Interviewers Practices and Perceptions During the Job Interview for an EFL Assistant Lecturer Position

Tiaiba Imane [1], Nedjai Mebtouche Fatma Zohra [2]

1 - Abou El-kassim Saadallah -Algiers 2 imane.tiaiba@univ-alger2.dz

2- Ecole Supérieur des Beaux Arts –ESBA- mebtouche.nedjaifz.esba@gmail.com

ABSTRACT: **This cross-disciplinary study seeks to investigate interviewers' practices and perceptions during the faculty-hiring interview for an EFL assistant professor/ lecturer position. Data is collected through ethnographic notes, a questionnaire with the members of the hiring committees, and the analysis of official HR documents. Results revealed that current practices during faculty hiring interviews are somewhat an amorphous process namely in terms of procedures to conduct and evaluate interviews. Thus, stakeholders in higher education institutions should reconsider selection criteria for more validity of the job interview**

KEYWORDS: faculty hiring committee; job interview; anchored rating scale; interviewers' perceptions; faculty position, EFL assistant lecturer

ملخص

تسعى هذه الدراسة إلى التحقيق في ممارسات أعضاء لجنة المحاورة وتصوراتهم خلال مقابلة توظيف الأساتذة المساعدين في قسم اللغة الإنجليزية . تم جمع البيانات من خلال الملاحظات ، واستبيان مع أعضاء لجان التوظيف ، وتحليل وثائق الموارد البشرية الرسمية. كشفت النتائج أن الممارسات الحالية أثناء مقابلات التوظيف هي عملية غير متبلورة إلى حد ما من حيث طريقة إجراء وتقييم المقابلات. وبالتالي ، يجب على أصحاب المصلحة في مؤسسات التعليم العالي إعادة النظر في معايير الاختيار لمزيد من صلاحية مقابلة العمل.

كلمات مفتاحية: مقابلة العمل، أعضاء لجنة المحاورة ، توظيف الأساتذة المساعدين ، مقابلات التوظيف ، تقييم المقابلات.

corresponding author: Tiaiba Imane: i.tiaiba@univ-setif2.dz

1. Introduction

The employment of post-graduates at Algerian universities continues to be one of the major interests to the different stakeholders in Higher Education and Scientific Research Ministry especially for applicants and faculties. This is due to the large numbers of applicants with respect to the short hiring windows, over the last years after the introduction of the LMD reform (Tiaiba & Nadjai, 2020)

The hiring process for an assistant lecturer position at Algerian universities follows a number of procedures starting from streaming applicants on the basis of their qualifications and matching with the requirements of the position, evaluating their Curriculum Vitae (henceforth CVs) or resumes in terms of the history of publications and relevant scientific contribution both in national/international events, their related work experiences, and eventually applicants' performance during the job interview (Circular N°7, 2011). When applicants have similar CVs in terms of qualification and experience as it would be the case of novice post-graduates (with Magister or PhD degree), their performance during the job interview could make the difference in getting the position or not. Generally, job interview can be regarded as a form of a gatekeeping activity that is centered between two parties: first, the interviewers, in the current case the members in the faculty hiring committees, asking questions and trying to appraise the performance or answers of applicants; second, the interviewees representing candidates for an assistant lecturer position who are answering, in turn, questions and trying to get positive feedback from their interviewers. Both parties' interaction runs in accordance with the selection criteria set by the HR office at university as a major stakeholder in making the final hiring decision. For many applicants, current practices in faculty hiring interviews are somewhat ambiguous in evaluating the performance of candidates. A prior survey to this study that investigated the perceptions of pre-service applicants, precisely EFL doctoral students from different Algerian universities, about the faculty-hiring interview revealed

significant unconsciousness regarding selection and evaluation procedures, in addition to applicants' immediate needs to enhance communication skills for managing interviews successfully (Tiaiba & Nadjai, 2020, pp. 196-197). To link between what applicants expect and what faculties aspire, Tiaiba & Nadjai called for exploring the interviewer's practices and perceptions during the faculty-hiring interview in relation to HR documents and regulations (p.198). In an attempt to answer that call, the present paper focuses on the faculty-hiring interview through the lens of interviewers at two Algerian universities. A key contribution of this work is to raise the awareness of all the stakeholders in the faculty hiring process to rethink of the current practices in conducting and evaluating the interview and to connect HR practices with academic requirements for more validity of the interview.

