by determining the use of participation,

communication, openness, and feedback efforts helped with better social quality via the

experiences.

According to Meixner et al., (2010), there was a sizable gap in the literature on

identifying the experiences of faculty candidates. Therefore, the social validity theory

was used to assess the experiences for the lack of social quality. This included the

effective distribution of information, adequate participation information, adequate

participation per the candidates, transparency of the process, and open two-way

communication efforts during the preemployment hiring process. One identified concern

in the hiring process is rarely knowing and understanding the procedures of rules (Darley

& Zanna, 1987). Unaware of the procedures and rules led to the transparency mechanism

of the social validity theory, which addressed the lack of openness in the process. Within

the study, further data was discovered via the faculty candidates' experiences to directly

assess the lack of social quality. According to Wright and Vanderford (2017), there was a

need for the faculty candidate's hiring process to become more transparent.

Other examples of social quality concerns included equitable search strategies,

diverse settings, and hiring practices and procedures (Sekaquaptewa et al., 2019).

According to Stewart and Valian (2018), findings per long-standing faculty candidates'

experiences, a list of other social quality concerns during the preemployment hiring

process consisted of broader search features, informative; clear instructions about the process, welcoming environments, diverse groups of people, a sense of belongingness, opportunity to see the candidate at his/her best, job relevance in evaluating candidates, and providing detailed information of the selection process. Brown et al., (2000), identified the faculty candidates experiences as stressful, impersonal, non-relevant, lacking assurance in how the process is conducted, displayed biasness with sex, race/ethnicity, and sexual orientation, being treated in an unhuman manner, and lacked clarity and honesty in questions and concerns presented during the experiences.

J.M. McCarthy et al., (2017) researched "what is new" and "what is next" in understanding applicant reactions to the process. Sekaquaptewa et al., (2019) convinced it was important to motivate faculty candidates to engage in the change; the change of identifying where we are, where we want to be, and how we will get there with the experiences, the preemployment hiring process, and social quality. The data was needed to shed light on the experiences of each faculty candidate to expand the study. Therefore, the study was being conducted to contribute to bridging the gap in the literature, by discovering the experiences. By discovering the experiences, the data shed light on the concerns associated with the lack of social quality via the preemployment hiring process. In discovering and surveying the concerns, the social quality was assessed concerning the experiences; determining if there was a lack of participation, information, transparency, and communication in the process. Discovering "the new" and "the next" can shed light on how to better handle faculty candidates' experiences leading to more touch points of interaction.

J.M. McCarthy et al., (2018) researched how to improve the candidates' experience with interventions via various conceptual frameworks i.e., social fairness and informational fairness. By addressing the two, the candidates' experience from a social and informational standpoint allowed for more insight on the fairness attribute to the field of study. For example: are you interacting with the candidates with social fairness; being appreciative and showing appreciation to the candidates? And, if the information being shared was fair and informative for candidates determining social quality. This study further discovered the social quality aspect of improving the candidates' experience during the preemployment hiring process by contributing to the participation, transparency, and communication aspects of the social validity theory.

Nduagho (2018) conducted lived experience research identifying the challenges and barriers associated with African-born black women in the US Higher Education. Inequalities and differences were addressed exploring the lack of success in higher education for African-born black women. This research discovered some concerns which led to questioning some social quality concerns with the process. Yet, further research was needed to discover more and determine possible solutions. Some solutions were based upon the social validity theory, especially with transparency and informative efforts in the process. Can inequalities per unique experiences be addressed with the social quality application?

Schuler (1993) explored the impact of selection situations on applicants, their well-being, decision efforts, and behaviors during the process with a focus on social quality during each. The social validity theory was developed and applied in assessing the

applicants' situation, helping determine what provokes behaviors on both sides, understanding the perspectives. This study introduced social validity and mechanisms that make up the theory used to identify empirical realizations. However, further research was needed to identify with a broader perspective of candidates' experiences determining social quality in certain touch points of the preemployment hiring process, via the research questions and design methods. So, did the social validity theory help discover, survey, and address social quality concerns per the faculty candidates' experiences and perceptions of the process?

These studies were selected based on the methodology type(s) and commonalities in the key terms, themes, patterns, and variables, which were used in the data search process. The information yielded data that identified just cause for reactions and behaviors toward various touch points in the candidates' experiences during the preemployment hiring process. For example, variables per Interview Questions (see Appendix B):

- Identify an experience during the preemployment hiring process where you experienced informative actions?

- Identify an experience during the preemployment hiring process where you had the opportunity to participate, a sign of inclusion?

- Identify an experience during the preemployment hiring process where you experience openness/transparency in the process?

- Identify an experience during the preemployment hiring process where you experienced a variance of and effective communications?

Some of the data addressed the social aspect of the process as well as fairness. However, in this study, a more in-depth approach was taken to discover and survey the concern(s) of faculty candidates, which he/she experience. According to Seidman (1993), the in-depth approach is understanding the lived experience of others and the meaning they make of that experience. The results helped discover and survey what was done to shed light on the concerning lack of social quality during experiences and correcting for better future candidate experiences during the process. In comparing the researchers' studies from technology, social fairness, and informational fairness, the data led to viable results in addressing the research questions. The following shed some light on the mechanism and how social validity was of great concern due to the lack of informative, participative, transparent, and communicative efforts:

Informative Mechanism: Organizational Effectiveness

There was a lack of information in knowing how to handle the preemployment hiring process from the faculty candidates' standpoint. According to K. McCarthy and Cheng (2015), due to the lack of a comprehensive overview and/or review of steps that candidates and organizations applied, this was a great opportunity to identify with the preferred suggestions more than the other, which was experienced during the process. Organizational effectiveness varied according to the institution. It grossly depended on the policies and procedures in place to conduct the preemployment hiring process. Per Burgess et al., (2014), an inappropriate process caused candidates to dispute the outcome, which led to legal concerns. The operating dynamics of the organization were a direct reflection of the organization and what is valued. Therefore, it was important to continue

to contribute to organizational effectiveness. From the study, corrective measures were put into place to bring about better operating policies and procedures in conducting the preemployment hiring process. Some procedural rules consisted of the following (Nikolaou et al., 2015): job-relatedness, opportunity to perform, consistency, honesty, and two-way communication. Candidates' perspectives have a major impact on the organization (Burgess et al., 2014). Therefore, when institutions are focused on ensuring high-quality faculty candidates' experiences, they were more likely to attract, engage, and connect with top faculty candidates.

Participative Mechanism: Effective and Efficient Interactions

Faculty candidates hiring was a feature of the academic world that caused some concerning factors during the preemployment hiring process (Clauset et al., 2015). In the world of work, all interactions should be effective and efficient during the hiring process. According to Salgado et al., (2008), one of the preemployment processes – the selection was one critical process of integrating human resource management in organizations; it strongly conditions the effectiveness of management processes. During the preemployment hiring process, the way faculty candidates were treated determines the type of outcome for the candidate as well as the institutions. Effectiveness and efficiency of social quality in the experiences assessed for appropriateness and acceptance of interactions and treatment of the candidates (Schuler, 1993); to assess the experiences between the institutions and the faculty candidates was one by using the mechanisms of the theory: The faculty candidates' experiences took place at any point in the process: job search, application, interview, selection, onboarding, and communication/feedback

efforts. For example, the job search: 73% of the respondents per a survey conducted by CareerBuilder (2017), found the job search process to be one of the most stressful events of the preemployment process (J.M. McCarthy et al., 2018).

Per Eriksen (2010), it is necessary to treat all candidates in a way that does not yield conditions of negative experiences. Negative experiences can be a result of poor communication/feedback, interactions, and/or transparency. With the lack of social validity during the experiences, there can be a profound presence of social inequality (Clauset, 2015).

The ideal interactions should be of respect with appropriate and acceptable interactions at all points in the experiences and the hiring process. Examples include (J.M. McCarthy et al., 2018): providing candidates upfront process information, ensuring all interactions are job-related, providing updates after a process, beginning to end communication/feedback/responses, all material are consistent and accurate, showing appreciation to candidates (written & verbal form), being honest/respectful, minimizing anxiety, providing reassurance, ensuring/encouraging opportunity to ask questions at all points, actively listen, and providing agendas/descriptions of the process. These are all typical examples of how faculty candidates should be treated during the preemployment hiring process. However, in most cases, there was a lack of effective and efficiently applied efforts. Therefore, in the study, the faculty candidates' experiences were discovered and analyzed using the mechanisms of the social validity theory; to help identify the recommended step actions for a better positive faculty candidate experience.

According to Clauset (2015), there was a need for a clear and systemic understanding of the efficiency of faculty candidates hiring, which is lacking.

Transparency Mechanism: Preemployment Hiring Process

According to J.M. McCarthy et al., (2018), CareerBuilder estimated 42% of the candidates were dissatisfied with their experience and would not seek employment with the organization. And this outcome contributed to the concern(s) of the preemployment hiring process. Therefore, in the study, the preemployment hiring process components were addressed; identifying and surveying the areas of concern, when it came to the faculty candidates and his/her experiences of the process. The components of the process consisted of job search, application, interview, selection, onboarding, and communication/feedback efforts. The preemployment hiring process can take many routes in the way steps are performed. However, the identified six were the focus in assessing if social validity was found via each step of the process (Biswas, 2019). For example, during the job search efforts of the process, where it was important how the faculty candidates can interact with the institutions with easy access i.e., institutional website, social media platforms, and/or job announcements/job board use. Communication is key within this touch point of the process. In this effort, the non-verbal style of communication was the touch point example that led to identifying the presence of informative and communicative efforts within the process.

Next, the job application was assessable, clear, and concise with step-by-step instruction on successfully accessing and completing with little to no needed assistance. This step in the process was crucial to obtaining the desired candidate pool of faculty

candidates. During the entire process, it was important effective and efficient communications took place, in verbal and nonverbal forms. According to a CareerBuilder survey, candidates stated, the experience can be improved with more communication during the process (Biswas, 2019). The communication can take the form of whatever methods have been identified as a means of contact for follow-up i.e., phone, text, email, and/or automated communications. In the communication process, you have a sender and a receiver, which the receiver must be able to decode the message. Therefore, the overall clarity was with feedback and how it was important for the feedback to occur frequently and plentiful with process updates.

The interview was the opportunity for the institutions to get to make official contact with the potential faculty candidates via phone, face to face, and/or virtual access. During the interviews, the institutions can identify who was possibly qualified for the position(s). Per Moratti (2020), this was when the candidates are identified and sorted according to qualifications i.e., qualified, not qualified, and best qualified. Per Biswas (2019), the interview was where candidates can showcase his/her knowledge, skills, and/or abilities.

Onboarding was the time of officially involving the faculty candidates in the official operations of the institution. It was the formal opportunity to incorporate all mechanisms within the process for a better candidate experience, reducing the lack of touch points within the process. Therefore, participation, inclusion, transparency, and open communications should take place in the process, which can be applied in many

forms. The study identified and surveyed the experiences and analyze for active touch points of interaction throughout the process for a better candidate experience.

In some higher institutions, the preemployment hiring process does not have strictly followed formalities and/or processes. Therefore, there were concerns with the process per the faculty candidates. All the faculty candidates were extended employment opportunities; however, there were still concerns with the process. So, the perceptions ranged according to the individual experiences of each candidate.

Communicative Mechanism: Hiring Practices Per Institutions

The hiring practices per the various institutions varied from great to not so great, depending on the application and the perception of the practices per the faculty candidates. According to K. McCarthy and Cheng (2015), candidate experiences can range, ranging from highly positive to highly negative. However, it was important effective and efficient practices were exercised during the preemployment hiring process. Some institutions found themselves, not communicating as needed, not being inclusive, and/or not providing opportunities to participate. Therefore, the study was being conducted to identify and survey where institutions went wrong; and how this can be changed with feedback from the faculty candidates; per their lived experiences.

The process per public and for-profit institutions varied. Yet, the process steps followed a basic structure in interacting and communicating with the candidates. However, there was room for updates on how the preemployment hiring process was conducted. According to Yoder (2017), the faculty candidates hiring process could use an overhaul. For example: incorporating more diversity in the search committees,

unrestricted selection timeframe, better frequency in communication/feedback, reduced

stressed environment experience, and more accountability (Warren, 2020). Per Moratti

(2020), the timeframe of the process took a year from advertisement to the appointment.

Not sure, if the year timeframe was necessarily needed, however, time was needed to

carefully review, assess, and decide on the best candidate, which required active and

consistent communication/feedback efforts, interactions, transparency, and

accountability.

Table 5

Preemployment Hiring Process Comparison – Public vs For Profit

Public	vs	For Profit
Advertisement i.e., social media, NEOGov, LinkedIn, Indeed, and HigherEd		**Identify Demographic Target** **Advertisement i.e., social media, NEOGov, LinkedIn, Indeed, and HigherEd**
Internal Recommendations		
Screening **Search Committee** **Volunteer/Assigned (1-20)**		**Screening** **Search Committee** **Volunteer/Assigned (1-5)**
Face to Face Interviews/Assessments/HR		**Online/Virtual Interviews/Assessments/HR**
Teaching Demonstration		
Dean Interview		
Provost Interview		

Committee Review	**Committee Review**
Open Discussion	**Open Discussion**
Rating Candidates	
Final Selection	**Final Selection**
Offer Extended	**Offer Extended**
Onboarding	**Onboarding**
Vetting	**Vetting**
Departmental Credentialing process (17 people)	**PD Credentialing (1 person)**

As previously stated, the preemployment hiring process was the same for the two types of institutions. However, there was a need for incorporating more checks and balances in the process. According to Moratti (2020), checks and balances are in place to resist undue pressures, manipulations, and rushing the decision. There remains room for enhancement to the process to create more participative, informative, transparent, and communicative efforts within the preemployment hiring process for the faculty candidates.

