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ABSTRACT

The Relative Effects of Interview Structure and Person-Organization Fit on Recruiting Outcomes: An Individual Differences Perspective

by

Laura S. Kohn

Two laboratory experiments were conducted to examine the effect of interview structure on recruiting outcomes. The first study was a 2 x 2 x 2 between subjects design in which subjects were presented with transcripts of either a structured or unstructured interview and information describing the organization as either affiliative or achievement oriented and the job as either data or socially oriented. Subjects rated numerous recruiting outcomes concerning their perceptions of the interviewer, organization, and job. The results of study 1 supported the hypothesis that structured interviews negatively influenced recruiting outcomes. Subjects given structured interviews rated the interviewer, organization, and job less favorably than subjects given unstructured interviews. The hypothesis that subjects would rate organizations congruent with their personal interests more favorably was not confirmed with examination of the individual difference measures of need for achievement and need for affiliation. However, some support was found for person-organization congruence with individual item measures of self-perceived organization and job fit. Study 2 was a 2 x 2 x 2 x 2 within subjects design in which specific attributes of the interview structure were examined: Job-relevance of questions, question standardization, applicant voice, and interviewer warmth. The findings revealed more favorable
reactions to the interview when interviews were high in applicant voice and
interviewer warmth, and low in question standardization. When the interview was
high in applicant voice and interviewer warmth, and low in question
standardization and job relevance, organizational attractiveness was rated more
favorably. Of the four factors, applicant voice and interviewer warmth had the
largest effects, followed by question standardization and job-relevance.
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The Relative Effects of Interview Structure and Person-Organization Fit on Recruiting Outcomes: An Individual Differences Perspective

Effective organizations attract and select the most suitable types of employees (e.g., Schneider, 1975, 1987). It is not surprising then that the focus of much research has been on the selection tools organizations can use to find the right employees (e.g., cognitive ability tests, biographical data, work-samples, employment interviews). Only recently have investigators begun to examine the recruiting side of employment decisions (e.g., Rynes, 1991). Past theory and research suggest that applicants will base their choices of occupations and organizations largely on the characteristics of the job and organization and the degree to which those characteristics fit their personal attributes. It may be, however, that the style of the interview impacts these choices as applicants form impressions about organizations on the basis of their interactions with interviewers. The purpose of this research was to examine the influence of these two factors, the fit of the person to the organization and interview style, on reactions to an interview and attraction to an organization.

Organizations always have been concerned with selecting the most suitable employees, but organizations simultaneously must be concerned with attracting the most qualified applicants (Schneider, 1987). The attention that is paid to attracting versus selecting employees is based on many external factors including the state of the labor market, selection ratio, and the attractiveness of the vacancy (Guion, 1976; Rynes, 1991). Due to certain demographic conditions such as the leveling off of the female labor force participation and the baby bust, some social scientists and forecasters predict that labor shortages will develop and persist well into the
21st century (Rynes & Barber, 1990). Because of the demographic statistics, labor economists and demographers anticipate an increased emphasis on attracting suitable employees (Johnston & Packer, 1987). These trends suggest that organizations will need to devote even more effort in the future to attracting well qualified applicants and maintaining favorable selection ratios (Bernstein, 1987; Finney, 1989; Hamlet, 1989; Hanigan, 1987; Merrill, 1987).

A dilemma that organizations will likely face to an increasing extent in the future is how to maintain selection standards while using good recruiting practices. Striking a balance between these two goals is crucial for organizational success. A variety of selection techniques have been proposed that appear to yield high predictive validities, including mental ability tests, biodata inventories, and structured interviews, but a highly valid procedure will not be effective in actual use if it discourages or alienates prospective recruits. A crucial question that requires investigation is the effect that selection procedures have on organizational recruiting efforts. Without an analysis of this question, the utility of many of the selection techniques advocated in research literature remains unclear. This issue has become increasingly important, given evidence that failing to attract and hire the most qualified candidates can lead to significant declines in the utility of a selection program (Murphy, 1986).

The present research was concerned with the effects on recruiting of one specific approach to selection that has been shown to have high validity - the structured interview. There is increasing evidence that structured interviews are superior to unstructured interviews when evaluated on the basis of psychometric standards. The effects of interview structure on recruiting have been largely
ignored, however. Although structured interviews are more valid, it remains to be seen whether potential employees perceive them more favorably than unstructured interviews. A second issue concerns the relative effects of interview structure and fit of the person to the organization. Specifically, does interview structure have much of an influence on attraction to the organization once the fit of the person to the organization is taken into account? Similarly, once job characteristics are taken into account, does interview structure have much of an influence on recruiting outcomes? It may be that attraction to the organization is based mostly on an assessment of fit to the organization and/or impression of the job characteristics, resulting in interview structure having very little influence on recruiting outcomes. Additionally, research has not examined the various factors that may moderate the influence of interview structure on recruiting outcomes such as individual differences and the amount of information on the job and organization. To address these questions, two studies were conducted. The first study addressed the effect of interview structure, job characteristics, and organizational characteristics, while taking into account, individual differences to gain a more complete picture of the manner in which applicants select organizations. The second study used a policy capturing approach to assess four specific components of interview structure - job-relatedness of questions, question standardization, applicant voice, and interviewer warmth - on recruiting outcomes. Prior to stating hypotheses for the effects of interview structure and person-organization fit, relevant literature will be reviewed. First, research showing that employees tend to base their choices of organizations on the perceived fit of their personalities, interests, and values to the organization is presented. Next, research
and theory relevant to the effects of interview structure on recruiting outcomes is reviewed.

How do Individuals Select Occupations and Organizations?

Considerable research has been conducted on the interest patterns of individuals and how they relate to occupational and organizational choices. The findings demonstrate that individuals choose occupations and organizations that are consistent with their personalities and interests (Holland, 1966; Holland, 1976; Holland, 1985; Fabry, 1976; Horton & Walsh, 1976; Wiggins, 1976; Schneider, 1987; Turban & Keon, 1993; Bretz, Ash, & Dreher, 1989).

Choice of Occupation

Researchers have focused on the processes that guide the occupational choices of individuals. Several early studies have reported positive correlations between the extent to which a person is attracted to another person or group and the extent to which he/she describes that person or group as similar to himself/herself (Fiedler, Warrington, & Blaisdell, 1952; Preston, et. al., 1954; Fieldler, 1952; Davitz, 1955; Farber, 1957; Vroom, 1959; Vroom, 1960; Newcomb, 1961). Research in the area of occupational choice provides evidence for the theory that there is a relationship between the occupations that people select and the extent to which people perceive their own characteristics to be similar to those of members of an occupation. Rosenberg (1957) reported a tendency for people intending to enter the same occupations to hold similar value orientations. Furthermore, he found that these values had a significant effect on changes in occupational choice.
Super (1953) developed a theory of vocational choice in which he stated that "the process of vocational development is essentially that of developing and implementing a self-concept...". The self-concept of an individual is an "organized configuration of perceptions of the self which are admissible to awareness. It is composed of such elements as the perceptions of one's characteristics and abilities; the percepts and concepts of the self in relation to others and the environment; the value qualities which are perceived as associated with experiences and objects; and goals and ideals which are perceived as having positive or negative valence" (Rogers, 1951).

Considerable support has been found for Super's theory that in choosing an occupation an individual is choosing a means of implementing his/her self-concept. Englander (1960) found that education majors perceived teaching as a means of implementing their self-concept when compared with non-education majors. Morrison (1962) found similar results with nursing students. Bloucher & Schutz (1961) found that the occupational stereotypes of high-interest vocations were more congruent with self-descriptions than were the occupational stereotypes of low-interest vocations. Healy (1968) found a relationship between occupational choice and similarity between self-ratings and occupational ratings. Furthermore, Ziegler (1970) found that self-descriptions and perceived attributes of individuals in preferred occupations were more congruent than the self-descriptions and the perceived characteristics of individuals in least preferred occupations. Substantial research has been conducted to demonstrate that people prefer vocations that they perceive to be congruent with their values and characteristics (Holland, 1966;

**Choice of an Organization**

Once an individual has committed to a particular occupation, he/she is then faced with the task of choosing an organization. Similar to choices of occupations, there is research and theory to suggest that people assess the features of the job and organization (e.g., pay, benefits, etc.) and are attracted to organizations that fit their values, attributes and orientations (e.g., Schneider, 1987; Chatman, 1989). Schneider's (1987) attraction-selection-attrition theory proposes that applicants are attracted to organizations that are congruent with their personal values and attributes, organizations select applicants who have similar characteristics and orientations to those of members within the organization, and finally, those members of the organization who do not possess characteristics and orientations similar to those of organization members leave the organization. The outcome of this cycle is a homogeneous group of organization members with similar backgrounds, characteristics and orientations. A similar approach to Schneider's is that of Chatman (1989). She suggested that individuals are attracted to and remain within organizations they perceive to have similar values and norms to their own.

Several studies have supported the hypothesis that persons are attracted to organizations that fit their values and attributes. Tom (1971) conducted a laboratory experiment with 100 college students in which he tested the hypothesis that the similarity between an individual's self-description and his/her description of the most preferred organization will be greater than the similarity between an
individual's self-description and his/her description of the least preferred organization. In support of a person-organization fit approach, self-descriptions were more similar to descriptions of the most preferred organizations than the least preferred organizations.

Zedeck (1977) used policy capturing combined with judgment analysis clustering to categorize individuals into groups on the basis of similarity between their individual policy equations. His results indicate that subjects who are alike in their job choice decision-making processes also display similarities on certain biographical data such as age, gender, college, major, and work experience. These findings provide further evidence that organizational characteristics influence the organizational-choice process differently for different groups of people.

Bretz, Ash, & Dreher (1989) examined two individual difference characteristics; need for achievement and need for affiliation. Their hypothesis was that individuals similar on these two characteristics would make similar organizational choices. A laboratory study was conducted in which two organizational types were created and described in terms of their reward systems. One organizational type represented an environment that encouraged and rewarded individual behavior, whereas the other encouraged and rewarded effort directed at the organization's collective well-being. The experimenters used video taped segments of interviews to convey the differing organizational characteristics. Subjects were administered the Jackson Personality Research Form in order to assess their need for achievement and need for affiliation. The results indicate limited support for the congruency hypothesis that certain types of individuals will be more attracted to certain types of organizations. Bretz, Ash, & Dreher (1989)
hypothesized that individuals with high need for achievement would find the
individually oriented system to be more attractive and that those with a high need
for affiliation would find the organizationally oriented system to be more
attractive. Analysis of variance results showed no interaction for need for
achievement or for need for affiliation indicating that need for achievement and
need for affiliation scores tended to be essentially the same regardless of the
organization chosen as most attractive. However, an interaction effect was found
between need for achievement and need for affiliation. Subjects low in need for
affiliation and low in need for achievement were more likely to choose
organizations with individually oriented reward systems. Those low on need for
affiliation and high on need for achievement were more likely to choose
organizations with organizationally oriented reward systems. Conversely, when
subjects were high on need for affiliation and low on need for achievement, they
were more likely to choose the organizationally oriented reward system. Those
high on need for affiliation and high on need for achievement were more likely to
favor the individually oriented system.

Turban & Keon (1993) built on previous research with their examination of
need for achievement and self-esteem as they relate to organizational characteristic
preferences. The researchers examined four organizational characteristics, reward
structure, centralization, organization size, and geographical dispersion, and two
individual characteristics, need for achievement and self-esteem. Management
students read vignettes describing varying levels of the four organizational
characteristics and then rated their attraction to the organization. In support of
attraction-selection-attrition theory (Schneider, 1987), the high need for
achievement subjects were more strongly attracted to the firm when pay was based on merit than were the low need for achievement subjects. Also supportive of the theory, low need for achievement individuals were more attracted to medium versus small organizations, whereas high need for achievement individuals were less attracted to medium versus small organizations. Furthermore, low need for achievement subjects were less attracted to large versus medium organizations, whereas the high need for achievement subjects were more attracted to large versus medium organizations.

A study by Cable & Judge (1994) investigated the degree to which preferences for particular compensation attributes depended on job seekers' dispositional characteristics. The results indicated that dispositional characteristics can serve as reliable predictors of individuals' fit with certain pay systems, and pay systems may cause consistent self-selection behavior in job seekers. For example, more materialistic job seekers placed greater emphasis on pay level when deciding whether or not to pursue an organization than less materialistic job seekers. Additionally, job seekers with an internal locus of control were more attracted to organizations offering flexible benefits than were those with an external locus of control. This study provided support for the notion that individuals self-select into organizations that are congruent with their personal characteristics.

The current research builds on previous research and theory showing that applicants are attracted to organizations that fit their personalities. Specifically, hypotheses are presented for the influence of need for achievement and need for affiliation on attraction to an organization depicted in an interview situation. Need
for achievement and need for affiliation are individual difference variables for which prior research justifies generating hypotheses.

**Hypothesis I:** Individuals will choose organizations that are congruent with their own personal interests and orientations. Specifically, individuals who are high in need for achievement will rate organizations that are achievement oriented more favorably than organizations that are affiliative. Individuals who are high in need for affiliation will rate organizations that are affiliative as more attractive than organizations that are achievement oriented.

**The Employment Interview as a Recruiting Device**

The research on person-organization fit suggests that applicants are fairly rational in their choices of organizations and are drawn to those organizations that fit their personal characteristics. However, a variety of factors associated with the interview can influence attraction to the organization, besides specific information on the organization. The research that has been conducted on the effect of recruiters on applicant perceptions suggests that interviewer behavior contributes to impressions that applicants form about organizations and their selection of organizations. Glueck (1973) interviewed business and engineering students during their job quests and found that, for more than one third of them, the recruiter was the primary reason they identified for selecting a particular organization.
In further support of the recruiter playing a major role in applicant organization selection, Alderfer & McCord (1970) found that applicant perceptions of recruiters was significantly related to applicant intentions to accept a job offer if one were extended. Similarly, Schmitt & Coyle (1976) questioned college graduates who had been interviewed for jobs at a university placement service about their reactions to an interviewer and their subsequent job decisions. Factor analyses revealed that perceived interviewer personality, manner of delivery, and adequacy of job information affected interviewee evaluations of the interviewer and the company he/she represented. Additionally, these factors predicted the applicant's reported likelihood of job acceptance. This research suggested that the interviewer can play a role in recruiting potential employees.

How recruiters may influence applicant impressions

There are three hypotheses for why recruiters might influence applicant decisions. One possibility is that applicants view recruiter behaviors as signals of organizational characteristics (Reynolds, 1951). Specifically, what recruiters say and do influences expected job favorability because they are viewed by applicants as representative of organizational characteristics (Downs, 1969). Another hypothesis is that applicants interpret recruiter behaviors as clues to their probability of receiving job offers. To the extent that applicants become pessimistic about their chances for an employment offer due to recruiter dislike or disinterest, they are attracted to other organizations that appear to offer more favorable employment prospects (Gerstner, 1966). In support of this hypothesis, applicants who describe individual recruiters as unenthusiastic, unfriendly, or
unprepared also report low expectations of receiving job offers from the organizations they represent (Alderfer & McCord, 1970; Schmitt & Coyle, 1976).

Several studies have shown that recruiter behavior influences applicant impressions of the organization and have provided support for one or both of the above hypotheses. Rynes & Miller (1983) conducted a laboratory study using college students whereby subjects viewed a mock video of an interview and rendered impressions about the recruiter, organization, and their personal intentions if they were in the role of the applicant. In their study they manipulated recruiter affect and knowledge of the job. The results revealed a significant relationship between recruiter non-verbal behavior (e.g., steady eye contact, frequent smiling and nods of encouragement, verbal indications of approval of the applicant's responses, and positive reactions to the applicant's humor) and several outcome measures including recruiter representation of company, recruiter intention to extend a second interview, recruiter intention to endorse a job offer, how well the company treats its employees, and subject willingness to attend a second interview. Results regarding the amount of information offered by the recruiter were also found to be significantly related to several outcome measures including how well the recruiter represented his organization, whether the applicant was likely to receive further consideration, and attractiveness of the job and organization.

A third hypothesis is that applicants ascribe personal characteristics to interviewers, and these personal characteristics impact applicant impressions of a job and organization. Harris & Fink (1987) conducted a study using a pre-post design in a naturally occurring setting with graduating college students. They used
hierarchical regression to address the effect of recruiter characteristics (personableness, competence, informativeness, and aggressiveness) on four job attributes (including the job itself, the work/company environment, compensation/job security, and minor fringe benefits), regard for the company and job, likelihood of job offer, and intentions to accept a job offer. The results revealed that recruiter characteristics were significantly related to applicant perceptions of the job attributes including perceptions of the job itself, compensation/job security, and work/company environment. Recruiter characteristics were significantly related to regard for the company ($\Delta R^2 = .19$) and job ($\Delta R^2 = .09$). Recruiter characteristics also showed a significant relationship with likelihood of joining the organization. Specifically, recruiter characteristics were related to expectancy of job offer ($\Delta R^2 = .15$) and displayed a statistically significant relationship with intentions to accept a job offer ($\Delta R^2 = .10$). These results indicate that recruiter behavior plays a role in applicant perceptions of organizations, the expected likelihood of a job offer, and intention to accept a job offer.

The link between recruiter behavior and applicant impressions was also supported by Harn & Thornton (1985). Their study examined graduating college students who completed questionnaires following employment interviews at a university placement center. The results revealed a significant main effect of recruiter behavior on applicant reactions. Furthermore, the amount of variance accounted for in willingness to accept a job offer increased from 12% to 37% when perceived representativeness of the recruiter was added as a moderator. Similarly, Liden & Parsons (1986) reported correlations of .20 ($p < .05$) and .10 ($p$
<.05) between reactions to the job and perceptions of recruiter personableness and competence, respectively. Taylor & Sniezek (1984) examined applicant reactions as a function of interviewer conduct and found that applicants rated their satisfaction with the opportunity received to present job qualifications and the interview's effect on organizational attractiveness as more positive when interview content addressed general job qualifications than when interview content addressed the applicants' technical skills and geographic preferences.