In line with the research aim, the current paper poses the following research questions:

1. In terms of practices, how is the faculty-hiring interview conducted and evaluated for an assistant lecturer position?

2. In terms of perceptions, what are the requirements of an assistant lecturer position according to FHC and HR documents?

2. Review of the Literature

21.. Faculty Hiring Interview

From the human resources perspective, the faculty-hiring interview can be regarded as a form of selection device to assess applicants' performance and their suitability for a certain position or job (Macan, 2009). The faculty-hiring interview differ from other sorts of interviews in the sense that it is conducted in an academic institution, in the case at hand ' university', in which the requirements of the position are mainly associated with academic tasks like teaching,

doing research, etc. The faculty-hiring interview can be also viewed as a 'gatekeeping activity'. Gatekeeping encounters, as defined by Schiffrin (1994, p.146), "are asymmetric speech situations during which a person who represents a social institution seeks to gain information about the lives, beliefs, and practices of people outside of that institution in order to warrant the granting of an institutional privilege." In this situation (interview) a gatekeeper (interviewer) makes a judgment regarding gatekeepees' (applicants) suitability for a position offered by an institution, and then grant a hiring decision to join as new members of the institution (Erickson & Shultz, 1982). The way in which the gatekeepees inform their 'lives, beliefs, and practices', as well as how they 'perform' (Scheuer, 2001) and 'present' (Lipovsky, 2006, p. 1151) these in 'fluent, coherent and consistent' manners in terms of an institutional framework, are continuously evaluated by gatekeepers during the interview process which can be either structured or not (Campbell & Roberts, 2007, as cited in Choi, 2014).

2.2 Structured and Unstructured Interviews

As mentioned earlier, the employment interview, can be either structured or unstructured (Dipboye, 1994). Interviewer judgments based on structured interviews are more predictive of job performance than those from unstructured interviews (Macan, 2009). Actually, a great number of quantitative and qualitative reviews of the employment interview research have concluded that adding structure to the interview process may enhance the reliability and validity of interviewer evaluations eg : (Macan , 2009; Levashina, 2014). Major differences are highlighted in Table.1

Table 1. Structured Versus Unstructured Interviews

Structured Interview	Unstructured Interview
*Applicants are asked the same questions in the same order. *Applicants are evaluated using a common rating scale. *Interviewers are in agreement on acceptable answers.	*Applicants may be asked different questions. *A standardized rating scale is not required. *Interviewers do not need to agree on acceptable answers.

Source : adapted from (Campion et al., 1997)

2.2.1 Definition of the Structure

The structure in a job interview can be defined as 'any enhancement of the interview that is destined to raise psychometric properties by increasing standardization or otherwise helping the interviewer in determining what questions to ask or how to appraise responses (Campion et al., 1997). The structure can be also seen as ' the degree of discretion that an interviewer is allowed in conducting the interview' (Huffcut and Arthur 1994: 186). Two dimensions can be, henceforth, proposed : (a) standardization of interview questions and (b) standardization of response scoring. The process of developing a structured employment interview involves a number of procedures that starts with job analysis and extends to other steps as suggested by Dipboye (1994, p. 80) 'The usual recommendation is to start with a formal job analysis to determine the knowledge, skills, and abilities required of incumbents and the criteria for measuring their performance'. Hence, developing a structured interview includes a number of steps: (a) conducting a job analysis to identify the job characteristics (i.e., job tasks, duties, and responsibilities) and the competencies/knowledge, skills, abilities required to perform the job successfully;   (b) determining the competencies to be assessed by the interview; (c) choosing the interview format and develop questions; (d) develop rating scales to evaluate candidates ; (e) create interview probes; (f) pilot-test the interview questions; (g) create the

interviewer's guide; (h) and document the development of the interview process.

