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Structured interviewing is a prominent method of assessment that has higher levels of predictive validity than other methods of assessment. Predictive validity however can only be established after the interview is developed and used to make high stakes decisions about candidates. Content validity, on the other hand, is a type of validity that can be done while the interview is being developed and before it is used to assess candidates. Although this method is used extensively by researchers and practitioners alike, the method for conducting it is unclear, making it seem less robust than other methods of validity. In this paper, we discuss the use of cognitive interviewing as a method of content validation of structured selection interviews. We do this by: 1) developing an interview protocol for selecting volunteers into the Lebanese Red Cross; and 2) pre-testing the questions on the protocol through cognitive interviewing technique. The results show that 19 out of the 20 questions developed needed revising, but for different reasons. Our analysis revealed six different reasons for amending the questions including: Missing details, Misleading situation, Misleading order of probes, Complex nature of competency, Misleading terminology, and Irrelevant details. This study reveals the importance of pre-testing selection interview questions and gives tips for constructing future questions and guidance on how to test these questions through the cognitive interviewing technique.
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“We make a living by what we get, but we make a life by what we give.”

Winston Churchill
CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Across industries and organizations today, people are the most important asset, and organizations could not succeed without selecting individuals with the right knowledge, skills and other personal qualities (Armstrong, 2006). Selection and recruitment activities therefore need to be effectively conducted for organizations to attain success, making human resource planning an integral part of the organization’s strategy (Heneman & Judge, 2005). Much of the research published in the past 25 years on selection and recruitment has focused on the selection interview, which “continues to be one of the most popular selection and recruiting devices in organizations” (Posthuma, Morgenson & Campion, 2002, p. 5). As early as 1949, Wagner stated that all selection interviews should be conducted according to a structure. Since then, all the literature reviews have supported the conclusion of structuring the selection interview to enhance its psychometric properties (Conway, Jako & Goodman, 1995; Huffcutt & Arthur, 1994; Hunter & Schmidt, 1998). The popularity of structured interviewing has gained most of the attention in the literature due to its high levels of predictive validity (Taylor & Small, 2002).

The wealth of research in selection interviews stems mainly from its strategic importance to the whole organization as it is the essence of hiring competent personnel that can help the organization achieve its mission and vision (Pulakos & Schmitt, 1995; Huffcutt, Conway, Roth & Stone, 2001; Posthuma, Morgenson & Campion, 2002). Yet, there appears to be a sizeable gap between the companies’ “espoused theories and their theories-in-use” with respect to selection interview practices (Argyris & Schön as cited
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in Bolman & Deal, 2003). Similarly in the MENA region, organizations are characterized by recruitment and selection practices that seem reactive and inconsistent across industries (El-Jardali, Tchaghchagian & Jamal, 2009). For example, according to a study that included 61 hospitals in Lebanon, poor work environments and the absence of effective recruitment practices are important health human resources challenges that are facing many Middle Eastern hospitals (El-Jardali, Tchaghchagian & Jamal, 2009). As another example, a recent study investigating selection and recruitment processes and problems among 55 multinational companies operating in Egypt, found major drawbacks in their recruitment processes, ultimately leading to less successful, efficient, and effective recruitment practices (Darrag, Mohamed & Abdel Aziz, 2010).

This discrepancy between best practices and the reality of recruitment becomes even wider when considering NGOs in the MENA region (Chahine, Al-Masri, Abi Samra & Safar, 2009). Findings from a recent study, which included data from around 3500 active Lebanese NGOs, revealed that “the potential of volunteerism is found to be poorly exploited, due to the lack of volunteer recruitment and management systems within NGOs” (Chahine, Al-Masri, Abi Samra & Safar, 2009, p. 17). In fact, volunteers are often recruited directly and informally and tend to "try-out" a position, which leads to lower commitment and less tenure (Cnaam, & Cascio, 1999).

Some humanitarian agencies focus mainly on volunteers to fulfill their major operations. For example, volunteers at the Lebanese Red Cross (LRC) must engage in life and death procedures, and work in a highly demanding and stressful environment. The LRC therefore needs to identify those candidates who 1) can learn how to do the job in the best possible way and 2) are most likely to stay in order to cut down on costs of training and turnover. Hence, a careful process of recruitment can help screen out candidates who are more likely to drop out of the organization. According to Clary,
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Synder, Ridge, Copeland, Stukas & Haugen (1998), a thorough selection can lead to dedicated volunteers who are more likely to be active, committed and loyal to the organization.

The purpose of this study is twofold. First, we aim to develop a structured interview to select the Emergency Medical Technicians (EMTs) volunteers in one of the LRC centers, namely: “Spears” or 101 Center. Second, we aim to assess the content validity of the structured interview using the cognitive interviewing method. This method has traditionally been used for enhancing questionnaires (Willis, 2005) or even adapting them to other languages and cultures (Daouk-Öyry & McDowal, 2012). However, it could also be a useful tool for understanding how judges perceive the interview questions and assess their appropriateness. The interview protocol will be developed based on a thorough job analysis (Daouk-Öyry & Karam, 2013) as well as an examination of the current EMT’s volunteering experience to serve as a base to build the structured interview questions. Our project’s research question is: “How to enhance the validity of a structured interview used for the selection of EMTs in the LRC, through the cognitive interviewing method?”
CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

Employers have a vested interest in making good hiring decisions, and the employment interview could potentially be an important part of achieving this outcome. The literature has closely examined the interview’s effectiveness and the constituent components that impact its validity, giving practical guidelines for implementation in organizations (Huffcutt & Arthur, 1994; Campion, Palmer & Campion, 1997; Chapman & Zweig, 2005). We will first explore how and why structure has become an important factor in enhancing the validity of the selection interview by looking into the early research of interview structure and how it helped limit interview bias. We then highlight the unique context of Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) specifically by investigating the challenges associated with being an EMT at the Lebanese Red Cross.

The importance of Structure in the Selection Interview

Early Research into the Interview Structure

Structure in selection interviews has been the focus of empirical investigations since 1929. One of the first studies done by O’Rourke (1929) examined the role of structure in the selection interview and proposed that interview questions should focus on actual job problems and that candidate responses should be evaluated according to pre-determined standards. The concept of a standardized interview gained further popularity in the 1930s and early 1940s (McMurray (1947) as cited in Buckley et al., 2000), due to a rise of interest in selection methods that several states had developed prior to World War II. For example, in 1942 the British Army, realized the unsuccessful
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results their traditional methods produced in selecting cadets in officer training, and decided to form the British War Office Selection Boards (Huck, 1973). Moreover, a more sophisticated selection methodology was in turn used by the American Office of Strategic Services in 1943 to select intelligence agents for service during World War II (Huck, 1973).

Subsequently, as the demands for human rights and the human rights movements increased throughout the 1960s, some countries like the United States developed equal opportunities legislations (e.g. the Equal Employment Act in 1972 and the Vocational Rehabilitation Act in 1973) that requires the use of prejudice-free selection tools in public and private sectors (Buckley et al., 2000). Thus, research into how interviewer biases can impact the hiring decision-making process began to receive more research attention in the 1960s (Eder & Harris, 1999).

**Interviewer Bias and Interview Fairness**

As information processors, humans have limitations and biases (Morgeson & Champion, 1997). Some studies have identified women candidates to be “at risk (of bias and prejudice) in the employment interview” (Arvey, 1979, p. 736). Biases in the selection interview were also shown to exist toward other groups such as overweight applicants (Pingitore, Dugoni, Tindale & Spring, 1994). The way interviewers automatically process and select cues may bias their judgment through, but not limited to, stereotypes, contrast effects and similarity effects (Schmitt, 1976), or making a decision about candidates within the first two or three minutes of the interview (Buckley & Eder, 1988). For example, interviewers may develop a stereotype of an ideal candidate, and then compare interview candidates to that stereotype (Webster et al. as cited in Eder & Harris, 1999).

These examples about selection interview biases bring to light the issue of
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fairness in the employment interview. Several alternatives have been proposed for minimizing biases that may arise from the interview, the most prominent of which is structuring. For example, there is evidence to suggest that the magnitude of interviewers’ biases could be reduced when they were required to use a standardized rating scale to evaluate the candidates’ responses (Kutcher & DeNicolis Bragger, 2004). While the structuring of selection interviews may reduce bias, this factor alone is not sufficient in order to achieve the goal of selecting the best candidate. In addition to freedom from bias, selection tools also need to be valid and reliable in order to make sure that employers are selecting candidates that best fit the job in terms of their knowledge, skills, abilities, and other characteristics (Thorndike as cited in Klehe, 2003). In the next section, we explore how structure may impact the reliability and the validity of selection interviews.

Impact of Interview Structure on Reliability and Validity

As early as 1915, Scott (as cited in Eder & Harris, 1999) found that when different interviewers’ rankings of the same sales candidates were compared, the results demonstrated very little consistency. Such a consistency is important to ensure that the tool is reliable, that is can ensure that different interviewers give similar ratings when observing the same performance. Scott’s work also prompted further investigation into whether or not an employment interview could add value when trying to assess a candidate’s future job performance; this measure of an interview’s effectiveness is termed validity (Eder & Harris, 1999). Hence, validity indicates the degree to which the selection interview is measuring what it claims to measure, and improving the validity of the interview leads to cover more effectively the behavioral domain it is supposed to measure.

In exploring ways to improve the interview’s effectiveness, the analysis of
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validity and reliability was a significant subject of interest in research, which demonstrated that structure was an important moderator of both reliability and validity (Huffcut & Arthur, 1994). As the level of structure increased, so did the interview’s validity and reliability. Campion, Palmer & Campion (1997) found that the validity of unstructured interviews ranged from 0.14 to 0.33, while those of structured interviews ranged from 0.35 to 0.62 (a perfect positive relationship between two variables would be represented by a correlation coefficient of 1.0.). Taylor and Small (2002) found that the reliability of structured interviews ranged from 0.56 to 0.87, depending on which elements of structure were examined.

These promising findings, confirmed the usefulness of the structured employment interview, making it one of the most valid forms of candidate assessments (Robertson & Smith, 2001). Furthermore, more sophisticated research has demonstrated what components of interview structure play an important mitigating role in relation to its validity. Understanding the role that structure can play in enhancing the effectiveness of the employment interview requires a deeper analysis of the dimensions of interview structure and its related developed techniques.

A Multi-Dimensional View of Interview Structure

In defining structure in the employment interview Huffcut (1992, as cited in Huffcut & Arthur, 1994) stated that structure is “any process which systematically reduces variability in the way in which applicants are treated and/or evaluated by interviewers” (p. 11). The “processes” Huffcut suggested to standardize as the five dimensions of structure were: (a) the questions posed by the interviewers, (b) the method used to evaluate the candidates’ responses, (c) the method used to combine the interviewers’ ratings of a candidate, (d) the membership of the interview team, and (e) the interview environment.
However, increasing the structure in some components might yield to no improvement in the interview’s validity (Huffcut & Arthur, 1994). Interviewers should be allowed some flexibility in the selection of questions and in asking follow-up questions to probe candidates for further information (Huffcutt & Arthur, 1994). This can also be considered as measure of protecting the integrity of the interview questions. Moreover, an important element that needs flexibility, is allowing the interviewers to score the candidates in broad categories, whereby they could provide an overall score for a specific candidate’s competency even if they asked several questions that pertained to it (Huffcutt & Arthur, 1994). Moderating the levels of structure for these specific elements would therefore not necessarily reduce the validity of the interview process.

Further to the above findings, and based on a review of the literature, Campion et al. (1997) divided the structure dimensions into two categories: content and evaluation. The content category consisted of conducting a job analysis, asking the same questions, limiting prompting, asking better questions, conducting a longer interview, controlling ancillary information, and not allowing questions from candidates. The evaluation category consisted of rating each candidate’s response, using anchored response rating scales, taking detailed notes, using multiple interviewers, using the same interviewers, not allowing discussion between interviews, providing training to interviewers, and using statistical methods rather than subjective ones to combine interview response ratings.

As a summary of the below findings, a simpler model was developed by Chapman & Zweig (2005), which reduces the above 15 dimensions of Campion et al. to three primary factors of structure components, which they termed: (a) evaluation standardization, (b) question sophistication, and (c) question consistency.
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Table 1

*Structure dimensions by Campion et al. (1997)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content category</th>
<th>1. conducting a job analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. asking the same questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. limiting prompting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. asking better questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. conducting a longer interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. controlling ancillary information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. not allowing questions from candidates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation category</td>
<td>8. rating each candidate’s response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9. using anchored response rating scales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10. taking detailed notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11. using multiple interviewers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12. using the same interviewers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13. not allowing discussion between interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14. providing training to interviewers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15. using statistical methods</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A new dimension introduced by Chapman & Zweig (2005) is “rapport building” related to the applicants’ reactions to the interview process, which is important to take into consideration while conducting the structured interview, in order to positively impact the candidates. Despite the importance of their findings, Chapman’s & Zweig’s (2005) four-factor model of structure did not provide a single standardized way to define and measure interview structure.

Thus, a single framework that allows the nature and degree of interview structure to be specified and investigated in a consistent fashion does not yet exist.

However, researchers developed very important techniques that guide in the composition of the interview questions while increasing the validity of the overall selection interview. Going back to the definition given by Campion et al. (1997), structure is “any enhancement of the interview that is intended to increase psychometric properties by increasing standardization or otherwise assisting the interviewer in determining what questions to ask or how to evaluate responses” (p. 656). In the next
section, we will explore how the literature contributed in helping the interviewer determine the type of questions to ask.

**Two Structured Techniques: Situational and Behavioral Interviewing**

Despite the lack of a single standardized model of structure, two structured interview approaches emerged, both integrating elements of structure by specifying the format of the interview questions: the situational interviewing developed by Latham in 1980 (as cited in Locke & Latham, 2002) and the patterned behavioral description interviewing (PBDI) developed by Janz in 1982 (as cited in George, 2006). The situational interviewing and PBDI techniques are predicated upon different theories of human behavior (Huffcutt, Conway, Roth & Stone, 2001).

When trying to predict candidates’ future job performance, situational interviewers solicit information about the candidates’ intentions, thus presenting to the candidate a job-related scenario and asking him/her to describe how they would address the situation. The validity of such an interview approach is predicated upon the goal setting model devised by Locke in 1968 (as cited in Bosshardt, 1993).

While interviewers using the PBDI technique explore the candidates’ past behavior, and ask questions that require the candidate to give specific examples from his or her own past experience. The theory underlying PBDI is the behavior consistency principle, which asserts that the best predictor of future behavior is past behavior (Wernimont & Campbell in 1968, as cited in George, 2006). The two approaches also differ somewhat in how components of structure are used. PBDI, for example, typically permits interviewers to vary their questions somewhat and to probe for further detail by asking follow-up questions (Bosshardt, 1993 as cited in Taylor & Small, 2002). The same practices are discouraged in situational interviewing (as cited in (Bosshardt, 1993 as cited in Taylor & Small, 2002).
With respect to reliability and predictive validity, both the situational and the patterned behavioral description interviewing approaches have shown encouraging results. When considering the situational interviewing format, Taylor & Small (2002) reported a corrected mean validity coefficient of 0.57 and a mean inter-rater reliability of 0.79. For the PBDI approach, Taylor and Small reported a corrected mean validity of 0.47 and a mean inter-rater reliability of 0.76.

**Optimizing the Interview Effectiveness in the LRC**

Researchers have provided great insights about the elements that have the greatest impact on the selection interview’s reliability and validity. The elements that consistently seem to be associated with higher levels of predictive validity are: selecting questions intended to assess past behaviors or future intentions; asking the same questions to each candidate; and evaluating responses in a standardized fashion. Building on this section’s literature review, we will incorporate these three elements in order to develop the structured selection interview for the LRC 101 Center.

However, in order to build the content of the interview questions, research into the constructs underlying these two question formats suggests a deeper examination of the context of the job and a thorough job analysis. In alignment with the structured interview research, findings suggest that one reason that structured interviews have higher levels of validity than unstructured interviews is because they assess characteristics that correlate more directly with job performance. Consequently, in order to learn more about the EMT’s job performance and come up with the questions’ content, an understanding of the various aspects of NGOs and Volunteerism, and a more specific look into the EMTs experience is necessary, in order to construct the structured selection interview.

As research suggests, the volunteers’ experience is integral to the ability of
organizations in recruiting and retaining volunteers (Taylor, Darcy, Hoye & Cuskelly, 2006). Therefore, the study of volunteerism and the NGOs environment is necessary to develop sound human resources practices that take into consideration the differences between the nonprofit and for-profit sectors.

Characteristics of NGOs and Volunteerism

Impacts of the Non-for-Profit Sector on Society

Following Dobkin Hall, in 1987 (as cited in Bahmani, Galindo & Mendez, 2012), Non-for-profit Organizations that are more commonly defined as Non-Governmental organizations are “a body of individuals who associate for any three purposes: (1) to perform public tasks that have been delegated to them by the state, (2) to perform public tasks for which there is a demand that neither the state nor not-for-profit organizations are willing to fulfill or (3) to influence the direction of policy in the state, the for-profit sector or other nonprofit organizations (p 68).”

It is clear in this definition, that NGOs play an important role in society by satisfying human necessities that are not covered by for-profit firms, because they do not fit their benefits, or by the state, due to lack of funding or scarce human resources. However, the main difference between NGOs and for-profit organizations is their aim; while firms aim to maximize profit, NGOs aim to maximize utility (Lee & Wilkins, 2011). Thus this sector has an important impact on the society at large. Volunteerism has been found to have a high economic contribution. In the American Society every year half of all American adults, an estimate of 25 million volunteers, give 5 or more hours per week and generate services worth more than $239 billion annually (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2010 as cited by Haski-Leventhal et al., 2011). Moreover, volunteers help sustain the NGOs they serve, in lowering their budgetary constraints, and
enhancing their reputation, thus in return attracting financial resources and other volunteers.

Additionally, volunteerism has a positive impact on the volunteers themselves, including self-esteem, better physical and mental health, their ability to address social problems, and the development of social capital (Musick & Wilson, 2008, as cited in Haski-Leventhal et al., 2011). Finally, the positive impact of volunteers spreads to the volunteer service recipients. Several studies have observed the unique impact of volunteers, compared to the paid workers, for example on cancer patients (Edgar, Remmer, Roserbger, & Rapkin, 1996, as cited in Haski-Leventhal et al., 2011) and their positive impact on youth at risk (Baker, Gersten & Keating, 2000, as cited in Haski-Leventhal et al., 2011). Hence, this sector has a significant effect on the society however, the livelihood of these NGOs are in some cases threatened by the nature of their operations and the nature of the volunteer work.

In fact, a lot of differences exist between paid workers and volunteers who operate within a particular setting. The NGOs’ setting differs from the usual working environment and has several characteristics that are not found in the private sector.

**Characteristics of NGOs: finance/workforce/ infrastructure/culture**

Scholars argue that nonprofit sectors and for-profit sectors differ in numerous ways; one of the most obvious distinguishing features in NGOs is that they operate in financial turbulence and uncertainty. “The lack of stability in finances can mean that long term planning is not an option for voluntary section organizations” (Ragsdell, 2013, p.350). Moreover financial restrictions are major limitations in the development of several areas, like for example the development of a wide-ranging Information Technology system (Ragsdell, 2013). Other uncertainties the NGOs face is the transient nature of volunteers. The ephemeral nature of volunteer work is often caused by the
volunteers having additional employment and other commitments to handle. Sometimes volunteers disengage in an arbitrary manner, because they don’t have a formal contract or an obligation that ties them to the NGO, causing a real challenge for the NGO in the continuity of their work (Ragsdell, 2013).