Turban & Dougherty (1992) used expectancy-valence theory as the basis for understanding how recruiter behavior influences recruiting outcomes. The authors conducted a field study to collect data from applicants and recruiters from the placement center at a large midwestern university. Two dependent measures of applicant impressions were used; expectancy perceptions (probability of being invited for a second interview) and valence perceptions (regard for the company and attractiveness of the job). Interviewers were surveyed to indicate the behaviors they displayed during the interview. The findings indicate that recruiter behavior explained a significant proportion of the variance in expectancy and valence perceptions (R² = .19 and .17, respectively). The applicant perceptions of recruiter behaviors that were uniquely related to applicant expectancy perceptions included recruiter interest in candidate, and recruiter intimidation (negative relationship). The applicant perceptions of recruiter behaviors that were uniquely related to valence perceptions included recruiter interest in candidate, and recruiter spending time discussing the job. The results failed to support the hypothesis that recruiter demographic characteristics play a role in applicant perceptions.
The Effects of Interview Structure

Most of the previous research on the effects of the interview on recruiting outcomes has examined the influence of the interviewer's behavior (e.g., eye contact, warmth) or personal characteristics. Few studies have examined the effect of interview structure on recruiting. Structured interviews have numerous characteristics that force the recruiter to behave in a particular manner. Structured interviewers will present applicants with questions that are based upon a job analysis, thus removing the possibility of inappropriate or non-job-relevant questions. Secondly, structured interviewers are required to ask the same questions of all applicants. Thirdly, structured interviewers must follow a definite course of discussion during the interview. Because of this, structured interviews have less of a free-flowing exchange of information than unstructured interviews. The opportunity for applicants to raise additional or tangential topics in the structured interview is very limited. There are many other characteristics of the structured interview such as individual rating dimensions and interviewer training, but job-relevant questioning, standardization of questioning, and lack of latitude in applicant presentation of information are the most salient characteristics and thus seem the most likely to influence applicant impressions. Unlike structured interviews, unstructured interviews lack the rigid guidelines of the structured interview and may contain non-job-relevant questions, non-standardization of questions, and a free-flowing exchange of information. The course which the unstructured interview follows is completely at the discretion of the interviewer.

The higher validity observed with the structured interview (Weisner & Cronshaw, 1988; McDaniel, et al, 1994; Marchese & Muchinsky, 1993) suggests
that it is a superior means of selection relative to the unstructured interview. As previously mentioned, such an inference may be premature given the lack of research on the effect that the structured interview has on recruiting outcomes.

A question that is central to the present research is how subjects differ in their reactions to structured and unstructured interviews. The few studies that have examined this issue have either consisted of survey studies that have relied on self-reports of interview structure or are experiments that have manipulated interview structure. In one of the survey studies, Turban & Dougherty (1992) used interviewer reports of interview structure to predict applicant perceptions of organizations. Recruiters were asked whether they followed a structured format, used rating scales for candidate responses, and asked a candidate the same questions as other candidates. Regression analyses indicated no relationship between interview structure and applicant attraction to firms. Although the authors attempted to address specific recruiter attributes and behaviors, the findings are limited due to the self-report nature of the data. Taylor & Bergmann (1987) found a positive relationship between interviewer reports of structure and applicant ratings of probability of offer acceptance. In this case, structure was measured with a response to a single item, "To what extent is your typical method of interviewing college students structured?". In both studies, recruiters may have been biased by their own idiosyncratic interpretations of the questions on structure.

Rather than using self-reports, two other experiments manipulated interview structure, and in both studies subjects reacted more favorably to unstructured interviews than structured interviews. Zehelein (1985) conducted a laboratory study with 96 students in which subjects rated their impressions of
directive or nondirective video-taped employment interviews. Results showed that nondirective interviewers were preferred to directive interviewers on several dimensions. Nondirective interviewers were viewed as more competent in their roles and more accurate in their assessments; subjects indicated that most people would like to be interviewed by nondirective interviewers, that it would be easy to talk to them, and that they would feel comfortable in this kind of situation. Moreover, non-directive interviewers were viewed as easier to influence, meaning that applicants' chances of receiving a job offer would be higher with a nondirective interviewer.

Latham & Finnegan (1993) conducted a study with 30 students posing as applicants using three types of interview formats; unstructured, patterned, and situational. When students indicated which of the three formats would most favorably influence them to accept a job offer, the number of subjects who chose the unstructured, patterned, and situational interviews were 17, 11, and 2, respectively. The differences in frequencies were significant (p < .01). Another question they asked subjects was worded as follows: "If you were the type of person who would file a lawsuit against a company if you felt you had been rejected unfairly, which interview format would make you the most optimistic of winning your case?" The difference in responses to the unstructured, patterned, and situational was significant, (p < .01) in favor of the unstructured interview. This study demonstrated that subjects who experienced an unstructured interview were more likely to accept a job offer and less likely to file a lawsuit than subjects who experienced a structured interview.
Factors Favoring a Structured Interview

Several studies have attempted to address the effect of interview structure on recruiting outcomes (Latham & Finnegan, 1993; Turban & Dougherty, 1992; Taylor & Bergmann, 1987; Zehelein, 1985). Given the mix of findings on reactions to interview structure, more research is needed that directly manipulates interview structure and examines the various effects that interview structure may have on recruiting outcomes. Past research on procedural justice would suggest that some of the attributes of structured interviews are conducive to fairness perceptions and will be favorably received, whereas other attributes of a structured interview appear inconsistent with procedural justice and are likely to evoke negative reactions (Schuler (1993; Gilliland, 1993).

Job-relatedness. A characteristic of a structured interview that seems to be conducive to applicant perceptions of interview fairness is job-relatedness. Leventhal (1980) argued that procedural justice is violated when performance is assessed on the basis of irrelevant information. Additionally, Sheppard and Lewicki (1987) found support for a resource rule, which suggests that decisions should be based on accurate resources and proficiency. Other researchers who have assessed applicants' reactions to selection measures have included job relatedness (Arvey & Sackett, 1993), job relevance (Iles & Robert, 1989), and task relevance (Schuler, 1993). Schmitt, Gilliland, Landis & Devine (1993) found that both perceived job relevance and overall perceived fairness were higher with a more content-valid, computerized work-sample test than with simple typing and dictation tests. Smither, Reilly, Millsap, Pearlman, & Stoffey (1993) investigated perceived job relatedness for different types of selection measures and found that
interviews, assessment centers, and cognitive ability tests that included concrete items were perceived to be more job relevant than personality tests, biodata forms, and cognitive ability tests that included abstract items. Kluger and Rothstein (1991) found a significant relationship between perceived relevance and perceived fairness for cognitive ability tests and biographical data measures. Furthermore, Gilliland (1993) studied job relatedness in a hiring situation and found that job relevance was related to perceptions of procedural and distributive fairness.

On the basis of this research, it appears that job-related selection procedures are seen as fairer by applicants. One could argue that structured interviews will be seen as fairer because they include only those questions that are job related as opposed to unstructured interviews that often include non-job-relevant questions. The perceived fairness associated with structured interviews may result in applicants forming more positive impressions about the organization. However, it is important to note that job-relatedness may be in the eye of the beholder. It is not clear that applicants will necessarily perceive questions about personality, outside activities, and other similar issues as unrelated to the job and therefore unfair.

What appears clear is that improper questions that are asked in an interview will be perceived as unfair. Evidence of this was provided by Bies & Moag (1986) who found that one of the factors that influenced perceptions of fairness was the propriety of questions asked during the selection process. Question propriety was comprised of improper questioning tactics and prejudicial questions and statements. Although this area has not been extensively researched, individual interviewers using unstructured interviews may differ on what they
consider to be appropriate questioning tactics. Structured interviews may guard against the use of improper questions by requiring all interviewers to use the same questions. Whether or not applicants perceive structured interviews as more fair because of the absence of improper questions remains to be researched.

**Consistency of Administration.** Consistency of administration is another attribute of the structured interview that would seem to enhance the perceived fairness of structured procedures. Consistency of administration ensures that decision procedures are consistent over all individuals and points in time (Gilliland, 1993). Research in the drug testing area provides support for the notion that consistency of administration is related to perceived fairness. Drug testing programs have received greater support when they have involved all organizational members as opposed to only those bearing a drug affected history (Gomez-Mejia & Balkin, 1987; Murphy, et. al., 1990). Gilliland (1993) hypothesized that structured interviews should be perceived as more fair than unstructured interviews because of the high level of standardization of questioning across applicants. Gilliland (1993) does raise the issue, however, that individuals may not be fully aware of how others are treated in the interview situation and therefore, may not be able to judge consistency.

**Factors Favoring an Unstructured Interview**

The greater job-relatedness and consistency of structured interviews would seem to favor structured over unstructured procedures. However, three other characteristics that would appear to support the argument that unstructured interviews will be seen as fairer are voice and control, feedback, and warmth.
Applicant Voice and Control. A characteristic of the structured interview that seems likely to influence perceived interview fairness is whether applicants are given sufficient opportunity to exhibit their knowledge, skills, and abilities relevant for the job (Arvey & Sackett, 1993). The most highly structured interviews do not allow for a free flowing exchange of information between interviewer and applicant (Campion, Pursell, & Brown, 1988; Latham & Saari, 1984). Rather, the content of the discussion is dictated by the interviewer's questions which may be perceived as limited in scope. That is, in the structured interview, the interviewer is required to follow a predetermined question set which does not allow the applicant to play much of a role in determining the course of conversation. Due to this constraint applicants may perceive that they have limited voice and thus judge the procedure to be less fair than that of an unstructured interview.

The findings of empirical research strongly support the contention that to the extent that structured interviews limit the voice that applicants have in stating their qualifications, applicants will perceive the structured interview as less fair than the unstructured interview. This prediction seems particularly likely to hold when a lack of voice limits the control the applicant has over the selection process (Schuler, 1993). Research in the organizational justice arena indicates that reward allocation and appraisal procedures are perceived as more fair when individuals are given ample opportunity to express themselves (Thibaut & Walker, 1975; Greenberg, 1986).

Other research has shown that the perceived fairness of selection measures depends on the extent to which they allow applicants to control the situation. Kluger & Rothstein (1991) found that individuals sensed higher control over their
test performance with biodata inventories than they did with cognitive ability tests. An important source of the control that applicants have over an interview situation is the opportunity they are given to raise issues and present information during the employment interview. Voice procedures are those that allow people an opportunity to provide inputs to the decision maker, and mute procedures are those that do not provide such an opportunity. One of the consistent findings of such research has been that people perceive voice procedures as fairer than mute procedures (Greenberg & Folger, 1983), even when a decision is unfavorable to them (LaTour, 1978; Lind, Kurtz, Musante, Walker & Thibaut, 1980). Similarly, voice procedures have been found to be perceived as fairer than mute procedures in studies involving participatory decision making (Greenberg & Folger, 1983), performance appraisal and compensation plans (Folger & Greenberg, 1983), and conflict management (Shepard, 1984). Bies & Shapiro (1988) conducted a study in which they manipulated transcripts given to subjects describing interviewing events. In the voice-procedure condition subjects read that the candidate had ample opportunity to present his/her qualifications. Subjects in the mute-procedure condition read that the candidate was not given the opportunity to ask questions or present his/her resume. When subjects were asked to rate procedural fairness, those in the voice-procedure condition rated fairness as significantly higher than subjects in the mute-procedure condition.

Voice and control seem more likely when there is two-way communication that allows applicants to offer input or to have their views considered in the selection process (Tyler & Bies, 1990). Schuler (1993) cited research that found more favorable impressions and reactions to nondirective than to directive
interviews. Students found nondirective interviewers to be easier to influence, and thus easier to get an employment offer from. Nondirective interviewers were also seen as more competent in their roles and accurate in their assessments. Moreover, subjects indicated that most people would like to be interviewed by nondirective interviewers, that they had a favorable impression of them, that it would be easy to talk to them, and that they would feel comfortable in this kind of situation. Two-way communication also refers to the opportunity to pose questions regarding the job, organization, or selection process (Gilliland, 1993). Gilliland (1993) argued that a selection system must provide applicants with sufficient opportunity to obtain information that is germane to making acceptance decisions. If such opportunities are not granted, applicants' satisfaction with the selection system will likely be decreased (Gilliland, 1993).

Reconsideration opportunity, which is defined as the opportunity to challenge or modify the decision-making evaluation process, is another construct relevant for perceived fairness (Greenberg, 1986; Leventhal, 1980; Sheppard & Lewicki, 1987). Arvey & Sackett (1993) proposed that the issues of reconsideration opportunity and the opportunity to review scores play a role in perceived fairness of procedures. Applicants given the opportunity to discuss any topics they wish at the conclusion of an interview may perceive that they were given reconsideration opportunity. That is, if applicants who believe they have performed badly throughout the interview are granted a second chance at the end of the interview, they may perceive that they have been given reconsideration opportunity. Therefore, they may perceive the procedure to be more fair. Structured interviews do not allow for applicants to present any information they
wish during any portion of the interview, or upon its conclusion. Thus, one may hypothesize that structured interviews may be perceived as less fair than unstructured interviews which typically allow applicants to present any information during the interview.

Feedback. Feedback is another factor which is cited as contributing to perceptions of fairness (Tyler, & Bies, 1990). Lounsbury, Bobrow, & Jensen (1989) reported that reactions to testing were more positive when individuals had received feedback on their performance than when they had not. Schmidt, Urry, & Gugel (1978) argued that the speed with which feedback was provided both in terms of test performance and qualification for a job, was an advantage of computer adaptive testing over conventional paper-and-pencil or oral examinations. Rynes, Bretz & Gerhart (1991) related time lag of information to recruiting. They found that one of the reasons applicants lost interest in organizations or turned down offers for site visits was delays in the recruiting process. Because interviewers follow a rigid format in the structured interview and refrain from making tangential comments, it may be more difficult for applicants to discern how well they are performing. Due to these circumstances, the structured interview may provide less feedback to applicants about their performance than unstructured interviews.

Interviewer Warmth. Warmth and friendliness of the recruiter appears to be a crucial variable when forming impressions about organizations (Schmitt & Coyle, 1976). Liden & Parsons (1986) demonstrated that the strongest predictor of general affect of an interview was the extent to which the interviewer was personable. Rynes (1991) reported that the factor that accounted for the greatest
percentage of variance explained in numerous applicant dependent measures was
af-fect of the recruiter. Since structured interviews constrain interviewers in the
type of questions they may ask and comments they may make, structured
interviewers may be perceived as less warm and friendly than unstructured
interviewers.

Predominance of Voice and Warmth. Competing arguments exist for
theories about whether the structured interview will be seen as more or less fair
than the unstructured interview. One may posit that because the structured
interview is consistent, job relevant, and does not include improper questions it
will be seen as fairer. However, on balance, it appears from the literature that the
lack of voice and opportunity for interaction during the structured interview will
lead applicants to rate the unstructured interview procedure as fairer. Research on
the interpersonal context of procedural justice by Bies (1986) suggests that factors
such as warmth and voice may overwhelm factors such as consistency and job-
relatedness. Specifically, Beis (1986) found that the quality of interpersonal
treatment that job candidates received led to perceptions of fairness, regardless of
whether or not they received job offers.

Moderators of the Effects of Interview Structure

On the basis of previous research and theory, interview structure appears
likely to influence attraction of the applicant to the organization. The influence of
interview structure may well vary, however, as a function of moderator variables.
Two categories of such variables were explored in the current research: Amount
of information on the job and organization, and personal characteristics of the
applicant.
Amount of Information on the Job and Organization.

Not all of the research has been supportive of the influence of recruiter behavior on applicant job acceptance. Powell (1984) conducted a study using actual job applicants in which he simultaneously examined attributes of the job and recruiting practices. The results indicated that job attributes, but not recruiting practices, influenced the likelihood of job acceptance among applicants. Although Powell did not find an effect of recruiter behavior, specific behaviors were not manipulated. Rather, the applicants rated their perceptions of recruiter characteristics (e.g., the recruiter's ability and willingness to answer questions, the spontaneity of the interview). Additionally, Taylor & Bergmann (1987) found that only at the initial stages of the process were potential employees' reactions influenced by recruiter behavior.

On the basis of findings such as those reported by Powell (1984), and Taylor & Bergmann, (1987) the interviewer would seem to have more influence when applicants have less information about the job and/or organization. In the absence of information, applicants rely on the interviewer because he/she is the primary source of data on the organization and job. The current study attempts to address the incremental effect of interviewer behavior on individuals' impressions of a job and organization when they already have job and organization information versus when they do not.

Individual Differences.

Individual differences among applicants are another potential category of moderators of the hypothesized effect of interview structure. Several personality variables were examined, including need for achievement, need for affiliation, need
for dominance, global self-esteem, interview self-esteem, job-related self-esteem, extraversion, openness, agreeableness, conscientiousness, and neuroticism. Additionally, age, previous work experience, race, and gender were examined. Given that no previous research had been conducted on this issue, the present research was exploratory and no a priori hypotheses were stated for specific effects of these variables.

**Hypothesized Effects of Interview Structure**

The research on the effect of interview structure on applicant perceptions of organizations is limited at best. Two of the four studies that have addressed interview structure (Turban & Dougherty, 1992; Taylor & Bergmann, 1987) have not done so in a controlled laboratory setting where interview structure is directly manipulated. Rather, interviewers provided experimenters with self-report data on the extent to which their interviewing format was structured. Because individuals may have different interpretations of the characteristics which constitute interview structure, interviewer self-report data make it difficult to interpret these findings. The two studies that did manipulate interview structure in a laboratory setting (Latham & Finnegern, 1993; Zehelein, 1985) failed to address specific attributes of the structured versus unstructured interview formats. That is, we cannot gain insight into which interview characteristics (e.g., question standardization, job-relevance of questions, voice) are influential in guiding applicant impressions. Moreover, past research has not addressed the potential moderators of the effect of interview structure on applicant perceptions of organizations.

The current research improves upon these limitations by directly manipulating three essential characteristics of structured interviews:
Standardization of questions, the exclusion of interview questions which are not job relevant, and the lack of opportunity of applicants to express themselves in a free manner throughout the interview. In order to address more fully the influence of interview structure on recruiting outcomes, the current research examined interview structure, job characteristics, and organizational characteristics simultaneously to assess the relative influence of each and examine potential interactions. Additionally, potential moderators of the effect of interview structure on applicant impressions were examined in the form of the amount of information on the organization and job, and individual differences. The following hypotheses were tested:

**Hypothesis 2:** Unstructured interviews will be evaluated more favorably than structured interviews in terms of interview fairness, interviewer accuracy, and likeability of the interviewer.

**Hypothesis 3:** Individuals will evaluate an organization and a job as more attractive and will more likely report that they would accept an offer of employment if an unstructured interview is used than if a structured interview is used.

**Hypothesis 4:** The presence of information on the job and organization will moderate the effects of interview structure on evaluation of the interview procedure, interviewer, job and organization. Specifically, more support will be found for hypotheses 1 and 2 for subjects who do not have information on
the job and the organization than for subjects who have information.

*Hypothesis 5:* Individual difference variables will moderate the effect of interview structure on perceptions of interview procedure, organization attractiveness, interviewer style and job attractiveness. These variables include need for achievement, need for affiliation, global self-esteem, interview self-esteem, job-related self esteem, need for dominance, extraversion, agreeableness, openness, neuroticism, conscientiousness, race, gender, work experience and age.