There have been a number of researchers who have attempted to introduce adequate typology of interview structure. The most comprehensive one, was that framework developed by Campion et al., (1997) in which he suggested 15 components grouped under two categories: content and evaluation dimensions.

.3 Job Analysis for a Faculty Position's Requirements 2

The goal of a job analysis is to identify the requirements of the job and the competencies that are necessary to be performed. In many instances, a new job analysis will not need to be conducted; however, the critical requirements and competencies should be re-confirmed by subject matter experts (SMEs) in the concerned institution or organization (Dipboye, 1994; Kell et al., 2017). The process of job analysis seeks to identify: (a) the job tasks and responsibilities; (b) the required competencies to perform the job tasks and   responsibilities successfully; (c) which of those competencies are required upon entry to the job.

This process is needed in the development of a reliable anchored rating scale that would assist interviewers in evaluating the performance of applicants during the interview based the documents of HR office and articles of the Official journal related to assistant lecturers duties and responsibilities.

2.4 Development of Anchored Rating Scales

Anchored rating scales (ARSs) have been developed to help interviewers with applicant evaluation. Standardized, anchored scales to rate responses to each question comprise one element of interview structure (Campion, Palmer & Campion, 1997). Therefore, ARSs can facilitate the complex judgmental tasks by providing behavioral, descriptive, or evaluative examples to illustrate points on the rating

scale. To evaluate responses, the interviewer matches the applicant's responses with the written anchors for each question (Levashina et al., 2014). Previous studies (Taylor and Small 2002; Maurer 2002; Reilly et al., 2006) demonstrated that ARSs enhance reliability and validity of structured interviews by controlling different biases, making the same job-related information salient to all interviewers, and helping to ensure that applicant responses are rated consistently across interviewers.

Using a common rating scale for all candidates is a key component of the structured interview procedure (Campion, 1997). The first step in the development of a standardized rating scale for a behavioral interview is specifying the range of proficiency for each competency. This can be done following a procedure as identified by Kell et al., (2017): (a) deciding on *one* proficiency-level range for all competencies (e.g., a range of 1-5 with 5 being the most proficient and 1 being the least proficient); (b) Creating at least three proficiency levels, but aiming for five to seven levels; (d) labeling at least three proficiency levels (e.g., unsatisfactory, satisfactory, and superior). Then, interviewers could include specific types of questions during the interview (eg:situational and behavioural question types)

2.5 Types of Question in Employment Interviews

2.5.1 Situational Versus Behavioural Questions

The types of questions used in structured interviews can be classified under two major varieties: situational and past behaviour. As for situational questions (SQs), candidates are presented with hypothetical work situations and asked to describe how they would respond to those situations (Latham, et al., 1980) Regarding past behavior questions (PBQs), applicants are presented with work situations they likely experienced in the past and are asked to describe how they

responded to those situations previously (Janz, 1982; Motowidlo et al., 1992). PBQs function under the assumption that past behavior is one of the best predictors of future behavior (the behavioral consistency principle; Schmitt & Ostroff, 1986; Wernimont & Campbell, 1968).

Previous research has shown that PBQs generally yeild higher validity coefficients than SQs (Taylor & Small, 2002). Moreover, although findings are not totally consistent, PBQ scores tend to be more strongly related to personality and job experience, while SQ scores tend to be more strongly related to cognitive ability or job knowledge (Levashina et al., 2014).

