

BMJ Open Cross-sectional evaluation of an asynchronous multiple mini-interview (MMI) in selection to health professions training programmes with 10 principles for fairness built-in

Alison Callwood ¹, Jenny Harris,¹ Lee Gillam,² Sarah Roberts,¹ Angela Kubacki,³ Angelos Christidis,² Paul Alexander Tiffin⁴

To cite: Callwood A, Harris J, Gillam L, *et al.* Cross-sectional evaluation of an asynchronous multiple mini-interview (MMI) in selection to health professions training programmes with 10 principles for fairness built-in. *BMJ Open* 2023;**13**:e074440. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2023-074440

► Prepublication history and additional supplemental material for this paper are available online. To view these files, please visit the journal online (<http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2023-074440>).

Received 06 April 2023

Accepted 18 September 2023



© Author(s) (or their employer(s)) 2023. Re-use permitted under CC BY. Published by BMJ.

¹Faculty of Health and Medical Sciences, University of Surrey, Guildford, UK

²Faculty of Engineering and Physical Sciences, University of Surrey, Guildford, UK

³IMBE, St George's University, London, UK

⁴Department of Health Sciences, University of York, York, UK

Correspondence to

Dr Alison Callwood;
a.callwood@surrey.ac.uk

ABSTRACT

Objectives We aimed to explore the psychometric properties of the first known online asynchronous multiple mini-interview (MMI) designed for fairness with subgroup analyses by key characteristics, usability and acceptability.

Design Cross-discipline multimethod evaluation.

Setting One UK University.

Participants Applicants to nursing, midwifery and paramedic science undergraduate programmes during 2021–2022.

Primary, secondary outcome measures Psychometric properties (internal consistency, construct validity, dimensionality) were assessed using Cronbach's alpha (α), parallel analysis (PA), Schmid-Leiman transformation and ordinal confirmatory factor analysis (CFA). Usability and acceptability were evaluated using descriptive statistics and conventional content analysis.

Methods The system was configured in a seven question 4 min MMI. Applicants' videorecorded their answers which were later assessed by interviewers and scores summed. Applicants and interviewers completed online evaluation questionnaires.

Results Performance data from 712 applicants determined good-excellent reliability for the asynchronous MMI (mean α 0.72) with similar results across subgroups (gender, age, disability/support needs, UK/non-UK). PA and factor analysis results suggested there were seven factors relating to the MMI questions with an underlying general factor that explained the variance in observed candidate responses. A CFA testing a seven-factor hierarchical model showed an excellent fit to the data (Confirmatory Fit Index=0.99), Tucker Lewis Index=0.99, root mean square error (RMSE) =0.034). Applicants (n=210) viewed the flexibility, relaxed environment and cost savings advantageous. Interviewers (n=65) reported the system to be intuitive, flexible with >70% time saved compared with face-to-face interviews. Reduced personal communication was cited as the principal disadvantage.

Conclusions We found that the asynchronous MMI was reliable, time-efficient, fair and acceptable and building fairness in was lost-cost. These novel, insights are applicable across health professions selection internationally informing the future configuration of online

STRENGTHS AND LIMITATIONS OF THIS STUDY

- ⇒ The underpinning theoretical approach aligned with an iterative process necessary to design a new technology to reduce bias.
- ⇒ The large sample enabled us to assess psychometric properties with subgroup analyses for the first time in this context.
- ⇒ The study provides perspectives from one large site; a necessary step to inform a planned international multisite evaluation.
- ⇒ The multimethod design provided insights necessary to embed fairness into online selection approaches in the absence of best practice guidance.

interviews to ensure workforces represent the societies they serve.

INTRODUCTION

Ensuring equity, inclusivity and diversity in selection to health professions training programmes is recognised internationally as an ethical and practical imperative.^{1,2} Globalisation and increased workforce pressures amplify this need.³ Fulfilling our responsibility to ensure fair selection is complex due to unintended biases that are intrinsic to human assessment compounded by recent unprecedented change to online interviews in the absence of published evidence.⁴⁻⁷

Historically, health professions' selection has been mainly face-to-face using unstructured or structured approaches including panel interviews, group interviews, assessment centres and multiple mini-interviews (MMIs).⁸ MMIs are a series of short, focused interactions with a number of different interviewers. The multiquestion format featuring structured scoring proforma with interviewers who have no prior knowledge of applicants, is

designed to mitigate the potential impact of interviewer bias.⁹ MMIs have been shown to be a feasible, acceptable, valid and reliable candidate selection approach across health professions. None-the-less, as a face-to-face method, MMIs can be costly, resource intensive and influenced by unintended bias.¹⁰

Online interviews were a relatively uncommon occurrence in selection to health professions before the pandemic. Approaches included Skype-based MMIs and asynchronous MMIs.¹¹ Research outside the field of healthcare has shown asynchronous video interviews to be faster, cheaper and require less employee time, easing scheduling burden and allowing for more applicants to be screened.¹² This can potentially increase the number of applicants who would have otherwise not had the opportunity to be interviewed.

During the Covid-19 pandemic, it was vital to ensure the continuance of recruitment to health professions. This resulted in rapid adaption to using online interviews facilitated by videoconference technology.^{13 14} Recent research suggests online interviews like MMIs are feasible and acceptable provided reliable high-speed internet connection is available. However, access to reliable Wi-Fi is not always possible.¹¹ In an asynchronous approach, applicants record their interviews at a convenient time and place, alleviating potential technical issues.

In live synchronous interviews, nuanced inconsistencies in, for example, tone and intonation, can arise in the way interviewers ask questions. Consistency of questioning across applicants is assured in asynchronous interviews through the use of prerecorded interview questions. Fairness is further ensured with the avoidance of non-adherence to set questions which can occur in live interviews when applicants and interviewers serendipitously find something in common and deviate to discuss this.^{12 15}

'Fairness' in this article is conceptualised as the quality of treating people equally or in a way that is right or reasonable. That encapsulates perceived fairness by participants as well as that borne out in data. Consensus on the design of online interviews to optimise applicant

accessibility and usability and mitigate potential unfairness issues for people across demographics, abilities and disabilities is not readily available.¹⁵ To address this, we applied to Innovate UK, the UK's innovation agency (2020–2021) to build and evaluate what we believe was, the first (proof-of-concept) asynchronous videoconference facilitated interview and assessment system uniquely grounded in the MMI method (figure 1).

Asynchronous MMI platform development summary

The asynchronous MMI is an on-demand videoconference interview where applicants log onto an online portal to complete their interview. The interview is a remote experience, where the system records applicants' short video responses to MMI questions in a timed process emulating the face-to-face MMI method. There is no synchronous, bidirectional communication and no interviewer to interact with; instead, questions are prerecorded by interviewers. Applicants' recorded responses are scored by an interview assessor at a convenient later date.

To inform the design, we undertook a rapid review of literature published between 2011 and 2021, guided by a five-stage process^{16 17} to help us understand how video-based interviews compare with face to face in terms of implementation and fairness including what makes for an optimising experience (details provided in online supplemental appendix 1).

Indicative themes were elicited and assimilated into the following 10 key principles and the system was reconfigured accordingly:

- ▶ Recognise potential issues with stereotype threats and belonging uncertainty that may impact on candidates' performance and use language that supports the affirmation of values, for example, 'well done for getting this far'.
- ▶ Incorporate encouraging words/phrases into the interview dialogue, as well as any communications circulated to applicants (eg, 'good luck').




Figure 1 Asynchronous Multiple Mini Interview (MMI) infographic.

- ▶ Soften the language of technical instructions, for example, ‘when you are ready ...’ or ‘when you have familiarised yourself with...’.
- ▶ Reduce the verbal load of interview content particularly for neurodivergent applicants.
- ▶ Accommodate access and engagement for neurodivergent applicants with extra time, adjusted fonts and a tailored user interface (UI) including background colours.
- ▶ Provide opportunities for candidates to familiarise themselves with the UI and format prior to their interview through a practice portal.
- ▶ Recommend generic, blank backgrounds for video or videoconference facilitated interviews or, if not possible, advise blurred backdrops.
- ▶ Ensure diversity of interviewers for prerecorded videos and those assessing them including gender, age and ethnicity, experts-by-experience, and other stakeholders.
- ▶ Avoid culturally sensitive subject areas, language, age and ability bias in interview content.
- ▶ Ensure the use of inclusive, gender-neutral language with appropriate pronouns for example, ‘they/them/their’.