In the effort to develop organizational effectiveness, the organization must be willing to implement changes to enhance the preemployment hiring process. According to Walker and Moretti (2018), certain operational characteristics should be considered: incorporating feedback mechanisms to capture candidate concerns and adding a step to aid in the smooth transition from one step to the next in the process. These considerations

contributed to identifying, assessing, and maintaining the accountability of the social validity theory mechanisms via the preemployment hiring process.

Phenomenon Under Investigation: Faculty Candidates' Experiences

Research has been predominately conducted through the lens of organizations (K. McCarthy and Cheng, 2015). The experiences of the candidates allowed a view through the lens of the faculty candidates. The experiences helped demonstrate how organizational support affects the faculty candidates' well-being, addressing how their orientation toward the organization and work itself can be affected by the lack of positive interactions (Eisenberger & Stinglhamber, 2011). In the study, the experiences of the faculty candidates were discovered, surveyed, and analyzed according to the social validity theory. The experiences ranged from each faculty candidate with the experience identified within the last three to five years. From the experiences, the perceptions were analyzed according to what was addressed via the interviews. A series of questions were presented to identify in detail the experiences of each faculty candidate and/or faculty candidates' candidate. The questions were based upon the four mechanisms of the social validity theory. And the experiences of the faculty candidates were important to the institutions in designing the procedures and processes to create a more positive preemployment hiring process with better faculty candidates' experiences (Anderson et al., 2010). The institutions need to identify with the faculty candidates for suggestions on what can be done better during the process, which can assist with the experiences and more social quality.

With the experiences of the faculty candidates ranging from positive to negative, the institutions needed to identify with examples of both. Per Burgess et al., (2014), negative experiences for candidates can have a detrimental effect on the well-being of the candidates. Therefore, the organization should consider the impact, which the process has on the participants (Schuler, 1993). So, the focus was placed on the extent to which faculty candidates developed both negative and positive perceptions of the way they experience the process (Burgess et al., 2014). The overall reflection was based on the fair, appropriate, and acceptable process to the faculty candidates and how each faculty candidate was personally impacted during the process due to the lack of social quality. Candidates should leave the process experiencing: fairness, quality guidance, and summative and formative feedback (Burgess et al., 2014). Some researched experiences were as follows (Moratti, 2019):

Negative:

- Going thru the process stressed

- Low transparency in the process

- Process steps filtering out qualified candidates without identifying and sharing with the candidates

A negative experience can cost the organization from a financial and human capital standpoint to candidate/employee loyalty. For example, Virgin Media lost over 6 million in revenue in a single year (Biswas, 2019).

Positive:

- Touch points with the candidates

- Automation interactions/communications; a relationship with candidates

- Applied onboarding steps

Positive experiences were those where there is transparency, effective communication efforts, and better interactive relationships with the faculty candidates. According to Biswas (2019), positive experiences can drive business growth and forge a more productive less concerning preemployment hiring process. IBM identified when candidates experience a more positive process, he/she was more likely to be that loyal customers and candidate; hired or not hired (Biswas, 2019). When institutions searched for faculty candidates, they were seeking candidates with the desired skill set and know-how to contribute and be the best as well as providing longevity as faculty candidate members. According to J.M. McCarthy et al., (2018), positive experiences contribute to attracting the best and creating the best retention efforts possible. Therefore, the experiences were key to understanding the concerns needing to be corrected during the preemployment hiring process. Faculty candidates should not focus on the concerns or the negatives, they should focus on teaching and learning during the process (Parker & Richards, 2020).

Studies Related to Research Questions and Why Approach Was Selected

Per Rubin & Rubin (2012), the purpose of the research question was to reflect a broader concern of what you want to discover. Therefore, the research questions focused on the lived experiences of the faculty candidates and identifying the lack of touch points of interaction during the preemployment hiring process. And the studies related to the research questions focused on reactions, experiences, interventions, and strategies. The

research by Bauer et al., (2012), "What we know about applicant reactions to selection: Research summary and best practices" were focused on the candidates' reactions, why they matter, attitudes/behaviors, and identifying best practices for organizations as it pertains to selections (Bauer et al., 2012). This study related to the basis of selections and best practices. The research questions explored possible suggestions per the lived experiences of the faculty candidates during the preemployment hiring process.

An additional study per J.M. McCarthy et al., (2018), "Improving the candidate experience: Tips for developing "wise" organizational hiring interventions" focused on candidates' experiences from the framework of informational fairness, social fairness, and uncertainty reductions, as we identified recommendations for implementing interventions for transparency, respect, and reassurance. This study related to the research questions from the basis of framework and identifying recommendations on improving the candidates' experience. The research questions focused on the lived experiences of the candidates during the preemployment hiring process; identifying suggestions on how to improve the process and candidates' experiences.

Other research related to the research questions: "What is the candidate experience? Definition, key components, and strategies" by Sushman Biswas (2019), introduced the research on identifying the components of the process and how candidates' experience each during the process as well as identifying strategies for improving the process. The research related by identifying and defining with candidates' experience and the components assessed during the experience. The research questions were based upon identifying with the faculty candidates' experience in assessing social

validity via the preemployment process per the components identified. Assessing the candidates allowed for a reflection on how candidates perceived and responded to the process, which shed evidence that the candidate's experiences can significantly affect the candidates' attitudes, intentions, and benefits (J.M. McCarthy et al., 2017).

Summary and Conclusions

The major themes were based on the preemployment process and the social validity theory mechanisms. The components of the preemployment process consisted of job search, job applications, communications, feedback, interviews, and onboarding, which were acquired via the lived experiences of the faculty candidates and assessed using the social validity theory mechanisms. The mechanisms helped determine and survey if there was a lack of consistent touch points of interaction via the preemployment hiring process within the various institutions. The themes of focus were the four mechanisms of the Schuler theory, which identified if the information received was useful, identified a feeling of inclusion/involvement, identified with an unambiguous process, and identified with the amount and comprehensiveness of the information via the process.

The known information about the study was the four mechanisms via Schuler's Social Validity Theory (1993) and the components of the preemployment hiring process by Biswas (2019). And some additional known information was the recommendations on helping to enhance the process from various suggestions per the faculty candidates. However, the unknown information was the lived experiences of the faculty candidates of

the public institutions, the concerns of the process, and what can be done better during the preemployment hiring process.

This study filled the gap in identifying and surveying with lived experiences of public higher education faculty candidates, which addressed concerns for the lack of touch points of interaction during the preemployment hiring process. The results helped determine if appropriate and acceptable touch points of interaction were evident and adequately applied. The study extended the knowledge in the discipline by exposing new directions and suggestions for the literature i.e., comparison institutions and the preemployment hiring process. And the additional focus was placed upon identifying with changed processes from a legislative standpoint in how higher ed institutions function within the hiring process.

In the chapter, the social validity theory was introduced and how it would help identify and analyze social quality within the preemployment hiring process. Therefore, in Chapter 3, the data introduced the specifics of the research design, rationale for the study, and the methodology, which addresses the various data points. The data points included the four mechanisms of the social validity theory informative, participative, transparency, and communicative.

Chapter 3: Research Method

The purpose of the qualitative study was to discover the experiences of faculty

candidates with social quality concerns (lack of touch points of interaction) during the

preemployment hiring process to enhance faculty candidates' experiences. The

mechanisms of social validity theory were used to assess the experiences of the faculty

candidates. The mechanisms were informative, participative, transparent, and

communicative (Schuler, 1993). The central phenomenon of interest was the faculty

candidates' lived experiences with social quality concerns (lack of touch points of

interaction) during the preemployment hiring process. Therefore, the informative,

participative, transparent, and communicative concerns were analyzed by addressing the

following:

- Was there an opportunity for adequate information?

- Did you experience a form of inclusion or involvement?

- Was there transparency in the process?

- Were you offered feedback on the process during and after? How often? In
  what form?

Data were gathered to identify the candidates' concerns with the preemployment hiring

process. Some concerns had a psychological effect that led to self-esteem, stress levels,

and/or self-worth concerns. According to Schmitt and Ryan (2006), anxiety and

motivation can lead to concerns. Other concerns include applying and never hearing

anything in return, getting an interview but not being selected to move forward,

advancing in the process but failing the assessment, advancing in the preemployment

process but not being offered the position, and advancing in the process but experiencing a lot of ambiguity. The concerns of the faculty candidates were identified regarding the appropriateness and acceptability of the preemployment hiring process.

In the study, I analyzed the experiences of the faculty candidates regarding the preemployment hiring process to determine whether the process was appropriate and acceptable according to the social validity mechanisms. The mechanism was used to discover the lack of social quality via the touch points of interaction in the faculty candidates' experiences:

1. participative (adequate interactions)

2. informative (organizational effectiveness)

3. transparent (unambiguous hiring process)

4. communicative (hiring practices of institutions)

Research Design and Rationale

Social validity theory was used to analyze the lived experiences of faculty candidates in the preemployment hiring process of public and/or for-profit institutions. I sought to understand candidates' social quality concerns within the preemployment hiring process. The gap in the literature indicated the need to discover the experiences to understand the reasons for the lack of social quality. The study was guided by the following RQs:

RQ1: What are the faculty candidates' perceptions toward the preemployment hiring process (i.e., helpful information, inclusion, fairness, and effective feedback)?

RQ2: Per the perceptions, what are specific suggestions to incorporate more touch points of interactions?

I followed the interactive model for research based on the research questions: goal, framework, methods, and validity (see Maxwell, 2005).

According to Rubin and Rubin (2012), the research question specifies what the researcher wants to discover, reflecting a broader concern. Because qualitative studies address topics with a small number of participants with relevant experience, I followed the same pattern and rationale in conducting the current study. The interview questions allowed the faculty candidates to report their experiences during the preemployment hiring process in higher education. The purpose was to understand the events to foster more effective and efficient experiences for faculty candidates (see Rubin & Rubin, 2012). The research questions aligned with the problem statement and purpose in determining the social validity concerns (lack of touch points of interaction) in the lived experiences of the faculty candidates.

According to McCombes (2019), the research design is a framework for planning research and answering the research questions. For the current study, the research design was a phenomenological qualitative approach to discover the lived experiences of faculty candidates with social quality concerns during the preemployment hiring process in public and/or for-profit institutions. Social validity theory was used to discover the lived experiences of the faculty candidates and enhance candidates' experiences during the process. Because the purpose of the study was to explore candidates' experiences, the interview questions allowed the participants to share their experiences and what they

thought should be done to enhance the process with more social validity via the various touch points.

The basic qualitative research design was considered for the study. However, that design was not appropriate due to lack of alignment with the study's purpose. The best design was the phenomenological qualitative design. With this design, more in-depth discovery of the lived experiences of the faculty candidates took place to identify the lack of social quality and determine enhancements for the preemployment hiring process.

Role of the Researcher

My role as researcher varied throughout the study, consisting of interviewer, scheduler, data collector, transcriber, writer, participator, and editor. As the researcher, I did not take a role that conflicted with the research efforts. My role focused on uncompromised data collection and analysis. In my role as interviewer, time was used to interview the faculty candidates in addressing the research questions via the interview questions designed to collect the data. As the scheduler, I worked with the participants to arrange meeting times and follow-up. The time scheduled was used to collect primary data on the faculty candidates' lived experiences. As the transcriber, I produced transcriptions and coded the data to identify similar themes and patterns. As the writer and editor, I formatted, recorded, and finalized the results per the required writing standards. In conducting the roles, I functioned as the interpreter of social cues, including verbal and written communication, and as an attentive researcher seeking to understand the lived experiences of the subjects.

Professional and personal relationships existed between me and the participants. However, there was no supervisory/instructor power or other form of power over the participants. The professional relationships with the faculty candidates were as colleagues within the work environment. Biases were managed by abiding by the interview process, coding, and reporting of data. There were no interviewer/researcher biases related to conflicts of interest. The study was not conducted within the work environment, and there were no power differentials. To avoiding potential biases, I followed a proper interview protocol in collecting data and interacting with the participants. Each semi structured interview included the use of open-ended questions and follow-up if needed. Also, to ensure consistency in data collection, the proper protocol was always followed for standard application.

Methodology

Participant Selection

The population targeted for this phenomenological study consisted of faculty candidates from public and/or for-profit higher education institutions who had been hired and had experienced social quality concerns during the preemployment hiring process. This population sample met the selection criteria of having lived experiences related to social quality via the preemployment hiring process. The participants selected for interviews yielded in-depth data that allowed me to identify themes patterns to answer the research questions (Patton, 2015).

Sampling Strategy

The use of faculty candidates from various higher education institution types was the sampling population. The reason for this sampling strategy was to use current faculty candidates or those not hired and experienced concerns with the preemployment hiring process, where he/she felt the process was not appropriate nor acceptable concerning social quality in the areas of being informative, participative, transparent, and communicative during the process. Of the sampling strategies, the instrumental use of multiple case sampling was applied. The study involved faculty candidates that experienced concern(s) via the preemployment process. Also, the study focused on data collection identifying what was taking place to raise concern(s) and how the concern(s) affect the faculty candidates. Multiple case samplings generated findings that were used to inform changes to the basic processes surrounding the process and incorporate more social quality. According to Patton (2015), it was important to inform professional practices and identify better decision-making processes. The evidence helped illuminate the phenomenon (Patton, 2015).

Selection Criteria of Participants

According to Patton (2015), sampling is selecting individuals rich with information and offer useful insight into the phenomenon. The study used purposeful sampling to inquiry information and understand the phenomenon in depth to validate qualitative research. And criterion sampling was the best option as the strategy for participant selection in the qualitative phenomenological study. Therefore, participants were selected according to identified criteria with knowledge and experiences as faculty

or faculty candidates. Patton (2015) stated each person identified and interviewed yields lead to additional informants. The strategy eliminated inaccurate data per the participants not meeting the criteria. The criteria include the following:

- Faculty candidates, tenured/non-tenured, hired within the last 1-3 years by a higher education institution.

- Experienced concerns (a lack of touch points) during the preemployment hiring process with social quality.

The faculty candidates met the criteria according to addressing the initial interview specifics and/or inquiry in other specific criteria.