Drawing on the theoretical background discussed above, a developed framework is utilized in this study to describe the process of conducting and evaluating the faculty hiring interview according to HR practices and is adapted from the models of Campion et al., (1997), Levashina et al., (2014) in terms of the content dimension; and Kell et al., (2017) for ARS development in terms of evaluation dimension. Table.3 demonstrates the major points of analysis in the developed model.

Table.2 Conceptual Framework for FHI Analysis

Content dimension		Evaluation dimension	
Adapted Framework Campion, et all (1997), Livashina, et al., (2014)	*Description*	*ARS according to Kell, et al., (2017)*	*Description*
.Conducting a job 1 analysis for the requirement of the position: • tasks, • duties, • and responsibilities • competencies • skills, • abilities required to perform the job successfully) 2. Defining the target skills, competencies for the interview . Developing 3 interview questions according to the targeted skills . Using a common 4 anchored rating scale . provide training 5 for interviewers	In the case of faculty hiring , is there any search committee conducted to prepare for the interview. * What skills and competencies are required? * The type the questions of the interview (types of questions: behavioural,) * the evaluation sheet to evaluate the performance of candidates	1.deciding on *one* proficiency-level range for all competencies (e.g., a range of 1-5 with 5 being the most proficient and 1 being the least proficient) 2. Creating at least three proficiency levels, but aiming for five to seven levels 3) labeling at least three proficiency levels (e.g., unsatisfactory, satisfactory, and superior).	***Eg: Question 1:*** *Fit with the University Can you tell us why this University would be the best place for you to further develop your research (and/or teaching) activities?* (answers are rating according to the following scale) • *1 Poor* • *2 Fairly poor* • *3.Acceptable* • *Good* • *5 Outstanding*

3.Method

To investigate how is the faculty hiring interview conducted and evaluated for an EFL assistant lecturer position, according to the adapted framework of analysis (Campion et al., 1997; Levashina et al., 2014; and Kell et al., 2017), data is obtained through ethnographic notes collected by the researcher during authentic faculty hiring interviews held at two universities: Setif 2 and Msila, a questionnaire with 12 members in the faculty hiring committees from both universities, and analysis of three documents obtained from the HR office at university that relate to the hiring interview, including: Circular (N7 , 2011, pp. 2-3) ; Official Gazette (N23, 2008, p. 22) ; and a sample of interview evaluation sheet (anchored rating scale , 2018).

3.1 Participants

The study at hand took place at two Algerian universities 'Msila and Setif 2 'precisely in the faculty of Letters and Languages. Initially, the researcher audited authentic hiring interviews for an assistant lecturers position after the consent of the Dean of Letters and Languages Faculty at both universities, was obtained. Participants in this questionnaire consist of lecturers from the Department of the English language and literature who served as members in the faculty hiring committee during the employment interview to recruit assistant lecturers. Due to their limited number, all members who have served in the panel of interviews were included. Thus a total of 12 subjects were involved.

To know whether FHI is conducted by subject matter experts (SME) in the department of the English Language and Literature (DELL), interviewers' profile is presented in terms of academic rank, teaching experience, field of expertise, and experience among faculty hiring committee. With regard to academic rank, most interviewers were assistant lecturers A (M.A A) with 59%, followed by associate lecturers A (MC.A) with 18% and associate lecturers B (MC.B), and

Professors with 9% for each category. As for interviewers teaching experience, 46% of respondents had been teaching for more than 2O years followed by 36% of participants whose experience was between 5-10 years, then 9% of them between 10-15years and 9% experience teaching between15-20 years. It can be noticed than both experienced and inexperienced teachers were involved in the faculty hiring committee. With regard to interviewers field of expertise or research area, 27% was TEFL and applied linguistics and the same rate also was for Literature. ESP and Civilisation represented 18% for each category, and a rate of 9% for TEFL and Educational Psychology. Consequently, interviewers had various research areas, therefore a broad prospect could be drawn. For respondents' experience among faculty hiring committees, 41% of them participated more than five times; 9% of them served four times; 18% participated three times; 18% participated twice; also 18% participated once. It can be viewed from the background data that the members in faculty hiring appointment is not restricted to high ranked experienced professors only, in other words SMEs, but include, in many cases professors with relatively short teaching experience. This could be related either to availability of professors at both departments or simply linked to the Dean's choice of members.