**Study 1**

**Method**

**Subjects**

Subjects consisted of 437 undergraduate students from four different universities: 37 subjects were from University of Houston Downtown, 44 subjects were from University of Houston Clear Lake, 174 students were from Temple University, and 182 students were from Rice University. Some students participated in the study in exchange for subject hour course credit, while other students participated in the study in exchange for a guest lecture on recruiting.

Subjects consisted of 203 males and 223 females (eleven students declined to indicate their gender). Of the 437 subjects, 285 were Caucasian, 49 were Hispanic, 38 were African American, 49 were Asian, and 8 were considered other
(13 subjects declined to indicate their race). Subjects ranged from 18 to 52 years of age with a mean of 22.6 years of age and a standard deviation of 6.3 years. Subjects had a range of 0 to 34 years of full time work experience with a mean of 3.23 years and a standard deviation of 6.08 years. Subjects represented a variety of academic majors (See table 1 for sample demographics and characteristics).

A packet of information. Subjects were told that once they had read the information, they would be required to answer numerous questions about their impressions and that they would be required to complete several personality measures. They were told to respond honestly and that their answers would be completely anonymous, and used only for research purposes. The study duration was approximately 50 to 60 minutes. Upon completion of all materials, subjects were debriefed and dismissed.

**Study Design**

The study was a $2 \times 2 \times 2$ between subjects design. The three factors included job type, organization type, and interview structure. The study included a control group in which the only manipulation was interview structure. In tests of hypothesis 4, the first two factors of the $2 \times 2 \times 2$ design were combined to form a high information group and a low information group. A $2 \times 2$ design was used to examine hypothesis 4 in which the two factors were interview structure and whether subjects had information on the job and organization. Table 2 presents the number of subjects per cell.

**Description of Independent Variables**

Three independent variables each with two levels were manipulated; interview structure, organization type, and job type. The interview structure
Table 1
Sample Demographics and Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GENDER:</th>
<th>NUMBER IN SAMPLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RACE:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAJOR:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural science (e.g., biology)</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Language</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music/Art</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Houston (Clearlake campus)</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Houston (Downtown campus)</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temple University</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rice University</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2
Number of Subjects in Each Cell of Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structured Achievement Job 1 (37)</th>
<th>Structured Affiliative Job 1 (37)</th>
<th>Structured Achievement Job 2 (37)</th>
<th>Structured Affiliative Job 2 (35)</th>
<th>Control: Structured (72)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Procedure

Subjects were introduced to the experimenter and told that they would read independent variable had two levels, structured interview and unstructured interview. In the structured interview condition, subjects read a transcript of segments of an interviewer's discussion with three different applicants. Incorporated into the structured interview transcripts were job-relevant questions, question standardization, and low voice. In the unstructured interview condition, subjects read a transcript of segments of an interviewer's discussion with three different applicants. Incorporated into the unstructured interview transcripts were non-job-relevance of questions, lack of standardization, and high voice. The stimulus materials for the structured interviews were developed according to the guidelines discussed in Janz (1986). The unstructured interview stimulus materials were developed on the basis of characteristics of typical unstructured interviews (there are no specific guidelines for unstructured interviews).

The organization type independent variable had two conditions: achievement oriented organization and affiliative organization. In the achievement oriented organization condition, subjects read a description of an organization in which characteristics of the organization included a high standard of performance, competitive atmosphere, exciting and risky environment, promotions based on individual performance, and high level of responsibility. This organization description was designed to appeal to individuals who are high in need for achievement. In the affiliative organization condition, subjects read a description of an organization in which characteristics of the organization included a nurturing environment, low pressure, family orientation, few status distinctions, and rewards
based upon group performance. This organization description was designed to appeal to individuals who are high in need for affiliation.

The job type independent variable had two conditions: Social job and data job. In the social job condition, subjects read a job description that depicted a social job in which employees help others. This is consistent with Holland's (1973) description of a job high in social attributes. In the data job condition, subjects read a job description that depicted a data job in which employees work with data analysis. This is consistent with Holland's (1973) description of a job high in investigative attributes.

At the end of the study, subjects received a battery of individual difference measures including scales to measure the following: Need for achievement, need for affiliation, and need for dominance (all taken from the Personality Research Form, Jackson, 1974). Other scales included global self-esteem (Rosenberg, 1974), interview self-esteem (Rosenberg's scale as adjusted by Taylor, 1987), job-related self-esteem (Rosenberg's scale as adjusted by Kohn, 1994), and an adjective checklist measure of the big five personality factors of extraversion, agreeableness, openness, conscientiousness, and neuroticism (Costa, & McCrae, 1985). Subjects also answered questions about their gender, race, amount of full time work experience, and age.

**Description of Dependent Measures**

The dependent measures included 54 Likert-type items (See table 3 for a list of items) which were rated on a scale of 1 (low) to 7 (high) concerning their perceptions of the interview, interviewer, job, and organization. Four of the items were manipulation checks of interview structure. A total of 50 dependent measure
Table 3  
Dependent Measures: Items and Abbreviations Key

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ABBREVIATION</th>
<th>ITEM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Likely accept offer</td>
<td>How likely would you be to accept an employment offer from this company?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair process</td>
<td>How fair was the interview process this company used?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attractive company</td>
<td>How attractive is this company to you as a place to work?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accept offer</td>
<td>Would you accept an offer from this company?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair decision</td>
<td>How fair would the interviewer's employment decision be about applicants?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explore employment opportunity</td>
<td>How likely is it that you would explore employment opportunity further with this company if you had not heard from the company in two weeks?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair procedure</td>
<td>How fair was the procedure that this interviewer used to interview applicants?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairly treat applicants</td>
<td>How fairly did the interviewer treat the applicants during the interview procedure?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewer accuracy</td>
<td>On the basis of this interview, how accurate do you believe the interviewer will be in determining the best applicants for the job?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall interview</td>
<td>Overall, how would you rate the interview this company used?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewer similarity</td>
<td>How similar do you believe this interviewer is to other employees at this company?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewer tone and style</td>
<td>To what extent does the tone and style of this interviewer represent what the company is like?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of stay</td>
<td>If you were to take a job with this company, how long do you think you would like to work with this company?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INTERVIEWER CHARACTERISTICS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interviewer prepared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewer competent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewer pleasant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewer warm personality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People like interviewer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewer interested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewer effective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewer cold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewer like company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential contributions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewer calm and relaxed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewer understand</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3 (continued)
Dependent Measures: Items and Abbreviations Key

| Interviewer clear questions       | To what extent did this interviewer use clear questions? |
| Interviewer familiar background   | To what extent was the interviewer familiar with the applicants background? |
| Interviewer personal fit          | To what extent was the interviewer concerned with determining the applicants personal fit with the organization? |
| Interviewer outside interests     | To what extent was the interviewer interested in determining the outside interests of applicants? |
| Interviewer get broad picture     | To what extent did this interviewer attempt to get a broad picture of the applicants? |
| Interviewer meet applicant needs  | To what extent did this interviewer attempt to meet the applicants needs? |
| You like to be interviewed        | To what extent would you like to be interviewed by this interviewer if you were an applicant for this job? |

**ORGANIZATION CHARACTERISTICS**

| Organization team-oriented       | To what extent is this organization team-oriented? |
| Organization cooperative         | To what extent is this organization cooperative? |
| Organization impersonal          | To what extent is this organization impersonal? |
| Organization rigid               | To what extent is this organization rigid? |
| Organization fun/enjoyable       | To what extent is this organization fun/enjoyable? |
| Organization domineering leaders | To what extent does this organization have domineering leaders? |
| Organization social              | To what extent is this organization social? |
| Organization innovative          | To what extent is this organization innovative? |
| Organization flexible            | To what extent is this organization flexible? |
| Organization size                | How large do you think this organization is? |
| Organization achievement oriented| To what extent is this organization achievement oriented? |

**SUBJECT FIT QUESTIONS**

<p>| You work in organization         | To what extent would you like to work in this organization? |
| Job qualifications               | How would you evaluate your qualifications for this job? |
| Receive job offer                | If you were to interview for this job in this organization, how likely would it be that you would receive a job offer? |
| Job fit                         | To what extent do you believe your personal interests and personality fit this job? |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job attractiveness</th>
<th>To what extent do you think that you would like to perform this job?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Likely apply</td>
<td>How likely is it that you would apply for a job like this one?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization fit</td>
<td>To what extent do you believe your personal interests and personality fit this organization?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MANIPULATION CHECKS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Same questions</th>
<th>To what extent did this interviewer use the exact same questions for all applicants?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Same question order</td>
<td>To what extent did this interviewer use the exact same questions in the exact same order for all applicants?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant questions</td>
<td>How relevant were the interviewer's questions for assessing the applicants' ability to perform the job duties?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview structure</td>
<td>A structured interview is one in which the interviewer uses the exact same questions in the exact same order for all applicants. Also, a structured interview includes only those questions that are directly related to the job. To what extent was this interview structured?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Likert-type items were used in the analyses (See Appendix A for all stimulus materials).

Factor analyses were conducted on the 50 dependent measure items to provide a basis for forming composite scales. Maximum-likelihood factor analysis method with varimax rotation was used (Lawley & Maxwell, 1971). Maximum-likelihood has desirable asymptotic properties (Bickel & Doksum, 1977) and gives better estimates than principal factor analysis in large samples. Furthermore, the maximum likelihood factor analysis method does not require a multivariate normal distribution.

Based upon the factor analyses, ten composite dependent measure scales were formed. The eigenvalues and item factor loadings are presented in table 4. Items that represented negative attributes were reverse scored prior to conducting the factor analysis. Items that loaded above .4 on a factor were used when forming the dependent measure composites. The ten dependent measure composites are as follows: Interviewer likeability, attraction to the organization and job, authoritarian nature of the organization, interview fairness, interviewer competence, self-evaluation of job qualifications (job qualifications), interviewer representativeness, the team orientation of the organization, interviewer accuracy, and the achievement orientation of the organization. The composites were formed by computing the mean for the items which loaded above .4 on a given factor (coefficient alphas were also computed and are reported in table 4).

A second factor analysis was conducted on the interview structure manipulation check items (see table 5). Three of the four items loaded significantly on the interview structure factor. Although one item ("How relevant were the
Table 4
Dependent Measure Items and Factor Loadings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTOR AND ITEM</th>
<th>Coefficient Alpha</th>
<th>Eigenvalue</th>
<th>Interviewer Likeability Factor Item Loadings</th>
<th>Attraction to the Organization and Job Factor Item Loadings</th>
<th>Authoritarian Nature of the Organization Factor Item Loadings</th>
<th>Interview Fairness Factor Item Loadings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INTERVIEWER LIKEABILITY</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>115.03</td>
<td>.91*</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.27*</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent did this interviewer have a warm personality?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent would most people like this interviewer?</td>
<td>.90*</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.24*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How pleasant was the interviewer for this company?</td>
<td>.88*</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent was this interviewer interested in the applicants he/she interviewed?</td>
<td>.86*</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.23*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent did this interviewer understand the applicants' point of view?</td>
<td>.79*</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent was this interviewer interested in determining the outside interests of applicants?</td>
<td>.79*</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent would you like to be interviewed by this interviewer if you were an applicant for this job?</td>
<td>.76*</td>
<td>.32*</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.25*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent was this interviewer cold?</td>
<td>.75*</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.24*</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent did the interviewer make an attempt to meet the applicants' needs?</td>
<td>.72*</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent did this interviewer attempt to get a broad picture of the applicants?</td>
<td>.70*</td>
<td>.24*</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4 (Continued)
Dependent Measure Items and Factor Loadings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTOR AND ITEM</th>
<th>Coefficient Alpha</th>
<th>Eigenvalue</th>
<th>Interviewer Likeability Factor Item Loadings</th>
<th>Attraction to the Organization and Job Factor Item Loadings</th>
<th>Authoritarian Nature of the Organization Factor Item Loadings</th>
<th>Interview Fairness Factor Item Loadings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To what extent was this interviewer familiar with the applicants' backgrounds?</td>
<td>.69*</td>
<td></td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent was this interviewer interested in the potential contributions of the applicants they interviewed?</td>
<td>.62*</td>
<td></td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent did this interviewer like his/her company?</td>
<td>.60*</td>
<td></td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent was this interviewer concerned with determining the applicants' personal &quot;fit&quot; with the organization?</td>
<td>.56*</td>
<td></td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent was this interviewer calm and relaxed?</td>
<td>.53*</td>
<td></td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATTRACTION TO THE ORGANIZATION AND JOB</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent do you think you would like to perform this job?</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td></td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How attractive is this company to you as a place to work?</td>
<td>.27*</td>
<td>.77*</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How likely would you be to accept an employment offer from this company?</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.76*</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent would you like to work in this organization?</td>
<td>.32*</td>
<td>.74*</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How likely is it that you would apply for a job like this one?</td>
<td>.32*</td>
<td>.72*</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTOR AND ITEM</td>
<td>Coefficient Alpha</td>
<td>Eigenvalue</td>
<td>Interview Likeability Factor Item Loadings</td>
<td>Attraction to the Organization and Job Factor Item Loadings</td>
<td>Authoritarian Nature of the Organization Factor Item Loadings</td>
<td>Interview Fairness Factor Item Loadings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent do you believe your personal interests and personality fit this job?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.23*</td>
<td>.71*</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent do you believe your personal interests and personality fit this organization?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.27*</td>
<td>.68*</td>
<td>.34*</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If you were to take a job with this company, how long do you think you would like to work with this company?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.61*</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How likely is it that you would explore employment opportunity further with this company if you had not heard from the company in two weeks?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.51*</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AUTHORITARIAN NATURE OF ORGANIZATION</strong></td>
<td><strong>.91</strong></td>
<td><strong>16.20</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent is this organization rigid?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.32*</td>
<td>.26*</td>
<td>.77*</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent is this organization flexible?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.34*</td>
<td>.30*</td>
<td>.69*</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent does this organization have domineering leaders?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.65*</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent is this organization social?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.35*</td>
<td>.25*</td>
<td>.64*</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent is this organization impersonal?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.34*</td>
<td>.26*</td>
<td>.64*</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent is this organization fun/enjoyable?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.36*</td>
<td>.43*</td>
<td>.63*</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4 (Continued)
Dependent Measure Items and Factor Loadings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTOR AND ITEM</th>
<th>Coefficient Alpha</th>
<th>Eigenvalue</th>
<th>Interviewer Likeability Factor Item Loadings</th>
<th>Attraction to the Organization and Job Factor Item Loadings</th>
<th>Authoritarian Nature of the Organization Factor Item Loadings</th>
<th>Interview Fairness Factor Item Loadings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INTERVIEW FAIRNESS</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>10.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How fair was the procedure that this interviewer used to interview applicants?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.87*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How fair was the interview process this company used?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.31*</td>
<td>.26*</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.73*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How fair would the interviewer’s employment decision be about applicants?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.69*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How fairly did the interviewer treat the applicants during the interview procedure?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.63*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERVIEWER COMPETENCE</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>5.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How competent was the interviewer for this company?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.25*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How prepared was the interviewer for this company?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent was this interviewer effective?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.33*</td>
<td>.25*</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.33*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOB QUALIFICATIONS</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How would you evaluate your qualifications for this job?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.45*</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If you were to interview for this job in this organization, how likely would it be that you would receive a job offer?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.34*</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor and Item</td>
<td>Coefficient</td>
<td>Eigenvalue</td>
<td>Factor Loadings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewer 1</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>0.12 0.02 0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewer 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.01 0.14 0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.07 -0.01 0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Orientation</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>0.14 0.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Orientation</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>0.22 0.02 0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview Accuracy</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>0.38 0.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview Accuracy</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>0.54 0.4 0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement Orientation</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>0.24 0.36 0.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement Orientation</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>0.40 0.20 0.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement Oriented</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.11 0.11 0.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Asterisks indicate statistical significance.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTOR AND ITEM</th>
<th>Interviewer Competence Factor Item Loadings</th>
<th>Job Qualifications Factor Item Loadings</th>
<th>Interviewer Representativeness of Organization Factor Item Loadings</th>
<th>Team Orientation of Organization Factor Item Loadings</th>
<th>Interviewer Accuracy Factor Item Loadings</th>
<th>Achievement Orientation of Organization Factor Item Loadings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INTERVIEWER LIKEABILITY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent did this interviewer have a warm personality?</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent would most people like this interviewer?</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How pleasant was the interviewer for this company?</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent was this interviewer interested in the applicants he/she interviewed?</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent did this interviewer understand the applicants' point of view?</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent was this interviewer interested in determining the outside interests of applicants?</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent would you like to be interviewed by this interviewer if you were an applicant for this job?</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent was this interviewer cold?</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent did the interviewer make an attempt to meet the applicants' needs?</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent did this interviewer attempt to get a broad picture of the applicants?</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent was this interviewer familiar with the applicants' backgrounds?</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4 (Continued)
Dependent Measure Items and Factor Loadings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTOR AND ITEM</th>
<th>Interviewer Competence Factor Item Loadings</th>
<th>Job Qualifications Factor Item Loadings</th>
<th>Interviewer Representativeness of Organization Factor Item Loadings</th>
<th>Team Orientation of Organization Factor Item Loadings</th>
<th>Interviewer Accuracy Factor Item Loadings</th>
<th>Achievement Orientation of Organization Factor Item Loadings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To what extent was this interviewer interested in the potential contributions of the applicants they interviewed?</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent did this interviewer like his/her company?</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent was this interviewer concerned with determining the applicants' personal &quot;fit&quot; with the organization?</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent was this interviewer calm and relaxed?</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ATTRACTION TO THE ORGANIZATION AND JOB</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent do you think you would like to perform this job?</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.24*</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How attractive is this company to you as a place to work?</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How likely would you be to accept an employment offer from this company?</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent would you like to work in this organization?</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How likely is it that you would apply for a job like this one?</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.25*</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent do you believe your personal interests and personality fit this job?</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.33*</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTOR AND ITEM</td>
<td>Interviewer Competence Factor Item Loadings</td>
<td>Job Qualifications Factor Item Loadings</td>
<td>Interviewer Representativeness of Organization Factor Item Loadings</td>
<td>Team Orientation of Organization Factor Item Loadings</td>
<td>Interviewer Accuracy Factor Item Loadings</td>
<td>Achievement Orientation of Organization Factor Item Loadings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent do you believe your personal interests and personality fit this organization?</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.24*</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If you were to take a job with this company, how long do you think you would like to work with this company?</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How likely is it that you would explore employment opportunity further with this company if you had not heard from the company in two weeks?</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUTHORITARIAN NATURE OF ORGANIZATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent is this organization rigid?</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent is this organization flexible?</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.27*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent does this organization have domineering leaders?</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent is this organization social?</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent is this organization impersonal?</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent is this organization fun/enjoyable?</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTOR AND ITEM</td>
<td>Interviewer Competence Factor Item Loadings</td>
<td>Job Qualifications Factor Item Loadings</td>
<td>Interviewer Representativeness of Organization Factor Item Loadings</td>
<td>Team Orientation of Organization Factor Item Loadings</td>
<td>Interviewer Accuracy Factor Item Loadings</td>
<td>Achievement Orientation of Organization Factor Item Loadings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERVIEW FAIRNESS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How fair was the procedure that this interviewer used to interview applicants?</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How fair was the interview process this company used?</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How fair would the interviewer’s employment decision be about applicants?</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How fairly did the interviewer treat the applicants during the interview procedure?</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERVIEWER COMPETENCE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How competent was the interviewer for this company?</td>
<td>.87*</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How prepared was the interviewer for this company?</td>
<td>.73*</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent was this interviewer effective?</td>
<td>.48*</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.30*</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOB QUALIFICATIONS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How would you evaluate your qualifications for this job?</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.75*</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If you were to interview for this job in this organization, how likely would it be that you would receive a job offer?</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.65*</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTOR AND ITEM</td>
<td>INTERVIEWER ATTITUDE</td>
<td>INTERVIEWER ACCURACY</td>
<td>TEAM ORIENTATION OF ORGANIZATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How similar do you believe this interviewer is to other employees at this company?</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>- .02</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent does the tone and style of this interviewer represent what the company is like?</td>
<td>.74 *</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent is this organization team oriented?</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent is this organization cooperative?</td>
<td>.64 *</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, how would you rate the interview the company used?</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On the basis of the interview, how accurate do you believe the interviewer will be in determining the best applicants for the job?</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4 (Continued)
Dependent Measure Items and Factor Loadings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTOR AND ITEM</th>
<th>Interviewer Competence Factor Item Loadings</th>
<th>Job Qualifications Factor Item Loadings</th>
<th>Interviewer Representative-ness of Organization Factor Item Loadings</th>
<th>Team Orientation of Organization Factor Item Loadings</th>
<th>Interviewer Accuracy Factor Item Loadings</th>
<th>Achievement Orientation of Organization Factor Item Loadings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACHIEVEMENT ORIENTATION OF ORGANIZATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent is this organization innovative?</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.52*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent is this organization achievement oriented?</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.46*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=412
* Indicates a significant item loading on the factor.
Note. Only items with loadings above .4 on any factor were included in the table.
Table 5
Manipulation Check of Interview Structure Items and Factor Loadings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTOR AND ITEM</th>
<th>Coefficient Alpha</th>
<th>Eigenvalue</th>
<th>Interview Structure Factor Item Loadings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INTERVIEW STRUCTURE FACTOR</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>62.64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent did this interviewer use the exact same questions for all applicants?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.98*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent did this interviewer use the exact same questions in the exact same order for all applicants?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.99*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How relevant were the interviewer's questions for assessing the applicants' ability to perform the job duties?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A structured interview is one in which the interviewer uses the exact same questions in the exact same order for all applicants. Also, a structured interview includes only those questions that are directly related to the job. To what extent was this interview structured?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.98*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=437
* Indicates a significant item loading on a factor
interviewer's questions for assessing the applicant's ability to perform the job
duties?")) did not significantly load on the interview structure factor, all four items
were used when creating the manipulation check interview structure composite.
The coefficient alpha for all four manipulation check items was .98. The mean of
all four interview structure items was used to create an interview structure
composite measure.