Moreover, as per Ragsdell (2013) the infrastructure of NGOs differ from that of a business firm, for instance it is common for many NGOs to operate with no physical head office, or permanent base. NGOs also work with little centralized administration or no formalized management systems. As per Stirling, Kilpatrick & Orpin (2011) many findings support the idea that volunteers prefer such informal management styles and high levels of autonomy. This non-bureaucratic environment fosters a culture of trust and a relaxed environment, in which volunteers take pride in accomplishing their responsibilities and sharing their experience and knowledge (Ragsdell, 2013).

Furthermore, volunteers were found to be “less concerned with transactional management practices such as job descriptions and evaluations, but more focused on relational communicative matters” (Stirling, Kilpatrick & Orpin, 2011, p. 325). Thus, in spite of the NGOs challenging environment, it offers volunteers a culture that seems to nurture their on-going helpfulness. However, many have asked about the motivations of volunteers on a personal level; why do people get involved in volunteer work, continues to be a question that arouses the interest of many researchers.

**Motivational factors behind Volunteers’ Commitment**

In their study, Stirling, Kilpatrick & Orpin (2011) used the psychological contract developed by Rousseau in 1995, as a framework to study volunteers’ motivation. The psychological contract implies that the perception of the employment agreement goes beyond the formal contract and is divided into the transactional contract
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that is the monetary exchanges and the relational contract that focuses on the social and emotional concerns. As per Clarly et al. (1998)(as cited in Stirling, Kilpatrick & Orpin, 2011, p. 323), “many volunteer motivations fit the relational contract concept because they are linked to social identity and emotions such as group belonging and doing something worthwhile”. In alignment with the importance volunteers’ give to the relational contract, the literature suggest that nonprofit employees are less likely to be motivated by extrinsic factors and more likely to be motivated by intrinsic rewards compared to workers in the for-profit sector (Buelens & Van den Broeck, 2007; Benz, 2005, as cited in Lee & Wilkins, 2011).

According to MacNeela (2008), an intrinsic motive, such as organization’s connectedness that translates into a strong sense of belonging, is an influential motive that keeps volunteers committed. Moreover, volunteers associate the organizational values with their personal identity and thus volunteering fulfills their self-definition, through satisfying their core values (Gronlund, 2011). This “Volunteering role identity” theory suggested by Gronlund (2011) demonstrates that volunteering is a way to express a person’s individuality, thus different people feel connected to different organizations.

It is of concern to understand the volunteers’ motives because they are related to their commitment and sustainability in the NGO. Hence, the volunteer, who will fulfill his/her motives, is likely to have more commitment to the organization, and experience the positive consequences of volunteering such as reducing depressive symptoms, improving social integration and better handling of stress (Plagnol & Huppert, 2010). Adding to that note, Francis developed a motives profile based on several needs, and noticed that well matched volunteers were more likely to remain active (69%) than those not matched (29%) (Francis, 1983). Other studies looked for signs of commitment and motivation in volunteers, some specifically developed for
Emergency Medical Technicians are: “engaging in career planning, setting career goals and working towards them, having insight into one’s strength and weaknesses and relating “emergency medical volunteering” to one’s personal identity and values” (Carson, Carson, Yallapragada, Langford & Roe, 1998). However enhancing the EMTs’ commitment and sustainability seems to be more challenging than in any other volunteering sector. Although the EMTs experience the positive effects of volunteerism mentioned above, however, they experience specific challenges and work stressors that are related to the nature of their job and the environment of the healthcare field in general.

The EMTs Experience

Experiencing the Traumatic Stressors

In fact, many occupations in the healthcare sector, such as firefighters, police officers, and EMTs, are physically, cognitively, and psychologically demanding. In other words, employees in such occupations experience a unique kind of work stressors, called traumatic stressors (Sliter, Kale & Yuan, 2013). This type of stressors might include daily exposure to human tragedy, such as dealing with injury, mutilation, death, injured children, drug abuse, gun shooting, mass casualties, car accidents, natural disasters and much more. As such, “traumatic stressors can be considered to be a special case of acute stressors, being located on the high-intensity end of the acute stressor spectrum” (Sliter et al., 2014, p.258). Moreover, EMTs have to face threats to their own lives as well, such as combat-related events for soldiers (Schaubroeck, Riolli, Peng & Spain, 2011, as cited in Sliter et al., 2014).

Naturally such traumatic stressors lead to several cognitive, behavioral and affective symptoms. Sliter, Kale & Yuan (2014) found that exposure to traumatic
stressors are positively related to post-traumatic stress disorder symptoms, burnout, and absenteeism. In fact, Paramedics or EMTs are reported to have the highest mean burnout score observed among health professionals (Vettor & Kosinski, 2000). Burnout is defined as a “psychological syndrome of emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and reduced personal accomplishment” (Baker, Van Der Zee, Lewig & Dollard, 2006). Eventually, the symptoms resulting from traumatic stressors, such as burnout are high predictors of dropout and termination of the volunteers work (Baker et al., 2006).

**Enhancing the EMTs Commitment**

Considering the psychologically straining work environment for volunteers, numerous researchers were interested in the coping mechanisms or buffers that would lead volunteers towards more commitment and longer sustainability. For example, Baker *et al.* (2006) showed that certain personality traits: extraversion and agreeableness, correlate negatively with burnout and adapt better to stressful situations. Moreover support from family and friends, and forming friendships within the NGO, have been shown to be important “resources in coping with the demands related to volunteer work and may protect volunteers from burnout, while helping them to stay connected to volunteering” (Huynuth, Xanthopoulou & Winefield, 2013).

Some findings suggest that important factors to resist burnout and consequently increase tenure, are managerial practices that enhance volunteer’s commitment, such as initial orientation, on-going training and recognition (Hartenian & Lilly, 2009). Moreover, a further pro-active managerial style, such as showing a caring attitude and creating a favorable work environment, enabled volunteers in the British Red Cross to have more commitment (Waikayi, Fearon, Morris & MaLaughlin, 2012). Barnes & Sharpe (2009) also noted that in the face of a worldwide decrease in volunteerism, it is crucial to implement effective volunteer management and retention strategies.
Hence, it has been suggested that "careful selection through structured interviews that focus on the job to be performed helps increase tenure and satisfaction of volunteers" (Hollwitz & Wilson, 1993), however, many “volunteer administrators have reported they need more knowledge and training in areas such as recruitment of volunteers, motivation, retention, rewards, and supervision” (Waikayi et al., 2012). Therefore, as the literature suggests, the current case based research into the Lebanese Red Cross recruitment may be relevant for a number of policy makers in non-profit organizations, specifically for the LRC management.
CHAPTER III
RESEARCH CONTEXT

To give some background about this study, it is based on a previous collaboration between two professors in the Olayan School of Business at AUB, Dr. Daouk-Öyry and Dr. Karam with the Red Cross Center Spears 101. Over a year ago, Dr. Daouk-Öyry and Dr. Karam interviewed around 40 active Red Cross volunteers in different roles and from different age groups and genders, and as a result, they developed a Job description and a Person Specification for the role of volunteer at Red Cross Lebanon (see Appendix number I). Based on their work and the Job Description document they developed, we developed the structured interview questions included in the developed interview protocols (see Appendix II, III, IV, V and VI). The questions were designed with the aim of targeting the specific competencies identified in the Job description and Person Specifications document. Five out of eight competencies and their definitions were taken from this document, and four questions were developed for each competency: two situational questions and two behavioral questions, thus developing in total 20 questions. After developing the interview questions, we pretested the same question twice with two different participants, based on the cognitive interviewing technique in order to explore their validity. Cognitive interviewing enabled us to detect possible sources of measurement error. The cognitive interviewing method focuses on the direct study of the question-and-answer process, “identifying how and where the question fails to achieve its measurement purpose” (Willis, 2005). This diagnostic tool helped us to gather information about the questions, to identify the errors
and rectify the questions as per a certain framework, that we developed based on the
task focused model proposed by Oksenberge *et al.* xxx (as cited in Collins, 2003).
CHAPTER IV
RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

General Research Objectives

The general research objectives are to:

- Develop a structured interview to assess potential applicants for the role of EMTs in one of the Lebanese Red Cross centers: “Spears” or 101 Center, and
- Assess the content validity of this interview using a novel method, that is, cognitive interviewing.

For the first objective, we will rely on major recommendations from the literature to help us enhance the validity of the structured selection interview. We will therefore write situational and behavioral questions in relation to competencies in the EMTs job analysis. For the situational interviews, will rely on examples extracted from a previous Critical Incident Technique (Daouk-Öyry and Karam, 2013) and that portray the experience of the EMTs.

For the second objective, we will use professional experts with background in EMT’s work, as well as academic experts in personnel selection and psychology in order to assess the content validity of the interview questions (i.e., appraising the relevance and representativeness of the developed structured interview questions). Hence, we will test that our questions measure the concepts or behaviors we want them to measure as perceived by professional and academic subject matter experts.

Through pretesting we will attain our second objective which is to ensure that the developed questions meet their purpose, and consequently assess their content validity. However, this study will take pretesting further by using the cognitive
interviewing method to enhance the content validity of the selection interview, the study will try to draw inferences about how to enhance the content validity of interview questions, and revise the questions accordingly.

Specific Research Questions

The following questions shall be investigated:

- How can the use of cognitive interviewing as a pre-testing method help enhance the validity of the structured selection interview?
- What inferences can be drawn from the common sources of errors found in the developed questions?
- How can these inferences help in the writing of future structured interview questions?
CHAPTER V

METHODOLOGY

Developing the Structured Interview

The first step in this study was to develop the structured selection interview for the EMTs based on the research literature suggestions, as well as using the Job Description and Personal Specifications of the Red Cross Volunteer member. The five competencies were: Conflict Resolution Skills, Communication Skills, Organizational Skills, Emotional Intelligence and Judgment and Decision Making Skills.

The two types of questions developed were the situational and the behavioral type. For example, for the competency of Conflict resolution skills, one of the situational questions was:

You are on a mission along with two of your teammates who do not have a very good relationship. While preparing the necessary equipment to save the patient, one of them started giving orders to the other, who in his turn felt offended and started yelling. The two people engaged in a fight; how would you solve the conflict between them/what would you do?

One of the behavioral questions developed for this competency was:

Describe a situation in which you were able to get your co-workers/colleagues who dislike each other to work together constructively.

Accordingly, five interview protocols containing four structured interview questions each were developed to be tested, and each protocol was tested twice by two different participants (see Appendix II, III, IV, V, and VI).

Participants

According to Foxcroft, Paterson, le Roux and Herbst in 2004, (as cited in
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Shetty, Componation & Gholtson, 2011, p.49), “by using a panel of experts to review the test specifications and the selection of items the content validity of a test can be improved. The experts will be able to review the items and comment on whether the items cover a representative sample of the behavior domain.”

Hence, participants for this study had to be Subject Matter Experts (SMEs) in order to assess the SIQs. We chose SMEs in three different domains: the Human Resources Management field (HRM), the Psychology field and the Red Cross field. In the HRM field, three professors having HRM experience and research in this domain participated from the AUB’S Olayan School of Business. Two other Professors were chosen from the Psychology department at AUB, adding a psychological view to the question’s assessment, very relevant to the study of the competencies and their related behaviors. Finally five senior members of the Lebanese Red Cross Emergency Team volunteers were chosen based on their seniority in the Center and their active participation in the recruitment activity.

In this study we will use the term “subject” to designate the participants as opposed to participant or respondent. As suggested by Willis (1994), the term subject refers to an individual who is tested through a cognitive interviewing procedure, as opposed to “respondent” who defines someone who is interviewed in a fielded survey. As such our participants are divided into “Academic Subjects” who are the Professors, and the “Practitioner Subjects” who are the Red Cross Members.

Data Collection

Data for this paper was collected from transcribed semi-structured interviews with the ten participants. After being granted the IRB approval for this research (see Appendix VII), we have conducted the interviews with five senior members of the
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Lebanese Red Cross Emergency Team volunteers that are part of the interviewing process and five AUB professors that are experts in the HR or psychology field.

Participants were sent an introductory email about the purpose of the interview and the nature of the study. The email also included a consent form for their oral approval. The consent form also outlined the rights of the participant to withdraw from the study, and/or to refuse to answer any question, without any consequences. Moreover, the consent form highlighted the data confidentiality and protection of privacy.

During the interview the participants were presented with samples of the structured interview questions followed by assessment questions for each question. They were notified that the interview will approximately take 30 to 45 minutes and told that the interview was structured into two parts for every question.

After being presented with a written form of the question, the participants were first asked to try to mentally reinstate the environmental and personal context of the Emergency Medical Technician and answer the questions from their own personal experience. The second part consisted of answering probes regarding the questions and more specifically their relatedness to the competencies. Such questions required participants to tap into their expertise as academic experts or as field experts in the LRC. Because an element of subjectivity might exist in relation to determining what a particular competency represents, the definitions of the competencies where provided to the subjects, as well as their related behaviors. For example:

*Definition of Conflict Resolution Skills:* Being able to be constructive when challenged, encourage buy-in and mutual understanding by resolving conflict, and being able to negotiate and influence others.

*Behaviors:* Encourage mutual understanding, able to negotiate and influence
The methods used to gather the impressions and information from participants are the think-aloud method and the verbal probing technique. Both methods are two subtypes of cognitive interviewing methods (Willis, 2005). In the think-aloud method subjects or interviewees are instructed to think aloud when answering, while the interviewer’s role is to encourage them to talk with very little intervention. On the other hand, during the verbal probing technique the interviewer probes pre-defined questions (Daouk-Öyry & Mcdowal, 2012). In this study a combination of both techniques was used, thus participants were given pre-defined open-ended questions that encouraged them to think aloud while further probing was used when found necessary.

Moreover while collecting the data we adopted the concurrent approach of the Cognitive Interviewing method, as opposed to the retrospective approach (Willis, 2005). The subjects where asked probes that they have encountered for the first time, after each structured interview question. The concurrent approach helps the subject remember the information better and is relevant to the question testing method because it provides causes and evidence of problems. While the retrospective approach that proposes to take all the test then start the cognitive interviewing, usually involves testing the whole survey process, in terms of length, quality and ease of administration (Collins, 2003). Thus, the concurrent approach is more relevant to our study, and helps in a direct study of the question-and-answer process.

According to the above methods, subjects were first asked to answer the SIQs, and put themselves in the hypothetical situations or past situations from their experience, in order to test the questions in their questionnaire context. Then subjects were asked to answer cognitive probes regarding the SIQ. For example, among the cognitive probes, subjects were asked to guess to which competency is the question
related, and were requested to suggest amendments to the errors or issues they detected while answering the questions. Another method was also used, in parallel with the cognitive interviewing process, subjects were asked to rate the relatedness of the question to the competency according to a five-point likert scale (1= strongly irrelevant, 2= irrelevant, 3= neutral, 4= relevant and 5= strongly relevant), and were asked to discuss their rationale behind the score.

**Qualitative Analysis Approach**

For the purpose of answering our research questions the ten transcribed semi-structured interviews containing the 20 SIQs and their eight probes each, were carefully transcribed, in order to generate abundant data. Each participants was given four SIQs, and for each SIQs each participant was asked eight questions as per the cognitive interviewing method, they being the following:

*Comprehension of question:*

1. Can you tell me in your own words what is the question asking?
2. Are all parts of the question comprehensible?
   
a. If not: What improvements or amendments, if any, do you suggest should be made to the above question?

*Relevance of question to the job:*

3. Practitioner: Was it hard for you to put yourself in this situation or is it something you would experience in your role as an EMT?
   
a. If not: What improvements or amendments, if any, do you suggest should be made to the above question?

*Question targeted to the competency:*

4. In your opinion which competency do the questions above target?
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(If answer is similar to competency: show definition and move to 8)

5. (If answer is different to competency: show the competency and the definition that this question aims to measure.) After viewing the competency, do you think that this question could also be targeting this competency?

6. Could you rate the extent to which the question targets the competency on a scale of 1 to 5? Could you explain your choice?

1: Strongly Irrelevant 2: Irrelevant 3: Neutral 4: Relevant 5: Strongly relevant

7. Considering the answer that you provided when I first asked you this question, do you believe that this answer gave indication about where you stand on the following behaviors: (show the behaviors)

8. If you don’t think the above behaviors are reflected in your answers, what improvements or amendments, if any, do you suggest should be made to the above question in order to target the desired behaviors?

In order to analyze qualitative data, Leech & Onwuegbuzie (2007) described multiple techniques that can be used (i.e. constant analysis, keywords in context, word count, classical content analysis, domain analysis, taxonomic analysis and componential analysis), among which, content analysis is the most frequently used. Content analysis proposes a systematic framework of describing, qualifying, and analyzing data, and identifying embedded codes (Elo & Kyngäs, 2008).

For the purpose of analyzing the data in our research, we have used the content analysis process developed by Barbour (2008). Barbour elaborated four steps: decide on the analysis, code the data, develop a provisionary coding frame and finally identify patterns in order to generate an inductive analysis.

As per the above framework, we started studying all the three hundred twenty answers given by the ten subjects. After doing so, we inserted the data in twenty tables:
for each SIQ separately we created a table containing the eight cognitive questions and both the answers of the Practitioner Subject and the Academic Subject. From the answers, we then identified the detected issues or errors for each SIQ, the reasons behind the errors as well as possible solutions to these issues (see Appendix VIII). We then chunked the data into smaller parts that contained all the possible causes of errors mentioned by the Subjects. We then gave each chunk a title or “code”, similar chunks were given the same codes. We then gathered the codes that fall under a general sub-theme or a common cause of error, and the sub-themes were gathered under wider themes that are the errors. We used the errors and the general causes of errors that are developed by the framework of the task-focused model (Collins, 2003). It is important to note, that we use the term “error” to refer to suspected or supposed problems identified by the evaluation method we developed without implying that these “errors” actually reduce the value of the data.

Finally we developed the following template:
Table 2

**Template of Components of Measurement Errors**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes: Categories of measurement errors</th>
<th>Categories: Cause of error as per the task-focused model</th>
<th>Sub-categories: Specific cause of error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Validity</strong></td>
<td>Both, academic and professional subject matter experts’ interpretation are similar but different from the researcher’s intention</td>
<td>Missing details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Academic and professional subject matter experts’ interpretation of the same question is different</td>
<td>Misleading situation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Processing difficulties</strong></td>
<td>Respondents unable to retrieve the information necessary to answer the question</td>
<td>Missing details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comprehension</strong></td>
<td>Complex sentence structure</td>
<td>Irrelevant detail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subject did not understand how to respond</td>
<td>Disorganized information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Confusing use of vocabulary</td>
<td>Missing details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Misleading term</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER VI

RESULTS

In order to begin with the data analysis it is important to explain how the errors were grouped into each theme, to define each of the three themes, and their categories and sub-categories, and to give examples for each kind of specific error found in the text. As mentioned before, the three themes as well as the general error categories were taken from a developed framework, the “task-focused model” that evolved from the traditional model of measurement errors in surveys to incorporate several task related errors: comprehension problems, validity problems and processing difficulties. It is important to note that the number of problems exceeds the number of questions because a question could contain more than one error, especially that it is revised by two subjects. Thus we counted 25 problems and accordingly 25 causes that lead to these errors in the 20 questions analyzed by the subjects. Moreover several specific causes could lead to an error. Thus the same question could contain several specific causes that are grouped under a general cause. We detected in total 27 specific causes. The problems are divided as follow.