The focus of the article is to detail the study undertaken to evaluate the psychometric properties of the asynchronous MMI. We aimed to explore reliability (internal consistency) for all users with subgroup analysis by key characteristics (age, gender, nationality, disability/additional support needs), construct validity, dimensionality, acceptability and usability.

In this context disability refers to a person who self-identifies with physical or mental impairment, and the impairment has a substantial and long-term adverse effect on the person’s ability to carry out normal day-to-day activities. Not all neurodivergent people consider themselves ‘disabled’ but instead neurological conditions are viewed a result of normal variations in the human genome but where additional support might be required. We, therefore, use the term ‘support need’ to include neurodivergent applicants.

METHODS

The MMI questions were developed and tested by the university’s community emulating our previously established in-person processes. A diverse range of individuals including academic staff, service users and practice partners were individually videorecorded asking MMI questions. The video recordings were uploaded and the system, configured in a seven question, 4min MMI with 1 min between questions.

The asynchronous online MMI system was adopted for selection to Health Professions undergraduate programmes (Adult, Child, Mental Health Nursing, Midwifery and Paramedic Science) at one UK university during 2021/2022 recruitment cycle. All applicants to these programmes were invited to register for a 1 week

slot that was convenient for them. At the start of their selected slot, applicants were emailed a link to the system. Here they could access the practice portal to check their Wi-Fi speed, familiarise themselves with the UI/key functionality, become conversant with the process through a detailed instructional video, and practice a question. When they felt prepared, they recorded their interview answers. To mirror our previous in-person process, once they had begun, applicants could not stop their MMI and start again. Any technical issues including those without the necessary equipment and/or Wi-Fi connectivity were supported to enable their successful completion on an individual basis.

All individuals at the university who would usually interview applicants as part of their role took part in this new process. These included academic staff, service users and practice partners. They were invited to self-allocate to 1-week interview assessment slots. Thereafter, they received a link and code to access the system to review and assess applicant interviews against uploaded scoring rubrics live on the system. Each interviewer was allocated a number of applicant’s video responses to a single question thereby aligning with the principles of an MMI. Also, emulating MMI methodology, a ‘red flag’ option could be ticked, and details populated in a text box if a cause for concern was raised in applicants’ answers. Applicant’s performance scores were downloaded at the end of the process to inform offer/reject decisions by university admissions officers.

University Admissions Officers conducted an internal resource evaluation to explore time and cost spent on the asynchronous MMI compared with face-to-face and Zoom-facilitated MMIs.

Design

This study was underpinned by Olsen and Eoyang’s theory of ‘Complex Adaptive Systems’.¹⁸ This is characterised by an adaptive and iterative working style appropriate when developing and optimising the system for fairness and reliability in the absence of any known precedent. We also grounded the system design in Gilliland’s¹⁹ justice-based model. According to their theory, a selection system’s adherence to procedural and distributive justice rules promotes applicants’ perceptions of fairness. Procedural justice rules relate to the approach used to derive decisions, in this case an asynchronous MMI. It includes the formal process (opportunity to perform and administration), explanation (feedback, information and transparency) and interpersonal communication throughout the selection process. Distributive justice rules encompass adherence to equity when determining selection outcomes.¹⁹

Participant recruitment

All applicants (n=712 at the data collection point) to the UK university and all interviewers (n=96) who assessed applicants were invited to evaluate the system.

Patient and public involvement

The university's service user group were supportive of the move to online asynchronous interviews. One service user acted as an interviewer by videorecording an MMI question. A further three were interview assessors, thereby continuing an established model at this university of service user involvement in recruitment. The service user group were also involved in the MMI question writing by reviewing draft questions and providing feedback. In the seven-question circuit, one practice partner video recorded an MMI question and eight assessed applicants' videos.

Data collection

Applicant interview performance data, routinely collected to inform offer/reject decisions, were used in the reliability analyses. Applicant interviews were scored against 10 question-specific criteria on a seven-point Likert-type scale with descriptive anchors for the seven questions. Criteria details are withheld for test security. Applicant interview scores were summed for each applicant.

To assess usability, applicants were invited to complete an online semistructured evaluation questionnaire hosted on Qualtrics once they had received their interview outcome decision.

To assess acceptability, interviewers were invited to evaluate the process at the end of the recruitment cycle through an online semistructured questionnaire also hosted on Qualtrics.²⁰

Analysis

We used applicant scores across questions to explore reliability (internal consistency) for all users and a randomly selected subsample self-reporting key characteristics including gender, age (<20 or 20+), nationality (UK/non-UK) and disability/support needs (absence/presence) using Cronbach's alpha (Stata, V.16.1, StataCorp).²¹ Cronbach's alpha, as a conventional measure of internal consistency (reliability), assumes that item responses are unidimensional, meaning that they are reflective of only one underlying construct or factor. However, this may not always be the case, therefore, scale dimensionality was assessed using a parallel analysis and confirmatory factor analysis (CFA).^{22 23} The parallel analysis and reliability values were derived using the software package FACTOR.²⁴ The ordinal factor analyses were conducted in Mplus²⁵ V.8.8. Usability and acceptability were explored with descriptive statistics (closed questions) and conventional content analysis²⁶ (open questions).

RESULTS

Sample characteristics

Data were available from 712 applicants to nursing, midwifery and paramedic science programmes at the data collection point on 1 May 2022 and for key characteristics for the subsample (n=284) (table 1). Disabilities self-reported by interviewers were reduced hearing and visual

acuity. Applicants reported neurodivergent challenges across the spectrum of dyslexia, dyspraxia and attention deficit hyperactivity disorder.

Reliability and assessment of fairness

Reliability

Applicant data were shown to be normally distributed (Kurtosis 0.000, $p = 0.005$) and symmetrical with skewness 1.0.

Internal consistency was good-excellent across scenario questions (for $n=712$ applicants) mean Cronbach's α 0.72 (range 0.64–0.89). Subgroup analyses showed similarly positive results with mean α female/male: 0.74/0.87 (range 0.70–0.89); age: <20years/>21 years 0.76/0.83 (range 0.72–0.86), disability/additional challenges/non-disability: 0.88/0.78 (range 0.74–0.89) and UK/non-UK 0.78/0.0.77 (range 0.72–0.83) (table 2).

Dimensionality/construct validity

The results of the parallel analysis suggested a maximum of seven dimensions underlay the response pattern. A Schmid-Leiman²⁷ transformation can be used to understand if a factor analytical model is best understood as a hierarchical in nature. This partitions observed variance into that explained by one or more general ('G') factors underlying three or more specific factors (a hierarchical model will be mathematically 'just identified' by three factors).²⁷ The results of the Schmid-Leiman transformed factor analysis indicated a seven-factor solution, relating to the MMI scenarios, with an underlying general factor which substantially loaded on all the former seven factors. An ordinal CFA to test this seven-factor hierarchical model showed an excellent fit to the data (Confirmatory Fit Index (CFI)=0.99, Tucker Lewis Index (TLI)=0.99, RMSE=0.034). In contrast, a one factor model showed a poor fit to the response data (CFI=0.70, TLI=0.69, RMSEA=0.19) (online supplemental appendix 2).

The results of the parallel analysis suggested a maximum number of seven plausible factors. The variance explained by additional postulated factors did not exceed that observed for the random data generated (online supplemental appendix 3).

Usability (applicants)

The online evaluation was completed by 210 applicants (29% response rate). The majority were under 20 years of age, self-identified as white female and with representation from across programmes (table 3).

The majority of applicants had not undertaken an asynchronous MMI previously. Overall applicants found the instructions either helpful or very helpful and did not experience any technical issues. From a setup perspective, was considered the right amount of time by over half with one-third stating it was too short. We asked additional overarching open free text questions regarding applicants' views on online interviews (table 3) as well as their overall 'top' positives and 'top' negatives of system (table 4 summary, online supplemental table 1).