Results

Manipulation Check

Prior to hypothesis testing, ANOVA was conducted on the interview
structure manipulation check composite to ensure that the manipulation of
interview structure was effective. A significant difference (in the expected
direction) in perceptions of interview structure was found between subjects in the
structured and unstructured interview conditions, $F(2, 435) = 4976.76, p < .0001$.
Table 6 presents the means and univariate findings on the interview structure
manipulation check individual measures as well as the composite measure of
interview structure.

Descriptive Statistics

The means and standard deviations for all variables are reported in table 7.
The simple bivariate intercorrelations among the independent and dependent
measures are presented in table 8. The simple bivariate correlations among the
dependent measures and the interview structure manipulation check items are
presented in table 9.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLE</th>
<th>MEANS FOR STRUCTURED INTERVIEW</th>
<th>MEANS FOR UNSTRUCTURED INTERVIEW</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>F VALUE</th>
<th>P VALUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To what extent did the interviewer use the exact same questions for all applicants?</td>
<td>6.85</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>1,435</td>
<td>4320.14</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent did this interviewer use the exact same questions in the exact same order for all applicants?</td>
<td>6.72</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>1,435</td>
<td>4074.30</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How relevant were the interviewer's questions for assessing the applicant's ability to perform the job?</td>
<td>5.76</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>1,435</td>
<td>1225.50</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A structured interview is one in which the interviewer uses the exact same questions in the exact same order for all applicants. Also, a structured interview includes only those questions that are directly related to the job. To what extent was this interview structured?</td>
<td>6.51</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>1,435</td>
<td>3947.07</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview structure composite (mean of four items listed above)</td>
<td>6.46</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>1,435</td>
<td>4976.76</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewer Beability</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attraction to the organization and job</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>6.89</td>
<td>437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authoritarian nature of the organization a</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewer Fairness</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewer competence</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job qualifications</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewer representativeness of organization</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team orientation of organization</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewer accuracy</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement orientation of organization</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Skew</td>
<td>Median</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for achievement</td>
<td>11.17</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for affiliation</td>
<td>9.95</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-esteem (global)</td>
<td>31.87</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-esteem (interview)</td>
<td>34.15</td>
<td>6.78</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-esteem (job)</td>
<td>33.30</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for dominance</td>
<td>10.92</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuroticism</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>23.81</td>
<td>7.17</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>52.0</td>
<td>428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full time work experience</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>6.08</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>423</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a = Authoritarian nature of the organization is reverse scored so that higher values indicate less authoritative.
Table 8
Intercorrelation Matrix of Independent Variables and Dependent Measure Composites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLE:</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewer likeability</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.57**</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attraction to the organization and job</td>
<td></td>
<td>437</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.60**</td>
<td>0.62**</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authoritarian nature of organization*</td>
<td></td>
<td>437</td>
<td>437</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.47**</td>
<td>0.46**</td>
<td>0.33**</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview fairness</td>
<td></td>
<td>436</td>
<td>436</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.21**</td>
<td>0.30**</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.48**</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewer competence</td>
<td></td>
<td>437</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>436</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.36**</td>
<td>0.61**</td>
<td>0.37**</td>
<td>0.32**</td>
<td>0.24**</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job qualifications</td>
<td></td>
<td>437</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>437</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.15**</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.15**</td>
<td>0.28**</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewer representativeness</td>
<td></td>
<td>435</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>435</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.38**</td>
<td>0.46**</td>
<td>0.69**</td>
<td>0.26**</td>
<td>0.21**</td>
<td>0.29**</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team orientation of organization</td>
<td></td>
<td>437</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>435</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.50**</td>
<td>0.48**</td>
<td>0.31**</td>
<td>0.67**</td>
<td>0.53**</td>
<td>0.31**</td>
<td>0.18**</td>
<td>0.26**</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewer accuracy</td>
<td></td>
<td>435</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>435</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.34**</td>
<td>0.50**</td>
<td>0.31**</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.29**</td>
<td>0.28**</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.20**</td>
<td>0.33**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement orientation of organization</td>
<td></td>
<td>437</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8 (Continued)
Intercorrelation Matrix of Independent Variables and Dependent Measure Composites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLE:</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11 Interview structure&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.86**</td>
<td>0.39**</td>
<td>0.53**</td>
<td>0.29**</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.23**</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.26**</td>
<td>0.28**</td>
<td>0.19**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>437</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Organization type&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.44**</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.64**</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.24**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>292</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Job type&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>-0.14*</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>292</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = p < .05  
** = p < .01

Note. The top number in a cell is the Pearson correlation, the bottom number is the pairwise number of observations.

<sup>a</sup>Autoritarian nature of the organization is reverse scored so that higher values indicate less authoritative.
<sup>b</sup>Structured interviews are coded as 1, unstructured interviews are coded as 2.
<sup>c</sup>Achievement oriented organizations are coded as 1, affiliative organizations are coded as 2.
<sup>d</sup>Social jobs are coded as 1, data jobs are coded as 2.
### Table 9
Correlation Matrix of Dependent Measure Composites With Interview Structure Manipulation Check Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLE:</th>
<th>Same questions item</th>
<th>Same question order item</th>
<th>Question relevance item</th>
<th>Interview structure item</th>
<th>Interview structure composite</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Interview likeability</td>
<td>-0.84**</td>
<td>-0.83**</td>
<td>-0.74**</td>
<td>-0.84**</td>
<td>-0.84**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>437</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Attraction to the organization and job</td>
<td>-0.38**</td>
<td>-0.36**</td>
<td>-0.30**</td>
<td>-0.37**</td>
<td>-0.37**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>437</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Authoritarian nature of organization*</td>
<td>-0.53**</td>
<td>-0.51**</td>
<td>-0.48**</td>
<td>-0.53**</td>
<td>-0.53**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>437</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Interview fairness</td>
<td>-0.30**</td>
<td>-0.29**</td>
<td>-0.22**</td>
<td>-0.29**</td>
<td>-0.29**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>436</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Interviewer competence</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>437</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Job qualifications</td>
<td>-0.22**</td>
<td>-0.22**</td>
<td>-0.15**</td>
<td>-0.22**</td>
<td>-0.21**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>437</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Interviewer representativeness</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>435</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Team orientation of organization</td>
<td>-0.27**</td>
<td>-0.24**</td>
<td>-0.25**</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
<td>-0.26**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>437</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Interviewer accuracy</td>
<td>-0.28**</td>
<td>-0.27**</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
<td>-0.28**</td>
<td>-0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>435</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Achievement orientation of organization</td>
<td>-0.19**</td>
<td>-0.18**</td>
<td>-0.18**</td>
<td>-0.19**</td>
<td>-0.19**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>437</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>437</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. The top number in a cell is the Pearson correlation, the bottom number is the pairwise number of observations.

* = p < .05
** = p < .01

a = Authoritarian nature of the organization is reverse scored so that higher values indicate less authoritative.
**Dependent Measures**

The dependent measures used in the analyses include the ten composite variables (described in the method section) of interviewer likeability, attraction to the organization and job, authoritarian nature of the organization, interview fairness, interviewer competence, self-evaluation of job qualifications (job qualifications), interviewer representativeness, team orientation of the organization, interviewer accuracy, and achievement orientation of the organization.

**Tests of the Hypotheses**

The main tests of the hypotheses were conducted in a series of multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) analyses. Univariate analyses were conducted to interpret significant effects found in the MANOVA.

**Hypothesis 1.**

In order to test whether individuals will choose organizations that are similar to their own personal interests and orientations, intent to accept a job offer (categorical question of "Would you accept an offer from this company?") was regressed on organization type, need for achievement and need for affiliation to examine the interaction effects. The three way interaction of organization type, need for achievement, and need for affiliation on intent to accept a job offer was non-significant. Similarly, the two way interactions of organization type and need for achievement, and organization type and need for affiliation on intent to accept a job offer were also non-significant.

Several MANOVA analyses were also conducted to examine the interactions of need for achievement and need for affiliation and the three
manipulated variables, interview structure, organization type, and job type. In the first test, the ten composite dependent measures were regressed on the five-way interaction of interview structure, organization type, job type, need for achievement, and need for affiliation. This interaction was non-significant and was followed by tests of all the four-way, three-way, and two-way interactions involving need for achievement and need for affiliation. These effects were also non-significant. Thus, no support was found for hypothesis 1. Table 10 presents the means on the dependent measures as a function of the individual difference measures.

**Hypothesis 2.**

To interpret the significant main effect for interview structure found in the MANOVA, univariate analyses were conducted on all of the ten dependent measure composites (see table 11). In support of hypothesis 2, subjects evaluated the unstructured interview relative to the structured interview, as fairer ($M=4.92$ versus $4.11; F(1, 435) = 39.74, p < .0001$), and more accurate ($M=4.11$ versus $3.32; F(1, 435) = 36.94, p < .0001$). Also consistent with hypothesis 2, subjects given the unstructured interview evaluated the interviewer as more likeable ($M=5.37$ versus $2.58; F(1,435) = 1347.09, p < .0001$). Although not hypothesized, it is interesting that subjects given the unstructured interview evaluated their own qualifications as higher ($M=4.64$) than subjects given the structured interview ($M=3.99, F(1, 435) = 23.45, p < .0001$. However, interview structure did not influence the evaluation of the interviewer's competence or the interviewer's representativeness.
Table 10  
Means for Dependent Measures as a Function of Individual Difference Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>High Need for Achievement Subjects</th>
<th>Low Need for Achievement Subjects</th>
<th>High Need for Affiliation Subjects</th>
<th>Low Need for Affiliation Subjects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interviewer likeability</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>3.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attraction to the organization and job</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>3.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authoritarian nature of the organization</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>3.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview fairness</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>4.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewer competence</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>4.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job qualifications</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>4.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewer representativeness</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>4.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team orientation of the organization</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>4.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewer accuracy</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>3.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement orientation of the organization</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>4.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 11
Means of Dependent Measures for Structured and Unstructured Interviews
and Univariate Tests of Significance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLE</th>
<th>MEANS FOR STRUCTURED INTERVIEW</th>
<th>MEANS FOR UNSTRUCTURED INTERVIEW</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>F VALUE</th>
<th>P VALUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interviewer likeability</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>5.37</td>
<td>1,435</td>
<td>1347.09</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attraction to the organization and job</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>1,435</td>
<td>75.72</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authoritarian nature of organization&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>1,435</td>
<td>170.61</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview fairness</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>1,435</td>
<td>39.74</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewer competence</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>1,435</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>.1986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job qualifications</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>1,435</td>
<td>23.45</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewer representativeness</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>1,433</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>.3221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team orientation of organization</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>1,435</td>
<td>30.74</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewer accuracy</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>1,435</td>
<td>36.94</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement orientation of organization</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td>1,435</td>
<td>16.12</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> Authoritarian nature of the organization is reverse scored so that higher values indicate less authoritative.
Another two way interaction effect of interview structure and job type was found on the dependent measure of interviewer likeability $F(1, 283)=13.37, p < .001$ (Figure 1 presents the interaction plot of interview structure and job type for the dependent measure of interviewer likeability). Subjects in the social and data job conditions, rated the interviewer higher on likeability in the unstructured interview than structured interview condition. However, this effect was more pronounced for subjects in the data job condition.

A two way interaction effect of interview structure and organization type was found for the dependent measure of interviewer representativeness $F(1, 283)=46.86, p < .0001$ (Figure 2 presents the interaction plot of interview structure and organization type for the dependent measure of interviewer representativeness). Subjects in the unstructured interview and affiliative organization condition rated interviewer representativeness as higher than subjects in the unstructured interview and achievement organization. This pattern was reversed for subjects in the structured interview condition. Subjects in the structured interview and achievement organization condition rated interviewer representativeness as significantly higher than subjects in the structured interview and affiliative organization.

**Hypothesis 3.**

Hypothesis 3 states that individuals will evaluate the organization and job as more attractive when an unstructured interview is used as opposed to a structured interview. Additionally, individuals will be more inclined to accept a job offer when an unstructured interview is used than when a structured interview is used. Support was found for both components of hypothesis 3.
Figure 1

Interaction Effect of Interview Structure and Job Type on the Dependent Measure of Interviewer Likeability
Figure 2

Interaction Effect of Interview Structure and Organization Type on the Dependent Measure of Interviewer Representativeness

[Diagram showing the interaction effect with points at 3.53 and 3.85 on the Y-axis for Structured Interview and 4.55 and 5.11 for Unstructured Interview.]
In order to test whether individuals evaluate the organization and job as more attractive when an unstructured interview is used, a univariate ANOVA was conducted in which attraction to the organization and job was predicted by interview structure. In support of the hypothesis, subjects were more attracted to the organization and job when the interview was unstructured ($M=4.21$) than when the interview was structured ($M=3.11$, $F(1,435)=75.72$, $p < .0001$).

A two way interaction effect of interview structure and job type was found for the dependent measures attraction to the organization and job ($F(1, 283)=12.12$, $p < .001$), authoritarian nature of the organization ($F(1, 283)=4.35$, $p < .05$), job qualifications ($F(1, 283)=3.99$, $p < .05$), and team orientation of the organization ($F(1, 283)=15.68$, $p < .0001$) (see figures 3 through 6). Significant univariate effects were found for the interaction of interview structure and job type on the dependent measures of attraction to the organization and job ($F(1, 283)=12.12$, $p < .001$), authoritarian nature of the organization ($F(1, 283)=4.35$, $p < .05$), job qualifications ($F(1, 283)=3.99$, $p < .05$), and team orientation of the organization ($F(1, 283)=15.68$, $p < .0001$). The means for these interactions are shown in figures 3 through 6. As shown in these figures, subjects given an unstructured interview rated attraction to the organization and job, authoritarian nature of the organization, their job qualifications, and the team orientation of the organization similarly regardless of whether the job was social or data oriented. However, subjects given structured interviews rated the organization and job as less attractive, more authoritarian, their job qualifications as lower, and the team orientation of the organization as lower if the job was data oriented than if the job was social oriented.
Interaction Effect of Interview Structure and Job Type on the Dependent Measure of Attraction to the Organization and Job

**Figure 3**
Interaction Effect of Interview Structure and Job Type on the Dependent Measure of Authoritarian Nature of the Organization

*This variable is reverse scored so that higher scores mean the organization was viewed as less authoritative.*
Figure 5

Interaction Effect of Interview Structure and Job Type on the Dependent Measure of Job Qualifications
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Figure 6

Interaction Effect of Interview Structure and Job Type on the Dependent Measure of Team Orientation of the Organization

![Graph showing the interaction effect of interview structure and job type on team orientation. The graph indicates that there is a higher team orientation for social jobs compared to data jobs, especially under unstructured interview conditions. The values for team orientation are marked for structured and unstructured interviews for both job types.]
In order to test whether individuals will more likely accept an offer of employment from a firm using an unstructured interview, ANOVA was conducted on willingness to accept a job offer (categorical variable of "would you accept an employment offer"). A main effect of interview structure was found in which subjects in the unstructured interview condition were more likely to report that they would accept a job offer from the company than subjects in the structured interview condition, $F(1, 430) = 31.17, p < .0001$. Both components of hypothesis 3 were supported. The results demonstrate that individuals will evaluate an organization and job as more attractive when an unstructured interview is used as opposed to a structured interview. Furthermore, they will more likely accept an offer of employment when an unstructured interview is used. It is also interesting to note that subjects given unstructured interviews rated the organization as less authoritative ($M=3.05$ versus $4.63$, $F(1, 435) = 170.61$, $p < .0001$), more team oriented ($M=4.68$ versus $3.74$, $F(1, 435) = 30.74$, $p < .0001$), and more achievement oriented ($M=4.91$ versus $4.44$, $F(1, 435) = 16.12$, $p < .0001$) than subjects given structured interviews.