3.2 Description of the Research Instruments

3.2.1 The Questionnaire

This study uses a questionnaire that is compiled by the researcher based on the adapted framework of study. It was opted for this tool due to the cross-disciplinary nature of the study in which respondents need to be given prompts and definitions of key concepts in order to gather more reliable data (to see their opinions and practices in relation to the theoretical background of the study); the possibility to use different types of questions (open-ended, close-ended) and Likert scales to yield deep insights of the issue at hand; the possibility for respondents to answer it easily and to keep record of it; and for cost

effectiveness as the study is conducted in different geographical areas (Msila and Setif)

3.2.2 Documents Analysis

Document analysis can be regarded as a systematic procedure for reviewing or evaluating documents both printed and electronic (computer-based and Internet-transmitted) material. Similar to other analytical methods in qualitative research, document analysis requires that data be examined and interpreted in order to elicit meaning, gain understanding, and develop empirical knowledge (Corbin & Strauss, 2008, as cited in Bowen, 2009). The rational for document analysis is sometimes to be used in combination with other qualitative research methods as a means of triangulation. In this study, document analysis is used to account for the practices of the faculty-hiring committees in relation to official articles and regularities.

4. Data Analysis

4.1 FHC Practices in Developing the Interview

With regards to participants' answers relating to the way the faculty-hiring interview is conducted and evaluated, all the interviewers said that the FHC was appointed by the Dean. As for interviewers' answers to conducting any job analysis, or search committees, for the requirements before the interview, 42% of them said 'No' while 25% were undecided and 33% said 'Yes'. It was noticed that the participants who answered with 'Yes' belonged to the same university. When interviewers were asked whether the current ARS or evaluation sheet, suggested by the HR office at university was reliable in evaluating applicant performance, 58% answered 'No' and only 17% said yes while the rest 25% were 'undecided'. Moreover, all participants said that no training was provided for FHC before the interview, in the last question .

4.2 Types of Interview Questions

When interviewers were asked about what type of questions that should be asked whether situational, behavioural, or combining both

their answers were as follows: 36% strongly agreed and 45% agreed with behavioural questions. 33% strongly agreed and 58% agreed with situational questions. While 45% strongly agreed and 36% agreed with asking both types of questions. Though the rates were slightly similar, it is noticed that interviewers opted for situational questions due to the fact that most applicants could be novice and had no previous experience, so it is better to present them with hypothetical situations than to ask them about past behaviours. Others added further, that ' we improve selection by asking thought-provoking question or problem based-questions.

4. 3 Selection Criteria in HR Documents

Circular N°7 (2011, pp. 2-3) describes the selection criteria related to the hiring process for an assistant lecturer position with the corresponding score for each criterion. It shows that there are five major axes in the selection process in which the employment interview represents 20% of the total score. The Suitability of applicant's field of speciality with the requirements of the position represents 25% and the same rate for applicant's training that completes the required certificate in the same speciality (in this case Ph.D. for candidates who have Magister degree). Applicant's publication and participation in conferences are estimated with 10% of the total score, and relevant work experience, mainly as part-time teachers at university, rates 20% out of the total score.

