



Interviewing and Onboarding That Actually Works

**How to Hire the Right People
and Set Them Up to Succeed**



Today we are going to talk about two things that are often treated as separate tasks, interviewing and onboarding, but in reality, are one continuous process.

Most hiring problems do not start on Day 30 or Day 90. They start in the interview and are reinforced, or not corrected, during onboarding.

This session is not about perfect interviews or flashy onboarding programs. It is about making better decisions, setting clearer expectations, and reducing the number of avoidable people problems managers spend their time reacting to.

You will leave today with practical tools you can use immediately, whether you are a seasoned leader or someone newer to hiring and onboarding.

This is a coaching conversation, not a compliance lecture. We will talk about what works, what breaks down, and how to strengthen both without adding unnecessary complexity.



Why Interviewing and Onboarding Fail

Most hiring problems are not caused by bad people. They are caused by unclear decisions, rushed processes and missed expectations.

Interviewing and onboarding fail when:

- We hire for urgency instead of fit
- We rely on gut instinct over observable behavior
- We assume experience equals readiness
- We confuse orientation with onboarding
- We expect new hires to “figure it out”

The result is avoidable turnover, frustration, and performance issues that surface weeks or months later.

Most organizations do not set out to hire poorly or onboard poorly. These breakdowns usually come from pressure. We need someone now. We are short staffed. The team is stretched. The interview feels good enough. The problem is that interviewing and onboarding are often treated as check-the-box tasks instead of decision-making processes.

Interviewing becomes about filling a role quickly.

Onboarding becomes about paperwork, schedules, and policies.

When that happens, managers unintentionally pass confusion downstream. New hires are left guessing about expectations, priorities, and how success is measured. What we are really talking about today is preventing predictable problems. The kind of problems managers end up managing later through corrective action, coaching, or performance conversations that could have been avoided earlier.



The Cost of Getting It Wrong

When interviewing and onboarding fall short, the cost shows up quickly and repeatedly.

It impacts:

- Turnover and rehiring costs
- Guest experience and service consistency
- Team morale and workload
- Manager time spent fixing preventable issues
- Trust between employees and leadership

Most of these costs never appear on a report, but leaders feel them every day.

When we talk about cost, most people immediately think of dollars. Recruiting fees, overtime, training time, uniforms, background checks.

But the bigger costs are often invisible.

Every time a new hire leaves early, the team absorbs the disruption. Schedules get rearranged. Standards slip. Guests notice inconsistency even if they cannot name it. Managers lose time. Instead of coaching strong performers or improving operations, they are correcting misunderstandings, retraining basics, or managing frustration that never needed to exist.

There is also a trust cost. When employees see a revolving door, they stop investing fully. When new hires feel misled or underprepared, confidence erodes fast.

Strong interviewing and onboarding are not about perfection. They are about reducing unnecessary friction so managers and teams can focus on what actually matters.



What Interviews Are Supposed to Do

Interviews are not about selling the job or liking the candidate. They are decisions tools.

Effective interviews help managers:

- Understand how a candidate has behaved in real situations
- Evaluate alignment with the role, the team, and the work environment
- Clarify expectations before an offer is made
- Reduce surprises after Day One

A strong interview creates clarity for both the manager and the candidate.

Many interviews quietly turn into sales conversations. We talk about how great the team is, how flexible the schedule might be, or how much opportunity exists. There is nothing wrong with sharing positives, but that is not the purpose of the interview.

The interview is a decision tool. It should help you determine whether this person can consistently perform in the environment you actually have, not the one you wish you had.

It is also the first opportunity to set honest expectations. When interviews are vague or overly optimistic, onboarding becomes the place where disappointment shows up. A strong interview protects both sides. It allows candidates to self-select in or out, and it allows managers to make decisions based on behavior rather than chemistry alone.



Why Traditional Interviews Don't Predict Performance

Traditional interviews often reward confidence, not competence.

They tend to focus on:

- Hypothetical questions
- Rehearsed answers
- First impressions
- Likeability and rapport

These factors feel convincing in the moment but do not reliably predict day-to-day performance.

Most candidates prepare for interviews by practicing what to say, not by reflecting on how they actually work. Strong communicators often shine, even if their follow-through is inconsistent.

Traditional questions like “What would you do if...” invite ideal answers. Candidates tell you what they think you want to hear, not what they have consistently done.

This is especially common in hospitality and service environments where personality and confidence can mask gaps in reliability, teamwork, or resilience under pressure.

Managers are human. We connect with people who feel familiar or easy to talk to.

That connection is not wrong, but it is not enough.

The goal is not to eliminate instinct. It is to balance it with structured questions that reveal real behavior.



Common Interviewing Mistakes

Most interview mistakes are unintentional and pressure driven.

Common pitfalls include:

- Hiring to fill a gap instead of filling the role
- Letting likeability outweigh evidence
- Talking more than listening
- Skipping structure and consistency
- Avoiding hard or clarifying questions

These mistakes increase the odds of a mismatch long before onboarding begins.

Most managers recognize at least one of these because they have lived them. When teams are short staffed, the pressure to move quickly is real. The risk is that urgency becomes the decision driver instead of fit.

Likeability is another trap. A candidate who feels easy to talk to can create a false sense of confidence. That comfort often disappears when the pace picks up or expectations increase.

Many interviews also become manager led conversations. We explain the job, the culture, the schedule, and the challenges, but we leave with limited insight into how the candidate actually operates.

Structure matters. Asking different questions to different candidates makes it harder to compare answers and easier to justify a decision we already want to make.

Avoiding clarifying questions may feel polite, but it often leads to bigger issues later. Interviews are the safest place to surface uncertainty.



Preview Information

This preview provides a **brief sample** of the *Interviewing and Onboarding That Actually Works* presentation. It is intended to demonstrate the **content style, structure, and instructional approach** of the full program.

The **complete presentation** includes:

- Full instructional content
- Guided participant discussion and activities
- Real-world scenarios and manager prompts
- Action planning and application exercises

To access the **full presentation**, please purchase the complete product.

If you are interested in a **customized version** tailored to your organization, industry, or leadership level, please contact us for additional information.