**MANOVA-Relevant to Tests of Hypotheses 2 and 3.**

Given the non-significance of the MANOVAs conducted in the test of hypothesis 1, the analyses were repeated without the individual difference variables. General linear modeling with the MANOVA option was conducted in which the ten composite dependent measures were regressed on the three factor manipulations of interview structure, job type, and organization type. Significant main effects were found for interview structure (Wilks' Lambda = .16, $F(10, 274) = 146.79$, $p < .0001$), and organization type (Wilks' Lambda = .49, $F(10,
274)=28.71, \( p < .0001 \). No significant main effect for job type was found (Wilks' Lambda=.96, \( F(10, 274)=1.23, \text{ ns} \)). Also found were significant two-way interactions between interview structure and job type (Wilks' Lambda=.89, \( F(10, 274)=3.29, \ p < .01 \)), and interview structure and organization type (Wilks' Lambda=.84, \( F(10, 274)=5.32, \ p < .0001 \)). The results of the univariate analyses conducted on these interactions are discussed below.

**Hypothesis 4.**

Hypothesis 4 states that the presence of information on the job and organization will moderate the effects of interview structure on evaluation of the interview procedure, interviewer, job and organization. Specifically, more support will be found for hypotheses 2 and 3 for subjects who do not have information on the job and organization than for subjects who have information.

In order to test this hypothesis, general linear modeling with the MANOVA option was conducted in which the ten composite variables were regressed on the interview structure variable and information (categorical variable of whether subjects had information on the job and organization). A significant interaction of interview structure and information was found, Wilks' Lambda=.92, \( F(10, 422)=3.63, \ p < .0001 \). Hypothesis 4 was supported by the results.

To interpret this interaction, the effects of the information and interview structure interaction were examined at the univariate level. The interaction of interview structure and information was significant for the five dependent measures of attraction to the organization and job (\( F(1, 431)=5.35, \ p < .05 \)), authoritarian nature of the organization (\( F(1, 431)=22.25 \ p < .0001 \), interviewer representativeness (\( F(1, 431)=9.78, \ p < .01 \), team orientation of the organization
(F(1, 431)=9.89, \( p < .01 \)), and achievement orientation of the organization (F(1, 431)=4.56, \( p < .05 \)). The means for these interactions are reported in figures 7 through 11. As shown in these figures, subjects given an unstructured interview rated their attraction to the organization and job, the authoritarian nature of the organization, interviewer representativeness, the team orientation of the organization, and the achievement orientation of the organization similarly, regardless of whether or not they had information on the organization and job. However, subjects given structured interviews rated the organization and job as more attractive, the organization as less authoritarian, the interviewer representativeness as lower, the team orientation of the organization as higher, and the achievement orientation of the organization as higher if they were given information on the job and organization than if they were not given information on the job and organization. The findings support hypothesis 4 and demonstrate that information about the job and organization reduces the effect that the structured interview has on the ratings of the dependent measures.

**Hypothesis 5.**

Hypothesis 5 states that individual difference variables will moderate the effect of interview structure on perceptions of interview fairness, attraction to the organization and job, interviewer likeability, and intent to accept a job offer. Both correlational and MANOVA analyses were conducted to examine this hypothesis (table 12 presents the correlational analyses).

A MANOVA was conducted on the ten composite dependent variables using interview structure and each of the individual difference variables as independent variables. A total of 15 MANOVA analyses were conducted for the
Interaction Effect of Interview Structure and Information on the Dependent Measure of Attraction to the Organization and Job
Figure 8

Interaction Effect of Interview Structure and Information on the Dependent Measure of Authoritarian Nature of the Organization

*This variable is reverse scored so that higher scores mean the organization was viewed as less authoritative.
Figure 9

Interaction Effect of Interview Structure and Information on the Dependent Measure of Interviewer Representativeness

![Graph showing the interaction effect. The x-axis represents Interview Structure (Structured Interview and Unstructured Interview) and the y-axis represents Interviewer Representativeness. The graph includes data points for With Information and Without Information with lines indicating the trend.]
Interaction Effect of Interview Structure and Information on the Dependent Measure of Team Orientation of the Organization
Figure 11

Interaction Effect of Interview Structure and Information on the Dependent Measure of Achievement Orientation of the Organization

Legend:
- ■ With Information
- □ Without Information
Table 12
Correlation Matrix of Dependent Measures With Individual Difference Variables
Within Structured and Unstructured Interview Conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLE:</th>
<th>Interviewer likeability</th>
<th>Attraction to organization and job</th>
<th>Authoritarian nature of organization</th>
<th>Interview fairness</th>
<th>Interviewer competence</th>
<th>Job qualifications</th>
<th>Interviewer representativeness</th>
<th>Team orientation of organization</th>
<th>Interviewer accuracy</th>
<th>Achievement orientation of organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Need for achievement</td>
<td>-0.05 (216)</td>
<td>0.10 (216)</td>
<td>-0.09 (216)</td>
<td>0.15* (216)</td>
<td>-0.14* (216)</td>
<td>0.00 (216)</td>
<td>0.04 (216)</td>
<td>0.07 (216)</td>
<td>0.02 (215)</td>
<td>0.04 (215)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for affiliation</td>
<td>0.08 (214)</td>
<td>0.08 (213)</td>
<td>-0.03 (214)</td>
<td>0.14* (214)</td>
<td>-0.06 (214)</td>
<td>-0.01 (214)</td>
<td>-0.13 (214)</td>
<td>-0.13 (214)</td>
<td>-0.02 (214)</td>
<td>-0.11 (214)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-esteem (global)</td>
<td>0.02 (214)</td>
<td>0.04 (214)</td>
<td>-0.05 (214)</td>
<td>0.02 (214)</td>
<td>0.00 (214)</td>
<td>-0.15* (214)</td>
<td>-0.03 (214)</td>
<td>-0.02 (214)</td>
<td>-0.11 (214)</td>
<td>0.14* (214)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-esteem (interview)</td>
<td>0.12 (212)</td>
<td>0.06 (212)</td>
<td>-0.06 (212)</td>
<td>0.12 (214)</td>
<td>-0.11 (212)</td>
<td>0.06 (214)</td>
<td>-0.15* (212)</td>
<td>0.01 (214)</td>
<td>-0.02 (212)</td>
<td>0.20** (212)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-esteem (job-related)</td>
<td>-0.17* (210)</td>
<td>0.10 (214)</td>
<td>-0.18** (210)</td>
<td>0.12 (214)</td>
<td>-0.18** (210)</td>
<td>0.04 (214)</td>
<td>-0.13 (210)</td>
<td>0.02 (214)</td>
<td>-0.01 (210)</td>
<td>0.24** (214)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for dominance</td>
<td>0.08 (214)</td>
<td>0.08 (212)</td>
<td>0.15* (214)</td>
<td>0.03 (212)</td>
<td>0.00 (214)</td>
<td>-0.01 (214)</td>
<td>0.11 (211)</td>
<td>0.10 (214)</td>
<td>0.04 (212)</td>
<td>0.23** (214)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>0.13 (214)</td>
<td>0.17* (213)</td>
<td>0.07 (214)</td>
<td>0.09 (213)</td>
<td>-0.02 (214)</td>
<td>0.05 (213)</td>
<td>-0.08 (214)</td>
<td>0.06 (213)</td>
<td>0.14* (214)</td>
<td>0.09 (213)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness</td>
<td>0.08 (213)</td>
<td>0.13 (213)</td>
<td>0.12 (213)</td>
<td>0.07 (213)</td>
<td>0.00 (213)</td>
<td>0.10 (213)</td>
<td>0.01 (213)</td>
<td>0.00 (213)</td>
<td>0.17* (213)</td>
<td>0.04 (213)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>0.09 (211)</td>
<td>0.12 (213)</td>
<td>-0.06 (211)</td>
<td>0.13 (213)</td>
<td>-0.13 (211)</td>
<td>0.03 (213)</td>
<td>-0.03 (211)</td>
<td>0.06 (213)</td>
<td>0.00 (211)</td>
<td>0.09 (211)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuroticism</td>
<td>-0.13 (212)</td>
<td>0.04 (212)</td>
<td>-0.10 (212)</td>
<td>0.02 (212)</td>
<td>-0.12 (212)</td>
<td>0.04 (212)</td>
<td>0.00 (212)</td>
<td>0.11 (212)</td>
<td>0.00 (212)</td>
<td>0.05 (212)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
<td>-0.01 (214)</td>
<td>0.13 (211)</td>
<td>-0.07 (214)</td>
<td>0.21** (211)</td>
<td>-0.18** (214)</td>
<td>0.04 (211)</td>
<td>-0.15* (214)</td>
<td>0.11 (211)</td>
<td>-0.17* (214)</td>
<td>0.25* (211)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.02 (214)</td>
<td>0.04 (214)</td>
<td>-0.02 (214)</td>
<td>0.04 (211)</td>
<td>-0.07 (214)</td>
<td>0.12 (214)</td>
<td>-0.06 (214)</td>
<td>-0.32** (214)</td>
<td>-0.13 (214)</td>
<td>0.07 (214)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work experience</td>
<td>0.03 (212)</td>
<td>-0.16* (211)</td>
<td>0.06 (212)</td>
<td>0.02 (211)</td>
<td>-0.10 (212)</td>
<td>0.15* (211)</td>
<td>0.00 (212)</td>
<td>-0.22** (211)</td>
<td>-0.08 (212)</td>
<td>-0.02 (212)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Top number in cell is the correlation within the structured interview condition, followed by number of observations in pairwise correlation. Bottom number in cell is the correlation within the unstructured interview condition, followed by number of observations in pairwise correlation.

* p < .05, ** p < .01, a = Authoritarian nature of the organization is reverse scored so that higher values indicate less authoritarian.
individual difference variables of need for achievement, need for affiliation, need for dominance, global self-esteem, interview self-esteem, job-related self-esteem, extraversion, openness, agreeableness, conscientiousness, neuroticism, race, gender, age, and work experience. Of the 15 MANOVAs that were conducted, significant interactions of interview structure and an individual difference measure were found for job-related self-esteem (Wilks' Lambda = .95, $F(10, 410) = 2.00, p < .05$), openness (Wilks' Lambda = .94, $F(10, 412) = 2.56, p < .01$), conscientiousness (Wilks' Lambda = .95, $F(10, 410) = 1.98, p < .05$), and age (Wilks' Lambda = .95, $F(10, 414) = 2.18, p < .05$). The effects found for the other individual difference variables were all non-significant.

**Job-Related Self Esteem:** The univariate analyses for the individual difference variables for which significant effects were found are now reported. The univariate analyses were examined and the interview structure and job-related self-esteem interaction was significant for four dependent measures including interviewer likeability ($F(1, 419) = 8.63, p < .01$), attraction to the organization and job ($F(1, 419) = 9.86, p < .01$), authoritarian nature of the organization ($F(1, 419) = 6.01, p < .05$), and job qualifications ($F(1, 419) = 4.56, p < .05$). Figures 12 through 15 present the interaction plots for these interaction effects. Both low and high job-related self-esteem subjects rated interviewer likeability and attraction to the organization and job as lower, and authoritarian nature of the organization as higher when in the structured interview condition. However, these effects were more pronounced for high job-related self-esteem subjects. Both high and low job-related self-esteem subjects rated their job qualifications similarly when in the structured interview condition. However, subjects high in job-related self-esteem
Interaction Effect of Interview Structure and Job-Related Self-Esteem on the Dependent Measure of Interviewer Likeability
Figure 13

Interaction Effect of Interview Structure and Job-Related Self-Esteem on the Dependent Measure of Attraction to the Organization and Job
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Figure 14

Interaction Effect of Interview Structure and Job-Related Self-Esteem on the Dependent Measure of Authoritarian Nature of the Organization

*This variable is reverse scored so that higher scores mean the organization was viewed as less authoritative.*
Figure 15

Interaction Effect of Interview Structure and Job-Related Self-Esteem on the Dependent Measure of Job Qualifications
who were given unstructured interviews rated their job qualifications as higher than subjects who were low in job-related self-esteem and given unstructured interviews.

**Openness:** The interaction of interview structure and openness was significant, Wilks' Lambda = .94, $F(10, 413) = 2.56, p < .01$. Univariate tests conducted to assess this interaction revealed that this interaction effect was significant for the dependent measure of attraction to the organization and job $F(1, 421) = 4.59, p < .05$ (see figure 16 for interaction plot). In the unstructured interview condition, both high and low openness subjects rated attraction to the organization and job similarly. However, in the structured interview condition, subjects high in openness rated attraction to the organization and job as higher than subjects in the structured interview condition who were low in openness.

**Age:** The interaction of interview structure and age was significant, Wilks' Lambda = .95, $F(10, 410) = 2.08, p < .05$. Univariate tests of this interaction revealed that the interaction of interview structure and age was significant for three dependent measures including interviewer likeability ($F(1, 423) = 5.40, p < .05$), interview fairness ($F(1, 423) = 4.35, p < .05$), and interviewer representativeness ($F(1, 423) = 17.26, p < .01$). Figures 17 through 19 present the plots for these interaction effects.

For the dependent measure of interviewer likeability, both older and younger subjects rated interviewer likeability as lower when in the structured interview condition. However, this effect was more pronounced for younger subjects. Older subjects rated interview fairness as lower in both the structured
Interaction Effect of Interview Structure and Openness on the Dependent Measure of Attraction to the Organization and Job
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Interaction Effect of Interview Structure and Age on the Dependent Measure of Interviewer Likeability
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Interaction Effect of Interview Structure and Age on the Dependent Measure of Interview Fairness
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Interaction Effect of Interview Structure and Age on the Dependent Measure of Interviewer Representativeness
and unstructured interview conditions. However, this effect was more pronounced for subjects in the structured interview condition. For the dependent measure of interviewer representativness, older subjects in the structured interview condition rated interviewer representativeness as higher than younger subjects in the structured interview condition. In the unstructured interview condition this pattern was reversed whereby younger subjects rated interviewer representativeness as higher than older subjects.

Other Findings

Univariate analyses were conducted on all of the dependent measures for each independent variable of interview structure, organization type, and job type. Tables 11, 13, and 14 present the results of these analyses. The effects of interview structure were previously discussed under hypotheses 2 and 3.

Organization Type.

Univariate tests of the effect of organization type on the dependent measures were conducted. Significant univariate main effects were found for organization type for the dependent measures of authoritarian nature of the organization, team orientation of the organization, and achievement orientation of the organization (see table 13). Subjects given the affiliative organization rated the authoritarian nature of the organization as lower ($M=3.37$ versus $4.65$, $F(1, 290)=69.30$, $p < .0001$), the achievement orientation of the organization as lower ($M=4.61$ versus $5.15$, $F(1, 290)=17.39$, $p < .0001$), and the team orientation of the organization as higher ($M=5.72$ versus $3.26$, $F(1, 290)=203.46$, $p < .0001$) than subjects given achievement oriented organizations. All other univariate tests of organization type were non-significant.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLE</th>
<th>MEANS FOR ACHIEVEMENT ORGANIZATION</th>
<th>MEANS FOR AFFILIATIVE ORGANIZATION</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>F VALUE</th>
<th>P VALUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interviewer likeability</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>1,290</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>.8804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attraction to the organization and job</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>1,290</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>.1728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authoritarian nature of organization (^a)</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>1,290</td>
<td>69.30</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview fairness</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>1,290</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>.7324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewer competence</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>1,290</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>.7181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job qualifications</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>1,290</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>.3794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewer representativeness</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>1,290</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>.4542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team orientation of organization</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>5.72</td>
<td>1,290</td>
<td>203.46</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewer accuracy</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>1,290</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>.5261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement orientation of organization</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>1,290</td>
<td>17.39</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) = Authoritarian nature of the organization is reverse scored so that higher values indicate less authoritative.
Job Type.

Significant univariate main effects of job type were only found for the dependent measure of attraction to the organization and job. Subjects in the social job condition rated attraction to the organization and job higher ($M=4.06$ versus $3.67$, $F(1,290)=5.83, p < .05$) than subjects in the data job condition. All other univariate tests of job type were non-significant (see table 14).

Direct Measures of Organization and Job Fit.

As an exploratory analysis, MANOVA was conducted in which the ten composite dependent measures were regressed on two single items that measured job fit ("To what extent do you believe your personal interests and personality fit this job?") and organization fit ("To what extent do you believe your personal interests and personality fit this organization?") and interview structure in order to assess the independent effect of interview structure.

Three significant main effects were found for job fit (Wilks' Lambda=.86, $F(10, 417)=6.99, p < .0001$), organization fit (Wilks' Lambda=.87, $F(10, 417)=6.32, p < .0001$) and interview structure (Wilks' Lambda=.79, $F(10, 417)=10.86, p < .0001$). No significant interactions among any of these variables were found. Subjects rated the interviewer, organization, and job more favorably when they believed they "fit" the job and organization. Furthermore, subjects rated the interviewer, organization, and job more favorably when they were in the unstructured interview condition as opposed to the structured interview condition.
Table 14  
Means of Dependent Measures for Social and Data Jobs  
and Univariate Tests of Significance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLE</th>
<th>MEANS FOR SOCIAL JOB</th>
<th>MEANS FOR DATA JOB</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>F VALUE</th>
<th>P VALUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interviewer likeability</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>1,290</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>.2954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attraction to the organization and job</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>1,290</td>
<td>5.83</td>
<td>.0164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authoritarian nature of organization</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>1,290</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>.0672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview fairness</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>1,290</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>.2622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewer competence</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>1,290</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>.3973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job qualifications</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>1,290</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>.1097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewer representativeness</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>1,290</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>.3467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team orientation of organization</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>1,290</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>.0874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewer accuracy</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>1,290</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>.2077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement orientation of organization</td>
<td>4.97</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>1,290</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>.1690</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a = Authoritarian nature of the organization is reverse scored so that higher values indicate less authoritative.
Discussion

The findings of this study did not confirm previous findings of person-organization congruence, but they support the hypothesized effects of interview structure on recruiting outcomes. Interview structure negatively influenced a variety of recruiting outcomes including ratings of the organization, job, interviewer, and intent to accept a job offer. The effect of interview structure was attenuated but not eliminated when subjects were provided with job and organization information. Only minimal support was found for the hypothesis that individual difference variables moderate the effect of interview structure. In the discussion that follows, findings related to applicant fit as stated in hypothesis 1 are discussed first. Next, the findings related to interview structure are considered.