Number of Participants and Rationale

The selected sample size consisted of 6-10 participants until saturation. The rationale was based on the literature from Creswell (1997) and Bertaux (1981), which stated, the sample size should be five to 25 participants; Morse (1994) recommended at least six participants for phenomenological qualitative studies. Per Mason (2010), the most common sample sizes are 20 and 30, followed by 40, 10, and 25. Therefore, the sample size ranged between 6-10 as identified.

Specific Procedures for Participants

Faculty candidates were contacted from local and abroad higher education institutions via face to face, online, email, and/or by phone with the invitation to participate in the study. This information was compiled per interview/survey guides and recording efforts. The faculty candidates were selected from the criteria per volunteer

basis. The faculty candidates received an emailed introduction (letter) and/or flyer to the study, introducing the basic specifics:

- Focus of the study

- Identified topics of discussion

- Confidentiality statement(s)

- Agreement statement

- Contact Information

Once reviewed, the selected faculty candidates reviewed, consented, and interviewed according to the following: request for an interview date, scheduling of the appointment/date, obtaining signed consents, recording/notetaking, and follow-up.

Saturation and Sample Size

The sample size of 6-10 participants was selected and interviewed. Their responses were used to identify themes and patterns, ensure the interview questions were addressed, and appropriate data was collected. If saturation occurred before the complete sample size was interviewed, the saturated data was used as the cut-off because enough data had been identified to answer the research questions. Per Mason (2010), this is due to the collection of data and it does not yield any new information on the research being conducted; it is the guiding principle during data collection.

Instrumentation

In qualitative research, a detailed description of experiences and direct citations are collected which is rich relevant data and documents (Patton, 2015). The data sources for each data collection instrument included researcher-produced instruments and

published cited resources of reference. The source for each data collection instrument was researcher produced and conducted. Data collection instruments included the interview protocol guide, recorded audio, and archived data. The instrument presented standardized open-ended questions for a structured and semi-structured style of questioning; with an opportunity to elaborate and discuss the questions at hand, which provided rich data on the faculty and faculty candidates' lived experiences. This opportunity was provided for the faculty candidates to respond to the questions, elaborate on their answers, and/or examine new concerns. Each shared experience was recorded and used to address the research questions. Also, archived data was used to further align and support the research efforts. By using this strategy, they allowed flexibility and adjustments in addressing the interview questions of the study. Per the type of study being conducted, qualitative phenomenological study, an interview was sufficient for collecting data. The data were collected via face-to-face, online, and/or email using the created interview guide (electronic and paper versions) with audio recording in progress for 45-60 minutes in time.

The interview guide was researcher-produced. It consisted of open-ended questions used to provide structure, identify specific facts, describe events, and help answer the research questions during the interview (Rubin & Rubin, 2012). The guide followed a standard interview approach to help minimize variations; yet encourage open dialog and elaboration on each question (Patton, 2015). Themes and patterns were identified and coded in discovering and surveying the experiences, social quality concerns (lack of touch points), and shedding light on how to enhance the

preemployment hiring process with more social quality. The faculty could review and/or address the questions before the actual interview. Recording audio, research produced, was used to record, and review for data alignment and validity of the research. The archived data was collected and reviewed for further validation of the research topic at hand. With the study being of qualitative research, the recommended method of collecting data was interview form (Creswell, 1998). Therefore, the sufficiency of the data collection instruments used to answer the research questions was based on the triangulation efforts of the data collected and data saturation.

Researcher-Developed Instruments: Content Validity

A good qualitative research question is developed by the goals, framework, methods, and validity (Maxwell, 2019). Therefore, the content validity was established with the validation of the preemployment hiring experiences and social quality concerns (lack of touch points) per the data collected from faculty candidates and compared to the conceptual framework; social validity theory by Heinz Schuler (1993). When it came to content, the material investigated, analyzed, developed, supported, and validated the study. Therefore, content validity was established with the use of faculty candidates, qualitative research (primary and secondary), and via the use of the constructed interview guide, which was created to guide data collection per the faculty candidates. The interview guide, recording audio, and archived data were used to collect the data for the study. Per Rubin and Rubin (2012), interviewing was suitable for portions of the study while other parts can be answered with other data gathering techniques. Once collected,

the data helped establish content validity. This was done through the triangulation efforts of the three sources of data collection.

Procedures for Recruitment, Participation, and Data Collection

Data was collected from the faculty candidates of public institutions where the faculty candidates experience social quality concern(s) via the preemployment hiring process. The researcher collected the data using the identified data collection instruments. And the data collection frequency occurred at least 6-10 different times or until saturation; per the number of participants with follow-up if needed. The duration of the data collection took place between 45-60 minutes with 10-15 minutes of follow-up if needed. The data were collected via face-to-face, online, and/or email using the electronic and/or paper versions along with the audio recording. Also, data was recorded with coding notes, journaling, and follow-up efforts. The follow-up plan followed the initial recruitment plan with more intention in identifying with faculty; possibly considering referrals.

The participants exited the study by completing, approving, and submitting to the interview questions. If the participants requested or were asked to exit the study early, he/she would sign a waiver acknowledging he/she is exiting the study before interview/study completion, for documentation purposes, no early exits. The remaining participants went through a debriefing interview using a developed script on exiting the study.

According to Rubin and Rubin (2012), follow-up was determined per the interviewer; either to follow-up immediately, to wait until later in the interview, or to

wait altogether until subsequent interviews. Things to consider in determining when to

follow up (Rubin & Rubin, 2012):

- If the interviewee seems to invite for further discussions.

- Do not interrupt; allow the discussion to continue.

- Obtain a clear understanding of the context the interviewee is providing.

- Identify your speed in follow-up for timing reasons.

- Recognition failure: not identify the importance of what is discussed/shared.

Overall, the follow-up was not conducted on every point discussed. However, follow-up

was conducted only on matters that directly address the research questions (Rubin &

Rubin, 2012). And the follow-up was of faculty that were knowledgeable about the

research. The follow-up procedure included approval from the participants during the

initial interview; to contact later for a follow-up, if needed. Follow-up came in via email

and recorded audio and Zoom forms. Also, coding and journaling efforts were conducted

as well.

Data Analysis Plan

The study was of qualitative discovery with a small purposely sample of

participants using standardized open-ended questions and content analysis to report the

findings (Patton, 2015). Yet, there was a challenge in qualitative analyses, making sense

of the massive amount of data. The collected data was analyzed from the interviews,

recorded audio, and archived data. And the data collected supported the research

questions by identifying, surveying, and addressing the specific social quality concerns

(lack of touch points) and suggestions to make the preemployment hiring process better

overall. Each research question related to the data by identifying the perceptions toward the preemployment hiring process and determining if there is a lack of touch points within the recorded experiences. The touch points of interaction helped determine if there was a lack of social quality, was there adequate information throughout and during the process, was there inclusion, and if the process was ambiguous. The recorded collected data was analyzed and cross-referenced to the four mechanisms of the Social Validity Theory; to help validate the touch points of interactions by surveying the lack of social quality via the process. And the archived data helped support the collected data per the recorded interviews of the faculty candidates; to help address enhancements and suggestions for better experiences. Any discrepant cases were reported as identified to present the data differences. The discrepancies were used to further analyze the data collected for future suggested research.

The coding type included transcribing and basic debriefing, which the participants were allowed to review. Also, interview notes, journaling, and follow-up efforts were used in the coding process to better analyze the data. This provided content analysis helped validate the research. YouTube was used to help transcribe the recorded interviews. The use of YouTube was solely to transcribe the recording, which was marked as private unlisted for privacy reasons. Once the recordings were uploaded and viewed; the transcripts were opened, copied, and stored. Also, Microsoft Word was used to store and dissect the coding for pattern analysis. Other software of use included Atlas. ti, a qualitative data analysis software, which allowed for visual display of the data collected.

Data analysis began with identifying themes and patterns within the data. With the standard interview approach type and the use of content analysis, they helped minimize the data; however, there remained a sizable amount of data to analyze. According to Schreier (2012), qualitative content analysis is a great option to use in analyzing large amounts of data. The following steps were applied to analyze the data (Schreier, 2012):

1. Create a coding frame.

2. Segment the material.

3. Apply the coding frame.

4. Evaluate the coding.

5. Continue to apply code efforts.

6. Make use of elected software.

Issues of Trustworthiness

Qualitative research is no more trustworthy; instituting balance, fairness, and neutrality, which is aiming to produce high-quality data. Credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability all play a role in addressing trustworthiness (Patton, 2015). According to Fusch, P., Fusch, G. E., & Ness, L. R. (2018), trustworthiness is ensured by the position(s) presented and taken during the research to help validate the data.

Credibility

Research by Rubin and Rubin (2012) identified credibility comes not just from who you interview and how well you verify but it comes from showing readers how to

meticulously conduct the research, reporting the data transparently. The credibility was validated with data saturation, peer debriefing efforts, and peer-reviewed data. Peer debriefing allowed the opportunity to obtain different perspectives on the data from peers. Also, credibility was validated with methods of data collected that yielded credibility, knowledge of the content, recruitment efforts, participation, and consent form usage along with follow-up findings. Also, multiple coding efforts were conducted to validate the credibility of the material and the data collection process along with reflexivity. Collecting the same information from each participant was a unique perspective, which does not pose a credibility problem (Patton, 2015).

Transferability

The research questions discovered the data from the experiences. And surveying the data contributed to transferability; allowing the data to be analyzed and cross-referenced with the mechanisms of the social validity theory. According to Patton (2015), transferability is viewed as external validity. The data collected helped validate the social quality concerns (lack of touch points) during the preemployment hiring process. Therefore, transferability was validated with rich descriptions of data and context, selection criteria, and data collection settings and methods i.e., transcribed account of each experience(s). Notations and immediate analysis were conducted per each interview and after each interview for ease in transferring the data (Patton, 2015).

Dependability

Strategies to establish dependability included the researched data, rich data collection, and data collection procedures. Each of the candidates' recorded experiences

was surveyed for data alignment with the research questions, identifying the lack of social quality. The data was supported with researched material to support the dependability of the data. Research by Patton (2015) identified dependability as viewed as reliability, a systematic followed process. The content from the interviewees was rich data recordings of the experiences with basic notations. The audit trail provided a content analysis of the data; identifying the detailed specifics of each experience (see Appendix: G). Another dependability was validated with triangulation efforts of researched data, rich data collection, data collection procedures, and other specifics in identifying and reporting the data.

Confirmability

Appropriate strategies to establish confirmability included reflexity, data analysis, and reported conclusions. The data collected was supported by the outcome of the surveyed material. The data was confirmed with supported research and peer-reviewed efforts. Confirmability is viewed as objectivity (Patton, 2015). It was established with basic thought processes and decision-making criteria; understanding and reflecting on biases, predispositions, and basic observation of cognitive and emotional aspects related to the study.

Ethical Procedures

This phenomenological qualitative study followed the ethical standards in selecting and interviewing the faculty candidates. As the faculty candidates agreed to participate with signed consent forms/waivers, the interviews proceeded as outlined per the interview guide. There was transparency in the process with no deceit or pressure

efforts during the interview(s). An informed consent form was given to each participant

consenting to participate in and acknowledging factual data to the specifics of the study.

Also, privacy and protection were provided for each faculty candidate. Each faculty

candidate was guaranteed anonymity and confidentiality with the use of the consent

form(s)/waivers. An IRB review was included for the protection of the faculty candidates

during the recruitment, data collection, and debriefing efforts. Ethical procedures were

followed to protect the faculty candidates during the study using a consent form. Per

Rubin & Rubin (2012), the ethical standards were followed per the federally mandated

institutions, following the IRB rules and regulations (Rubin & Rubin, 2012).

Letters of invite, consent forms, and waivers gained access to the participants and

data. Faculty candidate participants participated in the recorded interviews to collect data

voluntarily. Each participant reviewed and consented to participate with a waiver of

liability signed; stating no physical harm shall be incurred during the data collection

efforts. Institution permissions were granted from the committee chair, committee, PD,

IRB, and any other approving officials. Data was kept and applied to the utmost

confidential level of privacy for all participants. The data was secured via password

access documents and technology. The only access was granted to the researcher and any

other approving authorized individuals. According to Rubin and Rubin (2012), collected

data should be kept in a secure place from others being able to gain access.

Summary

In Chapter 3, the research questions and research variables were identified and

how the research was conducted with proper research practices and protocol. The

invitation to the research consent form and waivers identified to grant permission to participate and protect all parties in the research efforts were also identified. And the additional focus placed on ethical standards and requirements in conducting and completing the study was identified as well. This chapter leads to the data collection of the material with approval and structure identified in the process, which is found via Chapter 4.

Chapter 4: Results

The purpose of this qualitative study was to discover the lived experiences of faculty candidates by surveying the candidates' recall and perceptions of the preemployment hiring process. The experiences of the candidates from 4-year public institutions of southern, eastern, and western U.S. regions were explored to identify concerns with the lack of effective touch points of interaction. The central phenomenon of interest was the faculty candidates' lived experiences with concerns in the preemployment hiring process. Data related to the preemployment hiring concerns (lack of touch points) were collected and analyzed using the mechanisms of Schuler's (1993) social validity theory, which included adequate information, inclusion, transparency, and effective feedback. To identify the lack of social quality touch points, the following RQs were used to guide the study:

RQ1: What are the faculty candidates' perceptions toward the preemployment hiring process (i.e., helpful information, inclusion, fairness, and effective feedback)?

RQ2: Per the perceptions, what are specific suggestions to incorporate more touch points of interaction?

In Chapter 4, the following topics are addressed: data collection, data analysis, evidence of trustworthiness, and results. The data collected addressed the identified problem with touch points of interaction during the preemployment hiring process. The data helped clarify the experiences and provided the essence of the lack of touch points during the process.