4.4.1 Identifying Required Duties, Skills and Competencies

Table 3. Analysis of HR documents

Duties and Tasks of MA.B	Criteria of Interview Selection	Criteria of the ARS of HR office
-teaching tasks, -collaboration, tuorial and -counselling and advising.	-applicant ability to analyse and summarise, -fluency and accuracy of speech, -ability to communicate, and -special scientific skills	-Non-verbal behaviour (look), -communication skills, -fluency and accuracy of speech and -special skills.
Source : (Official Gazette N23, 2008 , p. 22)	(Circular N7, 2011)	(HR office- Setif 2 , 2018)

Analysis of Official Gazette N23 (2008, p.22) shows that the duties of an assistant lecturer are relevant to teaching tasks in general in addition to collaboration with colleagues and advising students. Whereas interview criteria in the hiring process (Circular N°7, 2011) revealed four major points in total divided as follows: *Applicant ability to analyse and Summarise (1pt), Fluency and Accuracy of speech (1pt), Ability to communicate(1pt), and Special Scientific Skills (1pt).* As for the ARS or the sample of evaluation sheet retrieved from HR office at university (Setif 2, 2018) , it demonstrates that there are four criteria of evaluation : Non-verbal behaviour (eg look of the applicant), communication skills, fluency and accuracy of speech and special skills. No further details of how to conduct or evaluate the interview were provided.

4.4.2 Evaluation of the FHI

Table 4. Analysis of the Current Anchored Rating Scale

	Current A.R.S of HR at Setif2 University			
	Non-verbal behaviors and look (1pt)	*Communication skills (1pt)*	*Fluency and accuracy of speech (1pt)*	*Special skills (1pt)*
. Deciding on 1 *the competencies and skills*	+	_	+	_
.Creating 2 *proficiency levels (3-5)*	_	_	_	_
.Labeling the 3 *proficiency levels (e.g., unsatisfactory, satisfactory, and superior)*	_	_	_	_

(Left vertical header: Criteria of Developing A.R.S)

NB: (+) item existent , (-)item non-existent

Source: Human Resources Office at Setif2 University (2018)

Analysis of current anchored rating scale suggested by HR office at university, which is used by the faculty hiring committee to evaluate the performance of applicants during the employment interview, was examined in relation to Kell et al., model (2017) it was found that though four criteria were determined, yet communication skills and special skills were not clearly defined. In addition, proficiency levels to applicants' answers were neither created nor labelled. This leads to question the reliability of the current anchored rating scale.

4.5 FHC Perceptions of the Interview's Requirements

Faculty hiring committees' perceptions of the requirements for an assistant lecturer position were displayed on a 5 point Likert (from very important – important- undecided- less important and not

important). In item (1), almost all interviewers 92% said that it was very important to know the duties and responsibilities of an assistant lecturer, and only 8% of them were undecided. For item (2), which is about the knowing the internal law of the institution, 67% of interviewers considered it very important, 17% said it was important and 8% were undecided and those who thought it was less important gave the same rate 8%. With reference to item (3), which is about showing readiness to work under different conditions 83% of them said it was very important and 17% believed it was important. For expressing enthusiasm and interest in the institution (university) 58% of interviewers considered it very important, 33% said it was important and 8% were undecided. When interviewers were asked about the importance of demonstrating flexibility for applicants towards the requirements of the institution, 58% thought it was very important and 25% reckoned that it was important. With regard to interviewers answers of item (7), which is about applicants' fluency and accuracy of speech ,92% said that it was very important and 8% believed that it was important. In item (8), interviewers regarded knowing new and innovative teaching methods very important with 50%, while 33% of them asserted that it was important and 8% of them were undecided. The rest 8% regarded it less important. For applicants' potentials in classroom management (item 9), 50% of interviewers believed it was very important; 25% said it was important; 17% were undecided and 8% thought it was less important. Moreover, in item (10), that is related to applicants' potentials in problem solving, 75% of interviewers said it was very important, and 25% of the believed it was important. In the last item (11), interviewers regarded applicants' potentials in teamwork and collaboration as very important with 67%, the other 25% said that it was important.

Some interviewers added that all the personal, social and professional qualities are very important for such a position and also stated that applicants should show 'psychological readiness for the job of teaching, readiness to cope with unexpected situation; ability to

shorten class, make up for others as well; and defining the goal that should be reached'.