The Components of Measurement Errors

Validity Problems

The validity errors are errors that are caused by the subjects interpreting the aim of the question in a different way than of the researcher’s intention. Therefore, according to the subjects and to their answers, the questions don’t seem to measure the competency and the behaviors they are intended to measure and thus leading to a
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We have found ten errors of this type in the questions. The general causes leading to validity errors are the categories under the validity theme.

The first general cause of error is associated to both SME’s interpretation of question intent not in the way the researcher intended. The underlying specific causes or subcategories, leading to this general cause found in the SIQs are: “misleading situation” and “missing details”.

A misleading situation is related to the context of the question or the hypothetical situation that didn’t lead to answers containing the competency’s behaviors, instead it lead to answers containing different competencies or containing some of the behaviors of the sought competency.

For example in a question targeting communication skills, both the subjects found that the question does not allow an answer containing communication, but requires the subject to be discrete instead. The original form of the question was: *You and your team have just dropped to the ER a teenager who has lost consciousness due to an overdose and is in a very critical situation. When leaving the hospital, the child’s mother in shock grabs you and asks you what is wrong with her only child. What do you say?*

First both of the subjects’ answers did not reveal communication skills: “I wouldn’t disclose any other information on his situation.” “I would tell her to refer to the doctor”. Moreover, when asked which competency this question targeted, one of the subjects answered: “disclosure of information and dealing with emotionally charged situation”. When asked if this question could also target communication skills one subject replied: “Not organizing and presenting information because there is no verbal communication going on”.

The second subcategory or underlying cause that leads to both respondents
interpretation of question intent not in the way the researcher intended, is when the question had “missing details” that caused misleading interpretations of the question’s intent, different than of its original intent.

For example, in a question targeting judgment and decision making both subjects found that when adding a detail the question would target better the competency.

The original form of the question is: “You are called for an emergency in one of the areas of Beirut regarding a man who is having a nervous breakdown. As you go to the scene, you realize that the area is not safe and some shooting is taking place between people from opposed political parties. The man’s wife has already called you twice since you left the center telling you that his case is becoming more critical. What would you do?”

Both the subjects suggested adding to the urgency of the man’s case and adding that he went unconscious, in order to target “fast decision making” that is one of the behaviors in the competency.

The second general cause of validity errors is when SMEs interpret the same question in different ways, thus leading to two different and inconsistent interpretations of the question’s intent, one interpretation that is close to the researcher’s intent and the other that is not. The same sub-causes were detected as in the first cause, being “misleading situations” and “missing details”. Another underlying cause was found in this category: “misleading term”. In one question targeting communication skills it is more specifically a “misleading term” that led the subject to answer about a different competency thus leading to a validity error. The question’s original form is: “Tell me about a time you were approached by an irate customer, coworker, or individual. What was your response?”
The term “coworker” led the subject to believe that the question is targeting conflict resolution skills. The subject suggested that when dealing with a “co-worker who is equal to me, it is problem solving because my role is not to comfort him/her. If it is a customer, my goal is to communicate and defuse the anger”.

**Processing Difficulties**

Processing difficulties are problems that are related to the retrieval of information process that the subject encounters while answering the question, be it factual or hypothetical. The difficulties of recalling events are caused by: “the respondents may be unable to retrieve the information necessary to answer the question”. This processing difficulty may be associated with several underlying causes, in this research two specific causes were detected.

The first one is caused by “missing details” making the retrieval of the information harder for the subject because it is hard to distinguish from other similar events or information. For example, the question “Give me an example of a time when you had multiple and conflicting priorities, and explain how you handled them.” Was too vague, and led one of the subjects to encounter difficulties in retrieving information, and taking a long time to process the answer. The subject commented “The question is very open ended, candidates may take long time to think about it, can you give us more details or examples?”

The second specific cause found in the text is the “complex nature of the competency”, that led to processing difficulties because it may require a high level of maturity or years of experience that the subject did not reach yet, or not to the point of talking openly about it. For example the emotional intelligence competency required the subject to talk about his/her weakness: “Think of a challenging working relationship you have had. What was your part in the difficulty, and what was their part? Tell me
about the person and your interactions with them. What did you do to address the relationship or make it more successful?"

One of the subjects did not mention his part in the difficulty thus not tapping into one of the behaviors of emotional intelligence: “be aware of own emotions”, moreover the subjected commented: “the competency is a difficult one, and not all candidates may have experienced this.”

**Comprehension Problems**

The key issue for comprehension problems is whether the subjects understand the question and the question’s wording, in the same way as the researcher intended. The question should be understandable in the same way by the two subjects and in the way the researcher intended, or else this would lead to a measurement error or validity error. We found 12 errors of this type in the SIQs.

The first type of general cause behind the comprehension error, as cited in the task-focused model is the use of “complex sentence structure”. As per our analysis, this could be specifically caused by adding to the question “irrelevant details” that makes the question longer and confuses the subjects. For example a long question contained a detail which made it more encumbering: “You are in Hamra taking an old woman who has fallen and broken her leg to the hospital. You also get a call for an emergency in Hamra regarding a car accident in which both passengers are injured. As you go to the scene, you find the driver stuck with the seatbelt still on, bleeding and screaming from pain. The second passenger is bleeding and about to go unconscious. You can only transport two patients at a time and they both need to get to the hospital. The road is empty since it is Wednesday night. You are on the scene along with two other team members. What would you do?” in this question the irrelevant detail is: “the driver stuck with the seatbelt on”.

The second sub-cause leading to a complex sentence structure is “disorganized information” relevant to the logical flow of the information in the question and its follow-up probes. In one of the questions the probes were not organized in a logical matter to help the subject understand the question’s intent better. The question’s original form was: “Think of a challenging working relationship you have had. What was your part in the difficulty, and what was their part? Tell me about the person and your interactions with them. What did you do to address the relationship or make it more successful?”

The second type of general cause related to comprehension errors is the “confusing use of vocabulary” that contains semantic errors. The semantic error is caused specifically by “misleading terms” that led to the subject’s confusion, because they held several connotations. For example, in one of the questions targeting organization skills: “Tell about a time you were responsible for planning an event/project, with other people involved. How did you handle this? What was the outcome?”

The use of the phrase “how did you handle this” led the subject to think that the researcher intended a negative connotation, asking about the faced obstacles.

The third type of general cause that lead to a comprehension error is: the subject not understanding how to respond, the specific causes behind this is that the questions are “missing details” thus being too broad and not guiding the subject on how to answer. For example in the question: “Tell me about a time when you had to deliver bad news to someone. What was the outcome?” the subject did not understand the question’s intent because the probe “what was the outcome” is too broad, and led to confusion.
Specific Findings

The total numbers of questions analyzed was 20 questions. Subjects detected errors in 19 out of the 20 questions developed. As per our analysis, validity errors occurred ten times, comprehension errors twelve times and processing difficulties 3 times.

However if we closely examine the types of errors associated with the nature of the question (situational versus behavioral) we realize that a pattern exists. We noticed that validity errors occurred mostly in situational questions, 8 out 10 validity errors are found in the hypothetical situations that we created. While comprehension errors occurred in both situational and behavioral questions in the same rate: 6 comprehension errors found in the situational questions and 6 in the behavioral. On the other hand the 3 errors of processing difficulties occurred in the behavioral questions.

Of interest also, is the nature of errors detected by the practitioner subjects versus the nature of errors detected by the academic subjects. We found in the case of situational questions that the practitioner subjects detected only validity errors related to the situation not reflecting the competency, however the academics found also other types of error, i.e. comprehension problems, caused by unwanted details and missing details. Moreover in the behavioral questions, academic subjects detected two types of errors not mentioned by the practitioners: misleading terms that led to a validity error, and the use of vocabulary with misleading terms that led to comprehension errors.

We also proposed another tool to measure the validity of the questions as pertaining to the competency and its behaviors. Using a likert scale, we asked the subjects to rate the relatedness of the question to the competency it is supposed to measure, scores varied from 1 to 5:
Table 3

*Findings of the SMEs’ Ratings of the Relevance of the Question to the Competency*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Irrelevant to competency</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We then looked closely at the discrepancies between the two scores given by the two subjects for the same questions. We found that on a scale of 1 to 5, a difference of 2 points and above is a discrepancy worth mentioning. For example, if the Practitioner subject rated the relatedness to competency 5 and the Academic subject rated the relatedness 3, we considered this a conflicting point of view of the relatedness of the question to its competency. Thus, we found five scores out of twenty having a difference of more than 2 points.

The second part of the study was to find solutions in order to revise the questions, as per their detected errors. Thus, the 19 questions were revised and reedited, each depending on the type of error it had, as per Table 4.

As per the table below, each specific error could be resolved in several ways depending on the question’s context. For example, one of the solutions was to omit the behavior of active listening, that none of the 4 SIQs could cover, because of the nature of this behavior that needs a dialogue thus could not be measured in an interview but in a role play situation.
It is of interest to analyze how some solutions were more pertaining to the nature of the questions. We found that most of the revisions that required “adding probes” were done to behavioral questions. For example, the behavioral question: “Tell me about a time when you had to deliver bad news to someone. What was the outcome?” This question was found to be missing details that led to a comprehension problem, thus it was adjusted by incorporating more probes to guide the answers. The revised form was as follow: “Tell me about a time when you had to deliver bad news to someone, it could be at work or university.

- What did you specifically say?
- What was the outcome on that person?”

However, revisions that required to adjust the situation was only done to situational questions. For example, the following situational question in its original
form: “You and your team have just dropped to the ER a teenager who has lost consciousness due to an overdose and is in a very critical situation. When leaving the hospital, the child’s mother in shock grabs you and asks you what is wrong with her only child. What do you say?”

This question was detected with a misleading situation that led to a validity problem, and thus was revised and the situation was adjusted to: “You and your team have been called to a refugee camp because a teenager was not feeling good. By the time you arrive there, the teenager had lost consciousness due to a suspected drug overdose (as per your assessment) and needs to be transported to the ER immediately. The mother would not let you leave the house without knowing what is wrong with her son. How would you explain to the mother this situation?”

The solution that was mostly used is “adding details”, resolving most of the comprehension and the validity problems. We also noticed that the only solution used for the processing difficulties is adding probes, in order to help the subject to develop the answer.
CHAPTER VII
INTERPRETIVE ANALYSIS

According to the ratio of questions adjusted versus the questions that were not, 19 out of 20 questions were changed after the evaluation. This number suggests a very high possibility of errors’ occurrence if the questions are not revised or pre-tested. Validity errors are important because if candidates interpret the intention of the questions in a different way than of the researcher, the conclusions drawn from the candidates’ answers will be flawed, because they will not contain evidence of the thought-after competency or its behaviors. Ultimately, the goal of the researcher is to design questions that could target the competencies. Thus, this ratio suggests the importance of pre-testing selection interview questions.

The three categories of errors: validity, comprehension and processing problems are equally serious. The same importance should be accorded to each, disregarding their rate of occurrence, since, all three errors lead to a validity issue. Hence, they decrease the degree of fit between the question and the construct or the unit of measurement, the construct being the competency in this study.

Moreover, as the results show, some errors are related to the nature of the question being situational or behavioral. The situational questions could entail more validity errors, 8 out of 10 validity errors were found in situational questions. Hence, situational questions could be more challenging to develop according to a given competency, in contrast behavioral questions are straightforward and easier to formulate in relation to the competency.

On the other hand, processing difficulties only occurred in behavioral
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questions, thus suggesting that subjects might face difficulties in recalling past event from their own experiences. The solution we suggested is to add some details and probes, in order to help the respondent process his or her response better.

Our results also show that the academic subjects’ interventions were very important in detecting certain types of errors such as “unwanted details, missing details, misleading terms that led to a validity error, and the use of vocabulary that led to comprehension errors.” It is not surprising that having experts in questionnaire design review the questions for problems would result in a detailed revision of the quality of data. As per Rothgeb, Willis & Forsyth (2001), expert reviews of questionnaires are likely to reveal problems that are related to data analysis and question comprehension. Our results suggest the same findings.

In addition to the assessment of the questions through cognitive probing, we used another approach for assessing the validity between the competencies and the questions to which they ought to be related. Subjects scored the relatedness of the questions to their competencies on a likert scale, and results show that 35% of the questions had a score of 3 or under, meaning that they were neutral, irrelevant or strongly irrelevant in revealing the competency. This percentage is high and highlights once more the importance of the pretesting process and its objective to enhance the validity through revising the quality of the data.

It is important to mention that we actually had 3 ways to assess the relatedness of the question to its competency through:

- The subjects answering directly the SIQ in its questionnaire format, and thus assessing if the initial answer to the initial SIQ pertains to the competency.

- Cognitive probes that asked the subjects’ to first guess to which competency is the question related, then further probing about the relation of the
question to its competency.

- Asking the subjects to give scores on the relatedness of the questions to its competency.

We found it very important to reconfirm our findings through several ways, this data triangulation technique helped us determine the cause of the problem, as well as reconfirm our findings in order to execute the changes.

Moreover, using this technique was useful, when both subjects had a conflicting or contradicting point of view as to whether the question reveals the competency or not. As per the results, 5 scores were conflicting, thus the practitioner subject and the academic subject had 2 or more points of difference while scoring the question. In this case we looked for clues in the data gathered through triangulation and the several answers in order to make the necessary changes.

It is important to mention, the rationale we used behind finding solutions and reediting the SIQs. The first criteria we looked at was the data in the direct answers to the SIQs, which is the first measure as to whether the answers contain data that revealed the competency. Thus the high importance of the experts answering the questions in their questionnaire format. We collected a lot of data through these answers. Second, all the data we collected from the cognitive probes were used to come up with a conclusion on the kind of error be it: validity, comprehension or processing problem, and the specific causes behind them. The rating method helped in reconfirming these findings.

Moreover, we never changed the whole context of the situation; because a new question could not be tested thus it might contain new errors and lead to more validity problems. We only adjusted the situations that were misleading.

As mentioned above, changes were made according to the findings and suggestions of the subjects, results show that some changes were more relevant to the
nature of the questions and the nature of the error.

The changes made to most of the behavioral questions was to add probes in order to help reveal more the competency. Adding probes to the behavioral questions, stresses on the point developed earlier in the literature review about behavioral questioning allowing to probe for further and ask follow-up questions (Bosshardt, 1993 as cited in Taylor & Small, 2002).

As for the situational questions, most of the solutions pertained on adjusting the situation which is also related to our prior findings that suggested high occurrence of validity errors in such questions. Moreover our findings suggest that adding probes helps the respondent with the processing difficulties he/she might encounter. Finally as per our findings the solution that was the most common was “adding details”, it resolved most of the comprehension and the validity problems.

Moreover, in summarizing the findings above, we can draw the following inferences:

- It is important that the subjects who are assessing the questions, first answer the question in its questionnaire context, as candidates, without giving any analyses. This helps the subject in answering the probes, moreover it generates abundant data, and it confirms the data collected at a later stage by the cognitive probes.
- Including several ways or a data triangulation technique to reconfirm the relatedness of the questions to its competency is important, for example adding the likert scale in this helped confirm our findings.
- Having more than one subject reviewing the same item is very important and leads to higher content validity.
- Including academic experts in the review of the questions is important. They can help reveal detailed errors related to comprehension and data analysis.
• While writing situational questions, it is important to always keep in mind the competency and craft the situation accordingly.

• It is useful to add probes to behavioral questions, one question alone may not capture the competency and its related behaviors. Probes in behavioral questions, also help the candidate in processing the response.

• All kinds of errors are equally important if they lead to a validity problem, thus interfering with the degree to which the questions target their competencies.

The findings above lead to believe that the questions’ evaluation in this study ensured improving the data’s quality and confirmed the definition of cognitive interviewing offered by Beatty & Willis (2007). Cognitive interviewing is “the administration of draft survey questions while collecting additional verbal information about the survey responses, which is used to evaluate the quality of the response or to help determine whether the question is generating the information that its author intends” (p. 288). Thus, the use of the cognitive interview led to achieving the objective of enhancing the content validity of the questions, which is the degree of fit between questions and constructs. Hence, the cognitive interviewing enhanced the content validity of the overall developed selection interview.
CHAPTER VIII

CONCLUSION

Our research has greatly outlined the importance of the use of cognitive interviewing in the evaluation of structured selection interview questions. Cognitive interviewing has helped in our understanding of the causes of errors in situational and behavioral questions. It has also helped us develop better questions and thus a better selection instrument.

As such, we can say that this study added values in several ways:

- Demonstrating that pretesting interview questions through cognitive interviewing is very important in detecting potential sources of errors, and ways of amendment. Thus, cognitive interviewing can be a practical and valuable tool researchers can use for pretesting selection interview questions.

- Providing a coding scheme that resulted from our data transcription, and that can be used to identify similar possible errors in interview questions.

- Providing inferences taken from the data analysis, which can be used when writing interview questions and when pre-testing them.

- Providing a reedited version of the interview questions which can be used in the actual selection of volunteers in the Lebanese Red Cross, since they have been pre-tested, and have high content validity.
CHAPTER IX

LIMITATIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

Our study faces certain limitations. First, the cognitive interviewing technique (CIT) generates data qualitative in nature, thus indicating the existence of a problem, and possible solutions, however this method does not provide quantitative information on the degree and the size of its impact on survey questions. Providing quantitative data on the use of the CIT in questionnaire design would have been very interesting to support our objectives and conclusions.

Furthermore, the cognitive interviewing technique as used in this research helped to evaluate the existing forms of questions, and generate a possible revision of the original questions. However, the CIT did not provide evidence on whether the revised version of the question is better than the original. Thus the revised questions have better content validity than the initial versions but could have also been re-tested to confirm our findings.

Adding to the above points one other limitation to the CIT, found by Wilson et al. in 1995 (as cited in Collins, 2003), is that it could discriminate against less articulate subjects, who find difficulties in verbally processing their thoughts.

As per the above limitations, future studies might include a quantitative study on the effects of the CIT on selection questions, thus using quantitative methods that include measurements of reliability and validity. To obtain this type of information different question-testing methods might be required.

Moreover, future research could use a second iteration of the CIT, combining to the initial pre-testing phase, a second round of field testing phase. Thus enhancing
even more the validity of the revised questions and making sure they correlate better to their competencies, and most importantly reconfirming our findings.

Another direction for future researches and as a continuity to this study, is for researchers to develop a response scoring standardization to measure the responses of candidates, also by using the CIT. Under such a model, researchers could experiment with response scoring standardization and determine how best to use it to enhance the effectiveness of the interview process.
CHAPTER X

PRACTICAL IMPLICATIONS

On a practical level, our research findings generate useful insights to be applied while designing interview questions. For instance, in the study, we constructed a structured interview based on the best practices developed in the literature, thus taking into account all the criteria that lead to the enhancement of its validity. The questions were developed based on specific constructs that are the competencies taken from the EMTs job description. Moreover, the questions were divided into two types, which were found to have the highest validity: the behavioral and the situational questions. Thus, the interview protocol developed, and the methodology behind it can serve as an example for the construction of other structured selection interviews. Moreover, the developed coding scheme based on the task-focused model, contained additional specific errors that questionnaire designers can make use of while preparing their selection questions. The inferences that were made through the cognitive testing method could also serve as a guide during similar selection interview construction, pre-testing and revision.