Table 1 Participant self-identified characteristics

		Interview assessors n=65		Applicant subsample n=284		
		N	%	N	%	
Age (years)	25 and under	0	0	<20	193	68
	26–35	8	13	>20	91	32
	36–45	18	28			
	45+	35	53			
	Prefer not to say	4	6			
Gender	Female	55	84	Female	230	81
	Male	7	10	Male	54	19
	Other	0	0	Other	0	0
	Prefer not to say	3	6	Prefer not to say	0	0
Disability/ additional support needs	No	60	93	No	228	80
	Yes	5	7	Yes (64% neurodiverse, 34% mental health, 2% hearing challenges)	58	20
	Prefer not to say	0	0	Prefer not to say	0	0
Ethnicity	White (English/Welsh/Scottish/Northern Irish, Irish, Gypsy, Irish traveller, other white background)	61	94	UK/Ireland	229	81
	Mixed/multiple Ethnic Groups (white and black Caribbean, white and black African, any other mixed background)	2	3	Non-UK/Ireland	55	19
	Asian/Asian British (Indian, Pakistani, Bangladeshi, Chinese, any other Asian background)	0	0	N/A	N/A	
	Other (Arab, any other ethnic group)	0	0			
	Prefer not to say	2	3			
Role	University Health Sciences Staff	46	71	N/A	N/A	
	Practice partner	10	16			
	Service user	9	13			
	Prefer not to say	0	0			

N/A, not available.

We received 158 separate positive comments and 140 negative comments in relation to the questions asking for ‘top’ positives and ‘top’ negatives. Notably, 93% of the positive comments centred around three themes: ease (40%), reduced stress (28%) and fair (25%). We received fewer negative comments overall and these were split into two main themes: limited direct communication (34%) and critique of the MMI process itself (32%). Nineteen per cent of respondents raised technical issues as a potential negative issue, however, these did not transpire for around 80% in reality. The 12 respondents who did experience technical issues cited: buffering (3), frozen screen (2), crash (2), video skipping (2), screen scaling (1), microphone (1) and upload (1). They all subsequently successfully completed their interview at a second attempt.

Acceptability (Interviewers)

Sixty-five interviewers took part in the online evaluation representing a 71% response rate. The majority were white British female university staff, over the age of 45

years with no declared disability (table 1). This is representative of the University Faculty staff profile which is located in the Southeast of the UK.

Ninety-six per cent (n=62) of interviewers found the system intuitive, easy to use and reported a perceived reduction in stress. They primarily attributed this to increased convenience and flexibility. A 70%-time reduction was independently reported by our admissions officers. They estimated this based on time spent on other interview approaches (face-to-face MMIs and video-conference-facilitated MMIs) compared with our asynchronous MMIs; categorised into preinterview communications, setup, staff recruitment (including covering sick time), interview facilitation and postinterview communications (online supplemental appendix 4). The majority of the time saving was ascribed directly to the asynchronous modality which removed the need for staff to either facilitate face-to-face or online live interviews. Additionally, the asynchronous approach alleviated the pressures of last-minute non-availability of interviewers particularly

**Table 2** MMI question reliability (internal consistency) N=712

Question (total mean)	Obs	Mean	SD	Min	Max	Item-test correlation	Item-rest correlation	Cronbach's alpha
1	765	48.6732	10.3966	10	70	0.6541	0.4677	0.68
2	795	51.57107	9.70229	10	70	0.6434	0.4532	0.67
3	790	51.08101	9.10597	10	70	0.599	0.421	0.69
4	809	50.23486	8.97655	10	70	0.5826	0.4001	0.70
5	762	50.27428	9.88047	10	70	0.6624	0.4941	0.67
6	765	51.79869	8.7486	20	70	0.6132	0.4484	0.69
7	712	50.10499	11.0865	14	70	0.6076	0.3871	0.70
Scale reliability coefficient								0.7216
Subgroup reliability n=284								
Cronbach's alpha								
		Age		Self-identified gender		Self-declared disability		Country of birth
Question (total score)	<20years	>20years	Female	Male	Yes	Non	UK/Ireland	Non-UK/Ireland
1	0.74	0.83	0.73	0.87	0.88	0.76	0.78	0.74
2	0.74	0.83	0.72	0.87	0.88	0.76	0.77	0.75
3	0.75	0.83	0.74	0.87	0.87	0.77	0.78	0.77
4	0.77	0.85	0.76	0.89	0.88	0.79	0.79	0.79
5	0.73	0.82	0.71	0.86	0.87	0.75	0.76	0.73
6	0.77	0.84	0.76	0.87	0.87	0.79	0.79	0.79
7	0.79	0.87	0.78	0.88	0.89	0.80	0.80	0.86
Mean	0.76	0.83	0.74	0.87	0.88	0.78	0.78	0.77
MMI, multiple mini interview.								

practice partners as they were not tied to one scheduled day/time but had a time period (1 week) within which they could assess the interview recordings.

None of the interviewer assessors stated that they had used an asynchronous online MMI previously. Almost all (96%) found it easy to use and the user interface intuitive (92%). Less than 10% reported technical issues other than download issues which were resolved. Five per cent were 'not accepting' of using the asynchronous MMI in the future.

We were interested to better understand whether interviewers felt communication could be assessed in an asynchronous modality. Thirty-three per cent said 'yes', 54% 'somewhat', while 13% of respondents (n=6) responded 'no'. To generate more in depth insights we asked interviewers their top positives and negatives of the system. These are presented in table 4. We received 132 positive and 90 negative comments. The majority of positive comments (94%) related to perceived convenience (62%), fairness (14%) ease of navigation (9%) and benefits for the applicant (9%). Negative comments were split more evenly into perceptions of their being less personal (30%), critique of MMI methodology (24%), limited communication assessment and ability to build rapport (23%), and 5% had technology-related process concerns. Six per cent cited 'none'.

DISCUSSION

These findings suggest the online asynchronous MMI is reliable, fair, time-efficient and acceptable. The results of the factor analyses infer that there are scenario-level effects but that these all relate to an underlying general factor indicative that the process is assessing different dimensions/constructs relevant to healthcare. These could be method effects or alternatively conceptualised as representing different aspects of the interpersonal procedural knowledge required to perform well on the MMI.

This platform is the only known custom built asynchronous online interview emulating the MMI methodology. Cognisant of Gilliland's¹⁹ procedural and distributive justice rules, our aim was to optimise applicant accessibility through building principles for fairness into the MMI design and system setup. The reliability results and usability and acceptability evaluation signal this was largely achieved which is critical to applicants perception of fairness.²⁸ These data suggest the configuration of our asynchronous MMI resulted in an equitable process particularly with the familiarisation enabled through the practise portal.¹⁵ We note the higher Cronbach's alpha for disability compared with non-disability. While this is reassuring, it merits further investigation with a larger sample size.

Table 3 Applicant characteristics and usability evaluation

N=210				
Demographics		N	%	
Age	<20	120	57	
	20+	90	43	
Self-identified gender	Female	172	82	
	Male	36	17	
	Other/non-binary	2	1	
Nationality	UK/Ireland	134	64	
	Non-UK/Ireland	68	32	
	Prefer not to say	8	4	
Programme representation				
Nursing	Adult	42	20	
	Child	34	16	
	Mental health	52	25	
Midwifery		32	15	
Paramedic science		50	24	
Closed question responses summary data				
Had not taken an asynchronous MMI like this before			94	
Found the instructions helpful/very helpful			90	
Did not experience technical issues			79	
Said the 1 min between questions was 'about right'			75	
Found the probe questions helpful/very helpful			66	
Four minutes was about the right amount of time			65	
Open question free text responses				
Question		Response %		
How do you feel about videorecording and uploading your MMI responses as part of a 'new look' interview process triggered by COVID-19 social distancing restrictions?	Happy/very happy	67	Not very happy/not at all happy	33
Please tell us about your views on online interviews generally	Accepting/very accepting	66	Partly accepting/not at all accepting	35
Do you see a future for online interviews like the one you have used with us?	Yes/definitely yes	68	Probably not/definitely not	32
MMI, multiple mini interview.				

Rice^{29(p452)} suggests that social presence or the 'degree to which a medium is perceived as conveying the presence of the communicating participants' impacts on applicant acceptability. Social presence plays a central role in trust, enjoyment and the perceived usefulness of the technological medium.²⁸ There was by definition an absence of actual social presence in the asynchronous modality. However, we sought to mitigate this through softening the intersection between human and technology by design. The majority said they found the system intuitive/very intuitive and simple to use. This infers that the UI design and inclusive language may have contributed towards a positive experience.

