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The article reviewed for this Critical Reflection was a literature review of interview, hiring, staff retention, and termination processes from the points of view of the individual applicant/employee and the organization (Taylor & Giannantonio, 1993). The article offered possible strategies for employers to improve their interview and staff retention methods and for job seekers to be more effective and efficient in their search for and attainment of jobs. This year, I am doing my practicum SAFEHOME, the domestic violence agency in Johnson County. In this paper, I will discuss my reaction to the article in the context of my viewpoint as a practicum intern, a student, and a soon-to-be job seeker. I will analyze how this article reflects SAFEHOME’s organizational practices, and how the article’s information can be useful as a part of the class’s emphasis on diversity. **Excellent intro.**

**Critique**

My understanding of this article is influenced by my particular “lens”, i.e. the context of my current situation as a practicum intern, a student, and a soon-to-be job seeker. **Good.** Two elements of the article were particularly salient for me: the discussion of what interviewers value in job applicants and what job applicants do that improve their chances of being hired (because I will soon be seeking employment); and the discussion of ways that organizations improve their staff retention and job satisfaction (because the discussion adds to my understanding of SAFEHOME’s organizational practices). **Good.**

I found it interesting that studies found that a job applicant’s interpersonal skills, as displayed during a job interview, sometimes make a greater impact on the interviewer’s assessment than the applicant’s employability as reflected in his or her resume (Taylor & Giannantonio, 1993). The applicant’s fitness with the organization’s values and culture was also
a significant factor in the job seeking process from both the employer’s and the potential employee’s point of view (1993). Good.

Interpersonal skills and personal values seem to be a significant part of many job applicant assessments at SAFEHOME, at least to some extent. SAFEHOME staff first screen out those applicants that do not seem qualified based on their resumes. Since they only interview applicants that meet basic experience requirements for the position, staff can use the interview to judge whether the applicant would have the appropriate interpersonal skills for the job. Staff therefore base their judgments on a combination of the applicant’s background experience and his or her demonstration of a passion for SAFEHOME’s mission and values. In one interview I observed, the applicant’s answers to questions such as “How would you react in [situation x]?” seemed to be weighed more heavily than the person’s education and experience. In this circumstance, the studies from the article reflected my real-life observations. Good.

For the most part, the authors of this article did not address diversity issues in the workplace. Good. The research is nevertheless applicable to the study of diversity issues that is a central component of this class. For example, if an interviewer weighs interpersonal skills too heavily over education and experience, an applicant from a different background than that of the interviewer might have a significant disadvantage in the interview process. Indeed, the authors noted studies that show that interviewers will rate applicants that are similar to themselves more positively (Taylor & Giannantonio, 1993); this has ethical implications for employers that want to offer Equal Opportunity. Good.

Another diversity-related issue discussed in the article was the tendency of many organizations towards staff homogeneity (Taylor & Giannantonio, 1993). This tendency can have the effect of working against workplace diversity. Similarities among the staff can
contribute positively to the cohesion of the staff body, but it can also lead to a lack of innovative ideas, skills, and perspectives that come with a more diverse staff body. The article, while not explicitly discussing diversity, impacted my understanding of the importance of staff diversity. I had never really thought about the balance that must be created between diversity and uniformity, which I consider to be an ethical issue for social worker managers.

In addition to the topics already discussed, the article impacted my understanding of SAFEHOME’s organizational practices in other ways. Although I have not seen specific statistics, I think SAFEHOME has a very good staff retention rate. Many of the staff have been with the agency for over five years, and a few have been with SAFEHOME for over ten years. The staff seem to have a high level of job satisfaction. Based on my understanding of the research discussed in the article, this might indicate that SAFEHOME uses “more intense socialization practices [that] tend to lead to a better fit on the part of newcomers” (Taylor & Giannantonio, 1993, p. 507). SAFEHOME’s socialization practices, such as staff recognition events and staff inclusion in decision-making, are likely the cause of their high staff morale. This is an important lesson for my possible future work as a manager.

Conclusion

From my viewpoint as a soon-to-be job seeker and possible future manager, I focused on the parts of Taylor and Giannantonio’s 1993 article that discussed effective practices for job applicants as well as managers of organizations. In critiquing the authors’ analysis of the literature, I compared SAFEHOME’s organizational practices to those described as being typical of many organizations. The information in the article impacted my understanding of workplace diversity by noting that organizations often have a tendency towards staff homogeneity. By using SAFEHOME as a comparison to the organizations described in the article, I was able to
recognize SAFEHOME’s practices that benefit the staff. I will certainly use this information in my career. **Excellent conclusion.**
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You did an outstanding job on this reflection. I appreciated how you used the article to support your points throughout your paper. You are well on your way to completing your organizational analysis. Great job! Grade = 100