Finally, the developed interview protocols will be given to the Lebanese Red Cross 101 Center in order to be used in the interviewing process, hence the final result of this study which is the revised interview questions will be used in the practical world.

However, enhancing the validity of the selection interview is the first step to effective selection, but several other steps have to be integrated to enhance the validity of the entire process. Apart from designing the questions, Red Cross Volunteers involved in selection should be able to accurately score the responses. Moreover, they
need to be trained on how to administer the questions, how to assess the candidates’ characteristics and how to be able to have decision-making free from biases.
APPENDIX I

JOB DESCRIPTION AND PERSON SPECIFICATION FOR VOLUNTEER AT RED CROSS

Position title
Emergency Medical Technician - Volunteer

Reporting to
Team leader

Location
Spears, Beirut, Lebanon

Hours
12 hours weekly during a specific weekday (6pm to 6am) + 16 hours once every 5 weeks during the weekend (Saturday 4pm till Sunday 6pm OR Sunday 10am till Monday 6am)

ORGANIZATION CONFORMANCE STATEMENTS

In the performance of their respective tasks and duties, all RC volunteers are expected to conform to the following:

- Uphold the seven Red Cross Principles
- Perform quality work while on duty
- Work effectively as a team member on all assignments
- Work independently while understanding the necessity for communicating and coordinating work efforts with the Chef de Mission
- Act and interact professionally while representing the Red Cross
- Remain mentally and physically prepared for emergencies
- Arrive promptly to the allocated shift
- Follow the itinerary of the shift
- Maintain personal hygiene

POSITION PURPOSE

The purpose of this position is to provide free urgent medical care to anyone in need. Such services may include providing first aid care on-scene, at home, or at the Red Cross Center; transporting patients to different locations; and providing temporary rescue units at festivals and sports events.
RESPONSIBILITIES/DUTIES/FUNCTIONS/TASKS

Checking and setting the team’s schedule
- Checking with operations (140) to record the current shift’s missions
- Setting a schedule to prioritize and to attend to each of the missions

Checking and readying ambulances and automobiles
- Ensuring all materials in ambulances are available, functional and packed correctly (i.e., according to a checklist)
- Maintaining a sterile environment in ambulances and automobiles

Treating minor wounds and burns (soins) at the station
- Providing treatment and care services for new and follow-up patients
- Rolling gauzes

Attending emergencies and missions outside the station
- Providing rescue services to patients during emergencies
- Stabilizing patients after emergencies
- Transporting patients to different locations

Training new recruits
- Preparing and running training camps for new recruits
- Imparting experience to new recruits while on missions and emergencies
- Holding technique sessions at the station for new recruits or other colleagues

Attending meetings
- Attending team meetings towards the end of every shift
- Attending station meetings occasionally
- Attending committee meetings occasionally
- Conducting committee work (such as inventories, social services, etc.) occasionally

Acting as standby emergency medical services at events
- Setting up and providing emergency medical services at events upon request (e.g., concerts, sports events, official state visits of foreign dignitaries, etc.)

Upgrading professional skills and first-aid techniques
- Participating in first-aid technique updating trainings and sessions (sometimes outside shift time)
- Researching how to work with equipment
Maintaining the station

- Cleaning and tidying the station
- Performing ad hoc tasks such as inventories, repairs, and other maintenance tasks
- Maintaining a sterile environment in “soins” rooms at the station

Engaging in team related activities

- Participating and facilitating team building activities and team outings
- Taking responsibility for preparing dinner for teammates on shift at the station (one team member per shift)
- Covering for teammate’s shifts (consensually)

SPECIAL POSITION REQUIREMENTS

As with any activities surrounding emergency medical services, there are security risks, hazards, and inconveniences to which volunteers will be exposed. Volunteers must be ready and willing to be active in these situations. In case of national emergencies (e.g., war, disaster, large scale accidents), volunteers are required to report to the center for dispatch regardless of their regularly scheduled shifts. Additionally, there sometimes arises a need for the Red Cross volunteers to attend to missions or emergencies in remote areas of the country that are far from the station. In these cases, volunteers are therefore required to spend the entire shift outside the station. Overall, these types of activities during critical situations may pose psychological and physical strain.

Depending on work assignments, this position requires physical strength and the ability to stand for long periods of time as well as to walk/run while manipulating (i.e., lifting, carrying, moving) light, medium, and sometimes heavy weights.

PERSON SPECIFICATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job-related</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Pre-existing Knowledge** Knowledge of Arabic is essential and knowledge of other languages is an asset.
Skills & Abilities

**Conflict Resolution** Is able and willing to encourage buy-in and acceptance by looking for points **Skills** in common, building mutual understanding, and/or finding ways to break deadlocks (**Diplomacy**). Is able and willing to effectively get others to be flexible in their views in order to compromise and resolve conflict (**Negotiation**). Is able and willing to shape the decisions, actions or perceptions of others towards particular outcomes or courses of action in an honest manner (**Influence**).

**Communication Skills** Is able and willing to organize and present (sensitive, technical, or medical) information, views and concepts in a concise, understandable format for a variety of people from different backgrounds. Is able and willing to communicate in an appropriate manner to maximize understanding of both the message and its intent. Is able and willing to communicate (verbally and nonverbally) in a sensitive and comforting manner. Able and willing listen to others fully and intently without interruption.

**Organizational Skills** Is able and willing to manage one's own time and the time of others efficiently and effectively.

**Emotional Intelligence** Is able and willing to identify, assess, and control one’s own emotions (**Intrapersonal Skills**). Is aware and tolerant of other’s feelings and emotions (**Interpersonal Skills**)

**Judgment and Decision** Is able and willing to tell when something is wrong or is likely to go wrong. It **Making Skills** does not involve solving the problem, only recognizing there is a problem (**Problem Sensitivity**). Is able to investigate, identify and analyze key issues and the alternative solutions to develop practical solutions (**Critical Thinking**). Can be creative and innovative when developing effective solutions and the ability to manage related risks (**Creative Problem Solving**). Can identify the process required to facilitate a decision within established timeframes (**Fast Problem Solving**).

**Teamwork Skills** Is able and willing to work cooperatively with others in the accomplishment of joint tasks and common objectives. Is able and willing listen and respond to the input of others in a manner that creates an environment of mutual trust and respect. Is able and willing to accept feedback from others irrespective of seniority, gender, age etc. Reflects a sense of humor that is congruent with the situation.
### Leadership Skills
Is able and willing to lead, take charge, and offer opinions and direction. Is confident is his or her actions yet modest. Can hold self and others accountable through direct communication. Is energetic and active and takes initiative when needed. Is able and willing to act maturely. Is ethical and fair in his actions.

### Stress Tolerance
Is able and willing to deal calmly and effectively with high stress situations.

### Other characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Humane</strong></td>
<td>Demonstrates the capacity for, and interest in, helping others and in charity work more generally. Values volunteerism and understands its importance for self-development, serving patients, and contributing to the wider community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commitment to the job</strong></td>
<td>Demonstrates responsibility towards the mission of the RC and seriousness towards the day-to-day tasks of the job. Is hard working and willing to make sacrifices for the sake of the job and the greater RC mission.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self-development</strong></td>
<td>Demonstrates the capacity for, and interest in, taking personal responsibility for one’s own learning and development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tolerance</strong></td>
<td>Demonstrates the capacity for, and interest in, recognizing and respecting the beliefs or practices of others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bravery and courage</strong></td>
<td>Demonstrates the capacity and willingness to engage in their tasks despite facing difficulty, danger, pain, etc. Willing to take risks.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Physical characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Health</strong></td>
<td>Physical health: Lack of illness that may interfere with job. Mental Health: No hemophobia or other job debilitating psychological conditions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Other

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interests</strong></td>
<td>Medicine, science, anatomy, physiology, and related fields.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affiliations</strong></td>
<td>Candidates should not be (nor have been) actively affiliated to any political party.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TIME COMMITMENT AND AVAILABILITY

Due to the time-sensitive and critical nature of the job, volunteers must be able to manage their own schedule and have freedom to come to work at night and on weekends. Shift and emergency situations should take precedence over other social obligations.

OPPORTUNITIES

By the nature of volunteering with RC, individuals are provided with many opportunities to:

- Help others and make a difference in their lives
- Give back to, and build a better, society and contribute as an active citizen
- Meet and interact with people from different backgrounds and regions
- Develop friendships and become a part of the RC family and community
- Learn new life-saving skills and techniques on a regular basis
COMPETENCY 1- CR SIQS1

You are on a mission along with two of your teammates who do not have a very good relationship. While preparing the necessary equipment to save the patient, one of them started giving orders to the other, who in his turn felt offended and started yelling. The two people engaged in a fight; how would you solve the conflict between them/ what would you do?

Comprehension of question:
1. Can you tell me in your own words what is the question asking?
2. Are all parts of the question comprehensible?
   a. If not: What improvements or amendments, if any, do you suggest should be made to the above question?

Relevance of question to the job:
3. Practitioner: Was it hard for you to put yourself in this situation or is it something you would experience in your role as an EMT?
   a. If not: What improvements or amendments, if any, do you suggest should be made to the above question?

Question targeted to the competency:
4. In your opinion which competency do the questions above target?
   (If answer is similar to competency: show definition and move to 8)
   **Conflict Resolution Skills**: Being able to be constructive when challenged, encourage buy-in and mutual understanding by resolving conflict, and being able to negotiate and influence others.

5. (If answer is different to competency: show the competency and the definition that this question aims to measure.) After viewing the competency, do you think that this question could also be targeting this competency?

6. Could you rate the extent to which the question targets the competency on a scale of 1 to 5? Could you explain your choice?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Irrelevant</td>
<td>Irrelevant</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Relevant</td>
<td>Strongly Relevant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Considering the answer that you provided when I first asked you this question, do you believe that this answer gave indication about where you stand on the following behaviors:
Encourage buy-in, being able to negotiate and influence others, being able to be constructive when challenged.

8. If you don’t think the above behaviors are reflected in your answers, what improvements or amendments, if any, do you suggest should be made to the above question in order to target the desired behaviors?

Competency 2- COM SIQS1

You and your team have just dropped to the ER a teenager who has lost consciousness due to an overdose and is in a very critical situation. When leaving the hospital, the child’s mother in shock grabs you and asks you what is wrong with her only child. What do you say?

Comprehension of question:

1. Can you tell me in your own words what is the question asking?
2. Are all parts of the question comprehensible?
   a. If not: What improvements or amendments, if any, do you suggest should be made to the above question?

Relevance of question to the job:

3. Practitioner: Was it hard for you to put yourself in this situation or is it something you would experience in your role as an EMT?
   b. If not: What improvements or amendments, if any, do you suggest should be made to the above question?

Question targeted to the competency:

4. In your opinion which competency do the questions above target?

   (If answer is similar to competency: show definition and move to 8)

   Communication Skills: Is able to organize and present information for people from different backgrounds. Is able to communicate in a sensitive and comforting manner. Is able to actively listen to others.

   (If answer is different to competency: show the competency and the definition that this question aims to measure.) After viewing the competency, do you think that this question could also be targeting this competency?

5. Could you rate the extent to which the question targets the competency on a scale of 1 to 5? Could you explain your choice?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Irrelevant</td>
<td>Irrelevant</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Relevant</td>
<td>Strongly Relevant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Considering the answer that you provided when I first asked you this question, do you believe that this answer gave indication about where you stand on the following behaviors: Is able to present information for people from different backgrounds, is able to communicate in a sensitive and comforting manner and is able to actively listen to others.
7. If you don’t think the above behaviors are reflected in your answers, what improvements or amendments, if any, do you suggest should be made to the above question in order to target the desired behaviors?

**Competency 3- ORG SIQB1**

**Give me an example of a time when you had had multiple and conflicting priorities, and explain how you handled them.**

**Comprehension of question:**

1. Can you tell me in your own words what is the question asking?
2. Are all parts of the question comprehensible?
   a. If not: What improvements or amendments, if any, do you suggest should be made to the above question?

**Relevance of question to the job:**

3. Practitioner: Was it hard for you to put yourself in this situation or is it something you would experience in your role as an EMT?
   b. If not: What improvements or amendments, if any, do you suggest should be made to the above question?

**Question targeted to the competency:**

4. In your opinion which competency do the questions above target?
   (If answer is similar to competency: show definition and move to 8)
   **Organizational Skills: Is able to plan realistically, is able to prioritize, and is able and willing to manage one's own time, resources and the time of others efficiently and effectively.**

5. (If answer is different to competency: show the competency and the definition that this question aims to measure.) After viewing the competency, do you think that this question could also be targeting this competency?

6. Could you rate the extent to which the question targets the competency on a scale of 1 to 5? Could you explain your choice?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Irrelevant</td>
<td>Irrelevant</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Relevant</td>
<td>Strongly Relevant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Considering the answer that you provided when I first asked you this question, do you believe that this answer gave indication about where you stand on the following behaviors:

**Being able to plan realistically, being able to prioritize and being able to manage own time/resources/other’s time.**

8. If you don’t think the above behaviors are reflected in your answers, what improvements or amendments, if any, do you suggest should be made to the above question in order to target the desired behaviors?
Competency 4- EI SIQB2

Think of a challenging working relationship you have had. What was your part in the difficulty, and what was their part? Tell me about the person and your interactions with them. What did you do to address the relationship or make it more successful?

Comprehension of question:
1. Can you tell me in your own words what is the question asking?
2. Are all parts of the question comprehensible?
   a. If not: What improvements or amendments, if any, do you suggest should be made to the above question?

Relevance of question to the job:
3. Practitioner: Was it hard for you to put yourself in this situation or is it something you would experience in your role as an EMT?
   b. If not: What improvements or amendments, if any, do you suggest should be made to the above question?

Question targeted to the competency:
4. In your opinion which competency do the questions above target?
   (If answer is similar to competency: show definition and move to 8)
   Emotional Intelligence: Is able to identify one’s own emotions, able to control one’s own emotions, is aware and tolerant of other’s feelings and emotions.
5. (If answer is different to competency: show the competency and the definition that this question aims to measure.) After viewing the competency, do you think that this question could also be targeting this competency?
6. Could you rate the extent to which the question targets the competency on a scale of 1 to 5? Could you explain your choice?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Irrelevant</td>
<td>Irrelevant</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Relevant</td>
<td>Strongly Relevant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Considering the answer that you provided when I first asked you this question, do you believe that this answer gave indication about where you stand on the following behaviors:
   “Being aware of one’s own emotions, controlling one’s own emotions, being aware of others emotions”
8. If you don’t think the above behaviors are reflected in your answers, what improvements or amendments, if any, do you suggest should be made to the above question in order to target the desired behaviors?


APPENDIX III

INTERVIEW PROTOCOL 2:
LEBANESE RED CROSS SPEARS 101

Competency 1- CR SIQS2
You are on a mission along with two teammates trying to rescue a mother suffering from severe breathing problems. Two of her sons engage in a fight regarding whether they want to take her to the hospital or not. The older son, who does not want his mother to be transported to the hospital but rather keep her home, starts yelling at his brother for calling the Red Cross. They get into a fight and do not allow your team to leave the house. What would you do?

Comprehension of question:
1. Can you tell me in your own words what is the question asking?
2. Are all parts of the question comprehensible?
   a. If not: What improvements or amendments, if any, do you suggest should be made to the above question?

Relevance of question to the job:
3. Practitioner: Was it hard for you to put yourself in this situation or is it something you would experience in your role as an EMT?
   b. If not: What improvements or amendments, if any, do you suggest should be made to the above question?

Question targeted to the competency:
4. In your opinion which competency do the questions above target?
   (If answer is similar to competency: show definition and move to 8)

   Conflict Resolution Skills: Being able to be constructive when challenged, encourage buy-in and mutual understanding by resolving conflict, and being able to negotiate and influence others.

5. (If answer is different to competency: show the competency and the definition that this question aims to measure.) After viewing the competency, do you think that this question could also be targeting this competency?

6. Could you rate the extent to which the question targets the competency on a scale of 1 to 5? Could you explain your choice?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Irrelevant</td>
<td>Irrelevant</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Relevant</td>
<td>Strongly Relevant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. Considering the answer that you provided when I first asked you this question, do you believe that this answer gave indication about where you stand on the following behaviors:

   **Encourage buy-in, being able to negotiate and influence others, being able to be constructive when challenged.**

8. If you don’t think the above behaviors are reflected in your answers, what improvements or amendments, if any, do you suggest should be made to the above question in order to target the desired behaviors?

**Competency 2- COM SIQB1**

Tell me about a time when you had to deliver bad news to someone. What was the outcome?

**Comprehension of question:**

1. Can you tell me in your own words what is the question asking?
2. Are all parts of the question comprehensible?
   a. If not: What improvements or amendments, if any, do you suggest should be made to the above question?

**Relevance of question to the job:**

3. Practitioner: Was it hard for you to put yourself in this situation or is it something you would experience in your role as an EMT?
   b. If not: What improvements or amendments, if any, do you suggest should be made to the above question?

**Question targeted to the competency:**

4. In your opinion which competency do the questions above target?

   (If answer is similar to competency: show definition and move to 8)

   **Communication Skills:** Is able to organize and present information for people from different backgrounds. Is able to communicate in a sensitive and comforting manner. Is able to actively listen to others.

5. (If answer is different to competency: show the competency and the definition that this question aims to measure.) After viewing the competency, do you think that this question could also be targeting this competency?

6. Could you rate the extent to which the question targets the competency on a scale of 1 to 5. Could you explain your choice?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Irrelevant</td>
<td>Irrelevant</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Relevant</td>
<td>Strongly Relevant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Considering the answer that you provided when I first asked you this question, do you believe that this answer gave indication about where you stand on the following behaviors: **Is able to communicate with people from different**
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backgrounds, communicate in a sensitive and comforting manner and is able to actively listen to others.

7. If you don’t think the above behaviors are reflected in your answers, what improvements or amendments, if any, do you suggest should be made to the above question in order to target the desired behaviors?

Competency 3- ORG SIQB2

Tell about a time you were responsible for planning an event/project, with other people involved. How did you handle this? What was the outcome?

Comprehension of question:

1. Can you tell me in your own words what is the question asking?
2. Are all parts of the question comprehensible?
   a. If not: What improvements or amendments, if any, do you suggest should be made to the above question?

Relevance of question to the job:

3. Practitioner: Was it hard for you to put yourself in this situation or is it something you would experience in your role as an EMT?
   b. If not: What improvements or amendments, if any, do you suggest should be made to the above question?

Question targeted to the competency:

4. In your opinion which competency do the questions above target?
   (If answer is similar to competency: show definition and move to 8)
   Organizational Skills: Is able to plan realistically, is able to prioritize, and is able and willing to manage one’s own time, resources and the time of others efficiently and effectively.