Applicants in this study (>66%) were either accepting or very accepting of the online asynchronous MMI with

around one third (37%) agreeing we should 'definitely return' to face-to-face interviews.

Notably, only 2% (n=2) of applicants said they were 'not at all accepting' of the asynchronous MMI. The majority of applicants were 20 years or under. It could be suggested that a younger demographic are more familiar with and accepting of online technology and see it as part of their day-to-day lives. However, these data signal that there was no difference in reliability for those under 20 years compared with over 20 years old and that applicant performance was not impacted by their age.

Applicants' experiences, particularly perceptions of fairness, are of paramount concern for universities. The implications of fairness can extend to postinterview outcomes including offer/acceptance rates. It has been

**Table 4** Summary applicant and interviewer top positives and negatives

Applicant					
Positives					
Theme	Sub theme detail	N=158 (%)	% of total comments	Illustrative quote	
Ease	Access, intuitive, convenient, flexible, simple	63 (40)	21	<i>'Quick, not time consuming, simple'</i>	
Reduced stress	More relaxed in own home, take my time, breaks available, start when wish	45 (28)	15	<i>'It's more relaxing to be in your own home instead of a new environment which for me is much less intimidating resulting in perhaps me performing better in the interview.'</i>	
Fairer	Reduced costs (travel), reduced time away from other responsibilities (caring), the practice portal and availability of question text helped neurodiverse applicants	39 (25)	13	<i>'It's much easier in regard to travel for those who live far away, don't have the funds or time or who have other commitments'. 'Reduces the possibility of bias during the interview process'. '...I could do a practice question to get used to the layout of the interview, so I wasn't going into the interview completely blind'.</i>	
'Meet' staff	Able to see more of the university's community	9 (7)	3	<i>'I liked that there were 7 different people asking the questions...'</i>	
Covid safe	Travel not required	2 (1)	1	<i>'...Has helped to continue the process of admissions in a positive way...'</i>	
Negatives					
Limited direct communication	Less personal, no conversation	48 (34)	16	<i>'... Impersonal, I feel like I can't make a connection or read the interviewers body language in the interview...'</i>	
MMI	Pressure felt due to the timed methodology, presence of the countdown timer	45 (32)	15	<i>'4 minutes per question was quite pressuring to fill'. 'Ticking down time was off-putting'.</i>	
Technical issues	Wi-Fi cut out	27 (19)	9	<i>'My screen froze, potential upload failure, loss of connection'.</i>	
Don't get staff vibe	Not directly meeting staff	2 (1)	1	<i>'Lack of interaction between the student-tutor, the dialogue'</i>	
Cannot ask questions		18 (13)	6	<i>'Not personalised, not able to ask questions'</i>	
Interviewer					
Positives					
Convenient	Can prioritise workload. Flexible. Quicker Less stressful	82 (62%)	37	<i>'Efficient, less time consuming and able to prioritise your workload and complete interviews in chunks as opposed to one long stint'</i>	
Fairer	Less unconscious bias Reduced travel (costs)	18 (14%)	7	<i>'Reduced bias from different people asking the questions'. 'Equity... no student gets help with prompts more than others'</i>	
Easy to navigate	Simple	12 (9%)	5	<i>'Easy to use with clear instructions'</i>	
Benefits applicants	Less stressed in own environment	12 (9%)	6	<i>'Separating the two events(interview/ applicant day)will help manage anxiety and stress'</i>	
Applicant assessment	Can get a (better) sense of the applicant	4 (3%)	2	<i>'I feel I can get a sense of the applicant through this process'.</i>	

Continued

Table 4 Continued

Interviewer					
Less worried about technical issues	Not one time/date dependent	3 (2%)	2	<i>'Much less stressful as I don't have to worry about the internet connection'.</i>	
Ability to rewatch	If cause for concern'	1 (1%)	1	<i>'Ability to rewatch for clarification'.</i>	
Negatives					
Less personal	Don't get feel for applicant	27 (30%)	12	<i>'I think it's better for applicants to speak to someone in person'. 'I question whether it produces the same quality of response'.</i>	
Critique of MMI methodology	Timed circuit/countdown timer	22 (24%)	10	<i>'Encourages to me to make a snap decision'. 'Can't ask follow-on questions... permits no probing'.</i>	
Communication/building rapport difficult	Less able to assess non-verbal communication, social skills, spontaneous cognitive ability.	21 (23%)	9	<i>'Little in the way of holism'. 'Disconnect perhaps for applicants'.</i>	
Limited support for nervous applicants	Cannot help if upset or stressed	8 (9%)	4	<i>'No opportunity to provide any support if the candidate appears upset. if they are struggling mentally or emotionally'.</i>	
Tech related process concerns	Tech issues Stress of Zoom/Teams online mode	4 (5%)	2	<i>'Robotic process' 'Repetitive and boring watching multiple videos' 'Technical issues for some student may give them a disadvantage'.</i>	
Did not have any	Stated 'none'	5 (6%)	2	<i>'Don't have any'</i>	

MMI, multiple mini-interview.

suggested that applicants who perceive that recruitment and selection processes are fair are more attracted to organisations.³⁰⁻³² Concurring with Brenner *et al*¹² applicants reported 'perceived fairness' as one of their top three positives of the asynchronous interview system. Their reasons include reduced travel costs and time away from caring responsibilities, as well as enhanced familiarisation of the process through the practice portal. MMI interviews were prerecorded using inclusive language by diverse staff, representative of the university community. Additional time and an intuitive system UI appeared to help meet the needs of neurodiverse applicants.

Incorporating the 10 fairness principles was not difficult as many were low-cost design features that appeared to be impactful and generically applicable. We suggest these should become a default approach for online interviews used in health professional selection to enable applicant performance optimisation. In view of the paucity of published evidence,¹⁵ these novel insights are informative as we inevitably move towards a technology-augmented future where asynchronous video interviews are considered a modality that is here to stay.¹⁵

We received a 60:40 ratio of positive to negative comments from interview assessors. The largest contributor (62%) to the overall feedback related to positivity around convenience including ability to prioritise workload, flexibility, speed and reduced stress. This was

followed by ease of navigation and reduced bias. These findings corroborate evidence garnered outside the field of healthcare where asynchronous interviews have been found to be faster, cheaper, require less employee time and open the applicant funnel to allow more people to be interviewed than would otherwise have had the opportunity.¹⁵ Nevertheless, communication skills are central to the role of a health professional and are assessed as a generic skill/attribute in each MMI question at this university. One-sixth of interview assessors said they did not feel communication skills could be assessed while over one-third stated they could in the asynchronous modality. Further research is warranted to better understand the intersection between humans and technology including barriers and enablers to effective communication and communication assessment.

The largest contributing negative comment (30%) focused on a perception that the process was less personal. We might have anticipated this to be higher. Steps being considered to enhance personal connection include live chats and Q&A sessions as well as increasing the number of 'offer holder-days' provided by the university where applicants are invited onto campus to engage with staff without the stress of an interview clouding the experience. Further research evaluating the effectiveness of this strategy is suggested.



Strengths and limitations of this study

Invitations to evaluate the system were sent out after applicants received notification of their interview outcome. We understand this may have impacted on their perception of the process however, we were required to adhere to the university's policy.

The study was a theoretically driven mixed-methods cross-discipline approach. However, we acknowledge the generalisability limitations of a single site design, but this was an essential step ahead of a planned large multisite international evaluation.

While the sample size is large, the low response rate from applicants is a potential limitation and may infer selection bias. Users' views could be impacted by many factors outside the scope of this research for example past experiences for which we were unable to account for.

It was not possible to conduct a comparison study 'pre/post system optimisation'. Covid necessitated a move to online interviews in unprecedented times. Data were not collected on applicant or interviewer views at the time given the burdens they were already facing. During that time, however, we explored how fairness could be optimised through a review of published literature with findings embedded in our system (online supplemental appendix 1). In a high stakes admission process, it would be ethically wrong to conduct a prospective study now to compare with and without the 10 principles for fairness given the apparent benefits.