Setting

The participants volunteered from the institutions throughout the United States, particularly from the southern region. The institutions ranged from private to public institutions and were mainly 4-year public institutions. There was no coercion of the participants that may have influenced the findings. Participation was voluntary with no form of incentive or compensation. The participants did not work together at the same institutions. However, I had basic collegial relationships with the participants. No actions brought about any health concerns, minor or major, during the study.

Personal and organizational conditions influenced participation due to personnel and process concerns. The concerns consisted of lack of information, communication, interaction, and preparedness in the preemployment hiring process. The interviews were conducted via Zoom. All six interviews were recorded via iPhone audio recorder and Zoom recording. Before the interviews, each participant was briefed on the study, interview process, consent, survey, and follow-up.

Demographics

The demographic data indicated 100% non-tenure-tracked participants. The gender makeup consisted of 16.67% men and 83.33% women with 50% having 1–3 years of experience, 33.33% having 4–6 years of experience, and 16.67% having 7–9 years of experience. Demographic data were collected via SurveyMonkey after the Zoom interviews were conducted. Tables 6, 7, and 8 provide demographic details.

Table 6

Demographic Information of Participants

Participants & Region	Age	Gender	Education	Title	Years	Area
Interview #1 Southern Region	55-64	Female	Ed.D.	Professor	1-3	School of Education
Interview #2 Southern Region	45-64	Female	Master	Adjunct Faculty	4-6	School of Social Work
Interview #3 Western Region	65+	Male	Master	Associate Faculty	4-6	School of Business/Psychology
Interview #4	45-54	Female	Master	Adjunct Faculty	1-3	School of Nursing

Southern Region						
Interview #5 Southern Region	35-44	Female	Master	Assistant Professor	7-9	School of Nursing-Psychiatry/Adult Health
Interview #6 Southern & Eastern Regions	35-44	Female	Master	Adjunct Faculty	1-3	School of Education

Table 7

Age Groups and Percentages

Age Groups	Percentages
35-44	33%
45-54	33%
55-64	17%
65+	17%

Table 8

Position Titles and Percentages

Position Titles	Percentages
Adjunct	50%
Assistant Professor	16.67%
Associate Professor	16.67%
Professor	16.67%

Data Collection

Upon approval from Walden University's Institutional Review Board (Approval

Number 02-04-21-0048533), nine participants were recruited to participate in the study.

The projected number of participants was identified as six to 10 or until data saturation.

However, only six participants completed the study. The six participants met the

requirements of the study, which included returned consent form via email, tentative

dates and times for the interviews, and technology capability for the Zoom interviews.

The requirements for participation in the study were specified via flyer, social media

platform, emailed participant invitation letter, and Zoom. The eligibility to participate

required that participants be tenured/nontenured faculty hired within the last 1–3 years

by a higher education institution. Also, the participants must have had experienced

concerns during the preemployment hiring process regarding a lack of social quality. The

participants were asked to complete the following:

- consent form to participate via email.

- contact information form (i.e., phone number and email address).

- agreement to participate in a recorded Zoom interview.

- survey powered by SurveyMonkey.

- reviewed interview transcript and corrections, if needed.

- follow-up interview, if needed.

Due to COVID, in-person face-to-face interviews were not conducted in being

compliant with CDC guidelines and restrictions to ensure safety for all individuals.

Therefore, the interviews were conducted remotely via scheduled Zoom meetings for 45–

60-minute timeframes; no group Zoom sessions. The data collection period was from February 10, 2021, to March 5, 2021, with interviews spanning from 35-45 minutes. Surveys were independently conducted after each interview powered by SurveyMonkey, which was emailed to each participant from SurveyMonkey with a 10–15-minute completion timeframe within three days of receiving. The data was recorded via an iPhone audio recorder and per Zoom. Also, the data was manually recorded via the interview guide used to interview each participant. And no unexpected conditions or changes to procedures occurred during the collection of data; other than previously mentioned, COVID.

At the time of the Zoom interviews, I introduced myself, the project, and thanked the participants for participating in the study. The participants were greeted by name, but names were not recorded via the physical documents or transcripts, once produced. I discussed all the specifics of the study for example the duration of the interview, basic explanation of the study, consent, confidentiality, types of questions, survey, and follow-up. Standardized open-ended questions were used to provide a structured interview and survey to direct the questioning in successfully discovering the candidates' experiences via the preemployment hiring process; (see Appendix E) to review the experiences of the six participants.

Upon completion of the interviewing process, the participants were debriefed through basic checks and balances of the interview and allowed to view the transcripts once completed; to ensure accuracy of the recorded information for credibility and

validity of the data collected. At the closing of the interview, the following were

discussed for further closure of the interviews:

- Purpose of the study

- Assured Confidentiality

- Follow-up, if needed

- Transcript review, if needed

- Contact information verified.

A review of each transcript took place within a 10-day turnaround timeframe following

the conclusion of the interviews; to ensure the accuracy of the data collected. No

additional feedback was needed, however, one recorded transcript lacked clarity diction

via the recording. So, the manually recorded data was used to complete the transcript. All

transcripts were approved per participant within a one-to-two-day timeframe. And all

collected data were kept confidential and secured by security passcodes for access.

Data Analysis

The recorded data was uploaded using the Youtube software; protected by the

"Private" feature via YouTube, which flags the recording as private unlisted for privacy

assurance. Data was then transcribed and saved in Microsoft Word format on my

personal password-protected computer. Once the transcriptions were completed, the

documents were proofed and edited for accuracy. Then, the transcripts were forwarded to

each participant for review and accuracy approval. By reviewing the transcripts, the data

was ensured for accuracy, credibility, and validity. As the data collector, I was the only

individual allowed to listen to the recordings and view the transcribed data to maintain

privacy. Each of the recordings had specific identification codes, which avoided using the participant's actual names in the transcriptions and/or any other physical documents.

The six interview transcripts were reviewed along with notes and survey results to become familiar with the specifics of the data collected. The participant's responses were processed and analyzed to identify word patterns, themes, codes, and word usage/frequency. Atlas-ti software was used for the analysis; to further interpret the data by identifying common themes that existed throughout the coded data. Themes were derived from the data collected, which aligned with and addressed the two research questions of the study. Each research question was cross-referenced to the four mechanisms of the Social Validity Theory, by the identified perceptions toward the preemployment hiring process, determining the lack of touch points within the process. The archived data was used to help support the collected data and identify the enhancements and suggestions for a better candidate experience. At the sixth interview, data saturation occurred as no new emerging data was collected.

There are many ways to identify themes and/or patterns in qualitative data and to interpret the data. The Atlas-ti software was used to help store the interview transcript data and identify themes and patterns from the data which qualitative content analysis was applied in becoming familiar with the data, helping to create coding frames, segment the material, apply the coding frame, evaluating the coding, continue to apply coding efforts, and use of software (Schreier, 2012). Per Schreier (2012), qualitative content analysis is a great option to use in analyzing large amounts of data. The analysis assisted in understanding the lived experiences of the participants as faculty candidates of public

institutions that experienced social quality concerns via the preemployment hiring process, where there was a lack of informative, communicative, participative, and transparent touch points of interaction.

The Schreier (2012) analysis method was used to describe the specific codes, categories, and themes as they emerged from the data. The six-step procedure was applied as follows (Schreier, 2012):

Create a Coding Frame

I carefully and repeatedly reread the transcripts while transcribing via Youtube and in Microsoft Word. Close attention was given to identifying any similarities in the experiences provided via the participants; per the research questions being addressed. And the differences were noted as well in addressing discrepant cases. The identified similarities were analyzed and noted in developing the words and phrases while attempting to identify codes and meanings.

Segment the Material

For this procedure, I highlighted and coded the transcripts of specific data that showed similarities in addressing the two research questions. In addition, meanings/comments were notated to help with the coding.

Apply the Coding Frame

In identifying the themes, I created tables (see Appendix: H) to group the data into themes, using the meanings to better categorize the data. Atlas-ti was used to help store, categorize, and link the data.

Evaluate the Coding

The themes were examined to ensure all the coded data supported the themes. I cross-referenced responses that related to the conceptual framework of the study; focusing on the mechanisms used to identify with adequate touch points of interactions from an equitable and social standpoint, identifying if the process is appropriate and acceptable. A word cloud was created to help identify the data and generate a thematic map of the data.

Continue to Apply the Coding Efforts

18 themes and five codes were derived from the data collected and analyzed. Each of the codes was identified with specific notations to further generate clear names for each.

Table 9

Codes and Themes

Codes	Themes
Communication	Provide informative and timely feedback.
	Two-way communication.
	Honesty in communicating.
	Effective feedback.
	Offered
Informative	Opportunity for adequate information.
	Organizational effectiveness.
	Helpful information.
Participation	Allowed to perform.
	Adequate interactions.
	Inclusion.
Transparency	Fairness.
	Unambiguous.
	Biasness.
Other	Enhancement
	Suggestions
	Candidate experience
	Touch points

Make Use of the Elected Software

At this procedure, the Atlas-ti software was used to produce the desired information. The data was extracted, and a report was generated highlighting the specific data in addressing the two research questions of the study on the lived experiences of faculty candidates during the preemployment hiring process.

Quotes used to emphasize the importance of the codes and themes are as followed:

Code 1: Communication

- ""No, did not ask questions; an opportunity not given. No feedback; just doing fine statement. …" in Interview #1 Official Transcript 03023021.docx

- ""More interaction of what is expected to do and how. Being well informed, more communication with …" in Interview #1 Official Transcript 03023021.docx

- "The only thing that I would say, I feel was lacking would have been the consistent communication and…" in Interview #2 Official Transcription 03032021.docx

- "Provided there was no outcome or results provided; so, no …" in Interview #3 Official Transcription 02122021.docx

- "Yes, at the time, I believe that it did lack in adequate touch points in pretty much all the categories …" in Interview #3 Official Transcription 02122021.docx

- "I'm not knowing what's behind the curtain; the ambiguity and lack of communication …" in Interview #3 Official Transcription 02122021.docx

Code 2: Informative

- "Did I understand the information provided, no. Somewhat, a without being really prepared for what was ex…" in Interview #1 Official Transcript 03023021.docx

- "No, I was only given the syllabus of what was expected out of the course. And the first course that…" in Interview #1 Official Transcript 03023021.docx

- "More interaction of what is expected to do and how. Being well informed, more communication with …" in Interview #1 Official Transcript 03023021.docx

- "In most interviews that I have attended that's been one of the most unfortunate things that there …" in Interview #2 Official Transcription 03032021.docx

- "I think some may have not has been as informative. It was just kind of you're going to do this …" in Interview #4 Official Transcript 03042021.docx

- "No, not overall; no. So initially if I had to pick one it would be information…" in Interview #5 Official Transcript 03052021.docx

Code 3: Participation

- "The only interaction that I received was my request; self-initiated. So, it was a long time between…" in Interview #1 Official Transcript 03023021.docx

- "More interaction of what is expected to do and how.…" in Interview #1 Official Transcript 03023021.docx

- "No, I would not say they were job-related; they were more content-related. We did not…" in Interview #6 Official Transcript 03152021.docx

Code 4: Transparency

- "No. Not adequate because I was not really sure who my supervisor was until
  I think after the report…" in Interview #1 Official Transcript 03023021.docx

- "No, not included in the decision-making process or response to the decisions;
  they were behind the …" in Interview #3 Official Transcription
  02122021.docx

Code 5: Other

- "More interaction of what is expected to do and how. Being well informed,
  more communication with …" in Interview #1 Official Transcript
  03023021.docx

- "If they put forth a survey/questionnaire to redirect how things are done…" in
  Interview #1 Official Transcript 03023021.docx

- "Maybe have like one specific person for all the touch points basically while
  guiding them through …" in Interview #4 Official Transcript 03042021.docx

- "I would say having one person to do all of the contact: instead of multiple
  people. I do; yeah, I …" in Interview #4 Official Transcript 03042021.docx

- "Probably being more college-specific. And I think when you go back to the
  communication things kind…" in Interview #6 Official Transcript
  03152021.docx

In addition to using Atlas-ti, data was extracted from the surveys powered by
SurveyMonkey. Each participant received an email from SurveyMonkey instructing how
to complete the survey. Basic demographic information was collected as well as

information associated with the candidate's experience via the preemployment hiring process, where he/she had concerns with the lack of touch points of interaction; social quality: equity, fairness, appropriateness, and acceptable actions. A total of 45 questions were presented via the survey which identified the direct experiences via the four mechanisms: Informative, Participative, Transparent, and Communicative. The results were collected to further identify and provide support to the credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability of the data collected.

There was a large percentage of participants that experienced or expressed a large concern with the lack of touch points of interaction. An average of 83% of the participants did express a lack of effective touch points of interaction during the process with 66% agreeing the process could be enhanced for a better candidate experience. The concerns percentages for the lack of effective touch points are as follows (Note: In order by highest and lowest percentages): Informative – 66%, Participative – 66%, Communicative – 33%, and Transparency – 33%. The discrepant cases were in small to minimal percentages throughout the codes. For example, 16% disagreed with the lack of effective touch points of interaction during the process, lack of touch points of interaction within the preemployment hiring process, and the preemployment hiring process is effective. With 33% of the participants disagreeing to having concerns with the preemployment hiring process. These were factored in identifying the percentage(s) where there was a lack of touch points of interactions during the preemployment hiring process.

Evidence of Trustworthiness

According to Fusch et al., (2018), trustworthiness is ensured by the position(s) presented and taken during the research to help validate the data. Credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability all played a role in addressing trustworthiness in researching the study (Patton, 2015).

Credibility

According to Rubin and Rubin (2012), identified credibility comes not just from who you interview and how well you verify but it comes from showing readers how to meticulously conduct the research, reporting the data transparently. For this study, credibility was obtained through comparisons of recorded data collected, note-taking, peer debriefing/follow-up, survey analysis, and multiple coding efforts. The participants were allowed to view his/her transcribed interview to ensure accuracy, credibility, and validity through peer debriefing/follow-up. Participants were given three days to review and submit transcripts for approval. There were no revisions conducted for any of the interviews transcribed. And a detailed description of all the lived experiences of faculty candidates during the preemployment hiring process was compiled through data collection via interviews and surveys.