Applicant Fit

The findings of the current research differ from previous findings showing that applicants seek high congruence between their personality characteristics and the organizations they choose (Schneider, 1987; Chatman, 1989; Turban & Keon, 1993; Burke & Deszca, 1982; Bretz, Ash & Dreher, 1989). Perhaps differences in the way the current research and previous research were conducted account for the inconsistent findings. Unlike previous research, the present research directly manipulated degree of fit to the organization through an organizational profile that fit either need for achievement or need for affiliation. In contrast, previous research has taken a more indirect approach. Turban & Keon (1993), for instance, manipulated organizational characteristics such as reward structure, centralization, organization size, and geographical dispersion of plants and offices. They found some support for congruency in that applicants similar on individual difference
variables preferred particular organization characteristics. For example, they found that subjects high in need for achievement were more attracted to organizations that rewarded performance rather than seniority.

The approach used in the current study also differed from that of Bretz, Ash, & Dreher (1989), who used videotaped interviews to present subjects with system characteristics of two different organizations. One organization was presented as individually oriented in that rewards were based on individual performance. The other organization was presented as organizationally oriented in that organizational successes were shared among employees. Subjects were told that they received job offers from both organizations and asked to choose the organization from which they would accept a job offer. Their findings weakly support the person-organization congruency hypothesis in that only need for achievement moderated the attraction of subjects to a particular organization. Perhaps the person-organization fit hypothesis is supported when subjects consider individual organizational attributes, but not when they consider a more global organizational profile.

There are several possible reasons that hypothesis 1 was not confirmed using the manipulation of organization type in the current study. One possible explanation is that there was a restriction of range on need for achievement and need for affiliation. However, this does not appear to be an issue given the range, means and standard deviations reported in table 7. Another explanation is that the manipulation of organization type was not strong enough to present clear differences in the two organizations to subjects. This explanation also does not appear to be supported. Subjects rated the achievement organization as
significantly higher on the question "To what extent is this organization achievement oriented?" than subjects rated the affiliative organization on the same question ($M=5.9$ versus $4.71$, $F(1, 290)=106.08$, $p < .0001$). Similarly, subjects rated the affiliative organization as significantly higher on the question "To what extent is this organization team oriented?" than subjects rated the achievement oriented organization on the same question ($M=5.82$ versus $3.08$, $F(1, 290)=208.98$, $p < .0001$).

A third explanation for the lack of person-organization fit findings is that the achievement oriented organization was viewed by subjects as bureaucratic and risky. This type of organization would not appeal to an individual high in need for achievement. High need for achievement individuals prefer smaller organizations (Turban & Keon, 1993) and low risk situations. Additionally, need for achievement and need for affiliation may not become potent until activated (Murray, 1954). Perhaps the current study did not provide the conditions necessary to activate these traits. Another possible explanation is that need for achievement and need for affiliation were not salient personal characteristics that subjects used when judging their personal fit with an organization. However, the current study addressed nine other individual difference variables (previously listed), and did not find support to indicate that any of the individual difference measures moderated subjects' ratings of the dependent measures. The possibility still remains that the current research did not measure the personal characteristics that are relevant for subjects when judging their personal fit with the organization. Although evidence has been found in the laboratory (Turban & Keon, 1993; Bretz, Ash, & Dreher, 1989) that supports person-organization fit, Schneider (1987)
posits that person-organization fit cannot be tested in the laboratory. It may be difficult to address the exact mechanisms by which applicants determine person-organization fit and thus difficult to address in the laboratory.

Finally, the lack of support for the person-organization congruency hypothesis also could be the result of using a student sample as subjects. One could argue that these subjects did not have enough work experience to judge their personal fit to an organization and that they did not understand the message depicted in the organization descriptions. In other words, students in general have little work experience on which draw, the relevant organization specific attributes conveyed in the organization type manipulation may be viewed by subjects as irrelevant (Bretz, Ash, & Dreher, 1989). This possibility does not appear viable given the broad range of ages and work experience among the subjects. Their ages ranged from 18 to 52 years of age with a mean of 22.6 years and a standard deviation of 6.3 years. Furthermore, their work experience ranged from 0 to 34 years with a mean of 3.23 years and a standard deviation of 6.08 years (see table 1). A diverse sample of subjects was obtained, but one could still question the representativeness of the current sample of the workforce population. Thus, the possibility remains that the sample used in the current research did not have enough work experience (3.23 years is relatively inexperienced) to use the information presented about the organization in judging what an organization would be like and assessing personal fit.

Although the person-organization fit hypothesis was not confirmed when tested with the individual difference measures of need for achievement and need for affiliation, support was found for the single item measures of job fit and
organization fit. This suggests that subjects did assess fit when determining their attraction to the organization and job. Attraction to the organization and job was regressed on the two single item measures of job fit ("To what extent do you believe your personal interests and personality fit this job?"), and organization fit (To what extent do you believe your personal interests and personality fit this organization?"). Both of these variables were significant predictors of attraction to the organization and job. The standardized partial regression coefficients were .43 for job fit and .50 for organization fit ($R^2 = .79$, $F(2, 433) = 820.25$, $p < .0001$).

**Reactions to Interview Structure**

In contrast to the hypothesis for person-organization fit, strong support was found for the hypothesized effects of interview structure. Very few studies have manipulated interview structure directly to determine its effect on recruiting outcomes. The findings of the current study are consistent with research by Latham & Finnegan (1993) who found that subjects who experienced unstructured interviews were more likely to accept a job offer. Similarly, the results of the current study are consistent with Zehelein (1985) who found that non-directive interviewers were perceived more favorably than directive interviewers.

The current study demonstrates that interview structure influences applicant perceptions of the interviewer, organization, and job. Firstly, the interview fairness, interviewer accuracy, and likeability of the interviewer were rated more positively by subjects when they read unstructured interview transcripts as opposed to structured interview transcripts. Secondly, individuals rated an organization and a job as more attractive when they read transcripts from an unstructured interview as opposed to a structured interview. Thirdly, subjects
indicated that they would more likely accept a job offer if an unstructured interview was used as opposed to a structured interview. Finally, subjects given unstructured interviews rated the authoritarian nature of the organization lower and the team orientation of the organization and achievement orientation of the organization higher than subjects given structured interviews.

One could argue that the effects of interview structure on numerous dependent measures simply represents a halo effect. The factor analysis (table 4) of the dependent measures casts doubt on a halo effect interpretation, and indicates that subjects clearly discriminated among characteristics of the interviewer, organization, and job. Furthermore, significant main effects of interview structure were not observed for the variables of interviewer competence and interviewer representativeness.

Significant interactions suggest that there may be boundary conditions to the effect of interview structure on recruiting outcomes. An interaction was found between interview structure and organization type on the dependent measure of interviewer representativeness. Additionally, an interaction of interview structure and job type was found for the dependent measures of interviewer likeability, attraction to the organization and job, team orientation of the organization, authoritarian nature of the organization, and job qualifications. However, interview structure has very strong main effects on all of the dependent measures except for interviewer competence and interviewer representativeness. Although these significant interactions were found, they represent relatively minor boundary conditions when viewed in the context of very strong interview structure main effects.
There are several possible reasons why interview structure influenced subject impressions as they did. Reynolds (1951), Down (1969) and Rynes & Miller (1983) proposed that recruiter behaviors serve as signals of organizational characteristics. The current research supports this hypothesis to a small extent. Subjects in the current study who read structured interview transcripts rated the organization as more authoritative, less achievement oriented, and less team oriented. This effect was found in the control groups where subjects answer all of the dependent measure questions only on the basis of the interview transcripts, and in the experimental conditions where subjects were also given information on the job and organization. Thus, subjects rated specific organization characteristics strictly on the basis of their impression of an interview. This provides some support for the notion that interview structure serves as a signal or a cue that suggests to applicants what the organization is like.

A finding that appears inconsistent with the notion that the interviewer serves as a signal of organizational characteristics is the significant interaction found between interview structure and organization type on the dependent measure of interviewer representativeness. Subjects appear to be judging interviewer representativeness or "fit" with the organization on the basis of the organization description and the type of interview that is conducted. Subjects are not taking for granted that the interviewer is a signal of what the organization is like.

Another hypothesis is that the expectancy of receiving a job offer mediates the effect of interview structure on recruiting outcomes. Proponents of this argument (Gerstner, 1966) suggest that applicants estimate the probability of
receiving a job offer from interviewer behavior. According to this position, applicants who are pessimistic about their chances for receiving a job offer lose interest in the organization, whereas applicants who are optimistic of receiving a job offer are attracted to the organization. Past research tends to support expectancy playing a role in recruiting outcomes (Alderfer & McCord, 1970; Schmitt & Coyle, 1976; Turban & Dougherty, 1992; Taylor & Bergmann, 1987). The current study measured the self-perception of the subject on how qualified he/she is to perform the job, a variable that is probably related to the expectancy of receiving a job offer. The current study provides possible support for the expectancy hypothesis insofar as subjects who read unstructured interview transcripts rated their own personal job qualifications as higher than subjects who read structured interview transcripts. In turn, subjects who rated their own qualifications positively were more attracted to the organization.

The characteristics that applicants ascribe to interviewers may also explain the link between interviewer behavior and recruiting outcomes (Harris & Fink, 1987; Liden & Parsons, 1986). In order to test the possible mediators of expectancy, interviewer characteristics, and organization characteristics, hierarchical regression was conducted in which attraction to the organization and job were regressed on interview structure at the first step, and interviewer likeability, interview fairness, interviewer competence, interviewer representativeness, interviewer accuracy, job qualifications, team orientation of the organization, authoritarian nature of the organization, and achievement orientation of the organization at the second step (see table 15). Interviewer likeability, interviewer representativeness, interviewer accuracy, job qualifications,
Table 15
Hierarchical Regression of Attraction to the Organization and Job on Potential Mediators
(n=434)

Whole Model: F(10, 424) = 82.35, R²=.66, p < .0001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>β</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Min ΔR²</th>
<th>Max ΔR²</th>
<th>ΔR²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interview Structure</td>
<td>-.17**</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>75.72**</td>
<td>.01**</td>
<td>.15**</td>
<td>.15**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Possible Mediators
Interviewer Likeability .30** .66 10 82.35** .51** .65** .51**
Interview Fairness .02
Interviewer Competence .01
Interviewer Representativeness -.07*
Interviewer Accuracy .12**
Job Qualifications .32**
Authoritarian Organization .27**
Team Oriented Organization .03
Achievement Oriented Organization .21**

** p < .01, * p < .05

Note. Beta = Beta after all variables entered into the equation.
ΔMIN R² = Increment in variance accounted for when predictor set is entered last into the regression equation.
ΔMAX R² = Increment in variance accounted for when predictor set is entered first into the regression equation.
R² = Variance accounted for by the predictor set upon entry into the regression equation.
authoritarian nature of the organization, and achievement orientation of the organization were significant predictors of attraction to the organization. These findings provide support for the possibility of numerous mediators of the effect of interview structure on attraction to the organization and job. Support was found for the notion that expectancy, interviewer characteristics, and organizational characteristics play a role in subjects' attraction to the organization and job. The impact of interview structure on recruiting outcomes does not appear to be mediated by perceptions of interview fairness as the procedural justice literature would suggest (Gilliland, 1993). Interview fairness does not account for a significant proportion of unique variance in attraction to the organization and job. Job qualifications accounted for the largest proportion of unique variance and thus appears to be the most salient mediator. Interviewer likeability accounts for the second largest amount of unique variance, followed by authoritarian nature of the organization and achievement orientation of the organization. Future research should address more complex models involving several mediators of how interviewers impact recruiting outcomes.

A hypothesis not previously raised in the literature is that the effect of interview structure on recruiting outcomes is mediated by subjects' perceptions of organization and job fit. That is, subjects given unstructured interviews rated their fit perceptions as higher, and in turn, subjects who perceived higher fit between their personal characteristics and the organization and job rated recruiting outcomes more favorably. An analysis was performed in which the composite dependent measures were predicted from a measure of perceived job fit, perceived organization fit, and interview structure. Significant main effects were found for
all three of these predictors. It is interesting to note that the correlation between interview structure and self-perceived job fit is .31. Additionally, the Pearson correlation between interview structure and self-perceived organization fit is .36. When the subjects were given the unstructured interviews, they rated their job and organization fit as higher.

The findings of this study strongly support the contention that use of a structured interview impacts recruiting outcomes. The current research is consistent with previous research conducted on the effect of recruiters on applicant impressions about organizations (Alderfer & McCord, 1970; Schmitt & Coyle, 1976; Rynes & Miller, 1983; Harris & Fink, 1987; Harn & Thornton, 1985; Lident & Parsons, 1986; Taylor & Sniezek, 1984; Turban & Dougherty, 1992). In this study, interview structure influenced impressions of the interviewer, job, and organization. It is interesting to note that subjects made specific inferences (e.g., team orientation, achievement orientation) about the organization on the basis of interview structure. This study demonstrates that when a structured interview is used, recruiting outcomes may be less favorable.

The Moderating Influence of Information on the Job and Organization

Some researchers have found that once applicants have job and organization information, they rely less upon the interviewer and form their impressions on the basis of job and organization information (Powell, 1984; Taylor & Bergmann, 1987). The current research suggests that the interview has an effect even in the presence of other information, although the effect of the interview is lessened somewhat when there are other sources of information available. It is often the case that applicants have very little information about a job or
organization. To the extent that applicants lack such information, these findings suggest that they rely on the interviewer's behavior as a source of information on the organization and form an opinion of the organization on the basis their experiences with the interviewer.

No prior research has directly tested the effect of interview structure and the presence of job and organization information. Future research should address how different types of information impact the effect of interview structure. Furthermore, future research needs to examine the quantity of information subjects have access to when forming their impressions about organizations. Perhaps, the effect of interview structure could be eliminated with certain types or a sufficient amount of information.

Another interesting issue to guide further research is the timing of information given to applicants. It is possible that information on the organization that is presented first (primacy effect) has the most impact. It would be useful to know if an interviewer can overcome preinterview impressions that an applicant has about an organization or if additional information can overcome applicant impressions formed on the basis of a recruiter. Taylor and Bergmann (1987) and Powell (1984) would suggest that impressions formed on the basis of a recruiter can be overcome by other sources of information. The current study suggests that the interviewer maintains some role in recruiting outcomes even if to a lesser degree. Subjects in the current study first read information on the job and organization, followed by the interview transcripts.
Individual Differences

On an exploratory basis, individual differences were investigated to discern the potential moderating effect they may have on interview structure. Four of the fifteen individual difference measures moderated the effect of interview structure on the dependent measures: Job-related self-esteem, openness, conscientiousness, and age. Conscientiousness could not be interpreted because the distribution was highly negatively skewed with the median score being the highest possible value on the scale.

Interview structure had more of an impact on subject ratings of interviewer likeability, attraction to the organization and job, authoritarian nature of the organization, and job qualifications when subjects were high in job-related self-esteem than when they were low in job-related self-esteem. A possible explanation for this effect is that subjects low in job-related self-esteem have very low expectancy of receiving a job offer and therefore these subjects did not try to relate interviewer behavior to expectancy of receiving a job offer. In contrast, subjects high in job-related self-esteem interpreted their expectancy of receiving a job offer on the basis of interviewer behavior.

Openness served to moderate the effect of interview structure for the dependent measure of attraction to the organization and job. Both low and high openness subjects rated their attraction to the organization and job similarly when they were given unstructured interviews. However, subjects low in openness who were given structured interviews rated attraction to the organization and job as lower than subjects who were high in openness. It seems likely that relatively few of the subjects in this experiment had experienced a highly structured interview in
the past; thus the highly structured interview may have been seen as a novel experience. A possible explanation for the interaction is that subjects low in openness were less inclined to embrace the novelty of the situation and therefore rated their attraction to the organization and job as lower than subjects high in openness.

Finally, age appeared to moderate the effect of interview structure for the dependent measures of interviewer likeability and interview fairness. Younger subjects appeared to be more influenced by interview structure than older subjects with younger subjects rating interviewer likeability lower when given structured interviews as opposed to unstructured interviews. Older subjects rated interview fairness as lower than younger subjects in both the structured and unstructured interview conditions. However, this effect was more pronounced for subjects in the structured interview condition. Furthermore, younger subjects rated interviewer representativeness as lower when given structured interviews as opposed to unstructured interviews. Older subjects demonstrated the reverse pattern rating unstructured interviewers as less representative than structured interviewers. Thus, it appears that age moderates the effect of interview structure differently for varying dependent measures. It is interesting to note that all of the dependent measures for which age served as a moderator were related to the interview and interviewer, not the organization.

Although some individual differences appeared to moderate the effect of interview structure on the dependent measures, no clear pattern was observed to indicate that certain types of subjects would prefer a structured interview. It is possible that there are other individual difference variables besides those
investigated here that moderate the effect of interview structure. One possible variable that should receive attention in future research is the belief about the validity of the interview. For example, if some applicants lack faith in the validity of the interview, then these applicants may prefer a structured interview. It would be interesting to measure the types of interviewing experiences (e.g., prior experience with biased questions) individuals have had and their reactions to them prior to their participation in an interview structure study. Future research should address a broader range of personality variables, and other demographic, historical, and opinion variables.

An alternative possible explanation for the lack of individual difference findings is that the manipulation of interview structure was so strong that it overwhelmed the effect of any individual differences. That is, extreme levels of structure were provided in this experiment, and individual difference measures possibly could have more impact if more moderate levels of interview structure had been presented. Future studies should examine potential individual difference moderators of interview structure using weaker interview structure manipulations.

Overall, the results of study 1 failed to confirm the person-organization congruency hypothesis, but provided strong support for the notion that the structured interview harms recruiting outcomes. Furthermore, interview structure impacted recruiting outcomes both when job and organization information were provided and when this information was absent, although the effect of structure was more pronounced in the latter condition than in the former condition. Finally, only minimal support for individual difference moderators of interview structure was found.
Study 2

The results from the first study provide support for interview structure influencing recruiting outcomes. Because several aspects of interview structure were intentionally confounded in the first experiment, one is left with the question of what is it about the structured interview that influences recruiting outcomes. As discussed earlier, there are many characteristics of the structured interview (Gilliland, 1993; Dipboye & Gaugler, 1992). A second study was independently conducted to examine the relative influence of four interview attributes that appear to be the most salient of the structured interview; job-relatedness of questions, standardization of questions, applicant voice, and interviewer warmth. The goal of this study was to determine which attributes of interview structure play a role in recruiting outcomes. It is hypothesized that the interview and organizational attractiveness will be rated more favorably if interviews are high in voice, job-relatedness, consistency, and warmth.

Method

Subjects

Subjects consisted of 44 psychology undergraduate students at the University of Houston. Seventeen subjects were male and twenty-five were female (two subjects did not indicate gender), with a mean age of 25.4 years (standard deviation 5.70).

