

VIRTUAL REALITY JOB INTERVIEW TRAINING

MOCK INTERVIEW SCORING MANUAL

Autism Mock Interview Rating Scale (A-MIRS)

Kari Sherwood, MS, MEd, MSW
PhD Student
University of Michigan
School of Social Work
1080 S. University Avenue
Ann Arbor, MI 48109

Matthew Smith, PhD, MSW, MPE, LCSW
Associate Professor
University of Michigan
School of Social Work
1080 S. University Avenue
Ann Arbor, MI 48109

INSTRUCTIONS FOR RATING MOCK INTERVIEWS

Autism Mock Interview Rating Scale (A-MIRS)

Standards for evaluating responses to interview questions have been established. Therefore, it is important to use the specified criteria when assigning a score. Below is a list of procedures and considerations that must be taken into account when rating the interviews. Following these instructions will be critical to ensure adequate reliability between raters. Please read this manual carefully and use the same procedures for each interview that you rate.

The Autism Mock Interview Rating Scale (A-MIRS) asks raters to score item areas that encompass the entire interview and the instructions for scoring that sheet are the focus of this manual.

PROCEDURE FOR SCORING

- 1) For each interview, record your name, video ID number, and participant ID number. **THIS INFORMATION MUST BE RECORDED FOR EVERY INTERVIEW.**
- 2) Watch the entire video two times. You should NOT take notes the first time watching the video. After the first watch, make comments and score Item 1 *Likeliness to be Hired* ONLY.
- 3) During the second time watching the video, take notes on the space provided for items 2-15. Rewind and/or pause the videos as needed. Make sure you provide comments/rationales for the scoring on items 2-15.
- 4) Use your notes to finalize your scores for items 2-15 on the A-MIRS document. Re-watch the video as necessary so that you are confident in your ratings.

RATING CRITERION AND ANCHORS

All of the items are rated on a 7-point Likert scale, with 1 representing an exceptionally low level of that particular behavior and 7 representing an exceptionally high level of that particular behavior. Please remember that the average individual behavior will be scored a 4. Below is a comprehensive definition for each item as well as some things to consider when assigning a rating. Please read each one carefully as it will impact how you measure your ratings.

Basis of evaluation: A score of **1** indicates that the participant completely lacks the behavior being evaluated; a score of **2** indicates that the participant meets a combination of 1 and 3 criteria; a score of **3** indicates that the participant does exhibit some of the behavior being evaluated (but less than half of the time); a score of **4** indicates that the participant exhibits the behavior being evaluated half of the time; a score of **5** indicates that the participant exhibits the behavior being evaluated more than half of the time (but less than all of the time); a score of **6** indicates that the participant meets a combination of 5 and 7 criteria; and a score of **7** indicates that the participant exhibits the behavior being evaluated all (or nearly all) of the time.

Likelihood to be Hired – First Watch

This category is the primary index for assessing whether the participant is likely to be hired for this particular job. Higher scores reflect a likelihood to be hired based on overall interview performance. Lower scores reflect an unlikelihood to be hired.

Item 1 – Likelihood to be hired –

Very Likely (7)		(5)		Average(4)		(3)		Unlikely (1)	
<i>Comments:</i>									
7	6	5	4	3	2	1			

Level of Engagement

This category is the primary index for assessing whether the participant was engaged in the mock interview. Higher scores reflect a higher level of engagement (responding to questions, maintaining focus, etc.). Lower scores reflect a lower level of engagement (not responding, not maintaining focus, providing same responses for most questions or answering before interviewer completes sentences such as “I don’t remember”, “I don’t know”, “no”, etc.).

Item 2 – Level of Engagement –

Excellent (5)		(4)		Average(3)		(2)		Poor (1)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fully engaged in the interview Is consistently conversational Responses are applicable and detailed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mostly engaged in the interview Is conversational most of the time Responses are somewhat applicable and detailed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Somewhat disengaged in the interview Is conversational some of the time Responses are occasionally short, repetitive and/or uninformative 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Completely disengaged in the interview Is not conversational Responses are short, repetitive and/or uninformative 	<i>Comments:</i>					
5	4	3	2	1					

Being Confident

This category is the primary index of the participant’s level of confidence throughout the entire interview. Consider both verbal and nonverbal social cues for signs of comfort/discomfort (tense, sweating, wringing hands, fidgeting, stammering). Participants will score higher if they are prepared, give complete answers, and provide examples. Participants will score lower if they provide partial answers, if their responses require a lot of follow-up clarification, or if they continuously lose their train of thought.