Transferability

According to Patton (2015), transferability is viewed as external validity. The data collected helped validate the social quality concerns during the preemployment hiring process. Per the rich descriptions of the data, the interviews, notations, thorough thematic analysis, and cross-referencing of the data to the mechanisms of the social validity theory

were conducted in properly transferring the data. In addition, survey results and recorded interviews were used to help with the transferability of the data as well.

Dependability

According to Patton (2015), dependability is viewed as reliability, a systematic followed process. The audit trail was used to provide content analysis of the rich data, identifying the detailed specifics of each candidate experience per the preemployment hiring process and maintaining the accuracy of the data (see Appendix: G). Dependability was further validated with triangulation efforts of the researched data, data collected per the interviews and surveys, and other analysis of notations and comments per the interview guide.

Confirmability

According to Patton (2015), confirmability is viewed as objectivity. Reflexity, data analysis, and reported conclusions were used to validate confirmability. The data was recorded and transcribed by the researcher and confirmed via the participants. Codes and themes were developed as the transcripts were uploaded to the Atlas-ti software. The results were notated via the data and journal files; an audit trail was applied during this effort (see Appendix: G). And the survey results were used to support the rich data collected per the interviews of each candidate, accounting for his/her experience during the preemployment hiring process.

<div align="center">

Results

</div>

The five codes and 18 themes originated from the data using the thematic analysis and Atlas-ti software. In response to the 33 questions (see Appendix: C & E) asked

during the Zoom interviews, six faculty candidates shared their personal experiences and perceptions of the preemployment hiring process where there was a concern for the lack of social quality during the process. The results of the study were aligned with the two following research questions:

RQ1: What are the faculty candidates' perceptions toward the preemployment hiring process i.e., helpful information, inclusion, fairness, and effective feedback.

RQ2: Per the perceptions, what are specific suggestions to incorporate more touch points of interaction?

Research Question 1: Faculty Candidates' Perceptions of the Preemployment Hiring Process

The goal of the question (RQ1) was to encourage the faculty candidates to share his/her experiences during the preemployment hiring process where there was a lack of social quality, touch points of interaction. Participants were asked a series of 20 questions (see Appendix: C) in addressing if adequate information was provided throughout the process, was there an opportunity where you felt included, was the process unambiguous and was there effective feedback was provided. To address the question the following questions were presented to the participants: Information questions: questions 1-5, Participation questions: questions 3-6, Transparency questions: questions 1-7, and Communication questions: questions 1-4 (see Appendix: C). 14 of the 18 themes were derived for RQ1. See the following Table 10:

Table 10

Themes for Research Question 1

RQ1	Themes	Participants
What are the faculty candidates' perceptions toward the preemployment hiring process i.e., helpful information, inclusion, fairnesy, and effective feedback?	**Communication:** Provide informative and timely feedback Two-way communication Honesty in communication Effective feedback Offered	P1, P2, P3
	Informative: Opportunity for adequate information Organizational effectiveness Helpful information	P1, P2, P4, P5
	Participation: Allowed to perform Adequate interactions Inclusion	P1, P6
	Transparency: Fairness Unambiguous Biasness	P1, P3

The responses from the participants further supported the need for more touch points of

interaction per the preemployment hiring process, where social quality was not

effectively applied in the areas of information, participation, transparency, and

communication. Following are survey results and direct quotes to further support,

validate, and provide the needed credibility, transferability, dependability, and

confirmability for the study:

Communication

Provide informative and timely feedback, Two-way communication, Honesty in

communication, Effective feedback, and Offered.

Table 11

Communicative Survey Results

Communicative	Survey Questions	Results
	Experienced comprehensive information; understandable and clear	1 out of 6 participants disagreed: 16% (n = 1)
	Experienced timely feedback	2 out of 6 participants disagreed: 33% (n = 2)
	Experienced two-way communications/interactions	1 out of 6 participants disagreed: 16% (n = 1)
	Experienced various communication types	1 out of 6 participants disagreed: 16% (n = 1)

The interview results, per the themes created via the Atlas-ti software, validated a small

percentage concern with the communication aspect of the preemployment hiring process

with the lack of providing timely effective feedback with two-way communication

efforts. Results below are direct quotes per the participants; retrieved from the recorded interviews:

Communicative Interview Analysis Results:

- ""No, did not ask questions; an opportunity not given. No feedback; just doing fine statement. …" in Interview #1 Official Transcript 03023021.docx

- ""More interaction of what is expected to do and how. Being well informed, more communication with …" in Interview #1 Official Transcript 03023021.docx

- "The only thing that I would say, I feel was lacking would have been the consistent communication and…" in Interview #2 Official Transcription 03032021.docx

- "Provided there was no outcome or results provided; so, no …" in Interview #3 Official Transcription 02122021.docx

- "Yes, at the time, I believe that it did lack in adequate touch points in pretty much all the categories …" in Interview #3 Official Transcription 02122021.docx

- "I'm not knowing what's behind the curtain; the ambiguity and lack of communication …" in Interview #3 Official Transcription 02122021.docx

Information

Opportunity for adequate information, Organizational effectiveness, and Helpful information

Table 12

Informative Survey Results

Informative	Survey Questions	Results
	Experienced an opportunity with adequate information	1 out of 6 participants disagreed (during the process): 16% (n = 1)
		1 out 6 participants disagreed (after the process): 16% (n = 1)
	Experienced organizational effectiveness	2 out of 6 participants disagreed: 33% (n = 2)
	Experienced helpful information	2 out f 6 participants disagreed: 33% (n = 2)

The interview results, per the themes created via the Atlas-ti software, validated a 98% higher percentage concern with the informative aspect of the preemployment hiring process with the lack of frequency, timing, and adequate/helpful information (see Table 12). Results below are direct quotes per the participants; retrieved from the recorded interviews:

- "Did I understand the information provided, no. Somewhat, a without being really prepared for what was expected…" in Interview #1 Official Transcript 03023021.docx

- "No, I was only given the syllabus of what was expected out of the course. And the first course that…" in Interview #1 Official Transcript 03023021.docx

- "More interaction of what is expected to do and how. Being well informed, more communication with …" in Interview #1 Official Transcript 03023021.docx

- "In most interviews that I have attended that's been one of the most unfortunate things that there …" in Interview #2 Official Transcription 03032021.docx

Participation

Allowed to perform, Adequate interactions, and Inclusion

Table 13

Participative Survey Results

Participative	Survey Questions	Results
	Experienced an opportunity to perform	2 out of 6 participants disagreed (position/task domain): 33% (n = 2)
		1 out of 6 participants disagreed (perform demonstration): 16% (n = 1)
	Experienced adequate interactions	2 out of 6 participants disagreed: 33% (n = 2)
	Experience inclusion	1 out of 6 participants disagreed: 16% (n = 1)

The interview results, per the themes created via the Atlas-ti software, validated a 98% higher percentage concern with the participative aspect of the preemployment hiring process with the lack of opportunities to perform and interact, with overall inclusion

efforts (see Table 13). Results below are direct quotes per the participants; retrieved from

the recorded interviews:

Participation

- "The only interaction that I received was my request; self-initiated. So, it was

  a long time between…" in Interview #1 Official Transcript 03023021.docx

- "More interaction of what is expected to do and how.…" in Interview #1

  Official Transcript 03023021.docx

- "No, I would not say they were job-related; they were more content-related.

  We did not…" in Interview #6 Official Transcript 03152021.docx

Transparency

Fairness, Unambiguous, and Biasness

Table 14

Transparency Survey Results

Transparency	Survey question	Results
	Experienced biasness in the process	2 out of 6 participants agreed: 33% (n = 2)

The interview results, per the themes created via the Atlas-ti software, validated a small

percentage concern with the transparency aspect of the preemployment hiring process

with the lack of non-biasness efforts in the process. Results below are direct quotes per

the participants; retrieved from the recorded interviews:

Transparency

- "No. Not adequate because I was not really sure who my supervisor was until
  I think after the report…" in Interview #1 Official Transcript 03023021.docx

- "No, not included in the decision-making process or response to the decisions;
  they were behind the …" in Interview #3 Official Transcription
  02122021.docx

Research Question 2: Per the Perceptions, What Were Specific Suggestions to Incorporate More Touch Points of Interaction?

The goal of the question (RQ2) was to identify enhancements/suggestions to implement a better candidate experience as it related to the preemployment hiring process in identifying and implementing suggested enhancements within the institutions. By doing this, the results allowed more organizational effectiveness when it came to a lack of social quality, touch points of interaction: informative, participative, transparency, and communicative. Participants were asked a series of 20 questions in addressing possible changes in how the process was handled during the preemployment phase. To address the research question, the following questions were presented to the participants: Touch point questions: question 7 and Other questions: question 7 (see Appendix: C). 4 of the 18 themes were derived for RQ2. See the following Table 13 for the specifics:

Table 15

Themes for Research Question 2

RQ2	Themes	Participants
Per the perceptions, what are specific suggestions to incorporate more touch points of interaction?	Other:	P1, P2, P3, P4, P6
	Enhancement	
	Suggestions	
	Candidate	
	Experience	
	Touch points	

The responses from the participants further supported the need for more touch points of

interaction per the preemployment hiring process, where social quality is not effectively

applied in the candidate experience, which enhancements and suggestions are needed to

implement a better experience. Following are survey results and direct quotes to further

support, validate, and provide the needed credibility, transferability, dependability, and

confirmability needed for the study in identifying needed enhancements and suggestions:

Other

   Enhancements, Suggestions, Candidate Experience, and Touch points

Table 16

Other Survey Results

Other	Survey Questions	Results
	Can the process be enhanced?	4 out of 6 participants agreed: 66% (n = 4)
		2 out of 6 participants strongly agreed: 33% (n = 2)
	How can the candidate experience be better e.g., suggestions?	Note: See Survey Results Table 17
	Are touch points lacking?	
	(agreed the process lack effective touch points of interaction)	5 out of 6 participants agreed: 83% (n = 5)
		3 out of 6 participants agreed: 50% (n = 3)
	(agreed to the lack of touch points of interaction)	1 out of 6 participants disagreed: 16% (n = 1)
	(disagreed to the preemployment hiring process was effective)	3 out of 6 participants agreed: 50% (n = 3)
	(agreed to have concerns with the preemployment hiring process)	

The interview results, per the themes created via the Atlas-ti software, validated a higher

percentage concern for effectiveness, enhancements, and suggestions for the

preemployment hiring process in creating a better candidate experience. Results below

are direct quotes per the participants; retrieved from the recorded interviews:

Other

- "More interaction of what is expected to do and how. Being well informed, more communication with …" in Interview #1 Official Transcript 03023021.docx

- "If they put forth a survey/questionnaire to redirect how things are done…" in Interview #1 Official Transcript 03023021.docx

- "Maybe have like one specific person for all the touch points basically while guiding them through …" in Interview #4 Official Transcript 03042021.docx

- "I would say having one person to do all of the contact: instead of multiple people. I do; yeah, I …" in Interview #4 Official Transcript 03042021.docx

- "Probably being more college-specific. And I think when you go back to the communication things kind…" in Interview #6 Official Transcript 03152021.docx

The discrepant cases were in small to minimal percentages throughout the codes.

For example, 16% disagreed with the lack of effective touch points of interaction during

the process, lack of touch points of interaction within the preemployment hiring process,

and the preemployment hiring process is effective. With 33% of the participants

disagreeing to having concerns with the preemployment hiring process. These were

factored in identifying the percentage(s) where there was a lack of touch points of

interactions during the preemployment hiring process. Therefore, leading to suggested

enhancements identified to help improve the overall future of the candidate experience;

as it relates to social quality touch points of interaction; being informative, participative,

transparent, and communicative. Following are some of the suggested enhancements:

Table 17

Suggested Enhancements

---

1. More interaction on what is expected to do and how.

2. Being well informed; more communications

3. Communicated information e.g., process specifics

4. Uniform policy

5. Actual physical resources to reference

6. One specific personnel for all as guided through the process

7. One personnel as contact person

8. Being more college-specific in communication

Summary

The main purpose of the chapter was to present the data analysis outlining the

surveyed and interviewed experiences and perceptions of faculty candidates and their

concerns with the preemployment hiring process, where there was a lack of social

quality, touch points of interaction. The analysis presented the percentage of participants

who experienced some concerns with the touch points of interaction in the areas of

information, participation, transparency, and communication. Multiple case sampling was used to identify faculty candidates from the two higher education institution types who were hired and experienced concerns with the preemployment hiring process, where he/she felt the process was not appropriate nor acceptable concerning social quality in the process. Purposeful and criterion sampling was used to inquiry the information and understand the phenomenon and validate the study. This involved finding and selecting the key participants who were faculty candidates, tenured/non-tenured, hired within 1-3 years ago, and experienced a lack of touch points of interaction during the preemployment hiring process with social quality. The six interviews were conducted and recorded via an iPhone video recorder and Zoom.

Two research questions were developed for the study in discovering a broader description and understanding of the phenomenon being studied. Data collection was achieved by conducting six interviews and six surveys of the six participants. Data saturation occurred as no new information emerged from the participants interviewed. By using the Schreier (2012), qualitative content analysis method and Atlas-ti software, I developed codes and themes from an in-depth evaluation of the data. I carefully and repeatedly reread and evaluated the transcripts while transcribing the data using Microsoft Word and Youtube transcriber, to create the coding frame. The data was further highlighted and coded, segmenting the material that showed any similarities in meanings and comments. Tables were created to help categorize the data into themes and meanings. Tables 7-13 illustrated and provided a summary of the codes, themes, and

grouping of the data, which included the five codes and 18 themes; per each research question from the data collected per each interview and survey.

