**Interview Protocol:** Why faculty grade the way they do?

# Plan is to do a 20-minute individual interview sessions with a faculty member.

**Materials and Equipment:**

* White boards, Marker pens, Camera with voice recorder

**Interview:**

*Student comes in* – Hello how are you today?

 I’m Nandana and you are welcome to this interview session and this

 session will go for about 20 minutes. This interview session will be

 video and voice recorded for further review purposes. We won’t publish

 your information anywhere and we will keep your privacy.

Sign consent form – *If I had any.*

**Let me go ahead and turn on the camera and voice recorder.**

**Introduction:**

Let me introduce my self before we get started, I’m Nandana, a fourth year graduate student from the physics education research group. The goal of this project is to see how you understand the concepts related to problems and what mechanisms you use to solve the problem but not to get a final answer or a number.

Today I invited you to work on few physics problems and these are based on E&M 1 syllabus. Importantly there is no relation between this interview and E&M 1 course or any of your future courses. So you won’t be penalized for any of the mistakes if you happen to make any during this session.

Monday, September 10



Description: Conduct a practice interview on the topic of why faculty grade the way they do. You should conduct this interview on a faculty member (current or past). Try to use a different style than the one for the "Balls" interview.

To prepare for your interview: \* Think to yourself about why faculty choose the grading schemes that they do.

\* Write a protocol around this topic. Aim for 20 minutes.

 \* Solicit a faculty member to be interviewed. You should pick someone who isn't Ellie.

 \* Decide if you want to record the interview (e.g. on your phone) for later review.

After your interview \* Immediately write down what happened. \* Reflect on trying to use a different interviewing style than your native one.

\* Reflect on your protocol: too long? too short? too focused? too nebulous? Fix your protocol. \* Did you pay adequate attention to the emotional state of your interviewee?

 \* How, if at all, were your interviewee's ideas different than your own?

\* How, if at all, did you coax your interviewee to give you more details?

Bring your reflections and your improved protocol to class.

**Problem Solving:**

* Here is the white board and marker pen. I encourage you to work on the white board and write down everything you think is important.
* I’ll give you one problem each time.
* As you solve this problem, I’ll interrupt you and want you to discuss the problem on the white board.

**At the end:**

 Let them feel happy: “I’m really impressed about the work you done. Thank you for your participation”

**Note:** \* If students really can not proceed, will explain the problem/ will give them a hint.

 “What do you need to know to move forward”

 \* After they have done each problem - “Could you please run me through your solution” Plus follow up questions accordingly.

\* If the time is left, but more problems left,

 if the student is too slow, will just ask to explain how they will work in it.

**The Great Interview: 25 Strategies for Studying People in Bed Joseph C. Hermanowicz**

Hermanowicz (2002) drew on a sexual metaphor from Erving Goffman to argue that “**great interviewing is . . . a romantic-like dialogue”** (p. 482). Although Hermanowicz elaborated the sexual-romantic metaphor throughout his article, he does not explicitly discuss the two stereotypical metaphors that appear in his article.

In the first, he described great interviewing drawing on a metaphor of probing, pursuing deeper meaning through doggedly questioning the interviewee, revealing a person’s inner core: “one gets there through a serious of routes—a series of probes” (Hermanowicz, 2002, p. 485). *– (because he observed practices around him in which fellow students of society seemed only to scratch the surface of the people they studied.)*

Second, he drew on a metaphor of attentive openness that is associated with an interview technique to “embody detached concern (#16)”: “But if respondents are able to detect openness on the part of the interviewer, made possible by his or her detached reserve, they themselves will be more likely to talk openly, to delve into detail and to convey meaning” (p. 493*). – (You want to get to know your date deeply, and minimizing the amount of unproductive influence, or interviewer bias and great interviewers thus display a “quiet concern”)*

These two interviewing techniques, one of active probing and the other of attentive openness, would appear to be quite different approaches to performing an interview. *Hermanowicz combined them both as part of good interviewing technique.*

**Entering the child’s mind: Ginsberg** – Ch2: What is the clinical Interview? & Ch2: What happens in the clinical Interview?

The introductory chapter set up the central contrast of clinical interview methods with putatively more objective method of standardized evaluation.

The second chapter traces the clinical interview to intellectual traditions of the three seminal theorists: Freud, Vygotsky, and Piaget. A weakness of the treatise, in my view, is the tendency to homogenize these diverse intellectual traditions, eliding their contrasting epistemologies. Of course, there is much that is shared by these thinkers in their rejection of logical positivism and its methodological tyranny, but a more nuanced treatment of the clinical interview may explore its diverse possibilities, rather than appropriate all its histories to a common project.