Collapsing applicant data into UK/Ireland and Non-UK Ireland was a necessary pragmatic decision based on lack of consistent reporting of ethnicity between the university (who did not routinely retain applicant ethnicity data until enrolment) and the UK University Central Admissions System.

Rigour

In spite of reassurances in all communications, we were mindful that applicants might be concerned that their evaluation could impact on their interview outcome hence the invitations were sent once offer/reject decisions had been communicated to applicants.

All data in this evaluation were independently analysed and peer reviewed by multiple authors (ACallwood, JH, SR and PAT). The qualitative content analysis was undertaken by two authors independently (AChristidis, SR). A <5% difference was noted between authors' findings. A compromise was mutually agreed in instances where this occurred.

Conclusion

With 10 principles for fairness designed in, these findings suggest the asynchronous online interview is reliable, equitable, time-efficient and acceptable. It is a moral imperative that healthcare workforces represent the societies which they serve, however, unintended bias can influence selection decisions. In the absence of generically available consensus guidance on how fairness can be optimised in online interviews, these novel insights are applicable internationally across selection to health professions. Embedding fairness into the design of online interviews

is relatively straightforward and low cost to implement. These data advance our understanding which is vital as we inevitably move towards a technology augmented future in the context of global workforce pressures.

Twitter Alison Callwood @alisoncallwood1

Acknowledgements Grateful thanks to staff, students, practice partners and service users without whom this work would not be possible.

Contributors ACallwood is guarantor. ACallwood, LG and AChristidis contributed to the technical development. ACallwood, LG, AChristidis, JH, PAT, AK and SR contributed to the study design, data collection, drafting and revisions. ACallwood, JH, SR and PAT contributed to the data analysis. Author AChristidis is no longer directly affiliated to the university but was at the commencement of this study.

Funding This work was supported with funding from Innovate UK grant number 37043.

Competing interests ACallwood and LG are co-founders and AChristidis is an employee of Sammi-Select, funded by UKRI as a spinout company from the University of Surrey to build the platform.

Patient and public involvement Patients and/or the public were involved in the design, or conduct, or reporting, or dissemination plans of this research. Refer to the Methods section for further details.

Patient consent for publication Not applicable.

Ethics approval This study involves human participants and this study received a favourable ethical opinion (FEO) from the University Research Ethics committee (UEC/2017/111/FHMS). Participants gave informed consent where personal data was included

Provenance and peer review Not commissioned; externally peer reviewed.

Data availability statement Data are available on reasonable request.

Supplemental material This content has been supplied by the author(s). It has not been vetted by BMJ Publishing Group Limited (BMJ) and may not have been peer-reviewed. Any opinions or recommendations discussed are solely those of the author(s) and are not endorsed by BMJ. BMJ disclaims all liability and responsibility arising from any reliance placed on the content. Where the content includes any translated material, BMJ does not warrant the accuracy and reliability of the translations (including but not limited to local regulations, clinical guidelines, terminology, drug names and drug dosages), and is not responsible for any error and/or omissions arising from translation and adaptation or otherwise.

Open access This is an open access article distributed in accordance with the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 Unported (CC BY 4.0) license, which permits others to copy, redistribute, remix, transform and build upon this work for any purpose, provided the original work is properly cited, a link to the licence is given, and indication of whether changes were made. See: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>.

ORCID iD

Alison Callwood <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-9617-909X>

REFERENCES

- 1 Council of Deans of Health Equality, Diversity, and Inclusion, Available: <https://www.councilofdeans.org.uk/category/policy/equality-diversity-and-inclusion>
- 2 United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs 17 Sustainable Development Goals, Available: <https://sdgs.un.org/goals>
- 3 The post-COVID-19 rise in labour shortages. n.d. Available: <https://www.oecd.org/publications/the-post-covid-19-rise-in-labour-shortages-e60c2d1c-en.htm>
- 4 Sabesan V, Kapur N, Zemanek K, et al. Implementation and evaluation of virtual multiple mini interviews as a selection tool for entry into Paediatric postgraduate training: A Queensland experience. *Medical Teacher* 2022;44:87–94. 10.1080/0142159X.2021.1967906 Available: <https://doi.org/10.1080/0142159X.2021.1967906>
- 5 Cleland J, Chu J, Lim S, et al. COVID-19: designing and conducting an on-line mini-multiple interview (MMI) in a dynamic landscape. *Med Teach* 2020;42:776–80. 10.1080/0142159X.2020.1762851 Available: <https://doi.org/10.1080/0142159X.2020.1762851>

- 6 Kok K, Chen L, Idris F, *et al.* Conducting multiple mini-interviews in the midst of COVID-19 pandemic. *Korean J Med Educ* 2020;32:281–9.
- 7 Fuller R, Goddard VCT, Nadarajah VD, *et al.* Technology enhanced assessment: Ottawa consensus statement and recommendations [Medical Teacher Pages 836–850]. *Medical Teacher* 2022;44:836–50. 10.1080/0142159X.2022.2083489 Available: <https://doi.org/10.1080/0142159X.2022.2083489>
- 8 Patterson F, Roberts C, Hanson MD, *et al.* Ottawa consensus statement: selection and recruitment to the Healthcare professions. *Med Teach* 2018;40:1091–101.
- 9 Eva KW, Rosenfeld J, Reiter HI, *et al.* An admissions OSCE: the multiple mini-interview. *Med Educ* 2004;38:314–26.
- 10 Yusoff MSB. Multiple mini interview as an admission tool in higher education: insights from a systematic review. *J Taibah Univ Med Sci* 2019;14:203–40.
- 11 Selvam R, Hu R, Musselman R, *et al.* Video-based interviewing in medicine: A scoping review. *In Review* [Preprint] 2021.
- 12 Brenner FS, Ortner TM, Fay D. Asynchronous Video interviewing as a new technology in personnel selection: the applicant's point of view. *Front Psychol* 2016;7:863.
- 13 Huppert LA, Hsiao EC, Cho KC, *et al.* Virtual interviews at graduate medical education training programs determining evidence-based best practices. *Acad Med* 2021;96:1137–45.
- 14 Vining CC, Eng OS, Hogg ME, *et al.* Virtual surgical fellowship recruitment during COVID-19 and its implications for resident/fellow recruitment in the future. *Ann Surg Oncol* 2020;27:911–5.
- 15 Lukacik E-R, Bourdage JS, Roulin N. Into the void: A conceptual model and research agenda for the design and use of Asynchronous Video interviews. *Human Resource Management Review* 2022;32:100789.
- 16 Bamba C, Joyce KE, Bellis MA, *et al.* Reducing health inequalities in priority public health conditions: using rapid review to develop proposals for evidence-based policy. *J Public Health (Oxf)* 2010;32:496–505. 10.1093/pubmed/fdq028 Available: <https://doi.org/10.1093/pubmed/fdq028>
- 17 Mixedmethods appraisal tool (MMAT) version 2018. n.d. Available: http://mixedmethodsappraisaltoolpublic.pbworks.com/w/file/attach/127916259/MMAT_2018_criteria-manual_2018-08-01_ENG.pdf
- 18 Olsen E, Eoyang G. *Facilitating organisational change: lessons from complexity science*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2001.
- 19 Gilliland SW. The perceived fairness of selection systems: an Organisational justice Perspective. *AMR* 1993;18:694–734.
- 20 Qualtrics accessible, Available: <https://www.qualtrics.com/uk/>
- 21 Stata accessible, Available: <https://www.stata.com/>
- 22 HORN JL. A rationale and test for the number of factors in factor analysis. *Psychometrika* 1965;30:179–85. 10.1007/BF02289447 Available: <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02289447>
- 23 Timmerman ME, Lorenzo-Seva U. Dimensionality assessment of ordered Polytomous items with parallel analysis. *Psychol Methods* 2011;16:209–20. 10.1037/a0023353 Available: <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0023353>
- 24 Lorenzo-Seva U, Ferrando PJ. FACTOR: a computer program to fit the exploratory factor analysis model. *Behav Res Methods* 2006;38:88–91.
- 25 Muthén & Muthén. *MPlus version 8*. Los Angeles, CA, 2022.
- 26 Hsieh H-F, Shannon SE. Three approaches to qualitative content analysis. *Qual Health Res* 2005;15:1277–88. 10.1177/1049732305276687 Available: <http://doi.wiley.com/10.1177/1049732305276687>
- 27 Schmid J, Leiman JM. The development of Hierarchical factor solutions. *Psychometrika* 1957;22:53–61.
- 28 Schinkel S, van Vianen A, van Dierendonck D. Selection fairness and outcomes: A field study of interactive effects on applicant reactions. *Int J Select Assess* 2013;21:22–31. 10.1111/ijsa.12014 Available: <http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/ijsa.12014>
- 29 Rice RE. Media appropriateness: using social presence theory to compare traditional and new organizational media. *Hum Commun Res* 1993;19:451–84.
- 30 Oh CS, Bailenson JN, Welch GF. A systematic review of social presence: definition, antecedents, and implications. *Front Robot AI* 2018;5:114.
- 31 Chapman DS, Uggerslev KL, Carroll SA, *et al.* Applicant attraction to organizations and job choice: A meta-analytic review of the correlates of recruiting outcomes. *J Appl Psychol* 2005;90:928–44.
- 32 Truxillo DM, Bauer TN, Campion MA, *et al.* Selection fairness information and applicant reactions: A longitudinal field study. *J Appl Psychol* 2002;87:1020–31.