Study Design

The study is a within subject four factor, two level design resulting in 16 conditions. The independent variables include four characteristics of interviews;
question standardization, job relevance of questions, applicant voice, and interviewer warmth and friendliness. Subjects were presented with information on 16 companies. Subjects were told that they had recently interviewed with 16 companies and they were forming their impressions of those companies. In each company scenario the four conditions were presented in varying levels and orders. All conditions were randomized such that the sixteen companies consisted all possible combinations of low and high levels for each of the four conditions. The presentation of the interview characteristic cues were also randomized such that applicants did not read about the interview characteristics in any systematic order.

**Description of Independent Variables**

An attempt was made to control for social desirability for all of the independent variables. However, it should be noted that in the presentation of independent variables representing attributes of structure, a greater number of occurrences of the word "not" appeared in the text.

**Question Standardization**

**High Level:** In the high level of this factor subjects read that the particular company asked the same questions of all applicants and the questions were not designed for them as individuals.

**Low Level:** In the low level of this factor subjects read that the particular company tailored the interview to them as individuals and dealt with specifics of their backgrounds and history.

**Job-Relevance of Questions**

**High Level:** In the high level of this factor subjects read that the particular company asked only job related questions. They read that the interviewer did not
ask any questions about personal hobbies, interests, or friends and family. Additionally, subjects read that the interviewer asked a set of questions which were only related to the knowledge, skills, and abilities that were necessary to perform the job.

**Low Level:** In the low level of this factor subjects read that the particular company asked questions relating to personality, interests and hobbies. They further read that the interviewer tried to get a general picture of applicants as people rather than only discussing the knowledge, skills, and abilities as relevant for the job.

**Applicant Voice**

**High Level:** In the high level of this factor subjects read that a particular company allowed plenty of time for the applicant to raise topics and ask questions not covered previously.

**Low Level:** In the low level of this factor subjects read that a particular interviewer did not ask if the applicant had any questions, nor did the interviewer allow an opportunity for the applicant to raise further issues and topics which were not discussed.

**Interviewer Warmth and Friendliness**

**High Level:** In the high level of this factor subjects read that a particular interviewer presented and warm and friendly style.

**Low Level:** In the low level of this factor subjects read that a particular interviewer was neutral and impersonal.
Description of Dependent Measures

Interview Procedure Fairness: Subjects rated on scale of 1 (low) to 7 (high) how fair they believed the interview process was.

Likelihood of offer acceptance: Subjects rated on a scale of 1 (low) to 7 (high) how likely they would be to accept an offer with a particular company.

Company Attractiveness: Subjects rated on a scale of 1 (low) to 7 (high) how attractive a particular company would be to work for.

Accuracy of process: Subjects rated on a scale of 1 (low) to 7 (high) how accurate the interview process is in determining which applicants are qualified to perform the job.

Overall company rating: Subjects rated on a scale of 1 (low) to 7 (high) overall how they would rate a particular interview.

Procedure

Subjects participated in the study in exchange for a lecture on the employment interview. The study was conducted with members of two psychology classes at the University of Houston. The experimenter instructed subjects to read the documents they were given carefully and to take their time in reaching their impressions. The process was for subjects to read the scenario for each company and then immediately afterwards, answer five questions concerning their perceptions of the company. The order of cues and companies were randomized. Subjects proceeded reading the scenario for the next company and answering the same five questions. Following their completion, these documents
were collected from subjects. Subjects were debriefed and given a lecture on employment interviewing (See Appendix B for all stimulus materials).

Results

Dependent Measures

Two composite dependent measures were created from the five questions that subjects were asked about each company. The first dependent measure composite was related to perceptions of the interview (interview perceptions), and was formed by taking the mean of the following three questions: "How fair do you feel the interview procedure was?", "Do you think the type of interview procedure used by this company would be accurate in determining which applicants were qualified to perform the job?", and "Overall, how would you evaluate this interview?". The coefficient alpha for the interview perceptions composite measure was .94. The second dependent measure was organizational attractiveness and it was computed by taking the mean of the following two questions: "How likely would you be to accept an offer with this company?", and "How attractive would this company be to work for on the basis of your experience with the company during the employment interview?". The coefficient alpha for the organizational attractiveness composite was .94.

Descriptive Statistics

The mean for the dependent measure of interview perceptions was 4.24 with a standard deviation of 1.61. The mean for the dependent measure of organizational attractiveness was 4.31 with a standard deviation of 1.63. A correlation matrix of the independent and dependent variables is presented in
table 16. The correlation between interview perceptions and organizational attractiveness was .89 (p < .0001).

Main Findings

Repeated measures analysis was conducted in order to determine the attributes of structured and unstructured interviewing formats that have an effect of applicant perceptions. Table 17 presents the means by conditions as well as tests of significance. The results demonstrate that features of the unstructured interview are seen as more favorable than features of the structured interview. The interviews were rated significantly more positively when subjects read that interview questions were not standardized, the interviewer was warm, and the applicant had high voice. Similarly, subjects were more attracted to the organization when they read that the interviewer asked non-job-relevant questions, the questions were not standardized, the interviewer was warm, and the applicant had high voice.

In order to investigate the relative effects of voice, warmth, job-relatedness of questions, and question standardization on the dependent measures of interview perceptions and organizational attractiveness, two regression analyses were conducted. The regression of interview perceptions on all four independent variables yielded an R² of .29 (F(4, 699)=69.74, p < .0001). The standardized partial regression coefficients for job-relatedness of questions, warmth, voice, and question standardization were, respectively, .05 (ns), .17 (p < .0001), .48 (p < .0001), and .15 (p < .0001). Applicant voice had the most influence on interview perceptions followed by interviewer warmth and question standardization. Job-relevance of questions did not influence ratings of interview perceptions. The
Correlation Matrix of Independent and Dependent Variables for Study 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Interview Perceptions</th>
<th>Organizational Attractiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job relevance of questions</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.10**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question standardization</td>
<td>.15**</td>
<td>.16**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant voice</td>
<td>.48**</td>
<td>.49**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewer warmth</td>
<td>.16**</td>
<td>.18**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05  
** p < .01  
Levels representing the structured interview are coded as 1, levels representing the unstructured interview are coded as 2. 
Thus, positive correlations favor characteristics of the unstructured interview.
Table 17
Means of Dependent Measures for All Manipulated Variables and Univariate Tests of Significance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLE</th>
<th>MEANS FOR HIGH JOB RELEVANCE</th>
<th>MEANS FOR LOW JOB RELEVANCE</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>F VALUE</th>
<th>P VALUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interview Perceptions</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>1, 43</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>.4258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Attractiveness</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>1, 43</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>.0444</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLE</th>
<th>MEANS FOR HIGH STANDARDIZATION</th>
<th>MEANS FOR LOW STANDARDIZATION</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>F VALUE</th>
<th>P VALUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interview Perceptions</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>1, 43</td>
<td>20.17</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Attractiveness</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>1, 43</td>
<td>23.19</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLE</th>
<th>MEANS FOR HIGH VOICE</th>
<th>MEANS FOR LOW VOICE</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>F VALUE</th>
<th>P VALUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interview Perceptions</td>
<td>5.01</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>1, 43</td>
<td>121.41</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Attractiveness</td>
<td>5.11</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>1, 43</td>
<td>105.98</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLE</th>
<th>MEANS FOR HIGH WARMTH</th>
<th>MEANS FOR LOW WARMTH</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>F VALUE</th>
<th>P VALUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interview Perceptions</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>1, 43</td>
<td>33.22</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Attractiveness</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>1, 43</td>
<td>37.29</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
regression of organizational attractiveness on all four independent variables yielded an $R^2$ of .31 ($F(4, 699) = 77.19, p < .0001$). The standardized partial regression coefficients for job-relatedness of questions, warmth, voice, and question standardization were, respectively, .10 ($p < .01$), .18 ($p < .0001$), .49 ($p < .0001$), and .16 ($p < .0001$). Applicant voice had the most influence on organizational attractiveness followed by interviewer warmth, question standardization, and job-relevance of questions.

**Interaction Effects**

For both dependent measures, interview perceptions and organizational attractiveness, an interaction effect was found for question standardization and voice. This interaction was significant for both interview perceptions ($F(1, 43) = 7.65, p < .01$) and organizational attractiveness ($F(1, 43) = 4.29, p < .05$). For both dependent measures of interview perceptions and organizational attractiveness, subjects in the low voice condition rated their interview perceptions as more favorable when they read that the questions were low in standardization. Subjects in the high voice condition also rated the interview more favorably when questions were low in standardization versus high in standardization. However, this effect was more pronounced when subjects were in the high voice condition (figures 20 and 21 present the interaction plots).

**Discussion**

**Main Findings**

The results from this study indicate that when subjects are given attributes from an unstructured interview as part of the interview process, their perceptions
Interaction Effect of Voice and Question Standardization on the Dependent Measure of Interview Perceptions
Figure 21

Interaction Effect of Voice and Question Standardization on the Dependent Measure of Organizational Attractiveness
of the interview and organization are more favorable. Based on the research (as discussed in study 1) one would expect that some attributes of a structured interview would lead to favorable recruiting outcomes, such as consistency and job-relatedness. The findings of study 2 do not support this contention. When questions were lacking in job-relatedness, subjects rated organizational attractiveness as higher than when questions were strictly job related. Similarly, when subjects read that question standardization was low, they rated the interview and organizational attractiveness higher than when they read that question standardization was high. Consistent with previous research, when subjects read that applicants had high voice and interviewers were warm and friendly, they rated the interview and organizational attractiveness higher than when applicants were low in voice and interviewers were low in warmth and friendliness.

Applicant voice had the most influence on organizational attractiveness followed by interviewer warmth, question standardization, and job-relevance of questions. This is consistent with findings that job candidates feel fairly treated when they have the opportunity to fully present their "case" to interviewers (i.e., voice) Bies (1986). Previous findings would also suggest that interviewer warmth would play a large role in recruiting outcomes. Beis (1986) found that candidates focus on the interpersonal treatment that they receive during a job interview irrespective of whether or not they are offered a job. The fact that voice and warmth were the two most salient features of the interview for subjects in the current study confirms past research and provides further support for the argument that the structured interview may harm recruiting outcomes.
There was a significant interaction effect of voice and question standardization on both dependent measures of interview perceptions and organizational attractiveness. Interview perceptions and organizational attractiveness were rated as more favorable when subjects read that there was low standardization of questions than when there was high standardization of questions. However, this effect was more pronounced when subjects read that the applicant had high voice. Perhaps, when subjects read that the applicant had low voice, the impact of question standardization was not perceived as very large because the applicant did not have ample opportunity to present him/herself in the first place. That is, if an applicant has low voice, he/she will have little opportunity to impact the impression of the interviewer. If there is little opportunity for impact, it does not matter that questions are standardized because the impression the applicant can portray has already been stifled by lack of voice.

Attributes of Interview Structure

The procedural justice literature provides a basis for understanding how structured interview characteristics may be perceived. Researchers (Leventhal, 1980; Arvey & Sackett, 1993; Iles & Robert, 1989; Schmitt, Gilliland, Landis & Devine, 1993; Reilly, et al. 1993; Kluger & Rothstein, 1991) have argued that procedures are perceived as fairer when they are job relevant. Contrary to this position, however, subjects in this study rated organizational attractiveness significantly higher when interviewers did not ask strictly job-relevant questions. It may be that the typical applicant may view questions relating to personality and outside interests as job-relevant and may expect questions on these factors. Job-relevant questions as defined in this study and in structured interviews such as the
situational interview are developed strictly on the basis of a job analysis and are restricted to specific job related dimensions. Subjects in this experiment, and possibly applicants, may perceive an interview that is structured as overly narrow and incapable of revealing their unique qualifications.

Also contrary to past research (Gilliland, 1993; Gomez-Mejia & Balkin, 1987; Murphy, et al, 1990), subjects rated the organizational attractiveness and the interview more favorably when the interviewer was described as having a non-standardized set of questions as opposed to a standardized question set. Again, the findings of this study suggest that applicants prefer a set of questions that address specifics of their individual backgrounds as opposed to a list of questions. Additionally, applicants may not be aware of the consistency of administration as they do not have an opportunity to observe interviews with other applicants.

Strong support was found for the hypothesis that procedures with a high degree of voice and control will be perceived more positively than those with a low degree of voice and control (Arvey & Sackett, 1993; Schuler, 1993; Thibaut & Walker, 1975; Greenberg, 1986; Kluger & Rothstein, 1991; Greenberg & Folger, 1983; LaTour, 1978; Lind, et al., 1980). These findings not only support previous research and theory, but also are consistent with recent theorizing of Bies and his colleagues (1986) on interactional justice. Organizational attractiveness and interview perceptions were rated more favorably by subjects when they read that the applicant was given plenty of time to raise topics and ask questions as opposed to when the applicant did not have this opportunity. Moreover, the largest difference in the means was observed for high versus low applicant voice as opposed to job-relevance, question standardization, and warmth. Regression
analyses also indicate that applicant voice is the most salient of the four interview characteristics that were manipulated. The effect of warmth and friendliness was second to that of voice. These findings are consistent with past research showing that applicants rate organizational attractiveness and the interview more favorably when the interviewer is presented as warm and friendly (Schmitt & Coyle, 1976; Rynes, 1991).

The current study demonstrates that attributes of unstructured interviews positively influence recruiting outcomes. On the basis of job-relevance and consistency of administration, one would expect the structured interview to be rated more favorably on organizational attractiveness and interview perceptions. However, on the basis of applicant voice and interviewer warmth, one would expect the unstructured interview to be perceived more favorably. The current study proposed that applicant voice and interviewer warmth would overwhelm job-relevance and consistency of administration resulting in higher ratings of organizational attractiveness and interview perceptions when the interview is unstructured. Applicant voice and interviewer warmth were the most influential attributes of the interview for recruiting outcomes. Moreover, all four interview attributes of voice, warmth, job-relevance, and question standardization, influenced recruiting outcomes in the same direction.

**General Discussion**

The findings of studies 1 and 2 lead one to question the utility of the structured interview. Overall, the structured interview harms recruiting outcomes.
Moreover, when subjects read that specific attributes of the interview are structured they rate the interview and organization less favorably.

**Study Limitations and Future Research**

There are several limitations to the current research. Both studies were laboratory studies and the findings may not generalize to actual interview situations. Future studies should be conducted in which actual interviewers and applicants are used. A face to face interview situation may be viewed as very different from the paper and pencil method used in the current studies. Certainly, the media richness would be greater in an actual interview, and this may impact the effect of interview structure. Also, if subjects had experienced an actual person conducting an interview they may have identified with him/her in some way and not have rated the structured interview as unfavorably as they did. Additionally, all of the measures used in this study addressed behavioral intent. Actual behavior of applicants may be different in more realistic settings where job opportunities are perhaps limited.

Subjects in the current research viewed the interview experience as third parties. The pressure of performing and securing a job offer was not present for subjects. Rather, they read stimulus materials as outsiders to a situation and rendered judgments about a job, organization, and interview based upon their readings. In an actual interview situation, applicants may be more cautious in the judgments they make about organizations because these judgments have important implications for their futures.

Another limitation of the current research is that the manipulation of interview structure in this study was limited to high and low levels of structure.
Future research should address finer grades of interview structure to locate the actual point where interview structure has an impact on recruiting outcomes. The current research is also limited in that subjects did not have the visual cues of a face to face interview. For example, physical attractiveness and gender of the interviewer may play a role in how he/she is perceived. Future studies should address the impact of interview structure in the presence of visual cues.

A final point is that the impact of interview structure needs to be studied in the context of varying jobs. Both of the jobs used in the current research were white collar, fairly high status positions. The current research suggests that the unstructured interview is preferred in the context of these white collar jobs. Perhaps the structured interview would be more favorably received if it was presented in the context of blue collar or low status positions. Martin & Nagao (1989) found that job status moderated the impact of different interviewing styles on ratings of an interview. Specifically, subjects who interviewed for high status jobs rated a computerized interview format lower than subjects who interviewed for low status jobs.

It is clear from this research that more studies are needed to fully understand the role that the structured interview plays in recruiting. As discussed previously, researchers need to examine finer distinctions of interview structure in actual interview situations, numerous individual difference measures that have not been investigated, the structured interview in the context of varying jobs, and factors that may mediate or moderate the impact of interview structure.
Practical Implications

Both studies provide evidence for the contention that interview structure influences recruiting outcomes. The first study demonstrates an overall effect of interview structure on several dependent measures concerning the interviewer, organization, and job. The second study demonstrates that specific attributes of the structured interview, namely, applicant voice, interviewer warmth, question standardization and job-relatedness of questions influence impressions about the interview and organizational attractiveness.

Because of empirical evidence demonstrating that structured interviews are more valid (Wiesner & Cronshaw, 1988), organizations may be inclined to develop structured interview selection procedures. This study demonstrates that the use of a structured interview may have harmful effects on recruiting outcomes. Does this mean that practitioners should eliminate the structured interview from their selection procedures? It appears that at the very least some balance should be achieved between predictive validity and recruiting outcomes. The utility of the structured interview is certainly questionable if a reduction in acceptances of job offers is observed when using the structured interview. However, predictive validity is crucial for any selection program. Perhaps a semi-structured interviewing approach is more desirable. In this way features of both the structured and unstructured interview may be incorporated into the selection system. A semi-structured interview would allow for moderately high predictive validity and perhaps a favorable rate of job offer acceptance. Another possibility to aid recruiting is to use two interviews; one designed strictly for prediction, and the other a more informal question and answer period designed to meet the needs
of applicants. Such a procedure may mitigate the negative impact of the structured interview while maintaining high predictive validity. Although more costly, this approach may have more utility than a one-sided approach as employees may be more effective.

Use of the structured interview would also depend on labor market statistics such as selection ratio and job demand. If applicants are plentiful and the job is highly desirable then recruiters may be less concerned with enticing applicants than they are with selecting those who are most suitable. However, if applicants are scarce and the job is not clearly desirable then perhaps a structured interview would lessen the quality of the applicants who would accept job offers.

Cross-cultural issues should also be considered when developing selection procedures. The current research was conducted with Americans who perhaps were raised in a more individualistic society than people from other cultures. For example, in Asian cultures employees are encouraged to perform for the collective well-being of the organization, whereas individual achievements are often rewarded in America. The effect of interview structure on recruiting outcomes may differ in other cultures and societies. This is important for multi-national organizations to consider and should be addressed in future research.

It is clear that practitioners need to be informed about the potential repercussions of using a structured interview on recruiting outcomes. In this way they can assess the labor market, organization, and job attractiveness to determine the best procedure for a specific job and organization. The effectiveness of a selection procedure must be judged on more than its predictive validity. Recruiting outcomes should also be an important factor when developing selection
processes. It appears that use of the structured interview needs to be carefully considered and managed on the basis of specific issues facing an individual organization as opposed to identifying general trends and proposing sweeping recommendations.