Item 3 – Being confident –

Excellent (7)	(5)	Average(4)	(3)	Poor (1)		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Casual & relaxed affect Never fidgets Does not lose train of thought Gives complete answers most of the time Provides examples most of the time Consistently responds confidently 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mixed affect, majority relaxed Fidgets less than half of the time Seldom loses train of thought Gives complete answers some of the time Provides examples some of the time Responds confidently most of the time 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mixed affect, majority anxious Fidgets more than half of the time Sometimes loses train of thought Gives a combination of complete and partial answers Rarely provides examples Responds confidently some of the time 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tense/anxious affect Constantly fidgeting Continuously loses train of thought Gives partial answers that require follow-up Never provides examples Does not respond confidently 			
<i>Comments:</i>						
7	6	5	4	3	2	1

Being Positive

This category is the primary index for assessing whether participants share information about themselves in a positive way. Participants will score higher if they provide multiple examples of being flexible to change, and reframing prior experiences in a positive light suggesting that they learned from the experience. Participants will score lower if they share prior experiences of being inflexible, or that come across negatively (e.g., reflecting on past failures without reframing positively).

Item 4 – Being positive –

Excellent (7)	(5)	Average(4)	(3)	Poor (1)		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shares positive attributes with at least one example • Displays a positive mindset by emphasizing past lessons learned • Shares multiple examples of being flexible/adaptable 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shares positive attributes, without examples • Displays a positive mindset • Shares one example of being flexible/adaptable 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not share positive attributes • Makes statements that display a negative mindset • Shares one example of being inflexible/unadaptable 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shares negative attributes with examples • Reframes positive situations in a negative way • Shares multiple examples of being inflexible/unadaptable 			
<i>Comments:</i>						
7	6	5	4	3	2	1

Being Professional

This category is the primary index of whether the participant carries themselves in a professional manner. Higher scores will reflect participants who are respectful, polite, and provide work-related responses. Lower scores will reflect participants who overshare personal information, discuss inappropriate social topics (e.g., politics, religion, partying), and come across as too casual.

Item 5 – Being professional –

Excellent (7)	(5)	Average(4)	(3)	Poor (1)		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consistently provides specific work-related responses • Provides polite responses throughout the interview • Avoids discussing or joking about inappropriate topics • Discloses personal information in an appropriate, productive manner 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides work-related responses most of the time • Is polite throughout most of the interview • Avoids inappropriate topics most of the time • Productive self-disclosure is present but not consistent 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides work-related responses some of the time • Displays some signs of impoliteness • Discusses inappropriate topics some of the time • Self-disclosure is hesitant 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not provide work-related responses • Is not polite during the interview • Discusses or jokes about inappropriate topics • Discloses inappropriate personal information (oversharing) 		
<i>Comments:</i>						
7	6	5	4	3	2	1

Showing Interest

This category is the primary index of whether the participant sounds interested in the position. Higher scores will reflect participants who ask several thoughtful questions during the interview, reflect on job duties and how personal strengths can be applied to these duties, and asks about next steps for the employer to make a decision. Lower scores reflect an ‘any job will do’ attitude, or inaccurate citing of the job description.

Item 6 – Showing interest –

Excellent (7)	(5)	Average(4)	(3)	Poor (1)		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explicitly displays enthusiasm for the job • Asks multiple questions related to job • Cites job description in detail • Asks about next steps and verifies follow-up details 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Displays some enthusiasm for the job • Asks at least one question related to job • Generally cites the job description • Asks about next steps or verifies follow-up details 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Displays little enthusiasm for the job • Asks question, but does not express interest in position • Does not cite job description • Does not ask about next steps or verify follow-up details 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Displays no enthusiasm for the job • Asks no questions • Inaccurately cites job description • Disregards or dismisses comments about next steps or follow-up details 		
<i>Comments:</i>						
7	6	5	4	3	2	1

Being Honest

This category is the primary index of whether the participant sounds honest. Higher scores reflect a participant who comes across as believable, with clear, consistent, well-articulated answers. Participants will receive a lower score if a dishonest statement is made or if they would fail to follow a rule or report a coworker caught stealing.