Research question 1 (RQ1) was devised to encourage the faculty candidates to share his/her experiences during the preemployment hiring process where there was a lack of social quality, touch points of interaction and collect rich feedback data from the participants. As a result of code framing, segmenting the material, creating charts, and evaluating the coding of the data, 14 themes emerged leading to addressing the research question for the lack of social quality via the preemployment hiring process.

Research question 2 (RQ2) was devised to identify enhancements/suggestions to implement a better candidate experience as it relates to the preemployment hiring process in identifying and implementing suggested enhancements within the institutions. As a result of code framing, segmenting the material, creating charts, and evaluating the coding of the data, 4 themes emerged leading to addressing the research question by providing the suggested enhancements to the process.

The last chapter, Chapter 5 will provide an introduction, reiterating the purpose and nature of the study and why it was conducted. The interpretations of the findings will be addressed as well, describing, analyzing, and interpreting the findings. And the limitations of the study will be presented, along with the recommendations and implications for the study. Then ending the chapter with a conclusion, providing the key essences of the study.

Chapter 5: Discussion, Conclusions, and Recommendations

With a lack of social validity during the hiring experiences, there can be a profound presence of social concerns (Clauset, 2015). Therefore, all candidates should be treated respectfully with appropriate and acceptable interactions. The purpose of this qualitative phenomenological study was to discover the lived experiences of the faculty during the preemployment hiring process, where there were concerns with the lack of touch points. The study was conducted to address a gap in the literature. I conducted semi structured interviews and surveys to discover the experiences of the faculty candidates at 4-year colleges/universities from southern, eastern, and western regions of the United States. I was able to determine whether the touch points were applied or not applied during the process and to identify suggested enhancements for a better candidate experience. I found a lack of social touch points of interaction during the preemployment hiring process in the following areas: including helpful information, practicing inclusion efforts, exercising fairness, and providing effective feedback in the process. Key themes were identified via the data collected (see Appendix H). A total of five codes and 18 themes were developed from the data. The four mechanisms of Schuler's (1993) social validity theory were used to identify whether there was adequate information, inclusive experiences, transparency, and offered feedback during the preemployment hiring process, as shown in Table 18.

Table 18

Schuler's Four Mechanisms

- Information - Was there adequate information?

- Participation - Did you experience inclusion?

- Transparency - Was there transparency?

- Communication - Were you offered feedback?

The data gathered from the interviews and surveys were analyzed to identify the concerns about the lack of touch points in the preemployment hiring process. I was able to understand what the faculty candidates experienced during the process, which led to broader knowledge and suggestions to improve candidates' experiences and institutional effectiveness in the touch point areas. I conducted semi structured interviews with six faculty candidate participants from various colleges and universities. Results from the data analysis were compared to findings detailed in the literature to determine whether results contributed new information and to add to the existing body of knowledge regarding faculty's lived experiences with the lack of touch points during the preemployment hiring process. The key findings were substantiated by prior studies and aligned with Schuler's (1993) conceptual framework, indicating the existence of social quality concerns. I cross-referenced the results with the four mechanisms to determine adequate touch points of interaction in the following areas: informative, participative, transparent, and communicative. Adequateness varied within the four areas, and

enhancements were identified to improve organizational effectiveness and candidates'

experiences.

Interpretation of the Findings

Findings from the participants' experiences as college/university candidates in the

preemployment hiring process were determined through data analysis. In relation to the

literature (Bauer et al., 2012; Biswas, 2019; Brandon Hall Group, 2017; J.M. McCarthy,

2017 et al.; J. M. McCarthy et al.; 2018; Schuler, 1993; Stewart & Valian, 2018), key

findings indicated that the faculty candidates experienced a lack of social quality with

concerns in how the preemployment hiring processes were handled, which led to

suggested enhancements. The lived experiences shared by the six participants were linked

to the two research questions in response to the 33 open-ended interview questions (see

Appendix B).

The lack of social quality in the preemployment hiring process for the faculty

candidates was large to minimal in the perspective areas. However, the findings

suggested possible enhancements in the hiring practices of higher education institutions.

The key findings added to the research on the faculty candidates' shared experiences

during the process with social quality concerns. The themes that emerged for RQ1 are

presented in Table 19.

Table 19

Research Question 1 and Themes

RQ1: What are the faculty candidates' perceptions toward the preemployment hiring process i.e., helpful information, inclusion, fairness, and effective feedback?	**Communication:**
	Provide informative and timely feedback
	Two-way communication
	Honesty in communication
	Effective feedback
	Offered
	Informative:
	Opportunity for adequate information
	Organizational effectiveness
	Helpful information
	Participation:
	Allowed to perform
	Adequate interactions
	Inclusion
	Transparency:
	Fairness
	Unambiguous
	Biasness

For the first research question, I examined the lack of touch points of interaction of the candidates' experiences, per the four mechanisms for social quality (see Schuler, 1993). The interview questions were designed in relation to RQ1. The 22 questions were

intended to gather responses that would answer the research question. In response to RQ1, the participants provided detailed accounts of their experiences as faculty candidates at the colleges/universities. Participants experienced a lack of touch points of interaction during the process. The participants stated that experiences lacked timely feedback during the process (a communicative mechanism). Three out of six participants stated there was a lack of effective communications and feedback efforts. Also, the participants noted that the experiences lacked organizational effectiveness and helpful information during and after the process (an informative mechanism). Four participants described how there was a lack of organizational effectiveness along the lines of helpful adequate process information. These findings were consistent with the previous studies that indicated a need for timely feedback, organizational effectiveness, and helpful information during and after the process (Parker & Richards, 2020; Van Ruler, 2018). Also, the experiences did not include adequate interactions and an opportunity to perform (a participative mechanism). Two participants identified a lack of inclusion, interactions, and the opportunity to perform. Also, the process lacked nonbiased actions/behaviors during and after the interactions (transparency mechanism). Two participants stated there were times during the process when they encountered unfair and biased actions. These findings were also consistent with prior research, confirming a need for an opportunity to perform without biased actions and behaviors (J. M. McCarthy et al., 2018; Parker & Richards, 2020). See Appendix E for a more detailed account of the experiences. The themes that emerged for RQ2 are presented in Table 20.

Table 20

Research Question 2 and Themes

RQ2: Per the perceptions, what are specific suggestions that can be done to incorporate more touch points of interaction?	**Other:** Enhancement Suggestions Candidate Experience Touch points

RQ2 addressed the faculty candidates' perceptions regarding how to incorporate more touch points of interaction for a better candidate experience and organizational effectiveness. The interview questions were designed in relation to RQ2. In response to RQ2, the participants provided detailed accounts of their experiences as faculty candidates at the various colleges/universities, and the participants suggested what they thought could be done to incorporate more touch points of interaction. Table 21 includes suggested enhancements to incorporate more touch points of interaction.

Table 21

Suggested Enhancements Per Faculty Candidates

- More interaction on what is expected to do and how.

- Being well informed; more communications

- Communicated information e.g., process specifics

- Uniform policy

- Actual physical resources to reference

- One specific personnel for all as guided through the process

- One personnel as contact person

- Being more college-specific in communication

The participants provided the experiences lacked effective touch points of interaction, therefore, leading to the presence of concerns. Following is specific data collected per the interviews identifying with the lack of touch points of interaction for the communication and information mechanisms (see Appendix E for an exhaustive list):

- ""No, did not ask questions; an opportunity not given. No feedback; just doing fine statement. …" in Interview #1 Official Transcript 03023021.docx

- ""More interaction of what is expected to do and how. Being well informed, more communication with …" in Interview #1 Official Transcript 03023021.docx

- "Yes, at the time, I believe that it did lack in adequate touch points in pretty much all the categories …" in Interview #3 Official Transcription 02122021.docx

- "I'm not knowing what's behind the curtain; the ambiguity and lack of communication …" in Interview #3 Official Transcription 02122021.docx

- "More interaction of what is expected to do and how. Being well informed, more communication with …" in Interview #1 Official Transcript 03023021.docx

- "In most interviews that I have attended that's been one of the most unfortunate things that there …" in Interview #2 Official Transcription 03032021.docx

- "I think some may have not been as informative. It was just kind of you're going to do this …" in Interview #4 Official Transcript 03042021.docx

Also, the participants identified the preemployment hiring processes could be enhanced and specifically how they could be enhanced with more communication and participation (see Table 4). These findings were consistent with the past research studies identifying there is a lack of effective touch points, validated concerns, and needed enhancement suggestions (Anderson, 2010; Bauer, 2012; J.M. McCarthy, et al., 2018; Walker & Moretti, 2018; Yoder, 2017). Therefore, the findings helped address the two research questions by surveying and discovering the lack of touch points of interaction during the preemployment hiring process and identifying possible enhancements to bring about

more organizational effectiveness with the policies and procedures in how the preemployment processes are conducted for each candidate.

Limitations of the Study

Three limitations confined this qualitative research. For example, lack of a large pool of candidates (volunteer participants), a lack of in-person face-to-face interviews (non-virtual) due to COVID19, and feedback from HR personnel. Each of the participants were faculty candidates of various colleges/universities with concerns pertaining to the preemployment hiring process. The given responses of the six participants may not be representative of all experiences and perceptions of faculty candidates. As a result, this research was limited as it was not representative of every faculty candidate with preemployment hiring concerns. Due to the candidates' privacy being protected and each candidate freely volunteering, no limitations existed with the six participants as it relates to participating and being recorded.

Recommendations

The study explored the social quality lack via the process and identified the needed enhancements to aid in creating a better candidate experience and more organizational effectiveness. The findings of this research study were conducted for exploratory reasons to discover the lived experiences of faculty candidates at colleges/universities that experienced a lack of social quality during the preemployment hiring process. Since the research was scarce, key recommendations would be for more research specific to better organizational effectiveness during the preemployment hiring process and follow-up on the incorporated enhancements. Future research may provide

more in-depth meaning and understanding of the faculty candidates' experiences with the preemployment hiring process concerns per the recommendations. And future research can explore ways for more informative, participative, transparency, and communicative efforts for enhanced experiences and developed organizational effectiveness.

Implications

This study explored and advanced the understanding of the experiences and needs of the faculty candidates of the various colleges/universities with a lack of touch points during the preemployment hiring process. The identified concerns led to findings addressing the two research questions. Therefore, leading to the findings being contributed to the gap in the research as well as addressing the need for future recommendations of the research.

In this study, knowledge was applied as well as gained as the research was conducted and analyzed. The research allowed growth individually and collectively as the study was shared with all via the professional communities. Also, the study afforded the ability to bring about change within society in how faculty candidates experience the preemployment hiring process, inclusive of social quality. Therefore, having a developed process with organizational effectiveness and application can bring about enhanced experiences and processes for all involved, institutions, and faculty. And there are possibilities of achieving positive social change through sharing the results with the six participants, institutions, and other professional organizations/magazines and media platforms: as applicable. The results added to positive social change in a few ways, through knowledge and ability. Per WaldenU (n.d.), the institution strives to produce

graduates with knowledge, skills, and abilities to positively impact his/her professions, communities, and/or society.

Conclusion

This study explored the faculty candidates' experiences with the lack of social quality via the preemployment hiring process. The findings yielded results that addressed the research questions and aligned with the research found via the Literature Review, which identified there was a need for social quality via the processes of the preemployment hiring process. It was identified there is a need for more participation, information, and communication via the process with an overall update on how the processes are implemented and conducted. The suggested enhancements provided the needed changes on what should be done to bring about more social quality, touch points of interaction, during the preemployment hiring process, which included: uniformity with policy and procedures, single point of contact during the process, guided process with specifics and expectations, and a physical reference source guide/updated document.

Faculty candidates of the colleges/universities have scarcely experienced a lack of social quality via the preemployment hiring process; varied according to the mechanism area/touch point. With there being possible challenges to correcting the concerns, change can take place with how social quality was applied via the process. The institutions can incorporate the suggested enhancements to the process for better organizational effectiveness and practice. Therefore, creating better candidate experiences that included more application of effective information, participation, transparency, and communication efforts can bring about the change needed.

Although there is a need for future research, this phenomenological qualitative study contributed to the limited existing body of faculty candidates' touch points of interaction literature. The study discovered and cross-referenced the material using the conceptual framework to explore the concerns pertaining to the preemployment hiring process and how the process can change and/or alter the outcome of a candidates' experience.

References

Ali, A. A., Ryan, A. M., Lyons, B. J., Ehrhart., M. G., & Wessell, J. L. (2016). The long

    road to employment: Incivility experienced by job seekers. *Journal of Applied*

    Psychology, *101*(3), 335–349. https://doi.org.1037/ap10000055

Anderson, N. (2003). Applicant's and recruiter's reaction to new technology in selection:

    A critical review and agenda for future research. *International Journal of*

    Selection and Assessment, *11*, 125–136. https://doi.1111/1468-2389.00235

Basham, M. J. (2009). How "pathetic" is your hiring process? An application of the

    Lessig "pathetic dot" model to educational hiring practices. *Community College*

    Journal of Research and Practices, *33*, 363–385.

    https://doi.org/10.1080/10668920902564980

Bauer, T. N., McCarthy, J., Anderson, N., Truxillo, D. M., & Salgado, J. F. (2012). What

    we know about applicant reactions to selection: Research summary and best

    practices. *Society for Industrial & Organizational Psychology*. Bowling Green,

    OH.

Bertaux, D. (1981). From the life history approach to the transformation of sociology

    practice. In Daniel Bertaux (Ed.), *Biography and society: The life history*

    approach in the social sciences, 29–53. SAGE.

Bhalla, N. (2019). Strategies to improve equity in faculty candidates hiring: Molecular

    biology of the cell. *Molecular Biology of the Cell*, *30*(22).

    https://doi.org/10.1091/mbc/E19-08-0476

Biswas, S. (2019). What is candidate experience definition: Key components? *HR*

Technologist.

Brandon Hall Group. (2017). *The evolution of onboarding: Trends and future opportunity*. eSilkroad.