5. (If answer is different to competency: show the competency and the definition that this question aims to measure.) After viewing the competency, do you think that this question could also be targeting this competency?

6. Could you rate the extent to which the question targets the competency on a scale of 1 to 5. Could you explain your choice?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Irrelevant</td>
<td>Irrelevant</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Relevant</td>
<td>Strongly Relevant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Considering the answer that you provided when I first asked you this question, do you believe that this answer gave indication about where you stand on the following behaviors:

   Being able to plan realistically, being able to prioritize and being able to manage own time/resources/other’s time.
8. If you don’t think the above behaviors are reflected in your answers, what improvements or amendments, if any, do you suggest should be made to the above question in order to target the desired behaviors?

Competency 4- JDM SIQS1

You are called for an emergency in one of the areas of Beirut regarding a man who is having a nervous breakdown. As you go to the scene, you realize that the area is not safe and some shooting is taking place between people from opposed political parties. The man's wife has already called you twice since you left the center telling you that his case is becoming more critical. What would you do?

Comprehension of question:

1. Can you tell me in your own words what is the question asking?
2. Are all parts of the question comprehensible?
   a. If not: What improvements or amendments, if any, do you suggest should be made to the above question?

Relevance of question to the job:

3. Practitioner: Was it hard for you to put yourself in this situation or is it something you would experience in your role as an EMT?
   b. If not: What improvements or amendments, if any, do you suggest should be made to the above question?

Question targeted to the competency:

4. In your opinion which competency do the questions above target?

   (If answer is similar to competency: show definition and move to 8)

   Judgment and decision making: Is able to recognize that there is a problem (Problem Sensitivity). Is able to identify sources of the problem and solutions (Critical Thinking) in a creative and fast way while being able to manage related risks (Creative and fast Problem Solving).

5. (If answer is different to competency: show the competency and the definition that this question aims to measure.) After viewing the competency, do you think that this question could also be targeting this competency?

6. Could you rate the extent to which the question targets the competency on a scale of 1 to 5? Could you explain your choice?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Irrelevant</td>
<td>Irrelevant</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Relevant</td>
<td>Strongly Relevant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Considering the answer that you provided when I first asked you this question, do you believe that this answer gave indication about where you stand on the following behaviors:
Is able to recognize that there is a problem: Problem Sensitivity, is able to identify sources of the problem and solutions: Critical Thinking and is able to manage related risks: Creative and fast Problem Solving.

8. If you don’t think the above behaviors are reflected in your answers, what improvements or amendments, if any, do you suggest should be made to the above question in order to target the desired behaviors?
COMPETENCY 1- CR SIQB1

Tell about a time when you made a decision that was unpopular and did not receive the consensus of everyone. Some of your team members disagreed with your ideas or approach. How did you handle the situation?

Comprehension of question:
1. Can you tell me in your own words what is the question asking?
2. Are all parts of the question comprehensible?
   a. If not: What improvements or amendments, if any, do you suggest should be made to the above question?

Relevance of question to the job:
3. Practitioner: Was it hard for you to put yourself in this situation or is it something you would experience in your role as an EMT?
   b. If not: What improvements or amendments, if any, do you suggest should be made to the above question?

Question targeted to the competency:
4. In your opinion which competency do the questions above target?
   (If answer is similar to competency: show definition and move to 8)

   Conflict Resolution Skills: Being able to be constructive when challenged, encourage buy-in and mutual understanding by resolving conflict, and being able to negotiate and influence others.

5. (If answer is different to competency: show the competency and the definition that this question aims to measure.) After viewing the competency, do you think that this question could also be targeting this competency?

6. Could you rate the extent to which the question targets the competency on a scale of 1 to 5? Could you explain your choice?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Irrelevant</td>
<td>Irrelevant</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Relevant</td>
<td>Strongly Relevant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Considering the answer that you provided when I first asked you this question, do you believe that this answer gave indication about where you stand on the following behaviors:

   Encourage buy-in, being able to negotiate and influence others, being able to be constructive when challenged.
8. If you don’t think the above behaviors are reflected in your answers, what improvements or amendments, if any, do you suggest should be made to the above question in order to target the desired behaviors?

Competency 2- COM SIQB2

Tell me about a time you were approached by an irate customer, coworker, or individual. What was your response?

Comprehension of question:
1. Can you tell me in your own words what is the question asking?
2. Are all parts of the question comprehensible?
   a. If not: What improvements or amendments, if any, do you suggest should be made to the above question?

Relevance of question to the job:
3. Practitioner: Was it hard for you to put yourself in this situation or is it something you would experience in your role as an EMT?
   b. If not: What improvements or amendments, if any, do you suggest should be made to the above question?

Question targeted to the competency:
4. In your opinion which competency do the questions above target?
   (If answer is similar to competency: show definition and move to 8)

   Communication Skills: Is able to organize and present information for people from different backgrounds. Is able to communicate in a sensitive and comforting manner. Is able to actively listen to others.

5. (If answer is different to competency: show the competency and the definition that this question aims to measure.) After viewing the competency, do you think that this question could also be targeting this competency?

6. Could you rate the extent to which the question targets the competency on a scale of 1 to 5. Could you explain your choice?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Irrelevant</td>
<td>Irrelevant</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Relevant</td>
<td>Strongly Relevant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Considering the answer that you provided when I first asked you this question, do you believe that this answer gave indication about where you stand on the following behaviors:

   Is able to communicate with people from different backgrounds, communicate in a sensitive and comforting manner and is able to actively listen to others.
8. If you don’t think the above behaviors are reflected in your answers, what improvements or amendments, if any, do you suggest should be made to the above question in order to target the desired behaviors?

Competency 3- EI SIQS1

You and your team arrive at the scene of the emergency and find a girl who has fallen and broken her arm. You do the necessary first aid steps and carry her to the ambulance. Her brother, who is a medical student, starts telling you what to do and points out that you are doing things the wrong way. He wants to interfere in your work, and asks to help his sister himself. What would you do, how would you react?

Comprehension of question:
1. Can you tell me in your own words what is the question asking?
2. Are all parts of the question comprehensible?
   a. If not: What improvements or amendments, if any, do you suggest should be made to the above question?

Relevance of question to the job:
3. Practitioner: Was it hard for you to put yourself in this situation or is it something you would experience in your role as an EMT?
   b. If not: What improvements or amendments, if any, do you suggest should be made to the above question?

Question targeted to the competency:
4. In your opinion which competency do the questions above target?
   (If answer is similar to competency: show definition and move to 8)

   Emotional Intelligence: Is able to identify one’s own emotions, able to control one’s own emotions, is aware and tolerant of other’s feelings and emotions.

5. (If answer is different to competency: show the competency and the definition that this question aims to measure.) After viewing the competency, do you think that this question could also be targeting this competency?

6. Could you rate the extent to which the question targets the competency on a scale of 1 to 5. Could you explain your choice?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Irrelevant</td>
<td>Irrelevant</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Relevant</td>
<td>Strongly Relevant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Considering the answer that you provided when I first asked you this question, do you believe that this answer gave indication about where you stand on the following behaviors:

   Be aware of own emotions, control emotions, aware of others emotions.
8. If you don’t think the above behaviors are reflected in your answers, what improvements or amendments, if any, do you suggest should be made to the above question in order to target the desired behaviors?

**Competency 4- JDM SIQS2**

You are in Hamra taking an old woman who has fallen and broken her leg to the hospital. You also get a call for an emergency in Hamra regarding a car accident in which both passengers are injured. As you go to the scene, you find the driver stuck with the seatbelt still on, bleeding and screaming from pain. The second passenger is bleeding and about to go unconscious. You can only transport two patients at a time and they both need to get to the hospital. The road is empty since it is Wednesday night. You are on the scene along with two other team members. What would you do?

**Comprehension of question:**

1. Can you tell me in your own words what is the question asking?

2. Are all parts of the question comprehensible?
   a. If not: What improvements or amendments, if any, do you suggest should be made to the above question?

**Relevance of question to the job:**

3. Practitioner: Was it hard for you to put yourself in this situation or is it something you would experience in your role as an EMT?
   b. If not: What improvements or amendments, if any, do you suggest should be made to the above question?

**Question targeted to the competency:**

4. In your opinion which competency do the questions above target?
   
   (If answer is similar to competency: show definition and move to 8)

   **Judgment and decision making:** Is able to recognize that there is a problem (Problem Sensitivity). Is able to identify sources of the problem and solutions (Critical Thinking) in a creative and fast way while being able to manage related risks (Creative and fast Problem Solving).

5. (If answer is different to competency: show the competency and the definition that this question aims to measure.) After viewing the competency, do you think that this question could also be targeting this competency?

6. Could you rate the extent to which the question targets the competency on a scale of 1 to 5? Could you explain your choice?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Irrelevant</td>
<td>Irrelevant</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Relevant</td>
<td>Strongly Relevant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. Considering the answer that you provided when I first asked you this question, do you believe that this answer gave indication about where you stand on the following behaviors:

**Is able to recognize that there is a problem:** Problem Sensitivity, **is able to identify sources of the problem and solutions:** Critical Thinking and **is able to manage related risks:** Creative and fast Problem Solving.

8. If you don’t think the above behaviors are reflected in your answers, what improvements or amendments, if any, do you suggest should be made to the above question in order to target the desired behaviors?
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Competency 1- CR SIQB2
Describe a situation in which you were able to get your co-workers/colleagues who dislike each other to work together constructively.

Comprehension of question:
1. Can you tell me in your own words what is the question asking?
2. Are all parts of the question comprehensible?
   a. If not: What improvements or amendments, if any, do you suggest should be made to the above question?

Relevance of question to the job:
3. Practitioner: Was it hard for you to put yourself in this situation or is it something you would experience in your role as an EMT?
   b. If not: What improvements or amendments, if any, do you suggest should be made to the above question?

Question targeted to the competency:
4. In your opinion which competency do the questions above target?
   (If answer is similar to competency: show definition and move to 8)
   Conflict Resolution Skills: Being able to be constructive when challenged, encourage buy-in and mutual understanding by resolving conflict, and being able to negotiate and influence others.

   5. (If answer is different to competency: show the competency and the definition that this question aims to measure.) After viewing the competency, do you think that this question could also be targeting this competency?

6. Could you rate the extent to which the question targets the competency on a scale of 1 to 5? Could you explain your choice?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Irrelevant</td>
<td>Irrelevant</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Relevant</td>
<td>Strongly Relevant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Considering the answer that you provided when I first asked you this question, do you believe that this answer gave indication about where you stand on the following behaviors:

   Encourage buy-in, being able to negotiate and influence others, being able to be constructive when challenged.
8. If you don’t think the above behaviors are reflected in your answers, what improvements or amendments, if any, do you suggest should be made to the above question in order to target the desired behaviors?

Competency 2- ORG SIQS1

As a college student, your midterm exams have started, and you have an exam on Monday. As is the case every week, your shift at the RC is on Thursday, but this time the Team Leader exceptionally asks you to come on a Friday because there is an emergency at the center due to a critical political situation in the country. What would you do?

Comprehension of question:
1. Can you tell me in your own words what is the question asking?
2. Are all parts of the question comprehensible?
   a. If not: What improvements or amendments, if any, do you suggest should be made to the above question?

Relevance of question to the job:
3. Practitioner: Was it hard for you to put yourself in this situation or is it something you would experience in your role as an EMT?
   b. If not: What improvements or amendments, if any, do you suggest should be made to the above question?

Question targeted to the competency:
4. In your opinion which competency do the questions above target?
   (If answer is similar to competency: show definition and move to 8)

   Organization Skills: Is able to plan realistically, is able to prioritize, and is able and willing to manage one's own time, resources and the time of others efficiently and effectively.

5. (If answer is different to competency: show the competency and the definition that this question aims to measure.) After viewing the competency, do you think that this question could also be targeting this competency?

6. Could you rate the extent to which the question targets the competency on a scale of 1 to 5? Could you explain your choice?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Irrelevant</td>
<td>Irrelevant</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Relevant</td>
<td>Strongly Relevant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Considering the answer that you provided when I first asked you this question, do you believe that this answer gave indication about where you stand on the following behaviors:

   Being able to plan realistically, being able to prioritize and being able to manage own time/resources/other’s time.
8. If you don’t think the above behaviors are reflected in your answers, what improvements or amendments, if any, do you suggest should be made to the above question in order to target the desired behaviors?

Competency 3- EI SIQS2

You are at the center. You get a call from your mother telling you that your dad is not feeling well and that they had to take him to the hospital. As you hang up with your mother, the team leader is really upset because he sees everyone sitting. He immediately starts yelling; pointing mostly at you for not taking your responsibilities seriously. Although you have completed all your tasks and duties, the team leader rarely recognizes positive actions. What would you do? How would you respond?

Comprehension of question:

1. Can you tell me in your own words what is the question asking?
2. Are all parts of the question comprehensible?
   a. If not: What improvements or amendments, if any, do you suggest should be made to the above question?

Relevance of question to the job:

3. Practitioner: Was it hard for you to put yourself in this situation or is it something you would experience in your role as an EMT?
   b. If not: What improvements or amendments, if any, do you suggest should be made to the above question?

Question targeted to the competency:

4. In your opinion which competency do the questions above target?
   (If answer is similar to competency: show definition and move to 8)

   Emotional Intelligence: Is able to identify one’s own emotions, able to control one’s own emotions, is aware and tolerant of other’s feelings and emotions.

5. (If answer is different to competency: show the competency and the definition that this question aims to measure.) After viewing the competency, do you think that this question could also be targeting this competency?

6. Could you rate the extent to which the question targets the competency on a scale of 1 to 5? Could you explain your choice?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Irrelevant</td>
<td>Irrelevant</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Relevant</td>
<td>Strongly Relevant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Considering the answer that you provided when I first asked you this question, do you believe that this answer gave indication about where you stand on the following behaviors:

   Be aware of own emotions, control emotions, aware of others emotions.
8. If you don’t think the above behaviors are reflected in your answers, what improvements or amendments, if any, do you suggest should be made to the above question in order to target the desired behaviors?

**Competency 4- JDM SIQB1**

**Can you tell about any past critical situation/major problem at work/college in which you had to make an immediate decision on your own? What was the outcome?**

**Comprehension of question:**

1. Can you tell me in your own words what is the question asking?
2. Are all parts of the question comprehensible?
   a. If not: What improvements or amendments, if any, do you suggest should be made to the above question?

**Relevance of question to the job:**

3. Practitioner: Was it hard for you to put yourself in this situation or is it something you would experience in your role as an EMT?
   b. If not: What improvements or amendments, if any, do you suggest should be made to the above question?

**Question targeted to the competency:**

4. In your opinion which competency do the questions above target?
   (If answer is similar to competency: show definition and move to 8)

   **Judgment and decision making: Is able to recognize that there is a problem (Problem Sensitivity). Is able to identify sources of the problem and solutions (Critical Thinking) in a creative and fast way while being able to manage related risks (Creative and fast Problem Solving).**

5. (If answer is different to competency: show the competency and the definition that this question aims to measure.) After viewing the competency, do you think that this question could also be targeting this competency?

6. Could you rate the extent to which the question targets the competency on a scale of 1 to 5? Could you explain your choice?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Irrelevant</td>
<td>Irrelevant</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Relevant</td>
<td>Strongly Relevant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Considering the answer that you provided when I first asked you this question, do you believe that this answer gave indication about where you stand on the following behaviors:

   **Is able to recognize that there is a problem: Problem Sensitivity, is able to identify sources of the problem and solutions: Critical Thinking and is able to manage related risks: Creative and fast Problem Solving.**
8. If you don’t think the above behaviors are reflected in your answers, what improvements or amendments, if any, do you suggest should be made to the above question in order to target the desired behaviors?
APPENDIX VI

INTERVIEW PROTOCOL 5:
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Competency 1- COM SIQS1
A woman calls the Red Cross to come and help her old husband. As you arrive to
the house, you find out that the wife is providing very little medical information
about her husband; saying that he has done one open heart surgery, and today is
feeling pain in his chest. The wife totally refuses to transfer her husband to the
hospital; instead she wants the Red Cross volunteer to give him some medication.
What do you say?

Comprehension of question:
1. Can you tell me in your own words what is the question asking?
2. Are all parts of the question comprehensible?
   a. If not: What improvements or amendments, if any, do you suggest should be
      made to the above question?

Relevance of question to the job:
3. Practitioner: Was it hard for you to put yourself in this situation or is it something
   you would experience in your role as an EMT?
   b. If not: What improvements or amendments, if any, do you suggest should be
      made to the above question?

Question targeted to the competency:
4. In your opinion which competency do the questions above target?
   (If answer is similar to competency: show definition and move to 8)
   Communication Skills: Is able to organize and present information for people
   from different backgrounds. Is able to communicate in a sensitive and
   comforting manner. Is able to actively listen to others.
   5. (If answer is different to competency: show the competency and the definition
      that this question aims to measure.) After viewing the competency, do you think
      that this question could also be targeting this competency?

6. Could you rate the extent to which the question targets the competency on a scale
   of 1 to 5? Could you explain your choice?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Irrelevant</td>
<td>Irrelevant</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Relevant</td>
<td>Strongly Relevant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. Considering the answer that you provided when I first asked you this question, do you believe that this answer gave indication about where you stand on the following behaviors:

**Is able to communicate with people from different backgrounds, communicate in a sensitive and comforting manner and is able to actively listen to others.**

8. If you don’t think the above behaviors are reflected in your answers, what improvements or amendments, if any, do you suggest should be made to the above question in order to target the desired behaviors?

**Competency 2- ORG SIQS2**

You are in the center sorting important first aid material in the logistics room when the alarm rings and all the team leaves for an emergency. It is a rule that someone always stays on stand-by in the Control Room ready to handle the communication with the ambulance. At this same moment, a patient rings the doorbell and asks you to change his wound’s bandage. What do you do?

**Comprehension of question:**

1. Can you tell me in your own words what is the question asking?
2. Are all parts of the question comprehensible?
   a. If not: What improvements or amendments, if any, do you suggest should be made to the above question?

**Relevance of question to the job:**

3. Practitioner: Was it hard for you to put yourself in this situation or is it something you would experience in your role as an EMT?
   b. If not: What improvements or amendments, if any, do you suggest should be made to the above question?

**Question targeted to the competency:**

4. In your opinion which competency do the questions above target?
   (If answer is similar to competency: show definition and move to 8)

   **Organization Skills: Is able to plan realistically, is able to prioritize, and is able and willing to manage one's own time, resources and the time of others efficiently and effectively.**

5. (If answer is different to competency: show the competency and the definition that this question aims to measure.) After viewing the competency, do you think that this question could also be targeting this competency?

6. Could you rate the extent to which the question targets the competency on a scale of 1 to 5? Could you explain your choice?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Irrelevant</td>
<td>Irrelevant</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Relevant</td>
<td>Strongly Relevant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. Considering the answer that you provided when I first asked you this question, do you believe that this answer gave indication about where you stand on the following behaviors:

**Being able to plan realistically, being able to prioritize and being able to manage own time/resources/other’s time.**

8. If you don’t think the above behaviors are reflected in your answers, what improvements or amendments, if any, do you suggest should be made to the above question in order to target the desired behaviors?