Item 7 – Being honest –

Excellent (7)	(5)	Average(4)	(3)	Poor (1)		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presents themselves as trustworthy throughout entirety of interview • Makes statements about ethical work practice with examples • Does not provide any answers or examples that are contradicting • States they would report theft • Makes statement about following a policy or rule, with example 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presents themselves as trustworthy throughout most of the interview • States that they are honest and ethical without providing examples • Very few answers or examples that are contradicting • Hesitates about stating they would report theft • Alludes to following a policy or rule, without example 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presents themselves as trustworthy throughout some of the interview • Alludes to unethical work practice without providing examples • Provides some answers or examples that contradict one another • States they would not report theft • Answers related to following a policy or rule are ambiguous or avoidant 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presents themselves as untrustworthy throughout entirety of the interview • Provides examples of participating in dishonest or unethical work practices • Frequently provides answers or examples that contradict one another • States it is okay to steal • Makes statement related to going against a policy or rule 		
<i>Comments:</i>						
7	6	5	4	3	2	1

Being dependable/hardworking

This category is the primary index for assessing whether the participant comes across as a hard worker. Participants will be scored higher if they self-identify that they are a hard worker and use specific examples to support this claim. During these examples, participants indicate that they are self-motivated, stay on-task, make work a priority, and give examples of being efficient. Participants will score lower if they mention they are late to work or miss work frequently.

Item 8 – Being dependable/hardworking –

Excellent (7)	(5)	Average(4)	(3)	Poor (1)		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Describes self as hard worker, with examples • Provides multiple examples of staying on task & prioritizing work • Provides example of ability to multitask • Answers “above & beyond” question with example • Expresses importance of being on-time 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Describes self as hard worker with no examples • Provides one quality example of staying on task & prioritizing work • Describes self as good at multitasking, without examples • Alludes to going “above & beyond”, without examples • Expresses importance of being on-time, with qualifier (e.g., only during busy times, etc.) 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides some indication of laziness or unreliability, without examples • Alludes to tardiness, missing work, or avoiding responsibilities • Describes self as average at multitasking, without examples • Does not go “above & beyond” • Expresses indifference to being on-time 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides direct or indirect example of laziness or unreliability • Provides examples of showing up late, missing work, or avoiding responsibilities • Describes self as not able to multitask • Does less than expected on-the-job • States that it is not important to be on-time 		
<i>Comments:</i>						
7	6	5	4	3	2	1

Working Well With Others

This category is the primary index for assessing whether the participant sounds easy to work with. Participants will score higher if they state they work well on a team setting and provide convincing examples. They will also score high if they indicate they take direction well, and get along with others. Participants will score lower if they complain about former co-workers or supervisors, reflect on prior unresolved conflicts, or complain about prior jobs in general.

Item 9 – Working well with others –

Excellent (7)	(5)	Average(4)	(3)	Poor (1)		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discusses being easy to work with while providing multiple examples • Makes statement relating to: getting along with teammates, helping customers, listening and taking direction well • Able to successfully work on a team • Able to resolve conflicts • Provides multiple examples of initiating great teamwork 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Generally sounds easy to work with & provides at least one example • Seems flexible and likely easy to work with • Somewhat able to work on a team • Somewhat able to resolve conflicts • Provides one example of initiating great teamwork 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Generally sounds easy to work with, but shares some signs of difficulty • Makes statements that allude to being difficult to work with such as poor listening skills, being inflexible or unwilling to follow instructions • Has some difficulty working on a team • Able to resolve conflicts with assistance • Provides no examples of initiating teamwork 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discusses and provides examples of being difficult to work with • Explicitly discusses topics related to: bad-mouthing coworkers/boss, having conflict with others, complaining, difficulty compromising • Not able to work on a team • Has difficulty resolving conflicts • Provides an example of initiating poor teamwork 		
<i>Comments:</i>						
7	6	5	4	3	2	1

Sharing Strengths and Skills

This category is the primary index for assessing whether the participant shares their strengths and skills. Participants will score higher if they share multiple examples of their strengths and skills, and talk about how they use those strengths or skills on the job. Participants will score lower if they do not share relevant strengths or skills, or focus on their weaknesses.

Item 10 – Sharing strengths and skills –

Excellent (7)	(5)	Average(4)	(3)	Poor (1)		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides multiple examples of strengths or skills related to work, school, or home Explicitly states detailed career goals Shares multiple examples of strengths and skills in action 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides one example of strengths or skills related to work, school, or home Briefly or vaguely states career goals Shares one example of strengths and skills in action 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discusses strengths and skills, but does not share an example related to work, school, or home Does not discuss career goals Does not share example of strengths and skills in action 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does not discuss strengths or skills Makes statement that alludes to not having career goals Shares an example of an undesirable skill or weakness 		
<i>Comments:</i>						
7	6	5	4	3	2	1

Sharing Past Experiences

This category is the primary index for assessing whether the participant shares their past experiences. Participants will score higher if they share multiple examples of their past experiences and how those experiences will inform their work at this job. Participants will score lower if they do not share relevant past experiences.