Appendix 1 Rapid Review Key References in Health Professions Selection

Rapid review of published literature

To inform the design, we undertook a rapid review of literature published between 2011-2021, guided by a five-stage process¹⁸ to help us understand how video-based interviews compare with face-to-face in terms of implementation and fairness including what makes for an optimised experience.

The databases searched included: Medline, PsycInfo, Embase, ProQuest (BNI) and Google Scholar/Google (grey literature). We included original articles published in English that reported studies involving candidates interviewed using video with/without face-to-face methods in health professions selection. Articles focusing on psychometric tests and situational judgement tests were excluded. For quality appraisal we used the Mixed Methods Appraisal Tool (MMAT)¹⁹ combined with independent reviewer screening.

After review and removal of irrelevant and duplicates, 49 articles were included, 27 published pre-Covid (before Jan 2020) and 22 between Jan 2020 – Oct 2021 (Appendix 1). Of these, >90% originated in the US, the rest from Australia, Korea, and the UK. The majority were conducted in admissions to Medicine with two from Pharmacy and one Veterinary Medicine. Study methodologies included single site cross-sectional/cohort or quasi-experimental studies. Meta-analysis/meta-synthesis were not possible due to study heterogeneity. Each article was read by up to two of the research team looking for insights and recommendations to optimise accessibility and fairness in online interviews.

Key References

35. Ballejos, M. P., Oglesbee, S., Hettema, J., Sapien, R. An equivalence study of interview platform: Does videoconference technology impact medical school acceptance rates of different groups?. *Advances in Health Sciences Education: Theory and Practice*. 2018;23(3):601–610.

<https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10459-018-9817-2> Page 16/21

36. Bird, SB, Hern, G, Blomkalns, A, Deiorio NM, Haywood Y, Hiller KM, et al. Innovation in Residency Selection: The AAMC Standardized Video Interview. *Academic Medicine: Journal of the Association of American Medical Colleges*. 2019;94(10):1489–1497.

<https://doi.org/https://dx.doi.org/10.1097/ACM.0000000000002705>

37. Bowers, K., Comp, G., Kalnow, A., Casey, J., Fraser, W., Lloyd, C., Little, A. Are Standardized Video Interview Scores Predictive of Interview Performance? *Western Journal of Emergency Medicine*. 2018;S18
38. Breitkopf, DM, Green, IC, Hopkins, MR, Torbenson, VE, Camp, CL, Turner, NS. Use of Asynchronous Video Interviews for Selecting Obstetrics and Gynaecology Residents. *Obstetrics and Gynecology*. 2019;134(4):9S-15S.
<https://doi.org/https://dx.doi.org/10.1097/AOG.0000000000003432>
39. Chandler, N. M., Litz, C. N., Chang, H. L., Danielson, P. D., N.M., C., C.N., L., & H.L., C. Efficacy of Videoconference Interviews in the Paediatric Surgery Match. *Journal of Surgical Education*. 2019;76(2):420–426. <https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jsurg.2018.08.010>
40. Chung AS, Shah KH, Bond M, Ardolic B, Husain A, Li I, Cygan L, Caputo W, Shoenberger J, van Dermark J, Bronner J, Weizberg M. How Well Does the Standardized Video Interview Score Correlate with Traditional Interview Performance?. *The Western Journal of Emergency Medicine*. 2019;20(5):726–730. <https://doi.org/https://dx.doi.org/10.5811/westjem.2019.7.42731>
41. Cleland J, Chu J, Lim S, Low J, Lowe-Beer N, Kwek T. COVID-19: designing and conducting an on-line mini-multiple interview (MMI) in a dynamic landscape. *Medical Teacher*. 2020. May: 1-5.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/0142159X.2020.1762851>
42. Daram, S. R., Wu, R., Tang, S.-J. J., S.R., D., R., W., Daram, S. R., ... Tang, S.-J. J. Interview from anywhere: Feasibility and utility of web-based videoconference interviews in the gastroenterology fellowship selection process. *American Journal of Gastroenterology*. 2014;109(2):155–159.
<https://doi.org/10.1038/ajg.2013.278>
43. Davis M, Haas M, Gottlieb M *et al*. Zooming In Versus Flying Out: Virtual Residency Interviews in the Era of COVID-19. *AEM Educ Train* 2020; 4: 443-446.
-
44. Egan, D. J., Husain, A., Bond, M. C., Caputo, W., Cygan, L., Van Dermark, J., et al. Standardized video interviews do not correlate to United States medical licensing examination step 1 and step 2 scores. Page 18/21 *The Western Journal of Emergency Medicine*. 2019;20(1):87–91.
<https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.5811/westjem.2018.11.39730>
45. Edje, L., Miller, C., Kiefer, J., & Oram, D. Using Skype as an Alternative for Residency Selection Interviews. *Journal of Graduate Medical Education*. 2013;5(3):503–505.
<https://doi.org/10.4300/jgme-d-12-00152.1>
46. Gallahue, F. E., Hiller, K. M., Bird, S. B., Calderone Haas, M. R., Deiorio, N. M., Hern, H. G., et al. The AAMC Standardized Video Interview: Reactions and Use by Residency Programs During the 2018 Application Cycle. *Academic Medicine: Journal of the Association of American Medical Colleges*. 2019;94(10):1506–1512. <https://doi.org/https://dx.doi.org/10.1097/ACM.0000000000002714>
47. Grova MM, Donohue SJ, Meyers MO, Kim HJ, Ollila DW. Direct Comparison of In-Person Versus Virtual Interviews for Complex General Surgical Oncology Fellowship in the COVID-19 Era. *Ann Surg Oncol*. 2021;28(4):1908-1915. doi:10.1245/s10434-020-09398-2

