

My Discussion

Nowadays everyone knows how a job interview goes: the applicant ~~is handing hands~~ in his/her application documents, and ~~when-if~~ everything goes well ~~the result should be an invitation for a job interview, he will be invited to a job interview~~. Until this ~~moment~~ ~~now~~ the employers ~~have~~ ~~has had~~ to trust the correctness of ~~the applicant's~~ documents and statements. Today, it is common ~~to find~~ that ~~many~~ people ~~have~~ exaggerated with ~~regard to~~ their knowledge, their past experience, with the length of their ~~former~~ employment, etc. ~~So the~~ With a Structured Telephone Reference Check (STRC) employers ~~has have~~ the ~~chance~~ opportunity to ~~get gain~~ an external point of view, ~~which should in order to make~~ ~~asure~~ that the job will be given to the most qualified person. Therefore, the ~~best possibility would be to make a STRC could be considered a vital selection tool. On the one hand,~~ ~~t~~This method would ~~on the one hand~~ minimize the risk for ~~the employers~~ of hiring a “~~liar~~” ~~person under false pretences~~, and on the other hand, it would also increase the chances of ~~gaining employment~~ for ~~the~~ honest applicants. ~~Because~~ ~~This is because~~ ~~thereby in this case at~~ the first impression would not be the only ~~factor to decided~~ ~~deciding~~ ~~factor in~~ the ~~selection~~ process. The bottom line is that STRC should represent the interests of both sides as it contains three important points of views: conscientiousness, agreeableness and customer ~~focus~~.

They ~~authors have~~ revised the validity coefficient of the STRC. Doing this, the only source from which they could ~~get obtain~~ data's is the direct range restriction on the predictor resulting from short listing, based on the STRC. ~~For~~ ~~When~~ estimating the standard deviations of total STRC scores, they ~~receive~~ ~~achieved~~ 1.04. Using that, the validity ~~raises about~~ ~~increases by~~ .01 ~~point~~, which is very small. ~~So in~~ ~~Within~~ this range there is no ~~more~~ possibility ~~to for~~ ~~correcting~~ the validity. But they take the interrater reliability of supervisory performance ratings ~~for granted~~ ($r_{yy} = .52$) and corrected the criterion unreliability and direct range restriction on the predictor, so that they get a validity estimate of .36.

However, the ~~method of~~ STRC ~~not only also~~ has ~~positive~~ ~~impacts~~ ~~negative~~ ~~attributes~~: ~~for the~~ ~~organisation~~ ~~organization~~ it is not just a question of money and time but ~~also of effort to~~ ~~must spend time and money in their search to find and train~~ a qualified specialist for handling telephone reference checks. It is the future employee who could suffer more from the negative aspects of ~~the this method~~ (especially by STRC) because the previous employer could harm the good reputation of the applicant by making disadvantageous comments.

In my opinion it is important to make reference checks but they should ~~be designed to be job-relevant, cost effective, and~~ ~~fair~~ ~~stay in the line with the budget, the effort and the~~ ~~humanness~~.

Comment [p1]: Please state who you mean here by “both sides”. Also, you have not mentioned the role of the referee here. In addition, the things you have listed here are not “points of view”. They are job relevant personality/interpersonal dimensions, selected by the researchers as factors to design the STRC around, and later measure. This sentence does not make any sense.

Comment [p2]: This sentence is still worded rather awkwardly and it is difficult to determine what you were trying to say here. Please go back and re-think the critical elements of this sentence, and try wording it in another way.

Comment [p3]: Do you know what this phrase “take for granted” means? I don’t believe they have “taken” the ratings “for granted”. Perhaps “ignored” is a better word, but you should come up with something more precise if that still is not what you mean to say.

Comment [p4]: I think this is what you meant to say. Otherwise, you can change it again, but I really didn’t understand what you were first trying to say, so it will have to be worded much better.