. Discussion5

In the light of the research questions that sought to answer how the FHI is conducted and Evaluated (research question N°1); and the FHC beliefs of the requirement of an EFL assistant Lecturer position. Results gained from the questionnaire and document analysis are demonstrated in the following points:

a) **Amorphous process in conducting the faculty hiring interview (FHI)**

In comparison to the standards of developing the interview with the current FHC practices, it was found that the first and foremost step of conducting job analysis or search committees to identify the requirements in terms of target skills and competencies is not systematically conducted (42% of participants said no job analysis was conducted). Besides, the panel of interviewers belongs to the choice of Dean of the faculty rather than the search committees. Moreover, no training was provided for the FHC.

As for defining the skills and competencies to be assessed in the interview, it was found through the analysis of the HR documents that the skills and competencies were pre-definitely listed in terms of the ability to communicate and summarise, fluency and accuracy of speech, (Circular N7, 2011, and HR office- Setif2, 2018). Little matching was remarked between the duties of the assistant lecturer (Official Gazette N23, 2008, p. 22) and those skills. In fact, little texts and regulations were found to describe the target skills, and how the interview should be conducted.

b) **Unreliable Anchored Rating Scale:**

Regarding evaluation of the FHI, analysis of the current ARS used at university revealed that though some criteria are determined (Non-verbal behaviors, Communication skills, Fluency and accuracy of speech, Special skills); yet the level of proficiency to assess

applicants' answers were not created and labeled like it is as demonstrated in Table.4. Thus, the current ARS should be reconsidered to precisely rate applicants' answers *eg: (poor, fairly poor, acceptable, good, outstanding)* .

c) F**HC Perceptions of the Requirements of the Position**

According to the interviewers answers, and based on the available official documents (*Table 3)*, the requirements of an assistant lecturer position can be listed in terms of

o communication skills namely fluency and accuracy ;
o Knowledge of duties and responsibilities of the position ;
o potentials in coordination and team work ;
o potentials in advising students and conducting research ;
o potentials in problem-solving and classroom management;
o and demonstrating readiness and potentials in the task of teaching in general.

6. Conclusion

The aim of this research was to investigate interviewers' practices and perceptions of the faculty-hiring interview for an assistant lecturer position in the department of the English language and literature, at two Algerian universities. The study focused on the dimensions of conducting and evaluating the job interview within an academic institution based on the adapted framework (Campion, et al., 1997; Levashina, et al., 2014; and Kell et al., 2017). The researcher used a case study with members in the faculty hiring committees, and HR documents analysis in which data is descriptively analysed. The present study has some limitations that should be noted, as well as some implications for future research. As for the limitations, results cannot be generalized as the case study is not representative of the whole population. The findings of this study highlight a number of areas for future research. Firstly, a large-scale study with more participants would provide a more reliable view. In addition, other

stakeholders in the faculty hiring process, and policymakers need to be involved to improve selection criteria. Moreover, a study of this nature cannot account for the requirements in terms of position for applicants' successful communication strategies to manage positive images. Thus, further research can explore institutional discourse in academic interviews through the discourse analysis of extracts from authentic interviews based on firm theories.

References

Bowen, Glenn A., 2009, 'Document Analysis as a Qualitative Research Method', *Qualitative Research Journal*, vol. 9, no. 2, pp. 27-40. DOI 10.3316/QRJ0902027.

Campbell, S., and Roberts, C. (2007) Migration, Ethnicity and Competing Discourses in the Job Interview: Synthesizing the Institutional and Personal. *Discourse and Society*, *18*, 243- 271.

Campion MA, Palmer DK, Campion JE. (1997). A review of structure in the selection interview. *PERSONNEL PSYCHOLOGY*, *50*, 655–702.