48. Hakes, E., Schnapp, B., Ritter, D., Kraut, A., Fallon, S., Brown, K., Westergaard, M. Communication and Professionalism: Comparing Standardized Video Interview Scores to Faculty Gestalt. *Society for Academic Emergency Medicine*. 2018;S276.
49. Hall, MM, Lewis, JJ, Joseph, JW, Ketterer, AR, Rosen, CL, Dubosh, NM. Standardized Video Interview Scores Correlate Poorly with Faculty and Patient Ratings. *The Western Journal of Emergency Medicine*. 2019;21(1):145–148.
<https://doi.org/https://dx.doi.org/10.5811/westjem.2019.11.44054>
50. Healy, W. L., Bedair, H., & W.L., H. Videoconference Interviews for an Adult Reconstruction Fellowship: Lessons Learned. *The Journal of Bone and Joint Surgery. American Volume*. 2017;99(21):e114. <https://doi.org/https://dx.doi.org/10.2106/JBJS.17.00322>
51. Hopson, L. R., Dorfsman, M. L., Branzetti, J., Gisondi, M. A., Hart, D., Jordan, J., et al. Comparison of the Standardized Video Interview and Interview Assessments of Professionalism and Interpersonal Communication Skills in Emergency Medicine. *AEM Education and Training*. 2019;3(3):259–268.
<https://doi.org/https://dx.doi.org/10.1002/aet2.10346>
52. Humbert, A., Pettit, K., Mugele, J., Turner, J., Morgan, Z., & Palmer, M. Correlation of the Standard Video Interview Score With an Established Application Review Process. *Society for Academic Emergency Medicine*. 2018;S98.
53. Huppert L A, Hsiao E C, Cho K C *et al*. Virtual interviews at graduate medical education training programs determining evidence-based best practices. *Acad Med* 2020. doi: 10.1097/ACM.0000000000003868.
-
54. Husain, A., Li, I., Ardolic, B., Bond, M. C., Shoenberger, J., Shah, K. H., et al. The Standardized Video Interview: How Does It Affect the Likelihood to Invite for a Residency Interview?. *AEM Education and Training*. 2019;3(3):226–232. <https://doi.org/https://dx.doi.org/10.1002/aet2.10331>
- Inzana, K, [Vanderstichel, R](#), [Newman, S](#). Virtual Multiple Mini-Interviews for Veterinary Admissions. <https://doi.org/10.3138/jvme-2020-0107> *J Of Veterinary Medical Education*
56. Joshi, A., Bloom, D. A., Spencer, A., Gaetke-Udager, K., & Cohan, R. H. Video Interviewing: A Review and Recommendations for Implementation in the Era of COVID-19 and Beyond. *Academic radiology*. 2020;27(9):1316–1322. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acra.2020.05.020>
57. Kok K, Chen L, Idris F, Mumin N, Ghani H, Zulkipli. Conducting multiple mini-interviews in the midst of COVID-19 pandemic. *Korean J Med Educ*. 2020 Dec; 32(4): 281–289. Published online 2020 Oct 28. doi: [10.3946/kjme.2020.175](https://doi.org/10.3946/kjme.2020.175).
58. Krauss, W., Egan, D., Bond, M., Husain, A., White, M., Taylor, T., et al. Correlation Between Emergency Medicine Residency Applicant’s Standardized Video Interview Scores and United States Medical Licensing Examination Results. *Society for Academic Emergency Medicine*. 2018;S83

Kyong-Jee Kim, Nam Young Lee & Bum Sun Kwon. Benefits and Feasibility of Using Videos to Assess Medical School Applicants' Empathetic Abilities in Multiple Mini Interviews. *Medical Science Educator* volume 31, pages175–181 (2021)C

60. Lewis, J., Hall, M., Joseph, J., Dubosh, N., Ullman, E. Standardized Video Interview Scores Do Not Correlate With Attending Evaluations. *Society for Academic Emergency Medicine*, 2018;S229.

61. M., S.R., E., L.M., B., M.M., A., F.M., D., J.C., E., ... H., F. Initial Experience with a Virtual Platform for Advanced Gastrointestinal Minimally Invasive Surgery Fellowship Interviews. *Journal of the American College of Surgeons*. 2020;231(6):670–678.

<https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jamcollsurg.2020.08.768>

62. McAteer, R., Sundaram, S., Harkisoon, S., & Miller, J. Videoconference Interviews: A Timely Primary Care Residency Selection Approach. *Journal of Graduate Medical Education*. 2020;12(6):737–744. <https://doi.org/https://dx.doi.org/10.4300/JGME-D-20-00248.1>

63. McHugh, M., Kulstad, C., Van Dermark, J., Bischof, J. Do Standardized or Traditional Interview Questions Correlate With the Standardized Video Interview? *Society for Academic Emergency Medicine*. 2019;S216

64. Molina, G., Mehtsun, W. T., Qadan, M., Hause, K. C., Raut, C. P., & Fairweather, M. Virtual Interviews for the Complex General Surgical Oncology Fellowship: The Dana-Farber/Partners Experience. *Annals of Surgical Oncology*. 2020;27(9):3103–3106.

<https://doi.org/https://dx.doi.org/10.1245/s10434-020-08778-y>

65. Nutter, A., La Rosa, M., Olson, G. Perception of Candidates and Faculty on Maternal Fetal Medicine Fellowship Videoconference Interviewing. *Obstetrics and Gynecology*. 2020;S75.

Nwora C, M.D.^a Allred, D, M.D.^b Verduzco-Gutierrez, M, M.D.^c Mitigating Bias in Virtual Interviews for Applicants Who are Underrepresented in Medicine. *Journal of the National Medical Association* [Volume 113, Issue 1](#), February 2021, Pages 74-76

67. Patel T, Bedi H, Deitte L, Lewis P *et al*. Brave New World: Challenges and Opportunities in the COVID-19 virtual interview season. *Acad Radiol* 2020; 27: 1456-1460.

68. Proost, K., Germeys, F., & Vanderstukken, A. Applicants' pre-test reactions towards video interviews: the role of expected chances to demonstrate potential and to use nonverbal cues. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*. 2021;30(2):265-273. DOI: 10.1080/1359432X.2020.1817975

69. [Sabesan V](#), Kapur N, Zemanek K, Levitt D, Vu T, Erp A. Implementation and evaluation of virtual multiple mini-interviews as a selection tool for entry into paediatric postgraduate training: A Queensland experience. *Medical Teacher* Published online: 30 Aug 2021.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/0142159X.2021.1967906>

70. Schnapp, B. H., Ritter, D., Kraut, A. S., Fallon, S., Westergaard, M. C. Assessing residency applicants' communication and professionalism: Standardized video interview scores compared to faculty gestalt. *Western Journal of Emergency Medicine*. 2019;20(1):132–137.


<https://doi.org/http://dx.di.org/10.5811/westjem.2018.10.39709>

71. Shah SK, Arora, S, Skipper B, Kalishman S, Timm TC, Smith AY. Randomized evaluation of a web based interview process for urology resident selection. *Journal of Urology*. 2012;187(4):1380–1384. <https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.juro.2011.11.108>
72. Singh, N D, DeMesa, DO, MPH, Pritzlaff, S, MD, Jung, M MD, MBA, Green, C MA, LMFT. Implementation of Virtual Multiple Mini-Interviews for Fellowship Recruitment . *Pain Medicine*, Volume 22, Issue 8, August 2021, Pages 1717–1721, <https://doi.org/10.1093/pm/pnab141>
73. Sripad, A. Videoconference Interviews for Female Pelvic Medicine and Reconstructive Surgery Fellowship During a Pandemic: The Candidate Experience. *Female Pelvic Medicine & Reconstructive Surgery*. 2020;S181.
74. Staicu, M., Hamby, C., Wychowski, M., Reiss, B. Facetime faceoff: evaluation of video conferencing as a novel pre-interview screen for a PGY-1 pharmacy residency. 2015;E182.
75. Temple, M., Lagzdins, M. Streamlining the residency interview process using Web-based teleconferencing. *American Journal of Health-System Pharmacy*. 2014;71:697-701. Doi: 10.2145/ajhp130406
76. Tiller D, O'Mara D, Rothnie I, Dunn S, Lee L, Roberts C. Internet-based multiple mini-interviews for candidate selection for graduate entry programmes. *Med Educ*. 2013;47(8):801-810. doi:10.1111/medu.12224
77. Turpin C, Steele K, Matuk-Villazon O, Rowland, K, Dayton, Horn, K. Rapid Transition to a Virtual Multiple Mini-Interview Admissions Process: A New Medical School's Experience During the COVID-19 Pandemic. *Academic Medicine: August 2021 - Volume 96 - Issue 8 - p 1152-1155*. doi: 10.1097/ACM.0000000000004179.
78. [Ungtrakul](#) T, [Lamlertthon](#) W, [Boonchoo](#) B, [Aewarakul](#) C. Virtual Multiple Mini-Interview during the COVID-19 Pandemic. *Medical Education Adaptation*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/medu.14207>
79. Vadi, M. G., Malkin, M. R., Lenart, J., Stier, G. R., Gatling, J. W., & Applegate, R. L. Comparison of web-based and face-to-face interviews for application to an anaesthesiology training program: a pilot study. *International Journal of Medical Education*. 2016;7:102–108. <https://doi.org/10.5116/ijme.56e5.491a>
80. Vining CC, Eng OS, Hogg ME, et al. Virtual Surgical Fellowship Recruitment During COVID-19 and Its Implications for Resident/Fellow Recruitment in the Future. *Ann Surg Oncol*. 2020;27(Suppl 3):911- 915. doi:10.1245/s10434-020-08623-2
81. Willis, J., Surlles, T., Silverberg, M., Kendall, S., LoCascio, H., Gernsheimer, J., Schechter, J., Regan, A., Smith, T. Are Standardized Video Interview Scores Predictive of Interview Performance? *Western Journal of Emergency Medicine*. 2018;S5-S6.
82. Winfield-Dial, A., Chhabra, N., Schindlbeck, M., & Bowman, S. Demographic Differences Between High and Low Scorers on the Standardized Video Interview. *Western Journal of Emergency Medicine*. 2018;S48. <https://escholarship.org/uc/item/68c0x4pf>