The heart of chapter 3 is an account of Ginsberg’s own interview technique as displayed in his interaction with Tobby, a grade 1 student whom he had discussed in several previous publications. Whatever else one may think of Ginsberg’s work, his clinical sensitivity to children’s participation is unfailing and of a very high order. He approaches the interview intending that “interviewer and the child develops a relationship of trust and mutual respect that permits an intimacy centered on the child”.

The first two chapters articulate the need for and the theoretical origins of this method: clinical interview. Ginsberg first demonstrates that traditional standardized methods (achievement test and IQ test), are inadequate ways to examine the complex processes involved in children’s thinking. He then reviews the works of Freud, Vygotsky and Piaget in a manner that is both accessible to those who are unfamiliar with these theories and interesting to audiences that are more expert. On the whole, his discussion of the cognitive tradition and constructive approach provides a strong rationale for the increased use of the clinical interview.

# Interviewing

Interviewing involves asking questions and getting answers from participants in a study.  Interviewing has a variety of forms including: individual, face-to-face interviews and face-to-face group interviewing. Interviews can be structured, semi-structure or unstructured.

**Therapeutic or clinical interviews** are another special kind of professional interview, in which the purpose is to increase understanding and produce change in the person being interviewed.

# Structured Interviews

Characteristics of the Structured Interview

* The interviewer asks each respondent the same series of questions.
* The questions are created prior to the interview, and often have a limited set of response categories.
* There is generally little room for variation in responses and there are few open-ended questions included in the interview guide.
* Questioning is standardized and the ordering and phrasing of the questions are kept consistent from interview to interview.
* The interviewer plays a neutral role and acts casual and friendly, but does not insert his or her opinion in the interview.
* Self-administered questionnaires are a type of structured interview.

Benefits

* Structured interviews can be conducted efficiently by interviewers trained only to follow the instructions on the interview guide or questionnaire.
* Structured interviews do not require the development of rapport (a close and harmonious relationship) between interviewer and interviewee, and they can produce consistent data that can be compared across a number of respondents.

**Semi-structured Interviews**

*Characteristics of Semi-structured interviews*

* The interviewer and respondents engage in a formal interview.
* The interviewer develops and uses an 'interview guide' (interview protocol). This is a list of questions and topics that need to be covered during the conversation, usually in a particular order.
* The interviewer follows the guide, but is able to follow topical trajectories in the conversation that may stray from the guide when he or she feels this is appropriate.

Benefits

* Many researchers like to use semi-structured interviews because questions can be prepared ahead of time.  This allows the interviewer to be prepared and appear competent during the interview.
* Semi-structured interviews also allow informants the freedom to express their views in their own terms.
* Semi-structure interviews can provide reliable, comparable qualitative data.

# Unstructured Interviews

Characteristics of Unstructured Interviews

* The interviewer and respondents engage in a formal interview in that they have a scheduled time to sit and speak with each other and both parties recognize this to be an interview.
* The interviewer has a clear plan in mind regarding the focus and goal of the interview.  This guides the discussion.
* There is not a structured interview guide.  Instead, the interviewer builds rapport with respondents, getting respondents to open-up and express themselves in their own way.
* Questions tend to be open-ended and express little control over informants' responses.
* Ethnographic, in depth interviews are unstructured. Fontana and Frey (1994) identify three types of in depth, ethnographic unstructured interviews

Benefits

* Unstructured interviews are an extremely useful method for developing an understanding of an as-of-yet not fully understood or appreciated culture, experience, or setting.
* Unstructured interviews allow researchers to focus the respondents' talk on a particular topic of interest, and may allow researchers the opportunity to test out his or her preliminary understanding, while still allowing for ample opportunity for new ways of seeing and understanding to develop.
* Unstructured interviews can be an important preliminary step toward the development of more structured interview guides or surveys.

# Informal Interviewing

Characteristics of Informal interviewing

* The interviewer talks with people in the field informally, without use of a structured interview guide of any kind.
* The researcher tries to remember his or her conversations with informants, and uses jottings or brief notes taken in the field to help in the recall and writing of notes from experiences in the field.
* Informal interviewing goes hand-in-hand with participant observation.
* While in the field as an observer, informal interviews are casual conversations one might have with the people the researcher is observing.

Benefits

* Interviews can be done informally, and 'on the fly' and, therefore, do not require scheduling time with respondents.  In fact, respondents may just see this as 'conversation.'
* Informal interviews may, therefore, foster 'low pressure' interactions and allow respondents to speak more freely and openly.
* Informal interviewing can be helpful in building rapport with respondents and in gaining their trust as well as their understanding of a topic, situation, setting, etc.
* Informal interviews, like unstructured interviews, are an essential part of gaining an understanding of a setting and its members' ways of seeing.
* Informal interviews can provide the foundation for developing and conducting more structured interviews.