Brown, P. M., Rice, A. H., Angell, G. B., & Kurz, B. (2000). Faculty candidates hiring practices in social work education: A national survey. *Critical Social Work*, 1(2). [Faculty Hiring Practices in Social Work Education: A National Survey (uwindsor.ca)](uwindsor.ca)

Burgess, A., Roberts, C., Tyler, C., & Mossman, K., (2014). The social validity of a national assessment centre for selection into general practice training. *BMC Medical Education*, 14(1), 261. https://link.springer.com/content/pdf/10.1186/s12909-014-0261-6.pdf

Clauset, A. (2015). Systemic inequality and hierarchy in faculty hiring networks. *Science Advances*. 1(1). https://advances.sciencemag.org/conent/1//1/e1400005?hc_location=ufi

Creswell, J. (1998). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five traditions*. SAGE.

Cret, B., & Musselin, C. (2010). Academic hiring and inequality. *Hal Id. Sense Publishers* 2, 75–90. https://hal-sciencespo.archivesouvertes.fr/index/docid/973123/filename/academic-hiring-inequality-eng-oct.2010-cret-musselin.pdf

Darley, J. M., & Zanna, M. P. (1987). The hiring process in academia. Compleat Academic: A Practical Guide for the Beginning Social Scientist, (31-56) *The*

American Psychological Association. https://doi.org/10.1037/h0081171

Eichelberger, R. T. (1989). *Disciplined inquiry: Understanding and doing educational research*. Longman.

Eisenberger, R., & Stinglhamber, F. (2011). Perceived organizational support: Fostering enthusiastic and productive employees. *Open Journal of Business and Management. 8 (2). https://doi.org/10.1037/12318-000*

Eriksen, T. A. (2011). Applicant reactions to selection procedures: Method validity, cost, and utility. *ResearchGate.* (PDF) Applicant reactions to selection procedures: Method validity, cost, and utility (researchgate.net)

Farago, B., Zide, J. S., & Shahani-Denning, C. (2013). Selection interviews: Role of interviewer warmth, interview structure, and interview outcome in applicants' perceptions of organizations. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, *65*(3), 224–239. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0034300

Ferguson, J. L., & Cihon, J. (2017). Social validity. *ResearchGate.* https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Julia-Ferguson/publication/320283723_Social_Validity/links/5cf8436ea6fdcc847508a003/Social-Validity.pdf?

Fuestman, D., & Lavertu, S. (2005). The academic hiring process: A survey of department chairs. *PSOnline.* www.apsanet.org

Fusch, P., Fusch, G. E., & Ness, L. R. (2018). Denzin's paradigm shift: Revisiting triangulation in qualitative research. *Journal of Social Change*, *10*(1), 19–32. https://doi.org/10.5590/JoSC.2018.10.1.02

Herrman, P., & Lin, K. (2015). Introduction to social quality theory. A new perspective on social development. *ResearchGate.* https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Peter-Herrmann-2/publication/280803251_SOCIAL_QUALITY_THEORY_A_New_Perspective_on_Social_Development/links/5a19c55a4585155c26ac566e/SOCIAL-QUALITY-THEORY-A-New-Perspective-on-Social-Development.pdf

Kamenski, T. W. (2004). Strategies for establishing trustworthiness in qualitative research. *Research Digest.* https://doi.org/10.1123/att.9.1.26

Mahadi, M., Alias, A., & Ismail, I. S. (2015). *The effects of situational interview and patterned behavior description interview on applicant reactions*. International Postgraduate Network and IWNENST Publishers. https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Alizi-Alias/publication/338643636_The_Effects_of_Situational_Interview_SI_and_Patterned_Behavior_Description_Interview_PBDI_on_Applicant_Reactions/links/5e21234c299bf1e1fab80260/The-Effects-of-Situational-Interview-SI-and-Patterned-Behavior-Description-Interview-PBDI-on-Applicant-Reactions

Mason, M. (2010). Sample size and saturation in Ph.D. studies using qualitative reviews. *Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, 11 (3). http://www.qualitative-research.net/index.php/fqs/article/view/1428/3027

Maxwell, J. A. (2005). Designing a qualitative study. In L. Bickman & D.J. Rog. *The SAGE Handbook of Applied Social Research Methods*, 214-253. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE. DOI:10.413519781483348858.77.

McCarthy, J. M., Bauer, T. N., Truxillo, D. M. Anderson, N. R., Costa, A. C., & Ahmed, S. M. (2017). Applicants perspectives during selection: A review addressing & so what? & what's new? and where to next? *Journal of Management, 43*(6). https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206316681846

McCarthy, J. M., Bauer, T. N., Truxillo, D. M., Campion, M. C., & Iddekinge, C. H. (2018). Improving the candidate experience: Tips for developing "Wise" Organizational hiring interventions. *Organizational Dynamics*, 47, 147-154. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.orgdyn.2018.05.004

McCarthy, K & Cheng, B. (2015). Through the looking lens of job candidates. ResearchGate. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/299519399

McCombes, S. (2019). How to create a research design. *Sribbr.* https://www.sccibbr.com/research-process/research-design/

Meixner, C., Kruck, S. E., & Madden, L. T. (2010). Inclusion of part-faculty candidates for the benefit of faculty candidates and students. *College Teaching*, 58:141-147. (PDF) Inclusion of Part-Time Faculty for the Benefit of Faculty and Students (researchgate.net)

Moratti, S. (2020). Do low-openness, low transparency, procedures in academic hiring disadvantage women? *Social Sciences*; 9 (89). Social Sciences | Free Full-Text | Do Low-Openness, Low-Transparency Procedures in Academic Hiring Disadvantage Women? (mdpi.com)

Morse, J. M. (2000). Determining sample size. *Qualitative Health Research*, 10(1), 3-5. Determining Sample Size - Janice M. Morse, 2000 (sagepub.com)

Nduagbo, S. K. (2018). African-born black women faculty candidates. Their lived Experience, challenge, and perceived barriers to success and progress in the US higher ed. (ProQuest No. 1074097)

Nikolaou, I., Bauer, T. N., & Truxillo, D. M. (2015). Applicants reactions to selection methods: An overview of recent research and suggestions for the future. *Contemporary Issues for Theory & Practice*. Hove, East Sussex, Routledge. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/283024870

Nikolaou, I., & Georgiou, K. (2018). Fairness reactions to the employment interview. *Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*. 34(2), 103-111. (PDF) Fairness Reactions to the Employment Interview (researchgate.net)

Parker, S., & Richards, E. (2020). The application and hiring process for community college faculty candidates. *Journal of Political Science Education*, 16(1), 108-113. Full article: The Application and Hiring Process for Community College Faculty (tandfonline.com)

Patton, M. Q. (2015). Qualitative research & evaluation methods: Integrating theory and practice (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Chapter 7, "*Qualitative Interviewing*" (421–518).

Raupp, J. C. (2018). Uncertainty. *The International Encyclopedia of Strategic Communication*. Wiley Online Library.

Ridder, H. G., & Hoon, C. (2009). Introduction to the special issue: Qualitative methods in research on human resource management. *SAGE Journals*. Doi.1688/1862-0000_zfp_2009-02-Ridder. Introduction to the Special Issue: Qualitative Methods

in Research on Human Resource Management - Hans-Gerd Ridder, Christina

Hoon, 2009 (sagepub.com)

Rozario, S. D., Venkatraman, S., & Abbas, A. (2019). Challenges in recruitment and

Selection process: An empirical study. *MDPI Journal*. 10(35). (PDF) Challenges

in Recruitment and Selection Process: An Empirical Study (researchgate.net)

Rubin, H. J., & Rubin, I. S. (2012). Qualitative interviewing: The art of hearing data. 3rd

ed. *SAGE*. Washington, D.C. ERIC - ED409600 - Qualitative Interviewing: The

Art of Hearing Data., 1995

Salgado, J. F., & Mososo, S. (2008). Personnel selection in industry and public

administration: From the traditional view to the strategic view. *ResearchGate*

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/291079163

Schmit, M. J., & Ryan, A. M. (2006). Applicant withdrawal: The role of test-taking

attitudes and racial differences. *Personnel Psychology*. 50(4). 855-876.

https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.1997.tb01485.x

Schreier, M. (2012). Qualitative content analysis in practice. Sage Publications.

https://doi.org/10.1075/ssol.3.1.15aaf.

Schuler, H. (1993). Social validity of selection situations: A concept and some empirical

results. *Personnel Selection and Assessment*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

(PDF) Social validity of selection situations: A concept and some empirical

results (researchgate.net)

Seidman, I. (n.d.). Interviewing as qualitative research: A guide for researchers in

education and the social sciences. 3rd ed. *Teachers College Press*. Colombia

University. NY.

Sekaquaptewa, D., Takahashi, K., Malley, J., Herzog, K., & Bliss, S. (2019). An evidence-based faculty candidates recruitment workshop influences departmental hiring practice perceptions among university faculty candidates. *Equality, Diversity, and Inclusion: An International Journal.* https://doi.org/10.1108/EDI-11-2018-2015

Stewart, A. J., & Valian, V.V. (2018). The inclusion academy: Achieving diversity and excellence. *MIT Press*, Cambridge, MA.

Van Ruler, B. (2018). Communication theory: An underrated pillar on which strategic communication rests. *International Journal of Strategic Communication*. 12(4). 367-381. DOI: 10.1080/155311x.2018.1452240.

Walker, J. M., & Moretti. D. (2018). Recent trends in preemployment assessment. *Society for Individual and Organizational Psychology.* Bowling Green., OH. TENDENCIASACTUALES.pdf (infocoponline.es)

Wright, C. B., & Vanderford, N. L. (2017). What faculty candidates hiring committees want. *Nature Biotechnology*, 35 (9), 885-887. What faculty hiring committees want | Request PDF (researchgate.net)

Yoder, J. (2017). I found a tenure track job. Here's what it took. *Community Chronicle*. https://community.chronicle.com

Zibarras, L. (2018). Applicant perceptions and reactions to selection. *Selection and Recruitment in the Healthcare Professions*, 193-221. London, UK.

Appendix A: Recruitment Flyer

Information
――――
Participation
――――
Transparent
――――
Communication
――――
Touch points of Interaction

Surveying Faculty Candidates' Lived Experience During the Preemployment Hiring Process

Types of Participants:
Faculty candidates of public and for-profit institutions, tenured/non-tenured with an advance degree i.e., Masters or Ph.D. and gone through a preemployment hiring process within the last three years that included:

-Job Search/Application Process
-Interview Process
-Onboarding Process
-Communication/Feedback Exchange
Which he/she experienced social touch points of interaction during the process:
-being informed
-allowed participation
-fair/open encounters
-communication/feedback efforts

Purpose of the Study:
The purpose of the study is to discover the lived experiences of faculty by surveying the candidates' recall of the preemployment hiring process.

Survey via SurveyMonkey
Structured in-depth face to face, virtual/non-virtual, and phone interviews using interview guide
Audio recorded
Need 6-10 participants (Non-Compensated)
45 to 60-minute interview/survey
Follow-up, if needed; 10-15 minutes
Transcript review; 45 minutes

Note: Information will be securely stored for confidentiality.

Participation is voluntary.

Information
——————

Participation
——————

Transparent
——————

Communication
——————

Touch points of Interaction

Surveying Faculty Candidates' Lived Experience During the Preemployment Hiring Process

Types of Participants:
Faculty candidates of public and for-profit institutions, tenured/non-tenured with an advance degree i.e., Masters or Ph.D. and gone through a preemployment hiring process within the last three years that included:

-Job Search/Application Process
-Interview Process
-Onboarding Process
-Communication/Feedback Exchange
Which he/she experienced social touch points of interaction during the process:
-being informed
-allowed participation
-fair/open encounters
-communication/feedback efforts

Purpose of the Study:
The purpose of the study is to discover the lived experiences of faculty by surveying the candidates' recall of the preemployment hiring process.

Survey via SurveyMonkey
Structured in-depth face to face, virtual/non-virtual, and phone interviews using interview guide
Audio recorded
Need 6-10 participants (Non-Compensated)
45 to 60-minute interview/survey
Follow-up, if needed; 10-15 minutes
Transcript review; 45 minutes

Note: Information will be securely stored for confidentiality.

Participation is voluntary.

Appendix B: Interview Questions

Note:
And audio recorded dialog will be conducted for accurate elaboration and clarification, along with identifying suggestions/feedback on what can be done different for a better candidate experience.

Information Questions:
Adequate information throughout the process
1. During the experience was there feedback provided plentiful; frequent times during and after the process?
2. During the experience do you feel you were treated with respectful actions/behaviors with information provided?
3. During the experience was there honesty in the information provided?
4. During the experience was the information supportive in nature i.e., provided direction with the feedback?
5. During the experience was the information comprehensive i.e., understandable/clear?

Participation Questions:
Opportunity where you felt involved/included
1. During the experience do you feel the information provided was useful?
2. After the experience do you feel the information provided was useful?
3. During the experience would you say your experience/interactions were job-related?
4. During the experience was there an opportunity to interact within the actual role of the position/task domain?
5. During the experience was there an opportunity to interact within the organizational environment?
6. During the experience as there an opportunity to perform/demonstrate tasks related to the position?

Transparency Questions:
Was the process unambiguous
1. During the experience was there inclusion in the decision making/response to decisions made i.e. transparency?
2. During the experience do you feel the process/procedures were consistent; used for each candidate?
3. During the experience do you feel explanations/justifications for procedures/decisions were effectively applied?

4.During the experience do you feel there was consistency in the administrative efforts i.e., standard test, questioning, materials, and process?
5.During the experience do you feel there was biasness in the process?
6.During the experience do you feel fairness was always applied?
7.After the experience do you feel fairness was applied?

Communication Questions:
Effective feedback provided during and after the process
1.During the experience were you given the opportunity to challenge/respond to any of the results/outcome?
2.During the experience did you feel timely feedback was provided?
3.During the experience was there two-way communications/interactions i.e. opportunity to have your comments considered?
4.During the experience did you feel the administrator(s) were honest when communicating?