**Competency 3- EI SIQB1**

**Think of a situation you faced where you felt angry or frustrated at work/ college. What did you say or do? What was the impact you had on the other people who were involved?**

**Comprehension of question:**

1. Can you tell me in your own words what is the question asking?
2. Are all parts of the question comprehensible?
   a. If not: What improvements or amendments, if any, do you suggest should be made to the above question?

**Relevance of question to the job:**

3. Practitioner: Was it hard for you to put yourself in this situation or is it something you would experience in your role as an EMT?
   b. If not: What improvements or amendments, if any, do you suggest should be made to the above question?

**Question targeted to the competency:**

4. In your opinion which competency do the questions above target?
   (If answer is similar to competency: show definition and move to 8)

**Emotional Intelligence: Is able to identify one’s own emotions, able to control one’s own emotions, is aware and tolerant of other’s feelings and emotions.**

5. (If answer is different to competency: show the competency and the definition that this question aims to measure.) After viewing the competency, do you think that this question could also be targeting this competency?

6. Could you rate the extent to which the question targets the competency on a scale of 1 to 5? Could you explain your choice?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Irrelevant</td>
<td>Irrelevant</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Relevant</td>
<td>Strongly Relevant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Considering the answer that you provided when I first asked you this question, do you believe that this answer gave indication about where you stand on the following behaviors:
Be aware of own emotions, control emotions, aware of others emotions.

8. If you don’t think the above behaviors are reflected in your answers, what improvements or amendments, if any, do you suggest should be made to the above question in order to target the desired behaviors?

Competency 4- JDM SIQB2

Tell me about a time when you felt like you were able to anticipate a problem before it actually happened. What were the circumstances? What are the measures you took?

Comprehension of question:
1. Can you tell me in your own words what is the question asking?
2. Are all parts of the question comprehensible?
   a. If not: What improvements or amendments, if any, do you suggest should be made to the above question?

Relevance of question to the job:
3. Practitioner: Was it hard for you to put yourself in this situation or is it something you would experience in your role as an EMT?
   b. If not: What improvements or amendments, if any, do you suggest should be made to the above question?

Question targeted to the competency:
4. In your opinion which competency do the questions above target?
   (If answer is similar to competency: show definition and move to 8)
   
   **Judgment and decision making:** Is able to recognize that there is a problem (Problem Sensitivity). Is able to identify sources of the problem and solutions (Critical Thinking) in a creative and fast way while being able to manage related risks (Creative and fast Problem Solving).

5. (If answer is different to competency: show the competency and the definition that this question aims to measure.) After viewing the competency, do you think that this question could also be targeting this competency?

6. Could you rate the extent to which the question targets the competency on a scale of 1 to 5? Could you explain your choice?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Irrelevant</td>
<td>Irrelevant</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Relevant</td>
<td>Strongly Relevant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Considering the answer that you provided when I first asked you this question, do you believe that this answer gave indication about where you stand on the following behaviors:
Is able to recognize that there is a problem: Problem Sensitivity, is able to identify sources of the problem and solutions: Critical Thinking, and is able to manage related risks: Creative and fast Problem Solving.

8. If you don’t think the above behaviors are reflected in your answers, what improvements or amendments, if any, do you suggest should be made to the above question in order to target the desired behaviors?
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Original Form of Survey 1 Structured Interview Question 1:

**CR SIQS1-** You are on a mission along with two of your teammates who do not have a very good relationship. While preparing the necessary equipment to save the patient, one of them started giving orders to the other, who in his turn felt offended and started yelling. The two people engaged in a fight; how would you solve the conflict between them/what would you do?

**Definition of Conflict Resolution Skills:** Being able to be constructive when challenged, encourage buy-in and mutual understanding by resolving conflict, and being able to negotiate and influence others.

**Behaviors:** Encourage mutual understanding, able to negotiate and influence others

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Probes</th>
<th>Findings of Subject/Practitioner 1</th>
<th>Findings of Subject/Academic 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Answer</td>
<td>I will stop the fight and ask them to take care of the patient which is their priority at this moment, and when we go back to the center I would sit down with them to solve their issues.</td>
<td>I would try to redraw their attention to the task at hand, everyone is stressed out and the adrenaline level is high, however there is a life at stake.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensible?</td>
<td>Was able to rephrase it Yes all part are comprehensible</td>
<td>Was able to rephrase it Yes all part are comprehensible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant to the job?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Not Applicable - not EMT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Which competency?</td>
<td>Conflict Resolution</td>
<td>Conflict Resolution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If wrong above, what about this competency?</td>
<td>Not Applicable- Right answer</td>
<td>Not Applicable- Right answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question triggers desired behaviors?</td>
<td>Not all the behaviors are targeted; not negotiation. Another setting where he/she could negotiate would be better because the EMT cannot really solve anything in this situation.</td>
<td>Not really, the wording of the question: “what would you do” allows people to be vague. Also, it is not engaging the person to verbally communicate and to encourage buy-in.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate targetedness?</td>
<td>3/5 Neutral</td>
<td>2.5/5 Between Irrelevant and Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvements or amendments?</td>
<td>I would change the situation, maybe something from everyday life</td>
<td>I would add: “what specific words would you say”, or “what behaviors would you engage in”?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESULTS
Issues: The question’s context or the situation does not trigger all target behaviors which was revealed in both subjects’ answers + the question’s wording allows answers to be vague
Solution: Add probes + Remove one of the behaviors (because it does not apply in this context)

Relevance to competency score: 5.5/10 neutral

CR SIQS1R- You are on a mission along with two of your teammates who do not have a very good relationship. While preparing the necessary equipment to save the patient, one of them started giving orders to the other, who in his turn felt offended and started yelling. The two people engaged in a fight; how would you solve the conflict between them/what would you do?

- So when you have completed the task or you are back at the center, how would you resolve the conflict between the two?
- What specific words would you say?
- What behaviors would you engage in?

BARS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Target behaviors</th>
<th>Exceed expectations</th>
<th>Meets expectations</th>
<th>Does not meet expectations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conflict Resolution</td>
<td>Encourage mutual understanding</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To negotiate and influence others</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Original Form of Survey 1 Structured Interview Question 2:**

**COM SIQS1 - You and your team have just dropped to the ER a teenager who has lost consciousness due to an overdose and is in a very critical situation. When leaving the hospital, the child’s mother in shock grabs you and asks you what is wrong with her only child. What do you say?**

**Definition of Communication Skills:** Is able to organize and present information for people from different backgrounds. Is able to communicate in a sensitive and comforting manner. Is able to actively listen to others.

**Behaviors:** Is able to present information for people from different backgrounds, is able to communicate in a sensitive and comforting manner

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Probes</th>
<th>Findings of Subject/Practitioner 1</th>
<th>Findings of Subject/Academic 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Answer</td>
<td>I would tell her that he is unconscious but I wouldn’t tell her why, I would tell her to ask the hospital/the doctors and I wouldn’t disclose any other information on his situation.</td>
<td>I would say that she should refer to the doctor, that we brought your child and we don’t have much information and that she should seek information from the doctor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensible?</td>
<td>Was able to rephrase it Yes all part are comprehensible</td>
<td>Was able to rephrase it Yes all part are comprehensible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant to the job?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Not Applicable - not EMT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Which competency?</td>
<td>communication skills with people, not telling people something harsh</td>
<td>disclosure of information and dealing with emotionally charged situation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If wrong above, what about this competency?</td>
<td>NA right answer</td>
<td>Not Really</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question triggers desired behaviors?</td>
<td>Targeting the competency but not the active listening.</td>
<td>Not organizing and presenting information because there is no verbal communication going on, it could target communicate in a sensitive manner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate targetedness?</td>
<td>4/5 Relevant</td>
<td>2.5/5 Between Irrelevant and Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvements or amendments?</td>
<td>Some other situation that pushes the person to listen to the others point of view.</td>
<td>Maybe the mom can be from a different socio-economic level, or they are refugees… the situation should be changed into something that requires the need to talk and to explain.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RESULTS:**

**Issues:** The question’s context or the situation does not trigger all target behaviors, which was revealed in both subject’s answers.
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Solution: Adjust situation as per recommendations + Remove one of the behaviors (because it does not apply in this context)

Relevance to competency score: 6.5/10 neutral

COM SIQS1R- You and your team have been called to a refugee camp because a teenager was not feeling good. By the time you arrive there, the teenager had lost consciousness due to a suspected drug overdose (as per your assessment) and needs to be transported to the ER immediately. The mother would not let you leave the house without knowing what is wrong with her son. How would you explain to the mother this situation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Target behaviors</th>
<th>Does not meet expectations</th>
<th>Meets expectations</th>
<th>Exceed expectations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communication Skills</td>
<td>To present information appropriately for people from different backgrounds</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To communicate in a sensitive and comforting manner</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Original Form of Survey 1 Structured Interview Question 3

**ORG SIQB1-** Give me an example of a time when you had multiple and conflicting priorities, and explain how you handled them.

**Definition of Organizational Skills:** Being able to plan realistically (to manage own time/resources/other’s time, and being able to prioritize (based on importance or other relevant criteria).

**Behaviors:** Being able to plan realistically (to manage own time/resources/other’s time, being able to prioritize (based on importance or other relevant criteria)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Probes</th>
<th>Findings of Subject/Practitioner 1</th>
<th>Findings of Subject/Academic 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Answer</strong></td>
<td>Two weeks ago I had to spend the weekend in Red Cross as a duty, and I hadn’t finished my work at the office for Monday. I had to postpone my work and finish my Red Cross duty; then I went back to work Sunday night. Both of the above responsibilities were priorities and I managed to finish both of them.</td>
<td>My kids, my parents, my research, my teaching, my service. My children are dependent on me, so they are my priority, then ethically my students are dependent on me as well so they come second, then my research, then my service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensible?</td>
<td>Was able to rephrase it Yes all part are comprehensible</td>
<td>Was able to rephrase it Yes all part are comprehensible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant to the job?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Not Applicable- not EMT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Which competency?</td>
<td>Organization skills</td>
<td>Organization Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If wrong above, what about this competency?</td>
<td>Not Applicable- Right answer</td>
<td>Not Applicable- Right answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question triggers desired behaviors?</td>
<td>Yes all</td>
<td>Yes all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate targetedness?</td>
<td>4/5 relevant</td>
<td>5/5 Highly Relevant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvements or amendments?</td>
<td>The question is very open ended, candidates may take long time to think about it, what if they haven’t faced this at all? If the candidates are given a more specific setting it will help narrow down their options and thus answer better. You could give an example of the priorities: family v/s work.</td>
<td>Nothing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RESULTS:**

**Issues:** the question’s structure is vague and lack details, thus leading to difficulty of recalling incidents and requiring the person to take a lot of time to answer

**Solution:** Add probes

**Relevance to competency score:** 9/10 Highly Relevant
**ORG SIQB1R** - *Give me an example of a time when you had multiple and conflicting priorities (at work, university, school, family etc.).*

- *How did you deal with the situations?*
- *What did you do specifically?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Target behaviors</th>
<th>Exceed expectations</th>
<th>Meets expectations</th>
<th>Does not meet expectations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Skills</td>
<td>To plan realistically (to manage own time/resources/other’s time)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To prioritize (based on importance or other relevant criteria)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Original Form of Survey 1 Structured Interview Question 4

EI SIQB2- Think of a challenging working relationship you have had. What was your part in the difficulty, and what was their part? Tell me about the person and your interactions with them. What did you do to address the relationship or make it more successful?

Definition of Emotional Intelligence: Is able to identify one’s own emotions, able to control one’s own emotions, is aware and tolerant of other’s feelings and emotions.

Behaviors: Being aware of one’s own emotions, controlling one’s own emotions, being aware of others emotions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Probes</th>
<th>Findings of Subject/Practitioner 1</th>
<th>Findings of Subject/Academic 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Answer</strong></td>
<td>When I became a team leader, I had to be responsible of one of my colleagues with whom I had faced previous problems. As his team leader, the tension got worst, so I decided to sit with him and we talked about how we can get along better.</td>
<td>I gave a course with a colleague I didn’t get along with. I tend to lose my temper quickly and I thought they were incompetent. Working together was very difficult. I began to assist them and coordinating with them. Then I opted to teach another class after that, so not to stay with this person.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comprehensible?</strong></td>
<td>Was able to rephrase it Yes all part are comprehensible</td>
<td>Was able to rephrase it Yes all part are comprehensible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relevant to the job?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Not Applicable- not EMT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Which competency?</strong></td>
<td>Leadership, communication and conflict resolution as well</td>
<td>Inter-personal and intrapersonal skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I wrong above, what about this competency?</strong></td>
<td>Yes it could target Emotional Intelligence</td>
<td>Yes it could target Emotional Intelligence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question triggers desired behaviors?</strong></td>
<td>Yes however if the candidate doesn’t give the right example or experience it will not tell much about the behaviors.</td>
<td>Yes it did</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rate targetedness?</strong></td>
<td>3/5 Relevant</td>
<td>5/5 Highly Relevant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Improvements or amendments?</strong></td>
<td>I will not change the question, however because the competency is a difficult one, and not all candidates may have experienced this, I would use probing in order to get a more targeted answer.</td>
<td>Nothing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RESULTS:
Issues: The order to the information in the questions makes it less comprehensible + difficulty in recalling the events because of the complex nature of the competency
Validation of a Structured Interview in the Selection of the Lebanese Red Cross Volunteers (multiple facets to EI).

**Solution:** Shuffle the order of the information + Add probes to simplify/structure and to help the candidate answer.

**Relevance to competency score:** 8/10 Relevant

**EI SIQB2R:** Think of a challenging relationship you have had (at work or school). Tell me about the person and your interactions with them.

- What was your part in the difficulty, and what was their part?
- What did you do to address the relationship or make it more successful?
- What was the outcome?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Target behaviors</th>
<th>Exceed expectations</th>
<th>Meets expectations</th>
<th>Does not meet expectations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Intelligence</td>
<td>Being aware of one’s own emotions</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Controlling one’s own emotions</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Being aware of others emotions</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Original Form of Survey 2 Structured Interview Question 1:**

**CR SIQS2** - You are on a mission along with two teammates trying to rescue a mother suffering from severe breathing problems. Two of her sons engage in a fight regarding whether they want to take her to the hospital or not. The older son, who does not want his mother to be transported to the hospital but rather keep her home, starts yelling at his brother for calling the Red Cross. They get into a fight and do not allow your team to leave the house. What would you do?

**Definition of Conflict Resolution Skills:** Being able to be constructive when challenged, encourage buy-in and mutual understanding by resolving conflict, and being able to negotiate and influence others.

**Behaviors:** being able to negotiate and influence others, being able to be constructive when challenged

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Probes</th>
<th>Findings of Subject/ Practitioner 2</th>
<th>Findings of Subject/ Academic 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Answer</strong></td>
<td>I will explain to the people in the house the outcomes of their behavior, I will not pick a side but I will explain why their mom needs to be taken to the hospital, I will explain to them that they have a legal responsibility if her situation escalates, and if they didn’t decide to hospitalize right away.</td>
<td>We are 3 people in the team, so 2 teammates will remain with the mother and do the emergency procedures, I would take the brothers aside and talk to them about the urgency of transporting their mom to the hospital. Especially the one who is yelling I would talk to him rationally and explain what could go wrong if the mother is not transported now, I would make sure that I and the other brother don’t team up against the first one.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comprehensible?</strong></td>
<td>Was able to rephrase it</td>
<td>Was able to rephrase it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes all part are comprehensible</td>
<td>Yes all part are comprehensible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relevant to the job?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Not Applicable- not EMT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Which competency?</strong></td>
<td>negotiation and ethics as well</td>
<td>Conflict management/ persuasion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I wrong above, what about this competency?</strong></td>
<td>Not really, I didn’t see conflict resolution if both of them are having a conflict I cannot intervene between them. I have an objective, to take the mom to the hospital and I want to convince them.</td>
<td>Not applicable- Right answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question triggers desired behaviors?</strong></td>
<td>I am not encouraging buy-in, in this situation, it can target communication skills more.</td>
<td>Yes all, it fits all the behaviors that you mentioned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rate targetedness?</strong></td>
<td>2.5/5</td>
<td>4/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Improvements or amendments?</strong></td>
<td>I would change the situation</td>
<td>I would highlight the urgency to transport the mother, and add “there is a need to be transported to the hospital”, in order not to leave the option for the candidate not to engage in conflict.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESULTS:

Issues: the question’s context or the situation does not trigger all target behaviors as revealed by one subject, thus subjects interpreted the question’s intend in different ways + Lacks details (for the candidate to be able to answer accurately)

Solution: Adjust situation as per recommendations + Remove one of the behaviors (because it does not apply in this context)

Relevance to competency score: 6.5/10 Neutral

CR SIQS2R - You are on a mission along with two teammates trying to rescue a mother suffering from severe breathing problems, who must be transported to the hospital. Two of her sons engage in a fight regarding whether they want to take her to the hospital or not. The older son, who does not want his mother to be transported to the hospital, starts yelling at his brother for calling the Red Cross, and asks you to leave immediately. The mother’s situation is beginning to escalate. You realize that you will not be able to transport the mother unless you solve the problem between the two brothers? What would you do?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Target behaviors</th>
<th>Exceed expectations</th>
<th>Meets expectations</th>
<th>Does not meet expectations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conflict Resolution Skills</td>
<td>To negotiate and influence others</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Encourage mutual understanding</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Original Form of Survey 2 Structured Interview Question 2:**

**COM SIQB1:** Tell me about a time when you had to deliver bad news to someone. What was the outcome?

**Definition of Communication Skills:** Is able to organize and present information for people from different backgrounds. Is able to communicate in a sensitive and comforting manner. Is able to actively listen to others.

**Behaviors:** Is able to communicate with people from different backgrounds, communicate in a sensitive and comforting manner

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Probes</th>
<th>Findings of Subject/ Practitioner 2</th>
<th>Findings of Subject/ Academic 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Answer</td>
<td>Our job requires is to call an injured person’s relative to tell them about the accident. I try to use soft words, and let them know he is ok, if it is very bad news I try not to deliver it.</td>
<td>I had to deliver the death of a family members to my brothers on the phone. It was well received in that context, because I prepared them first and told them I was going to give them bad news, ex: “can you talk”. I put them at ease and gave them the context. The Outcome: we talked about the practical things to do in such a situation so good outcome.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensible?</td>
<td>Was able to rephrase it</td>
<td>Was able to rephrase it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes all part are comprehensible</td>
<td>Yes all part are comprehensible, but too broad, what was the outcome on who? It is confusing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant to the job?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Not Applicable- not EMT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Which competency?</td>
<td>Communication Skills</td>
<td>how to give negative feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I wrong above, what about this competency?</td>
<td>Not Available- Right answer</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question triggers desired behaviors?</td>
<td>actively listens to others depends on the answer of the person</td>
<td>Yes but it is too general, if it the answer didn’t give indication about the behaviors, you can use probing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate targetedness?</td>
<td>4/5</td>
<td>3/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvements or amendments?</td>
<td>Nothing</td>
<td>The question is missing, does it ask what I did or how I felt? Add an action verb. Additions could also include what are the steps you took? Add more contextualization: the situation occurred at work, or with an employee… What was the outcome on who? It should be: What was the outcome on the person you are delivering the bad news to?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESULTS:
Issues: The question lacks details thus, one subject did not understand the nature of the task and the rules about how to respond.