83. Winfield-Dial, A., Chhabra, N., Schindlbeck, M., & Bowman, S. Applicant Attitudes Towards the Standardized Video Interview - An Interim Analysis. *Western Journal of Emergency Medicine*. 2018;S4. <https://escholarship.org/uc/item/5xp7f587> Page 17/21

84. Yolanda, S, Wisnu, W, Wahjudi, J and Findyartini A. Adaptation of internet-based multiple mini-interviews in a limited-resource medical school during the coronavirus disease 2019 pandemic. *Korean J Med Educ*. 2020 Dec; 32(4): 281–289. doi: [10.3946/kjme.2020.175](https://doi.org/10.3946/kjme.2020.175)

Appendix 2. Estimated hierarchical confirmatory factor analytic (CFA) model for the SAMMI responses, with a general factor (g) and seven specific factors (f1 to f7), the latter representing the seven questions in the interview. Standardised factor loadings are shown.



Appendix 3. Results of a parallel analysis using Pearson correlations on the response data to the SAMMI MMI.

Number of postulated factors	Mean of real data % of variance	Mean of random % of variance	95 percentile of random % of variance
1	29.2*	2.9	3.1
2	11.1*	2.8	3.0
3	9.5*	2.8	2.9
4	8.3*	2.7	2.8
5	7.6*	2.6	2.7
6	7.4*	2.6	2.7
7	6.2*	2.5	2.6
8	1.1	2.5	2.5
9	1.0	2.4	2.5

*Percentage of variance in the responses explained by the number of factors in the real data exceeded that for the random data.

Appendix 4: Cost Evaluation

These data represent an indicative example from this University based on 500 candidates over 7 days doing a seven station, four-minute MMI circuit.

Hours spent	F2F/ Videoconf.	SAMMI®
Pre-interview preparation	20	15
Set up: physical/Zoom rooms	30	0
Co-ordinator time	55	0
Student helpers/staff support	65	0
Post-interview support	10	10
Coordinator time overall	15	15
Total hours	195	40

Supplementary Table 1: Applicant and interviewer top positives and negatives

Applicant				
Positives				
Theme	Sub theme detail	N=158 (%)	% of total comments	Illustrative quote
Ease	Access, intuitive, convenient, flexible, simple	63 (40)	21	<i>“Quick, not time consuming, simple”</i> <i>“Flexible, you can do it at your own time. It reduces stage fright. It is convenient, you can do it in your own home...”</i>
Reduced stress	More relaxed in own home, take my time, breaks available, start when wish	45 (28)	15	<i>“Its more relaxing to be in your own home instead of a new environment which for me is much less intimidating resulting in perhaps me performing better in the interview”.</i> <i>“... there is no external party criticising you in the moment, something which personally takes away a fair amount of nerves and stress from the process...”</i>
Fairer	Reduced costs (travel), reduced time away from other responsibilities	39 (25)	13	<i>“Its much easier in regard to travel for those who live far away, don’t have the funds or time or who have other commitments”.</i>

	(caring), the practice portal and availability of question text helped neurodiverse applicants			<p><i>"Reduces the possibility of bias during the interview process".</i></p> <p><i>"More inclusive".</i></p> <p><i>"Another great thing about this was I could do a practice question to get used to the layout of the interview, so I wasn't going into the interview completely blind".</i></p>
'Meet' staff	Able to see more of the university's community	9 (7)	3	<i>"I liked that there were 7 different people asking the questions..."</i>
Covid safe	Travel not required	2 (1)	1	<i>"Considering the situation with the pandemic, the online interview has helped to continue the process of admissions in a positive way..."</i>
Negatives				
Theme	Sub theme detail	N=140 (%)	% of total comments	Illustrative quote
Limited direct communication	Less personal, no conversation	48 (34)	16	<i>"... Impersonal, I feel like I cant make a connection or read the interviewers body language in the interview which I feel doesn't allow me to act how I usually do, and it felt unnatural".</i>

MMI	Pressure felt due to the timed methodology, presence of the countdown timer, lack of question face validity.	45 (32)	15	<i>"4 minutes per question was quite pressuring to fill"</i> <i>"Ticking down time was off-putting".</i> <i>"Could have asked more personal questions such as why this university and tell us about yourself, there was too many scenario questions which quite put us on the spot".</i>
Anticipated technical issues	Wi-Fi cut out	27 (19)	9	<i>"Technical issue (my screen froze) potential upload failure, potential loss of internet connection".</i>
Don't get vibe of staff	Not directly meeting staff	2 (1)	1	<i>"Lack of interaction between the student-tutor, the dialogue"</i>
Cannot ask questions		18 (13)	6	<i>"Not personalised, not able to ask questions"</i>
Interviewer				
Positives				
Theme	Sub theme detail	N=132 (%)	% of total comments	Illustrative quote
Convenient	Can prioritise workload. Flexible Quicker	82 (62%)	37	<i>"Efficient, less time consuming and able to prioritise your workload accordingly and complete interviews in chunks as opposed to one long stint"</i>

	Less stressful			<i>Don't have the issue of trying to find someone to cover like when another meeting comes up at the same time..."</i>
Fairer	Less unconscious bias Reduced travel [costs]	18 (14%)	7	<i>"Reduced bias from different people asking the questions". "Equity... no student gets help with prompts more than others"</i>
East to navigate	Simple	12 (9%)	5	<i>"Easy to use with clear instructions"</i>
Benefits applicants	Less stressed in own environment	12 (9%)	6	<i>"Separating the two events [interview/applicant day] will help manage anxiety and stress"</i>
Applicant assessment	Can get a [better] sense of the applicant	4 (3%)	2	<i>"I feel I can get a sense of the applicant through this process".</i>
Less worried about technical issues	Not one time/date dependent	3 (2%)	2	<i>"Much less stressful as I don't have to worry about the internet connection".</i>
Ability to rewatch	If cause for concern'	1 (1%)	1	<i>"Ability to rewatch for clarification".</i>
Negatives				
Theme	Sub theme detail	N=90 (%)	% of total comments	Illustrative quote
Less personal	Don't get feel for applicant	27 (30%)	12	<i>"I think it's better for applicants to speak to someone in person"</i>

				<i>"I question whether it produces the same quality and depth of response".</i>
Critique of MMI methodology	Timed circuit/countdown timer	22 (24%)	10	<i>"Encourages to me to make a snap decision"</i> <i>"Cant ask follow-on questions...permits no probing".</i>
Communication assessment and build rapport difficult	Less able to assess non-verbal communication, social skills, spontaneous cognitive ability.	21 (23%)	9	<i>"Little in the way of holism".</i> <i>"Disconnect perhaps for applicants".</i> <i>"Does not allow markers to assess a candidates ability to respond and adapt to others".</i>
Limited support for nervous/stressed applicant	Can not help if upset or stressed	8 (9%)	4	<i>"No opportunity to provide any support if the candidate appears upset.. if they are struggling mentally or emotionally"..</i>
Tech related process concerns	Tech issues Stress of Zoom/Teams online mode Repetitive watching videos Disadvantages those not familiar with tech	4 (5%)	2	<i>"Robotic process"</i> <i>"Repetitive and boring watching multiple videos"</i> <i>"Some people find Teams/Zoom very stressful and therefore we dont see the best of the candidate".</i> <i>"Technical issues for some student may give them a disadvantage".</i>
Did not have any	Stated 'none'	5 (6%)	2	<i>"Don't have any"</i>

				<i>"None to mention".</i>
University marketing	Does not show university as warm and welcoming	3 (3%)	1	<i>"We are very nice and they do not see that"</i> <i>"Current students often state they chose Surrey due to the friendliness of the staff when first meeting them, my concern is if this is the first impression".</i>