Choi Seunghee,(2010). Cross-cultural Job Interview Communication in Business English as a Lingua Franca (BELF) Contexts: A Corpus-based Comparative Study of Multicultural Job Interview Communications in World Maritime Industry . PH.D thesis. The University of Birmingham

Corbin, J. & Strauss, A. (2008). Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Dipboye RL. (1994). Structured and unstructured selection interviews: Beyond the job-fit model. *Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management*, *12*, 79–123.

Erickson, F. and Shultz, J. (1982) The Counselor as Gatekeeper: Social Interaction in Interviews. New York: Academic Press.

Harrison J. Kell, Michelle P. Martin-Raugh, Lauren M. Carney, Patricia A. Inglese, Lei Chen, & Gary Feng (2017) . Exploring Methods for Developing Behaviorally Anchored Rating Scales for Evaluating Structured Interview Performance. *Research Report. ETS RR-17-28.*

Janz JT. (1982). Initial comparisons of patterned behavior description interviews versus unstructured interviews. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *67*, 577–580.

Kerekes, J. (2007) The Co-construction of a Gatekeeping Encounter: An Inventory of Verbal Actions. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *39*, 1942-1973.

Latham GP, Saari LM, Pursell ED, Campion MA. (1980). The situational interview. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *65*, 422–427.

Levashina J, Hartwell CJ, Morgeson FP, Campion MA (2014) . The structured employment interview: Narrative and quantitative review of the research literature .*Personnel Psychology* 67 (1), 241-293

Lipovsky, C. (2006) Candidates' Negotiation of Their Expertise in Job Interviews. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *38*, 1147-1174.

Macan, T. (2009). The employment interview: A review of current studies and directions for future research. *Human Resource Management Review*. Doi:10.1016/j.hrmr:2009.03.006.

Maurer SD. (2002). A practitioner-based analysis of interviewer job expertise and scale format as contextual factors in situational interviews. *PERSONNEL PSYCHOLOGY*, *55*, 307–327.

Motowidlo, S. J., Carter, G.W.,Dunnette, M.D., Tippins, N.,Werner, S., Burnett, J. R.,&Vaughan, M. J. (1992). Studies of the structured behavioral interview. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 77, 571–587.

Reilly RR, Chao GT. (1982). Validity and fairness of some alternative selection procedures. *PERSONNEL PSYCHOLOGY*, *35*, 1–62.

Scheuer, J. (2001) Recontextualization and Communicative Styles in Job Interviews. *Discourse Studies*, *3*, 223-248.

Schiffrin, D. (1994) *Approaches to Discourse*. Cambridge: Blackwell.

Schmitt, N., & Ostroff, C. (1986). Operationalizing the "behavioral consistency" approach: Selection test development based on acontent-oriented strategy. *Personnel Psychology*, 39, 91–108.

Stevens, C. K., & Kristof, A. L. (1995). Making the right impression: A field study of applicant impression management during job interviews. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 80*(5), 587–606. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.80.5.587

Taylor PJ, Small B. (2002). Asking applicants what they would do versus what they did do: A meta-analytic comparison of situational and past behavior employment interview questions. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, *75*, 277–294.

TIAIBA, I., & Nadjai, F. Z. (2020). Exploring EFL Doctoral Students' Perceptions of Employment Interviews for a Faculty Position. *Traduction Et Langues*, *19*(01), 184-205. Retrieved from https://www.univ-oran2.dz/revuetranslang/index.php/translang/article/view/208

Wernimont, P. F., & Campbell, J. P. (1968). Signs, Samples, and Criteria. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 52, 372-376.

HR documents:

- Circular N°7 dated on 28 April 2011 relating to selection criteria for the competition on the basis of qualifications for recruitment to grades in Civil Service (page 2-3)
- Official Journal or Official Gazette No. 23 dated on 04 May 2008 page 22 .Executive decree No. 08-130 dated on 03-05-2008 laying down the particular status for the lecturer-researcher
- Anchored rating scale for an assistant lecturer position (2018). Human Resources Office Setif2 University.