Solution: Add details + Use probing + Remove one of the behaviors (because it does not apply in this context)

Relevance to competency score: 7/10 relevant

**COM SIQB1R-** Tell me about a time when you had to deliver bad news to someone, it could be at work or university. What did you specifically say? What was the outcome on that person?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Target behaviors</th>
<th>Exceed expectations</th>
<th>Meets expectations</th>
<th>Does not meet expectations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communication Skills</td>
<td>To communicate with people from different backgrounds</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To communicate in a sensitive and comforting manner</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Original Form of Survey 2 Structured Interview Question 3:**

**ORG SIQB2 - Tell about a time you were responsible for planning an event/project, with other people involved. How did you handle this? What was the outcome?**

**Definition of Organizational Skills:** Being able to plan realistically (to manage own time/resources/other’s time), and being able to prioritize (based on importance or other relevant criteria).

**Behaviors:** Being able to plan realistically (to manage own time/resources/other’s time), being able to prioritize (based on importance or other relevant criteria)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Probes</th>
<th>Findings of Subject/Practitioner 2</th>
<th>Findings of Subject/Academic 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Answer</td>
<td>My work involves project planning, I am part of a team and I am always responsible for project management, how I work things: division of a task, time scale, study the risks, study the outcomes, pros and cons, analysis of mistakes in order to do it better the next time</td>
<td>Prior to the meeting I sent by email to the team: the goal, ideas, division of roles, timeline, the targets, and other details I had previously prepared. I organized the meeting: introduction, share information, have a session on finalizing deliverables and roles and responsibilities among the team. As the head of the project I scheduled recurrent meetings, to discuss the progress, I followed up on everyone closely and the outcome is a positive progress so far. Issues came up because we don’t exist in the same place, so reliance on online tools was key.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensible?</td>
<td>Was able to rephrase it Yes all part are comprehensible</td>
<td>Was able to rephrase it Yes all part are comprehensible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant to the job?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Not Applicable- not EMT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Which competency?</td>
<td>Organization skills</td>
<td>Planning and organizing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I wrong above, what about this competency?</td>
<td>NA- right answer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question triggers desired behaviors?</td>
<td>Yes, and it gave indication about team work as well and learning from past experience.</td>
<td>I would make it more specific in order to target all the behaviors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate targetedness?</td>
<td>4/5</td>
<td>4/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvements or amendments?</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>I would change “how did you handle this?” because it triggers an idea that there was a problem, I would change it to what are the steps or walk me through what you did. I would also add what are the challenges you faced? Then “what was the outcome?”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESULTS:
Issues: One subject found a misleading terminology, thus leading to confusion.

Solutions: change the wording + add a probe

Relevance to competency score: 8/10 Relevant

ORG SIQB2R- Tell me about a time you were responsible for planning an event/project, with other people involved. Walk me through the steps you took.

- What were the challenges you faced?
- What was the outcome?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Target behaviors</th>
<th>Exceed expectations</th>
<th>Meets expectations</th>
<th>Does not meet expectations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organization Skills</td>
<td>To plan realistically (to manage own time/resources/other's time)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To prioritize (based on importance or other relevant criteria)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Survey 2- Original form of Structured Interview Question 4:**

**JDM SIQS1** - *You are called for an emergency in one of the areas of Beirut regarding a man who is having a nervous breakdown. As you go to the scene, you realize that the area is not safe and some shooting is taking place between people from opposed political parties. The man’s wife has already called you twice since you left the center telling you that his case is becoming more critical. What would you do?*

**Definition of Judgment and decision making:** Is able to recognize that there is a problem (Problem Sensitivity). Is able to identify sources of the problem and solutions (Critical Thinking) in a creative and fast way while being able to manage related risks (Creative and fast Problem Solving).

**Behaviors:** Is able to recognize that there is a problem: Problem Sensitivity, is able to identify sources of the problem and solutions: Critical Thinking and is able to manage related risks in a creative and fast way: Problem Solving.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Probes</th>
<th>Findings of Subject/Practitioner 2</th>
<th>Findings of Subject/Academic 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Answer</strong></td>
<td>Safety is a priority and I have to protect my life and the life of the team, so I will not pass in a shooting scene at all. I will have to identify the sources of the shooting: am I hearing it or did someone telling about it? Is it reliable information from the army or a rumor? Meanwhile I will talk to his wife on the phone or get some calm person to do some first aid moves to the patient and try to calm him down.</td>
<td>My main job is an emergency responder but I have to ensure a safe passage before going to the place, I would ensure my emergency signage is viewable, communicate with both sides involved in the conflict, if there is a checkpoint I would talk to the people. I would act as fast as possible but ensuring the security of my team and not putting them at risk. I would contact the wife and inform her that we are doing our best to get there, but if meanwhile she can assist her husband with the nervous breakdown, I would tell her what to do: lay him down, untie his tie, give him water….</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comprehensible?</strong></td>
<td>Was able to rephrase it</td>
<td>Was able to rephrase it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relevant to the job?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Not Applicable- not EMT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Which competency?</strong></td>
<td>Problem Solving</td>
<td>managing multiple demands or needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I wrong above, what about this competency?</strong></td>
<td>Yes it could</td>
<td>Yes of course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question triggers desired behaviors?</strong></td>
<td>All the behaviors</td>
<td>All the behaviors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rate</strong></td>
<td>5/5</td>
<td>4.5/5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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| targetedness? | Improvements or amendments? | One area of Beirut can be omitted, in order not to add unwanted details; and the urgency of the case can be highlighted: so change the nervous breakdown into a more urgent medical case, like seizure… to create more urgency and fast decision making. You can add “Who appears to be having a seizure”. The word the “scene” is misleading and should be changed to “neighborhood”, because the scene would mean the place of the emergency, and I would change “you are called” and put “your team” is called to an emergency.

| RESULTS: |
| Issues: the question has an irrelevant detail + lacks a relevant detail that helps better target the behaviors. |
| Solutions: Omit detail + add the detail to the situation (add urgency to situation) |
| Relevance to competency score: 9.5 highly relevant |

**JDM SIQS1R-** You and your team are called for an emergency regarding a man who appears to be having a nervous breakdown. As you go to the neighborhood, you realize that the area is not safe and some shooting is taking place between people from opposed political parties. The man's wife has already called you twice since you left the center telling you that he lost consciousness. What would you do?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Target behaviors</th>
<th>Exceed expectations</th>
<th>Meets expectations</th>
<th>Does not meet expectations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Judgment and decision making</td>
<td>To recognize that there is a problem: Problem Sensitivity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To identify sources of the problem and solutions: Critical Thinking</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To manage related risks in a creative and fast way: Problem Solving</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Original Form of Survey 3 Structured Interview Question 1:
CR SIQB1- Tell about a time when you made a decision that was unpopular and did not receive the consensus of everyone. Some of your team members disagreed with your ideas or approach. How did you handle the situation?

Definition of Conflict Resolution Skills: Being able to be constructive when challenged, encourage buy-in and mutual understanding by resolving conflict, and being able to negotiate and influence others.

Behaviors: Encourage buy-in, being able to negotiate and influence others, being able to be constructive when challenged.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Probes</th>
<th>Findings of Subject/Practitioner 3</th>
<th>Findings of Subject/Academic 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Answer</td>
<td>Our duty starts at 6, we have to be ready before that time, and an EMT in my team came 3 times in a row 5 minutes later than 6. After several warnings I took a decision and told him he had to leave the Red Cross or change his attitude and come on time although other team leaders didn’t support my idea. We made him change teams, so I wasn’t responsible for him anymore.</td>
<td>I make sure that by the time I propose a decision to a group that they will accept it, so I sit with individual members of the group and I discuss the situation before hand. What I did is to reformulate the argument and to further explain my decision, and recognize their concerns and alleviate their concerns, given that I am convinced of my position. I will change if they convince me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensible?</td>
<td>Was able to rephrase it Yes all part are comprehensible</td>
<td>Was able to rephrase it Yes all part are comprehensible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant to the job?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Not Applicable- not EMT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Which competency?</td>
<td>conflict resolution</td>
<td>teamwork, leadership, compromise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I wrong above, what about this competency?</td>
<td>NA- right answer</td>
<td>Yes of course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question triggers desired behaviors?</td>
<td>Yes all</td>
<td>Yes all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate targetedness?</td>
<td>3/5</td>
<td>5/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvements or amendments?</td>
<td>I would give a specific environment/ a situational question or I would ask two behavioral questions about this competency. I would add: he was the “team leader”.</td>
<td>Nothing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RESULTS:
Issues: The question has no revisions.
Relevance to competency score: 8/10 relevant
Keep original form: CR SIQB1- Tell about a time when you made a decision that was unpopular and did not receive the consensus of everyone. Some of your team members disagreed with your ideas or approach. How did you handle the situation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Target behaviors</th>
<th>Exceed expectations</th>
<th>Meets expectations</th>
<th>Does not meet expectations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conflict Resolution skills</td>
<td>Encourage buy-in</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negotiate and influence others</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Being constructive when challenged</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Original Form of Survey 3 Structured Interview Question 2:**

**COM SIQB2-** Tell me about a time you were approached by an irate customer, coworker, or individual. What was your response?

**Definition of Communication Skills:** Is able to organize and present information for people from different backgrounds. Is able to communicate in a sensitive and comforting manner. Is able to actively listen to others.

**Behaviors:** Is able to communicate with people from different backgrounds, communicate in a sensitive and comforting manner

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Probes</th>
<th>Findings of Subject/Practitioner 3</th>
<th>Findings of Subject/Academic 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Answer</td>
<td>I leave the person to talk and I won’t say a word, and I confront the person after a while, maybe after a few days. I don’t like to talk if someone is feeling angry or frustrated it wouldn’t lead anywhere.</td>
<td>Yes I dealt with an irate coworker, after he/she spontaneously confronted me. I called for a meeting with other members, in order to talk about how this idea should be dealt with.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensible?</td>
<td>Was able to rephrase it, Yes all part are comprehensible</td>
<td>Was able to rephrase it, Yes all part are comprehensible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant to the job?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Not Applicable- not EMT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Which competency?</td>
<td>Patience and listening</td>
<td>Anger Management and problem solving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I wrong above, what about this competency?</td>
<td>yes of course</td>
<td>Not really. If it is a customer, my goal is to communicate and defuse the anger and understand while staying non-defensive. But for me a coworker, is equal and if I face this with a coworker it is problem solving because my role is not to comfort him/her.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question triggers desired behaviors?</td>
<td>Yes all</td>
<td>Not really</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate targetedness?</td>
<td>4/5</td>
<td>3/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvements or amendments?</td>
<td>nothing</td>
<td>remove co-worker, use customer or patient instead</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RESULTS:**

**Issues:** The question contains a misleading term leads to resulted in an answer that does not target the competency.

**Solutions:** omit the term

**Relevance to competency score:** 7/10 relevant

**COM SIQB2R-** Tell me about a time you were approached by an irate customer, patient, or professor. What was your response?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Target behaviors</th>
<th>Exceed expectations</th>
<th>Meets expectations</th>
<th>Does not meet expectations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communication skills</td>
<td>Communicate with people from different backgrounds</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Communicate in a sensitive and comforting manner</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Actively listen to others.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Original Form of Survey 3 Structured Interview Question 3:**

EI SIQSI-You and your team arrive at the scene of the emergency and find a girl who has fallen and broken her arm. You do the necessary first aid steps and carry her to the ambulance. Her brother, who is a medical student, starts telling you what to do and points out that you are doing things the wrong way. He wants to interfere in your work, and asks to help his sister himself. What would you do, how would you react?

**Definition of Emotional Intelligence:** Is able to identify one’s own emotions, able to control one’s own emotions, is aware and tolerant of other’s feelings and emotions.

**Behaviors:** Being aware of one’s own emotions, controlling one’s own emotions, being aware of others emotions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Probes</th>
<th>Findings of Subject/Practitioner 3</th>
<th>Findings of Subject/Academic 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Answer</td>
<td>I will handle the patient first, then I would tell a team member to do the first aid to her, while I talk to the brother in a nice way. If he insists, I can ask him to save his comments to when we get in the ambulance and not while we are rescuing his sister. I am sure he will listen, if I talk in a nice way, he is a doctor after all and he will not accept any bad comments.</td>
<td>Talk to the brother and tell him I understand he is stressed, assure him we are doing the right thing. If he insists he will have to take responsibility for the case if he wants to interfere, so I have to be assertive as well, while being sensitive.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comprehensible?**
- Was able to rephrase it
- Yes all part are comprehensible

**Relevant to the job?**
- Yes
- Not Applicable- not EMT

**Which competency?**
- Communication and decision communication skills and problem solving
- communication skills and problem solving

**I wrong above, what about this competency?**
- Yes it could but more it targets more communication
- Yes sure

**Question triggers desired behaviors?**
- Yes but not all
- Yes it is but it could target communication as well, I would put a five on communication skills as well.

**Rate targetedness?**
- 2/5
- 5/5

**Improvements or amendments?**
- Do a more critical situation, the doctor/her brother do not let you touch her, he says: “I will take care of her”, pushes you and starts to curse at you.
- Add words describing feelings of the candidate “he is making you feel frustrated, angry, disrespected”.

**RESULTS:**

**Issues:** The question lack of details in order to tackle all behaviors.

**Solutions:** Add details as recommended

**Relevance to competency score:** 7/10 Relevant
EI SIQS1R- You and your team arrive at the scene of the emergency and find a girl who has fallen and broken her arm. While you do the necessary first aid steps, her brother, who is a medical student, starts yelling at you and telling you that you are doing things the wrong way. He disrespects your team and the whole Red Cross and starts to interfere in your work, wanting to help his sister himself. What would you do, how would you react?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Target behaviors</th>
<th>Exceed expectations</th>
<th>Meets expectations</th>
<th>Does not meet expectations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Intelligence</td>
<td>Being aware of one’s own emotions</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Controlling one’s own emotions</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Being aware of others emotions</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Original Form of Survey 3 Structured Interview Question 4:

**JDM SIQS2- You are in Hamra taking an old woman who has fallen and broken her leg to the hospital. You also get a call for an emergency in Hamra regarding a car accident in which both passengers are injured. As you go to the scene, you find the driver stuck with the seatbelt still on, bleeding and screaming from pain. The second passenger is bleeding and about to go unconscious. You can only transport two patients at a time and they both need to get to the hospital. The road is empty since it is Wednesday night. You are on the scene along with two other team members. What would you do?**

**Definition of Judgment and decision making:** Is able to recognize that there is a problem (Problem Sensitivity). Is able to identify sources of the problem and solutions (Critical Thinking) in a creative and fast way while being able to manage related risks (Creative and fast Problem Solving).

**Behaviors:** Is able to recognize that there is a problem: Problem Sensitivity, is able to identify sources of the problem and solutions: Critical Thinking and is able to manage related risks in a creative and fast way: Problem Solving.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Probes</th>
<th>Findings of Subject/ Practitioner 3</th>
<th>Findings of Subject/ Academic 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Answer</strong></td>
<td>I cannot make the old lady go down from the ambulance, I will let a team member go down with the needed material to take care of the driver who is bleeding. The priority is to the unconscious patient so I will take him to the hospital. I will call the center in order to send another ambulance to the scene.</td>
<td>I would call another ambulance for more help, assess the urgency of each patient, and take the patient that needs immediate care together with the old woman that is in the car, because her leg is extremely painful. I would leave one of the team members behind with the patient and reassure that help is coming.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comprehensible?</strong></td>
<td>Not all the parts, long question. (Remove “stuck with the seatbelt on: because it is too long”) Not really understood that the patient is in the ambulance already with the team.</td>
<td>Was able to rephrase it Yes all part are comprehensible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relevant to the job?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Not Applicable- not EMT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Which competency?</strong></td>
<td>Decision making</td>
<td>problem solving, risk assessment, crisis management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I wrong above, what about this competency?</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question triggers desired behaviors?</strong></td>
<td>Yes all</td>
<td>Yes all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rate targetedness?</strong></td>
<td>5/5</td>
<td>5/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Improvements or amendments?</strong></td>
<td>change the phrasing of the first phrase: “You are in the ambulance taking a patient that has broken her leg to the hospital”, remove “stuck with the seatbelt on: because it is too long”</td>
<td>Nothing, it made sense.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESULTS:
Issues: the question has an irrelevant detail leading to confusion + the subject didn’t fully understand the situation because it is lacking details.

Solutions: Omit unwanted detail + Add missing detail

Relevance to competency score: 10/10

JDM SIQS2R- You and your team are in the ambulance in Hamra, transporting an old woman who has fallen and broken her leg to the hospital. You also get a call for an emergency in Hamra regarding a car accident in which both passengers are injured. As you go to the scene, you find the driver bleeding and screaming from pain. The second passenger is bleeding and about to go unconscious. You can only transport two patients at a time and they both need to get to the hospital. The road is empty since it is Wednesday night. You are on the scene along with two other team members. What would you do?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Target behaviors</th>
<th>Exceed expectations</th>
<th>Meets expectations</th>
<th>Does not meet expectations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Judgment and decision making</td>
<td>To recognize that there is a problem: Problem Sensitivity</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To identify sources of the problem and solutions: Critical Thinking</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To manage related risks in a creative and fast way: Problem Solving</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Original Form of Survey 4 Structured Interview Question 1:**

**CR SIQB2** - Describe a situation in which you were able to get your co-workers/colleagues who dislike each other to work together constructively.

**Definition of Judgment and decision making:** Is able to recognize that there is a problem (Problem Sensitivity). Is able to identify sources of the problem and solutions (Critical Thinking) in a creative and fast way while being able to manage related risks (Creative and fast Problem Solving).

**Behaviors:** Is able to recognize that there is a problem: Problem Sensitivity, is able to identify sources of the problem and solutions: Critical Thinking and is able to manage related risks in a creative and fast way: Problem Solving.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Probes</th>
<th>Findings of Subject/Practitioner 4</th>
<th>Findings of Subject/Academic 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Answer</strong></td>
<td>I was a team leader within a team of 4. 2 members had a lot of tension between them, I tried not to interfere and let them take care of it, until it blocked. I started to initiate outings, I bought flowers and put them in the name of one of the members, now they are very good friends. I helped them to get to know each other more.</td>
<td>Two professors had a personal argument, and they stopped talking to each other although they had to teach a multi-section course, and I happen to be friends with both of them, and each would come to my office and complain. So what I did is when listening to them I would convince them that the other person is a good person and that they should avoid personal conversation and limit it to professional interactions and not to let a personal issue reflect on academic performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensible?</td>
<td>Was able to rephrase it</td>
<td>Was able to rephrase it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant to the job?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Not Applicable- not EMT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Which competency?</td>
<td>team work and adaptability</td>
<td>Conflict resolution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I wrong above, what about this competency?</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>NA- right answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question triggers desired behaviors?</td>
<td>Yes to all</td>
<td>yes encourage buy-in, being constructive when challenged not really, because I wasn’t challenged personally, except if you probe more, for example if the other person challenges your recommendations, so you have to ask about the outcome? Did they reject your recommendation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate targetedness?</td>
<td>4/5</td>
<td>4/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvements or amendments?</td>
<td>add the two co-workers come from a different culture different backgrounds</td>
<td>the word “situation” is not clear, it makes you think you have to come up with situation not a real incident, hypothetical, so rephrase to “recall an instance” to add “what was the outcome”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESULTS:
Issues: the question is missing details, thus it does not tackle all behaviors + one subject found a misleading term that leads to confusion.