Touch point Questions:
1.Did you feel the process lack effective touch points of interaction during the process?
2.During the job search experience was the process ensured with ease of access to the information?
3.During completing the job application were the instructions clear and concise?
4.During the process what type of communications did you experience i.e., text, email, phone call, all of the above, none of the above?
5.During the interview were you able to experience/learn the organization?
6.During onboarding were you equipped with a starter kit/information to get acclimated to perform the duties/responsibilities of the position?
7.What analysis can you provide on your experience and how it can contribute to improving the candidate experience?

Other Questions:
1.Check all which you experienced during the preemployment hiring process:
-Job Search
-Job Application
-Interview
-Assessment
-Onboarding
-Communications, Feedback, and Analysis
2.Tell me about the experience(s) that lack touch points of interaction within the preemployment hiring process?
3.What is your view of the institution prior to entering the preemployment hiring process?

4. What is your view of the institution after the preemployment hiring process (individual ending point)?

5.How would you rank the preemployment hiring process?

6.What concerns do you have with the preemployment hiring process?

7.Do you feel the concerns with the process can be corrected/enhanced for a better candidate experience?

Appendix C: Survey

Note:
A scale rating method will be used to address the questions:
5-Strongly Agree
4-Agree
3-Neither Agree nor Disagree
2-Disagree
1-Strongly Disagree

Survey Questions:
Adequate information throughout the process
1.During the experience was there feedback provided plentiful; frequent times during and after the process?
5-Strongly Agree
4-Agree
3- Neither Agree nor Disagree
2-Disagree
1-Strongly Disagree

2.During the experience do you feel you were treated with respectful actions/behaviors with information provided?
5-Strongly Agree
4-Agree
3- Neither Agree nor Disagree
2-Disagree
1-Strongly Disagree

3.During the experience was there honesty in the information provided?
5-Strongly Agree
4-Agree
3- Neither Agree nor Disagree
2-Disagree
1-Strongly Disagree

4.During the experience was the information supportive in nature i.e. provided direction with the feedback?
5-Strongly Agree
4-Agree
3- Neither Agree nor Disagree
2-Disagree
1-Strongly Disagree

5.During the experience was the information comprehensive i.e., understandable/clear?
5-Strongly Agree
4-Agree
3-Neither Agree nor Disagree
2-Disagree
1-Strongly Disagree

Participation Questions:
Opportunity where you felt involved/included
1.During the experience do you feel the information provided was useful?
5-Strongly Agree
4-Agree
3-Neither Agree nor Disagree
2-Disagree
1-Strongly Disagree
2.After the experience do you feel the information provided was useful?
5-Strongly Agree
4-Agree
3-Neither Agree nor Disagree
2-Disagree
1-Strongly Disagree

3.During the experience would you say your experience/interactions were job-related?
5-Strongly Agree
4-Agree
3-Neither Agree nor Disagree
2-Disagree
1-Strongly Disagree

4.During the experience was there an opportunity to interact within the actual role of the position/task domain?
5-Strongly Agree
4-Agree
3-Neither Agree nor Disagree
2-Disagree
1-Strongly Disagree

5.During the experience was there an opportunity to interact within the organizational environment?
5-Strongly Agree
4-Agree

3-Neither Agree nor Disagree
2-Disagree
1-Strongly Disagree
6.During the experience as there an opportunity to perform/demonstrate tasks related to the position?
5-Strongly Agree
4-Agree
3-Neither Agree nor Disagree
2-Disagree
1-Strongly Disagree

Transparency Questions:
Was the process unambiguous
1.During the experience was there inclusion in the decision making/response to decisions made i.e. transparency?
5-Strongly Agree
4-Agree
3-Neither Agree nor Disagree
2-Disagree
1-Strongly Disagree

2.During the experience do you feel the process/procedures were consistent; used for each candidate?
5-Strongly Agree
4-Agree
3-Neither Agree nor Disagree
2-Disagree
1-Strongly Disagree

3.During the experience do you feel explanations/justifications for procedures/decisions were effectively applied?
5-Strongly Agree
4-Agree
3-Neither Agree nor Disagree
2-Disagree
1-Strongly Disagree

4.During the experience do you feel there was consistency in the administrative efforts i.e., standard test, questioning, materials, and process?
5-Strongly Agree
4-Agree
3-Neither Agree nor Disagree

2-Disagree
1-Strongly Disagree

5.During the experience do you feel there was biasness in the process?
5-Strongly Agree
4-Agree
3-Neither Agree nor Disagree
2-Disagree
1-Strongly Disagree

6.During the experience do you feel fairness was always applied?
5-Strongly Agree
4-Agree
3-Neither Agree nor Disagree
2-Disagree
1-Strongly Disagree

7.After the experience do you feel fairness was applied?
5-Strongly Agree
4-Agree
3-Neither Agree nor Disagree
2-Disagree
1-Strongly Disagree

Communication Questions:
Effective feedback provided during and after the process
1.During the experience were you given the opportunity to challenge/respond to any of the results/outcome?
5-Strongly Agree
4-Agree
3-Neither Agree nor Disagree
2-Disagree
1-Strongly Disagree

2.During the experience did you feel timely feedback was provided?
5-Strongly Agree
4-Agree
3-Neither Agree nor Disagree
2-Disagree
1-Strongly Disagree

3.During the experience was there two-way communications/interactions i.e. opportunity to have your comments considered?
5-Strongly Agree
4-Agree
3-Neither Agree nor Disagree
2-Disagree
1-Strongly Disagree

4.During the experience did you feel the administrator(s) were honest when communicating?
5-Strongly Agree
4-Agree
3-Neither Agree nor Disagree
2-Disagree
1-Strongly Disagree

Touch point Questions:
1.Did you feel the process lack effective touch points of interaction during the process?
5-Strongly Agree
4-Agree
3-Neither Agree nor Disagree
2-Disagree
1-Strongly Disagree

2.During the job search experience was the process ensured with ease of access to the information?
5-Strongly Agree
4-Agree
3-Neither Agree nor Disagree
2-Disagree
1-Strongly Disagree

3.During completing the job application were the instructions clear and concise?
5-Strongly Agree
4-Agree
3-Neither Agree nor Disagree
2-Disagree
1-Strongly Disagree

4.During the process did you experience the listed types of communications i.e., text, email, phone call, and/or letter?
5-Strongly Agree

4-Agree
3-Neither Agree nor Disagree
2-Disagree
1-Strongly Disagree

5.During the interview were you able to experience/learn the organization?
5-Strongly Agree
4-Agree
3-Neither Agree nor Disagree
2-Disagree
1-Strongly Disagree

6.During onboarding were you equipped with a starter kit/information to get acclimated to perform the duties/responsibilities of the position?
5-Strongly Agree
4-Agree
3-Neither Agree nor Disagree
2-Disagree
1-Strongly Disagree
7.Woud you want your analysis provided to contribute to improving the candidate experience?
5-Strongly Agree
4-Agree
3-Neither Agree nor Disagree
2-Disagree
1-Strongly Disagree

Other Questions:
1.Select what you experienced during the preemployment hiring process:
-Job Search
-Job Application
-Interview
-Assessment
-Onboarding
-Communications, Feedback, and Analysis
-Other

2.Did the experience(s) lack touch points of interaction within the preemployment hiring process?
5-Strongly Agree
4-Agree
3-Neither Agree nor Disagree
2-Disagree

1-Strongly Disagree

3.Was your view of the institution prior to entering the preemployment hiring process positive?
5-Strongly Agree
4-Agree
3-Neither Agree nor Disagree
2-Disagree
1-Strongly Disagree

4. Was your view of the institution after the preemployment hiring process (individual ending point) positive?
5-Strongly Agree
4-Agree
3-Neither Agree nor Disagree
2-Disagree
1-Strongly Disagree

5.Is the preemployment hiring process effective?
5-Strongly Agree
4-Agree
3-Neither Agree nor Disagree
2-Disagree
1-Strongly Disagree

6.Do you have with the preemployment hiring process?
5-Strongly Agree
4-Agree
3-Neither Agree nor Disagree
2-Disagree
1-Strongly Disagree

7.Do you feel the concerns with the process can be corrected/enhanced for a better candidate experience?
5-Strongly Agree
4-Agree
3-Neither Agree nor Disagree
2-Disagree
1-Strongly Disagree

Appendix D: Survey Demographic Information

All participants please complete the following for research data purposes.

Gender:	Male
	Female
	Other
Profession:	Adjunct Faculty
	Assistant Professor
	Associate Professor
	Professor
	Other
Faculty Type:	Tenure
	Non-Tenure
	Other
Institution Type:	Public
	For-Profit
	Two Year
	Four Year
Number of Years as a Faculty Member:	1-3
	4-6
	7-9
	10 or more
Age:	25-34
	35-44
	45-54
	55-64
	65+
Highest Level of Education Completed:	Masters
	Ph.D.
	Other

Identify Type(s) of Position(s) Applied:

_____
_____
_____

Identify Area(s) of Teaching Experience:

_____
_____
_____

Appendix E: Experiences of Six Participants

Code #1 Communication

" No, did not ask questions; an opportunity not given. No feedback; just doing

fine statement. …" in Interview #1 Official Transcript 03023021.docx

" More interaction of what is expected to do and how. Being well informed, more

communication with …" in Interview #1 Official Transcript 03023021.docx

"The only thing that I would say, I feel was lacking would have been the

consistent communication and…" in Interview #2 Official Transcription

03032021.docx

"Provided there was no outcome or results provided; so, no …" in Interview #3

Official Transcription 02122021.docx

"Yes, at the time, I believe that it did lack in adequate touch points in pretty much

all the categories …" in Interview #3 Official Transcription 02122021.docx

"I'm not knowing what's behind the curtain; the ambiguity and lack of

communication …" in Interview #3 Official Transcription 02122021.docx

Code #2 Informative

"Did I understand the information provided, no. Somewhat, a without being really

prepared for what was ex…" in Interview #1 Official Transcript 03023021.docx

"No, I was only given the syllabus of what was expected out of the course. And

the first course that…" in Interview #1 Official Transcript 03023021.docx

"More interaction of what is expected to do and how. Being well informed, more

communication with …" in Interview #1 Official Transcript 03023021.docx

"In most interviews that I have attended that's been one of the most unfortunate

things that there …" in Interview #2 Official Transcription 03032021.docx

"I think some may have not been as informative. It was just kind of you're going

to do this …" in Interview #4 Official Transcript 03042021.docx

"No, not overall; no. So initially if I had to pick one it would be information…" in

Interview #5 Official Transcript 03052021.docx

Code #3 Participation

"The only interaction that I received was my request; self-initiated. So, it was a

long time between…" in Interview #1 Official Transcript 03023021.docx

"More interaction of what is expected to do and how.…" in Interview #1 Official

Transcript 03023021.docx

"No, I would not say they were job-related; they were more content-related. We

did not…" in Interview #6 Official Transcript 03152021.docx

Code #4 Transparency

"No. Not adequate because I was not really sure who my supervisor was until I

think after the report…" in Interview #1 Official Transcript 03023021.docx

"No, not included in the decision-making process or response to the decisions;

they were behind the …" in Interview #3 Official Transcription 02122021.docx

Code #5 Other

"More interaction of what is expected to do and how. Being well informed, more

communication with …" in Interview #1 Official Transcript 03023021.docx

"If they put forth a survey/questionnaire to redirect how things are

done…" in Interview #1 Official Transcript 03023021.docx

"Maybe have like one specific person for all the touch points basically while guiding them through …" in Interview #4 Official Transcript 03042021.docx

"I would say having one person to do all of the contact: instead of multiple people. I do; yeah, I …" in Interview #4 Official Transcript 03042021.docx

"Probably being more college-specific. And I think when you go back to the communication things kind…" in Interview #6 Official Transcript 03152021.docx

Appendix F: Audit Outline

Closing Dates	Key Step/Applications
12/3/2020	Proposal prepared for URR review
12/5/2020	Proposal URR Approval
12/7/2020	Proposal Oral Defense
12/15/2020	Proposal Oral Defense Approval
12/29/2020	Sent IRB Application
1/12/2021	IRB Application returned for revisions
1/20/2021	Second submission of IRB Application
1/27/2021	IRB Appliation returned for revisions
2/3/2021	IRB Application resubmitted
2/4/2021	IRB Application Approved
2/5/2021	Recruitment Begin Begin Data Collection
2/7/2021	Interviews Begin
2/10/2021	Surveys Begin
3/6/2021	Interviewed Transcribed
3/8/2021	Interviews Transcriptions forwarded for approval per participants
3/10/2021	Data Analysis conducted via Atlas-ti & Schuler Social Validity Theory
3/15/2021	Chapter 4 submitted for approval
3/17/2021	Chapter 4 returned for revisions
3/24/2021	Chapters 1-4 submitted for approval

3/26/2021	Chapters 1-4 returned for corrections; accept changes
3/28/2021	Chapters 1-4 resubmitted for approval
3/31/2021	Received feedback from Committee Member: Dr. Dailey
4/1/2021	Received feedback from Committee Chair: Dr. Asfari
4/3/2021	Chapters 1-4 resubmitted for approval
4/5/2021	Chapters 1-4 Approved
4/6/2021	Chapter 5 submitted for review & approval
4/7/2021	Received feedback from Committee on Ch.5
4/8/2021	Corrections made to Ch.5 & combined with chapters 1-4
4/9/2021	Chapters 1-5 submitted for review & approval

Appendix G: Codes and Themes

Codes	Themes
Communication	Provide informative and timely feedback.
	Two-way communication.
	Honesty in communicating.
	Effective feedback.
	Offered
Informative	Opportunity for adequate information.
	Organizational effectiveness.
	Helpful information.
Participation	Allowed to perform.
	Adequate interactions.
	Inclusion.
Transparency	Fairness.
	Unambiguous.
	Biasness.
Other	Enhancement
	Suggestions
	Candidate experience
	Touch points