Item 11 – Sharing past experiences –

Excellent (7)	(5)	Average(4)	(3)	Poor (1)		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shares multiple examples of past experiences with a positive frame • Provides multiple details of previous responsibilities at home, work, or school • Discusses experience with previous teacher or supervisor in detail 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shares one example of a past experience with a positive frame • Provides some details of previous responsibilities at home, work, or school • Briefly discusses experience with previous teacher or supervisor 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not share an example of a past experience • Does not provide details on previous responsibilities at home, work, or school • Alludes to experience with previous teacher or supervisor 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shares past experience with a negative frame • Had no previous responsibilities at home, work, or school • Does not discuss experience with previous teacher or supervisor 		
<i>Comments:</i>						
7	6	5	4	3	2	1

Sharing Past Limitations

This category is the primary index for assessing whether the participant shares past limitations. Participants will score higher if they share multiple examples of how they have overcome difficult situations, handled stress, or showed resilience or perseverance. Participants will score lower if they are unable to handle stress, or focus on limitations and how those limitations may prevent them from doing a job.

Item 12 – Sharing past limitations –

Excellent (7)	(5)	Average(4)	(3)	Poor (1)		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shares two personal improvements they have been working on • Shares multiple examples of handling difficult situations • Provides multiple examples of handling stress well 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shares one personal improvement they have been working on • Shares one example of handling a difficult situation • Provides one example of handling stress well 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not share any personal improvements they have been working on • Does not share any examples of handling difficult situations • Does not provide an example of handling stress well 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates or expresses refusal to work on any personal improvements • Demonstrates or discusses inability to handle difficult situations • Discusses or displays inability to handle stress well 		
<i>Comments:</i>						
7	6	5	4	3	2	1

Overall Rapport

This category is the primary index for assessing the overall rapport established between the participant and the HR representative. Higher scores reflect a smooth interaction where the participant was able to convey strong personal skills such as active listening, appropriate eye contact, friendliness, and expressiveness. Lower scores will reflect disorganized conversation, poor eye contact, lack of friendliness, and inattentiveness.

Item 13 – Overall rapport –

Excellent (7)	(5)	Average(4)	(3)	Poor (1)		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Displays positive affect & demeanor most of the time • Displays consistent, appropriate use of eye contact • Consistently nods and displays attentiveness • Initiates positive interactions at beginning & end of interview 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Displays positive affect and demeanor some of the time • Displays appropriate use of eye contact most of the time • Frequently nods and displays attentiveness • Engages in positive interactions at beginning & end of interview 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Displays negative affect & demeanor some of the time • Displays appropriate use of eye contact some of the time • Frequently displays inattentiveness • Engages in negative interactions at beginning & end of interview 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Displays negative affect & demeanor most of the time • Does not display appropriate use of eye contact • Appears inattentive most of the time • Facilitates negative interactions at beginning & end of interview 		
<i>Comments:</i>						
7	6	5	4	3	2	1

Likelihood to be Hired – Second Watch

This category is the primary index for assessing whether the participant is likely to be hired for this particular job. Higher scores reflect a likelihood to be hired based on overall interview performance. Lower scores reflect an unlikelihood to be hired.

Item 14 – Likelihood to be hired –

Very Likely (7)		(5)	Average(4)	(3)	Unlikely (1)	
<i>Comments:</i>						
7	6	5	4	3	2	1

Interviewer’s Effect on Performance

This category is the primary index for assessing whether the HR representative had any effect on the participant’s performance. Higher scores reflect that the HR representative had a positive effect on the participant’s performance due to over-facilitation, leading the interview, or by being overly complimentary. Lower scores reflect that the HR representative had a negative effect on the participant’s performance by being unresponsive, unengaging, or condescending towards the participant.

Item 15 – Interviewer’s Effect on Performance –

Positive Effect (+3)		(+1)	Average Effect (0)	(-1)	Negative Effect (-3)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interviewer over-facilitates the entire interaction • Interviewer is overly positive or overly complimentary towards interviewee • Interviewer asks mostly leading or elaborating questions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interviewer over-facilitates majority of the interaction • Interviewer is somewhat positive or complimentary towards interviewee • Interviewer asks too many leading or elaborating questions 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interviewer appears unresponsive or unapproachable throughout some of the interview • Interviewer is somewhat negative or condescending towards interviewee • Interviewer asks too few elaborating questions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interviewer appears unresponsive or unapproachable throughout most of the interview • Interviewer is overly negative or condescending towards interviewee • Interviewer asks no elaborating questions 		
<i>Comments:</i>						
+3	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	-3