Solutions: Add detail + Change term + Add probing

Relevance to competency score: 8/10 Relevant

CR SIQB2R- Recall an instance in which you were able to get your coworkers/colleagues who dislike each other to work together constructively (they could be from different background or having different opinions...).

- What was the outcome of your actions on your coworkers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Target behaviors</th>
<th>Exceed expectations</th>
<th>Meets expectations</th>
<th>Does not meet expectations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conflict Resolution skills</td>
<td>Encourage buy-in</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negotiate and influence others</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Being constructive when challenged</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Original Form of Survey 4 Structured Interview Question 2:

**ORG SIQS1** - As a college student, your midterm exams have started, and you have an exam on Monday. As is the case every week, your shift at the RC is on Thursday, but this time the Team Leader exceptionally asks you to come on a Friday because there is an emergency at the center due to a critical political situation in the country. What would you do?

**Definition of Organizational Skills:** Being able to plan realistically (to manage own time/resources/other’s time), and being able to prioritize (based on importance or other relevant criteria).

**Behaviors:** Being able to plan realistically (to manage own time/resources/other’s time), being able to prioritize (based on importance or other relevant criteria)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Probes</th>
<th>Findings of Subject/Practitioner 4</th>
<th>Findings of Subject/Academic 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Answer</strong></td>
<td>If I was a student and I faced this problem, it depends on my responsibilities in the center and in Red Cross, if I am senior or not. And I will try to do both, study in the center if the team leader permits it. I will ask him.</td>
<td>I will talk to the leader to see if it is very urgent or can be rescheduled, if not I will come and would study in the weekend, and sacrifice my own personal leisure in the weekend.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comprehensible?</strong></td>
<td>Was able to rephrase it Yes all parts are comprehensible</td>
<td>It not clear that I have to come both days, it is better if you rephrase it: “Friday in addition to Thursday”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relevant to the job?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Not Applicable- not EMT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Which competency?</strong></td>
<td>organizing priorities and time management</td>
<td>commitment, consciousness, dedication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I wrong above, what about this competency?</strong></td>
<td>NA- right answer</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question triggers desired behaviors?</strong></td>
<td>Yes to all</td>
<td>No because I understood if I would go to the meeting or not, so not targeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rate targetedness?</strong></td>
<td>5/5</td>
<td>1/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Improvements or amendments?</strong></td>
<td>add: “you haven’t prepared for the exam” add: the seniority of the person, how long has this person been in the center.</td>
<td>Describe the exam (difficult/long), add you haven’t studied. You have to put someone in a situation, or you have to add another responsibility as well: take your mom to the doctor, and ask how would you handle? How would you go about fulfilling these multiple demands?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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RESULTS:
Issues: the two subjects had different interpretation of the question’s intent + the question is missing details, thus it does not tackle all behaviors + the question is missing a term which leads to confusion.

Solutions: add details to the situation + add term to phrase

Relevance to competency score: 6/10 Neutral

ORG SIQS1R - Today is a Wednesday. As a college student, your midterm exams have started, and you have a difficult exam on Monday, for which you didn’t study. As is the case every week, your shift at the Red Cross is on Thursday, but this time the Team Leader exceptionally asks you to come for a shift on Friday as well from 6 pm to 6 am, due to a critical political situation in the country. You have to take your mom to the doctor’s on Friday late afternoon. Moreover, like every Wednesday you have to get together with your colleagues from university to organize an outdoor event taking place in 1 month. Walk me through the steps you would take to deal with this situation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Target behaviors</th>
<th>Exceed expectations</th>
<th>Meets expectations</th>
<th>Does not meet expectations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organization Skills</td>
<td>To plan realistically (to manage own time/resources/other’s time)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To prioritize (based on importance or other relevant criteria)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Original Form of Survey 4 Structured Interview Question 3:**

EI SIQS2- You are at the center. You get a call from your mother telling you that your dad is not feeling well and that they had to take him to the hospital. As you hang up with your mother, the team leader is really upset because he sees everyone sitting. He immediately starts yelling; pointing mostly at you for not taking your responsibilities seriously. Although you have completed all your tasks and duties, the team leader rarely recognizes positive actions. What would you do? How would you respond?

**Definition of Emotional Intelligence:** Is able to identify one’s own emotions, able to control one’s own emotions, is aware and tolerant of other’s feelings and emotions.

**Behaviors:** Being aware of one’s own emotions, controlling one’s own emotions, being aware of others emotions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Probes</th>
<th>Findings of Subject/Practitioner 4</th>
<th>Findings of Subject/Academic 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Answer</strong></td>
<td>I will talk to him alone, and I will explain to him what happened. And remind him about my previous positive attitude, and that only this time I am being low profile. He shouldn’t be judgmental according to my situation, it is comprehensible.</td>
<td>I would ask him to sit take a deep breath, reflect on what he did, advise him to read a book on EI, tell him that this is not how he should talk to people for his own sake. Clarify the expectations instead of yelling.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comprehensible?</strong></td>
<td>Was able to rephrase it Yes all part are comprehensible</td>
<td>What does sees everyone sitting mean? How is the phone call connected? It doesn’t make sense. You have to have two separate phrases. “as you hang up with your mom the team leader enters the room and sees everyone sitting idly”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relevant to the job?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Not Applicable- not EMT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Which competency?</strong></td>
<td>A Person’s Reaction, is able to understand others, and controlling his emotions.</td>
<td>anger management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I wrong above, what about this competency?</strong></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question triggers desired behaviors?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rate targetedness?</strong></td>
<td>5/5</td>
<td>5/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Improvements or amendments?</strong></td>
<td>Add you always manage to do your tasks to the fullest and without any delay. You can also add if the team leader is younger than you are.</td>
<td>Add details to the situation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESULTS:
Issues: The question is missing details, thus it does not tackle all behaviors.

Solutions: add punctuation + add detail

Relevance to competency score: 10/10 highly relevant

EI SIQS2R- You are at the center. You get a call from your mother telling you that your dad is not feeling well and that they had to take him to the hospital. As you hang up with your mother, the team leader enters the room, and sees everyone sitting idly. He immediately starts yelling; pointing mostly at you for not taking your responsibilities seriously. Although you have completed all your tasks and duties as usual, the team leader who is younger than you, rarely recognizes positive actions. How would that make you feel? What would you do? How would you respond? Why do you think she reacted that way?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Target behaviors</th>
<th>Exceed expectations</th>
<th>Meets expectations</th>
<th>Does not meet expectations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Intelligence</td>
<td>Being aware of one’s own emotions</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Controlling one’s own emotions</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Being aware of others emotions</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Original Form of Survey 4 Structured Interview Question 4:**  
JDM SIQB1 - Can you tell about any past critical situation/ major problem at work/college in which you had to make an immediate decision on your own? What was the outcome?

**Definition of Judgment and decision making:** Is able to recognize that there is a problem (Problem Sensitivity). Is able to identify sources of the problem and solutions (Critical Thinking) in a creative and fast way while being able to manage related risks (Creative and fast Problem Solving).

**Behaviors:** Is able to recognize that there is a problem: Problem Sensitivity, is able to identify sources of the problem and solutions: Critical Thinking and is able to manage related risks in a creative and fast way: Problem Solving.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Probes</th>
<th>Findings of Subject/ Practitioner 4</th>
<th>Findings of Subject/ Academic 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Answer</strong></td>
<td>I took a decision to resign from my work, and this decision helped me to find another job, although I was the caregiver in my family and my dad had just passed away. It was a good decision and I am so happy in my current job. I always take fast decisions then I adjust everything else upon it.</td>
<td>yes, I was acting assistant dean for student services, and there was a student that wasn’t doing well, and he was already twice on probation and AUB wanted to expel him, although he had only 3 courses left to graduate, and he had drug abuse problems. I integrate him back with support to make sure he would pass, sometimes you should break the rules, if I had let him go and start all over in another university you can push him further in drug abuse, he was back in the system and he made it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comprehensible?</strong></td>
<td>Was able to rephrase it: Yes all part are comprehensible</td>
<td>Was able to rephrase it: Yes all part are comprehensible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relevant to the job?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Not Applicable- not EMT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Which competency?</strong></td>
<td>Decision Making</td>
<td>crisis management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I wrong above, what about this competency?</strong></td>
<td>NA right answer</td>
<td>NA right answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question triggers desired behaviors?</strong></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rate targetedness?</strong></td>
<td>5/5</td>
<td>5/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Improvements or amendments?</strong></td>
<td>nothing</td>
<td>Don’t say immediate it is too urgent I would say change it to “prompt action”, instead of an immediate decision.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**RESULTS:**

**Issues:** Subject found some misleading term leading to confusion.

**Solutions:** change the wording + removing one behavior

**Relevance to competency score:** 10/10 highly relevant

**JDM SIQB1R** - Can you tell about any past critical situation/ major problem at work/college in which you had to make a prompt action on your own? What was the outcome?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Target behaviors</th>
<th>Exceed expectations</th>
<th>Meets expectations</th>
<th>Does not meet expectations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Judgment and decision making</td>
<td>To recognize that there is a problem: Problem Sensitivity</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To identify sources of the problem and solutions: Critical Thinking</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To manage related risks in a creative and fast way: Problem Solving</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Original Form of Survey 5 Structured Interview Question 1:
COM SIQS1- A woman calls the Red Cross to come and help her old husband. As you arrive to the house, you find out that the wife is providing very little medical information about her husband; saying that he has done one open heart surgery, and today is feeling pain in his chest. The wife totally refuses to transfer her husband to the hospital; instead she wants the Red Cross volunteer to give him some medication. What do you say?

**Definition of Communication Skills:** Is able to organize and present information for people from different backgrounds. Is able to communicate in a sensitive and comforting manner. Is able to actively listen to others.

**Behaviors:** Is able to communicate with people from different backgrounds, communicate in a sensitive and comforting manner

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Probes</th>
<th>Findings of Subject/Practitioner 5</th>
<th>Findings of Subject/Academic 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Answer</strong></td>
<td>I should negotiate with her and explain to her that we are not certified to give him medication, he needs proper medical physicians.</td>
<td>Is it a mandate hospitalization by law, I don’t have time to probe why she is so secretive, I will tell her I understand she is not at ease but I would explain to her the symptoms of a heart attack are.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comprehensible?</strong></td>
<td>Was able to rephrase it</td>
<td>Was able to rephrase it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes all part are comprehensible</td>
<td>Is the wife reluctant or secretive? Something is missing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relevant to the job?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Not Applicable- not EMT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Which competency?</strong></td>
<td>Convincing</td>
<td>People skills and how to manage difficult patients, quick decision making given incomplete information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I wrong above, what about this competency?</strong></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>It does, but medically you may think that there is no time to communicate in this situation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question triggers desired behaviors?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>not really</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rate targetedness?</strong></td>
<td>4/5</td>
<td>3/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Improvements or amendments?</strong></td>
<td>no nothing</td>
<td>You may add she is not obstinate, she is afraid and indecisive, distressed, agitated, add something about her.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RESULTS:**

**Issues:** The question is missing details, thus it does not tackle all behaviors.

**Solutions:** Add details

**Relevance to competency score:** 7/10 relevant to the competency
A woman calls the Red Cross to come and help her old husband. As you arrive to the house, you assess that he needs to be transported to the hospital immediately. The wife is illiterate with little understanding of medical conditions. She is very hesitant about transferring her husband to the hospital, she looks agitated and secretive; instead she asks you and your team to give him some medication. What do you say?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Target behaviors</th>
<th>Exceed expectations</th>
<th>Meets expectations</th>
<th>Does not meet expectations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Communicate with people from different backgrounds</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skills</td>
<td>Communicate in a sensitive and comforting manner</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Actively listen to others.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Original Form of Survey 5 Structured Interview Question 2:

ORG SIQS2- You are in the center sorting important first aid material in the logistics room when the alarm rings and all the team leaves for an emergency. It is a rule that someone always stays on stand-by in the Control Room ready to handle the communication with the ambulance. At this same moment, a patient rings the doorbell and asks you to change his wound’s bandage. What do you do?

Definition of Organizational Skills: Being able to plan realistically (to manage own time/resources/other’s time), and being able to prioritize (based on importance or other relevant criteria).

Behaviors: Being able to plan realistically (to manage own time/resources/other’s time), being able to prioritize (based on importance or other relevant criteria)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Probes</th>
<th>Findings of Subject/Practitioner 5</th>
<th>Findings of Subject/Academic 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Answer</td>
<td>Very essential or someone to stay in the control room until the ambulance reaches the patient, after that I can change the patient’s wounds. It’s in the same location and I can hear them calling me so I can stop and answer.</td>
<td>I would tell the patient I cannot take care of him now, and that I will be back after I finish with the ambulance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensible?</td>
<td>Was able to rephrase it Yes all part are comprehensible</td>
<td>Was able to rephrase it Yes all part are comprehensible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant to the job?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Not Applicable- not EMT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Which competency?</td>
<td>Organization Skills</td>
<td>Communication skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I wrong above, what about this competency?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not really</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question triggers desired behaviors?</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate targetedness?</td>
<td>3/5</td>
<td>2/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvements or amendments?</td>
<td>The first part isn’t relevant: “sorting out material” unwanted information I would probe, I will divide the question into 2 questions. I would change the question structure.</td>
<td>Change the situation. Not an unreasonable scenario but put several responsibilities. For example: in 3 months you have a project and you have a team with you, walk me through the process. Give them a hypothetical project with several tasks, not so obvious tasks so they have to break it down in their heads, and have teamwork as well.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RESULTS:
Issues: The question is missing details, thus it does not tackle all behaviors.
Solutions: Add probes
**Relevance to competency score:** 5/10 Neutral

**ORG SIQS2R** - You are in the center sorting important first aid material in the logistics room when the alarm rings and all the team leaves for an emergency. It is a rule that someone always stays on stand-by in the Control Room ready to handle the communication with the ambulance. At this same moment, a patient rings the doorbell and asks you to change his wound’s bandage.

- How would you handle this situation?
- How would you prioritize the tasks, knowing that you have to take care of all three tasks?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Target behaviors</th>
<th>Exceed expectations</th>
<th>Meets expectations</th>
<th>Does not meet expectations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organization Skills</strong></td>
<td>To plan realistically (to manage own time/resources/other’s time)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To prioritize (based on importance or other relevant criteria)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Original Form of Survey 5 Structured Interview Question 3:

EI SIQB1- Think of a situation you faced where you felt angry or frustrated at work/college. What did you say or do? What was the impact you had on the other people who were involved?

Definition of Emotional Intelligence: Is able to identify one’s own emotions, able to control one’s own emotions, is aware and tolerant of other’s feelings and emotions.

Behaviors: Being aware of one’s own emotions, controlling one’s own emotions, being aware of others’ emotions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Probes</th>
<th>Findings of Subject/Practitioner 5</th>
<th>Findings of Subject/Academic 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Answer</td>
<td>I wasn’t personally involved, but unfairness happened to someone else, no one talked about it. I talked about it and we did a big debate among each other. I think a team leader has to listen to my complaint, although this team leader did what he wanted at the end. I proved to the others my point even if the team leader didn’t change his attitude, but amongst the team we did.</td>
<td>My previous boss used to be a micromanager and I was really suppressed, along with all the team. One time I got really angry during a meeting and I expressed my opinion in a moderately assertive way, and coworkers told me we would love to have your courage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensible?</td>
<td>Was able to rephrase it Yes all part are comprehensible</td>
<td>I understood what did you change/“impact you had”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant to the job?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Not Applicable- not EMT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Which competency?</td>
<td>leadership skills</td>
<td>express emotions, regulate emotions and impact on others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I wrong above, what about this competency?</td>
<td>Yes it can</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question triggers desired behaviors?</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate targetedness?</td>
<td>4/5</td>
<td>4.5/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvements or amendments?</td>
<td>no nothing</td>
<td>What was the impact of your behavior, or of what you did or what you said on the person/people involved, because I thought it meant the actual change you did.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RESULTS:
Issues: The question lacks details which leads to confusion on how to answer it.

Solutions: Add details.

Relevance to competency score: 8.5 Relevant

EI SIQB1R- Think of a situation you faced where you felt angry or frustrated at work/college. What did you say or do? What was the impact of your behavior or what you said on the other people who were involved?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Target behaviors</th>
<th>Exceed expectations</th>
<th>Meets expectations</th>
<th>Does not meet expectations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emotional</td>
<td>Being aware of one’s own emotions</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligence</td>
<td>Controlling one’s own emotions</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Being aware of others emotions</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Original Form of Survey 5 Structured Interview Question 4:

**JDM SIQB2** - *Tell me about a time when you felt like you were able to anticipate a problem before it actually happened. What were the circumstances? What are the measures you took?*

**Definition of Judgment and decision making:** Is able to recognize that there is a problem (Problem Sensitivity). Is able to identify sources of the problem and solutions (Critical Thinking) in a creative and fast way while being able to manage related risks (Creative and fast Problem Solving).

**Behaviors:** Is able to recognize that there is a problem: Problem Sensitivity, is able to identify sources of the problem and solutions: Critical Thinking and is able to manage related risks in a creative and fast way: Problem Solving.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Probes</th>
<th>Findings of Subject/Practitioner 5</th>
<th>Findings of Subject/Academic 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Answer</strong></td>
<td>A huge misunderstanding. I refrained from the subject for 2 days till the tension went down. After 2 days we talked about it briefly and we solved it without any fights.</td>
<td>I had a patient in a clinic with very low fees, my supervisor told me no you have to let her pay more, I told my supervisor I cannot right now the relationship is fragile and I cannot do that now, so I did it and eventually the patient left. Because I had to do it, the most I could do is voice my opinion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comprehensible?</strong></td>
<td>yes, but add a problem “that was not expected” is better</td>
<td>Was able to rephrase it Yes all part are comprehensible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relevant to the job?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Not Applicable - not EMT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Which competency?</strong></td>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>proactive, judgment of the situation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I wrong above, what about this competency?</strong></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question triggers desired behaviors?</strong></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rate targetedness?</strong></td>
<td>3/5</td>
<td>4/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Improvements or amendments?</strong></td>
<td>The structure of the question can be changed maybe, or to add: from your daily life, be more specific.</td>
<td>The only thing is that if you don’t have senior people, you will have a lot of situational constraints to judgment and decision making, so you cannot target this competency. Because what if you don’t have the authority to have decision making.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESULTS:
Issues: the question is missing details which leads to a lack of comprehension, it is difficult to answer because the competency is related to the candidate’s seniority.

Solutions: Add details + use more probes.

Relevance to competency score: 7/10 Relevant

JDM SIQB2R- Tell me about a time when you felt like you were able to anticipate a problem that was unexpected, before it actually happened. What were the circumstances? What were the measures you took?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Target behaviors</th>
<th>Exceed expectations</th>
<th>Meets expectations</th>
<th>Does not meet expectations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Judgment and decision making</td>
<td>To recognize that there is a problem: Problem Sensitivity</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To identify sources of the problem and solutions: Critical Thinking</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To manage related risks in a creative and fast way: Problem Solving</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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