The current research demonstrates that interview structure negatively influences recruiting outcomes in the laboratory. The effect of interview structure may be even stronger in the field where there are actual consequences for applicants who accept job offers. Specifically, applicants who experience structured interviews in an actual interview setting may be more negative in their judgments about an organization because their impressions will influence employment decisions. The author observed a large American management consulting firm that developed a structured interview selection procedure experienced a decrease of 27% in applicant job offer acceptances.

The results of the current research indicate that organizations should be concerned about using structured interviews and may need to be creative in maintaining positive recruiting outcomes. This is an early study of the impact of interview structure on recruiting outcomes. Hopefully, future work would present a clearer picture to practitioners for managing the selection recruiting balance. As a result of the current research, it is evident that practitioners need to be informed and cautious when using structured interviews and anticipate solutions for attaining positive recruiting outcomes.
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APPENDIX A

All Stimulus Materials for Study 1
You have just received your college degree and are considering employment opportunities. One company you have decided to interview with is described on the following pages. You will read a description of the job, three interview transcripts conducted by the same interviewer for three different candidates, and an organization description. Consider yourself to be an applicant selecting an organization to work for. At the end of these descriptions, you will be asked a series of questions about the job and the organization. Please answer all of the questions honestly. All of your responses will only be seen by researchers so there is no motivation to answer in any particular manner. Please be as open and candid in your responses as possible. Your responses are completely anonymous.

The characteristics of the job are described on the following page.
Job Description

You may assume that you are qualified to perform the following job which is described below. You may also assume that this is a job for which you have taken the relevant coursework.

- This job requires that you work mostly with people in a profession that assists others with their problems.

- This job requires that you work directly with clients to assist them in their needs.

- This job requires a large amount of social skill, communication skills, interpersonal interaction, and interest in others.

- This job requires that you work very closely with clients. Client interaction comprises most of the employees’ duties.

- This job is emotionally demanding because of the intense contact with clients.

- In this job people usually place the needs of others before their own personal needs.

- Assume that the salary and benefits for this job are within a range that is acceptable to you.
Job Description

You may assume that you are qualified to perform the following job which is described below. You may also assume that this is a job for which you have taken the relevant coursework.

- This job requires that you work mostly with data.
- This job requires you to have a great deal of analytical ability. That is, you will have to synthesize information in order to solve problems.
- This job requires that you work to find solutions to problems through analyzing data.
- This job requires that you work directly with facts and files to obtain data.
- This job requires that you present results of analyses in order for the company to make policy changes.
- This job is intellectually demanding and challenging.
- Assume that the salary and benefits for this job are within a range that is acceptable to you.
On the following page, the organization with which you are interviewing is described.
Organization Description

This organization demands a high standard of performance. Employees are given high profile projects in which they have the opportunity to add a lot of value. The atmosphere tends to be competitive, and members try to influence and direct each other by expressing their opinions forcefully. The environment of this organization is exciting, challenging, and risky. This organization has a formal, business orientation where employees get a lot accomplished. Promotions are based upon individual performance and give employees access to high status positions. Those meeting or exceeding performance standards are rewarded handsomely with bonuses and promotions. The jobs at this organization are designed to give employees a high level of responsibility, variety, and significance.
Organization Description

This organization provides a nurturing environment where the consequences for making errors is minimal. Organization members do not feel pressure to compete with each other. The environment of this organization is relatively unstressful and organization members work together cooperatively. The atmosphere is a family orientation where the organization provides a nurturing environment. Employees typically work in teams and help each other to develop. Promotions at this organization are based as much upon seniority and "fit" as on merit. Work is designed to encourage cooperation with others rather than competition between employees. There are very few status distinctions among employees in order to promote cooperation. Rewards are based on group performance rather than on individual performance to encourage teamwork and cooperation.
While you were waiting outside the recruiter's office for your interview, you overheard segments of the interviews for three other applicants. The following pages are transcripts of the interview segments you overheard. **These are pieces of three thirty minute interviews** that you overheard while waiting outside the interviewers office.
(STRUCTURED INTERVIEW TRANSCRIPTS)

Interview 1 Transcript

Interviewer: I am going to ask you a series of questions to evaluate your qualifications. Please do not interrupt me or ask any questions. I will ask all applicants the same series of questions. I am not permitted to change the wording of the questions or ask any questions other than those on the list. If you do not understand a question, you can ask me to repeat it, but I cannot engage in any other conversation. These questions are designed to evaluate requirements of the job for which you have applied. Let me begin with the first question.

Interviewer: Describe a past experience you have had in a previous job in which you had to work directly with clients or customers.

Applicant: When I was in college, I was working on an internship with a group of students. We had to get survey information from organization members. In order for us to get all of the necessary information we had to work directly with employees. We had to impress upon them how important it was for them to provide us with the information we needed. I was very successful in communicating with them and got all the necessary information.

Interviewer: This job requires extensive client contact. How strong are your social skills?

Applicant: I believe that I am very socially skilled. I was the activities director at a summer camp and have served on many committees in my university. I feel I am a social person and get along well with others. I enjoy interacting socially and working with people.

Interviewer: Describe a situation in which you had to convince a person that your point of view was superior to his/her point of view.

Applicant: I'm sorry, I didn't understand the question.

Interviewer: Describe a situation in which you had to convince a person that your point of view was superior to his/her point of view.

Applicant: I took a debate course in college. In the course we were paired with another student debater to present two sides of an argument. The class voted on the more convincing debater. My topic was funding for the arts foundation. I argued against such funding, while the other debater I was paired with argued for the funding. We were both well prepared for the debate so it was a very challenging assignment. I managed to convince the professor and the class that my point of view was superior. The professor
said that I presented myself and information well. He also said that my communication skills were excellent.

**Interviewer:** Describe a past work experience where you have demonstrated an interest in helping others and shown a compassion for others.

**Applicant:** My sophomore year in college I volunteered at a local phone counseling center. My job was to take calls from people who were distressed. We were trained to talk to people in a non-judgmental way and do the best we could to help them with their problems. I volunteered for about 6 hours a week and was able to help a total of 25 or so people. People would usually call with problems ranging from their family to work, or school. I would just talk to them and try to help as best I could. I did not receive credit for doing this, it was strictly on a volunteer basis. I feel that the experience really helped me to understand others and communicate well. I was able to help a lot of people.

**Interviewer:** Sometimes employees have to deal with clients who are dissatisfied or angry. How would you handle a situation where a client was displeased with our service and very angry?

**Applicant:** I would try to calm the client down. I would offer him or her whatever I was allowed to in order to make him or her happier. I would not raise my voice or yell back at the client. I would try to be as nice as possible and see things from his or her point of view. I certainly would not become angry or impatient. I would let him or her speak about the problem as much as they wanted. I would try and find a solution to the problem. I would take responsibility to see that the matter was solved and that we did not lose the person as a client. If all else had failed I would have my superior give me some advice on how to handle the situation and what other measures I could take. What type of policy does your company have for dealing with angry clients?

**Interviewer:** Describe a past work related event in which you suppressed your own personal needs to help another person in need.

**Applicant:** When I was in college I was working on a research team for a class project. There were five project members and we all had to do a certain percentage of the work. It was during finals and one of the project members got sick. I had four finals that year and was very busy studying. If this project member who got sick did not complete the course he would have received an incomplete and may not have graduated on time. I took on his part of the assignment so that we could all finish the project and he could graduate on time. The project went well and we all got good grades.

**Interviewer:** We have offices throughout the U.S.. What geographic area would you want to work in?
Applicant: I am pretty much open to any major city. Where are your head quarters?

Interviewer: Describe a situation in which you showed initiative to accomplish a goal.

Applicant: Do you mean in school or on an internship?

Interviewer: Describe a situation in which you showed initiative to accomplish a goal.

Applicant: Well, when I was in school I started a social club with about 15 students where we would meet once a week to discuss current issues in the dorm and how we could improve student life. We would make suggestions and meet with resident associates to voice our concerns and complaints. I showed a lot of initiative in organizing the club and presenting information to resident associates. Through the club, the students helped to make changes in the policies that governed our dorms. We had several accomplishments, such as, getting access to certain entertainments and organizing parties. It was actually a very enjoyable activity. All of the students involved seemed to like it a lot.

Interview: Describe a situation in which you . . .

The interview continued for the remainder of the 30 minute period.
Interview 2 Transcript

**Interviewer:** I am going to ask you a series of questions to evaluate your qualifications. Please do not interrupt me or ask any questions. I will ask all applicants the same series of questions. I am not permitted to change the wording of the questions or ask any questions other than those on the list. If you do not understand a question, you can ask me to repeat it, but I cannot engage in any other conversation. These questions are designed to evaluate requirements of the job for which you have applied. Let me begin with the first question.

**Interviewer:** Describe a past experience you have had in a previous job in which you had to work directly with clients or customers.

**Applicant:** I had a sales position in my senior year and constantly had to work with customers. I had to answer questions about the product and handle returns and complaints. I was very friendly toward them and did well in my job. It was a busy store so it was a lot to manage.

**Interviewer:** This job requires extensive client contact. How strong are your social skills?

**Applicant:** I think my social skills are good. As I mentioned I worked in sales and you often have to sense what the customer wants and answer questions they may have about your store or product. I think people enjoy talking with me about products and I'm usually very eager to help.

**Interviewer:** Describe a situation in which you had to convince a person that your point of view was superior to his/her point of view.

**Applicant:** Pardon me, I don't understand the question.

**Interviewer:** Describe a situation in which you had to convince a person that your point of view was superior to his/her point of view.

**Applicant:** In my sales job I often had to convince people to buy the right product for them. It was a pet store and people were often not very knowledgeable about the products they actually needed. Sometimes people would come into the store and buy the wrong product for their needs. I had to convince them that they needed a different product. For some people this was very difficult because they felt like they had already decided what they needed and didn't need me to tell them. I felt I had an obligation though not to let them buy the wrong thing. Customers often thanked me for informing them and they bought the right product. There were always a few customers who didn't
agree with me, but for the most part customers really appreciated that I provided my input. I enjoy working with people to help them reach a decision.

Interviewer: Describe a past work experience where you have demonstrated an interest in helping others and shown a compassion for others.

Applicant: You mean where I have tried to help somebody in need?

Interviewer: Describe a past work experience where you have demonstrated an interest in helping others and shown a compassion for others.

Applicant: During my junior year I, with a group of friends, started a club in my dorm to help disadvantaged children. We organized about 30 students on campus to conduct a fund raiser and invite speakers to talk about ways to help the cause. I devoted about 10 hours per week for the entire year to see that the project was successful and that the students were able to make a least a small difference. We collected over $5,000 in donations from private citizens, organizations, and many businesses. It was well worth the effort. I feel like our group was really able to provide assistance. We also set up some younger students with all of our information so that the project may be carried on after we left school. Does your organization have any formalized charity groups?

Interviewer: Sometimes employees have to deal with clients who are dissatisfied or angry. How would you handle a situation where a client was displeased with our service and very angry?

Applicant: I would try to understand the problem before I attempted to solve it. I would ask the client exactly what had happened. I would collect all of the events that occurred so that I had the entire picture. I would then ask people in the organization if the events had happened and how they would describe the situation. I would try to calm the client down and explain that we would reach a solution that he or she approved of. After figuring out how the problem happened I would offer potential solutions to the client and ask him or her to select the one they thought was best. I would try and have us work through the problem together so that the client felt that they were being listened to and included in the process. Hopefully, we would reach an agreement and the client would be pleased. Ideally, that client would return to continue service with the organization.

Interviewer: Describe a past work related event in which you suppressed your own personal needs to help another person in need.

Applicant: I was working on a project that was really important to me in my last internship. I needed to complete it before I left in order to receive a good recommendation and learn the things I had intended to. My supervisor informed me that
we had another project that was less interesting but really needed to be done. She said that I didn’t have to do it and she would understand if I didn’t want to. It took me four months of work to get assigned to my current project that was really exciting. Well, I put the needs of the organization before my own and decided to work on the higher priority project. I never did complete my other project and regret not having that experience. I would still make the same choice though as I feel that the need to do the other project quickly was more important than to fulfill my own needs and interests.

**Interviewer:** We have offices throughout the U.S.. What geographic area would you want to work in?

**Applicant:** I would prefer Chicago or New York.

**Interviewer:** Describe a situation in which you showed initiative to accomplish a goal.

**Applicant:** Any situation?

**Interviewer:** Describe a situation in which you showed initiative to accomplish a goal.

**Applicant:** I showed a lot of initiative when I became dorm representative for my college. First I had to campaign a lot to get the votes of the students. This took a lot of time and effort. I had to meet with many students. I had to tell them my views on issues and convince them that I was right for the job. It was very time consuming especially with classes and everything. My hard work paid off and I was voted in to represent the students. While I served the students I was able to accomplish a lot. I had to work with school representatives as well as other students. Sometimes I had to motivate others to become interested in an issue. It took a lot of energy and initiative to change things that needed to be changed. I think it was a very valuable experience.

**Interview:** Describe a situation in which you . . .

The interview continued for the remainder of the 30 minute period.
Interview 3 Transcript

Interviewer: I am going to ask you a series of questions to evaluate your qualifications. Please do not interrupt me or ask any questions. I will ask all applicants the same series of questions. I am not permitted to change the wording of the questions or ask any questions other than those on the list. If you do not understand a question, you can ask me to repeat it, but I cannot engage in any other conversation. These questions are designed to evaluate requirements of the job for which you have applied. Let me begin with the first question.

Interviewer: Describe a past experience you have had in a previous job in which you had to work directly with clients or customers.

Applicant: I worked as a waiter during my sophomore and junior years in college. It was a very busy job where I was constantly dealing with customers. Sometimes the food at this place was not very good and people would complain to me often. I tried to be as nice as possible. I was always very busy and customers are always very individual in what they want. I always had to take special care to meet their needs and I did my best to make sure that they were pleased with our service. I was the one who had direct customer contact because the waiter in a restaurant is the person you see the most, not the chef or the hostess. I knew this so I did my best to impress the customer.

Interviewer: This job requires extensive client contact. How strong are your social skills?

Applicant: I feel that my social skills are really strong. Its one of my main strengths. I enjoy social events and working with people. I think that I am very good at it. I like to be in situations where social skills are a benefit.

Interviewer: Describe a situation in which you had to convince a person that your point of view was superior to his/her point of view.

Applicant: I took a course in college that was very difficult. I performed exceptionally on all of the exams up until the final. The final exam was completely subjective and all essay. When I did not receive as high a grade as I thought was appropriate I went to see the professor. She said she had not changed a grade ever in her career but would re-read my essay if I liked. I asked her to read it with an open mind. When she completed reading she said that she still would not give me a higher grade. I asked her the specifics of her grading policy and why she felt my essay was not exceptional. We went through my essay point by point for two hours. At the end of the session she agreed with me. She said that my arguments convinced her that I deserved a higher grade. She changed my grade and that is the only grade she had ever changed. I think that if you just explain specifics to people in a clear manner they often see your point of view.
Interviewer: Describe a past work experience where you have demonstrated an interest in helping others and shown a compassion for others.

Applicant: When I was working as a waiter there was another student working at the same restaurant who was having a hard time paying for tuition, attending class, and managing to keep up in general. The manager said that he was going to fire the other student because he did not show up on time for work often and our service was suffering. I asked the manager if he could decrease the student's number of required working hours if I could take the extra hours. The manager said he didn't know why I would want to do such a thing especially since I was pretty busy in my junior year and all. I said I would do it if it was fine with him. The manager said it was fine and I took on an extra shift. The other student didn't get fired and managed to make it through all of his classes. We became good friends later.

Interviewer: Sometimes employees have to deal with clients who are dissatisfied or angry. How would you handle a situation where a client was displeased with our service and very angry?

Applicant: First, I would be sensitive to the client's feelings. I would be aware of the fact that the client has probably suffered and is not pleased to be going through the hassle. I would then also realize that the problem may have been caused by one of our employees so I would take responsibility rather than place blame on the client. I would check up on our policy regarding the incident and do my best to make sure that the client was compensated for whatever problem he or she had encountered. I would try and maintain the relationship with the client so that we didn't lose the client. I think long term relationships are really important to preserve.

Interviewer: Describe a past work related event in which you suppressed your own personal needs to help another person in need.

Applicant: Do you mean where I put the needs of others before my own?

Interviewer: Describe a past work related event in which you suppressed your own personal needs to help another person in need.

Applicant: I did volunteer work while I was in college for the homeless. Although I received no credit or reward for this activity, I participated extensively in the cause. My grade point average may have been higher if I had not done this volunteer work. I devoted 8 hours a week to working at a shelter. I felt as though it was the right thing to do even if it meant that I might receive a lower grade in some of my courses. It would have been much easier for me to just do my own school work, but working there gave me
a sense of benefiting others. I continued to work there for some time and plan on doing some volunteer work after I get settled in a job.

**Interviewer:** We have offices throughout the U.S.. What geographic area do you want to work in?

**Applicant:** Preferably Boston, are your main offices in Boston?

**Interviewer:** Describe a situation in which you showed initiative to accomplish a goal.

**Applicant:** Initiative, hum.

**Interviewer:** Describe a situation in which you showed initiative to accomplish a goal.

**Applicant:** I think I am a motivator of others and show a lot of initiative in my extra-curricular activities. I am in the school band and I am also in the school theater group. It takes a lot of initiative to combine extra-curriculars and academics. In the theater group I have to audition for parts and convince people that I am the best person for the part. It's a very difficult task because everyone in the group is pretty talented. So I think I take initiative when I research a part and do my best at the audition. I often get very good parts. As I mentioned I also play in the band. I play the flute and it takes a lot of time to practice. Its very difficult to juggle all of my activities but I really enjoy all of them and think that it is good to have broad interests. So I would say that I show initiative often in managing all of these interests.

**Interview:** Describe a situation in which you . . .

The interview continued for the remainder of the 30 minute period.
Interview 1 Transcript

Interviewer: I am going to ask you a series of questions to evaluate your qualifications. Please do not interrupt me or ask any questions. I will ask all applicants the same series of questions. I am not permitted to change the wording of the questions or ask any questions other than those on the list. If you do not understand a question, you can ask me to repeat it, but I cannot engage in any other conversation. These questions are designed to evaluate requirements of the job for which you have applied. Let me begin with the first question.

Interviewer: Describe a past experience you have had in a previous job in which you had to work directly with data.

Applicant: Directly with data?

Interviewer: Describe a past experience you have had in a previous job in which you had to work directly with data.

Applicant: When I was in college, I worked as a research assistant for a professor. I had to enter the data, and collect it for this large project my professor was conducting. It was very detail oriented work because it would have been very bad to make any errors while entering or collecting the information. I was very careful though and did a good job. The professor wrote me a recommendation when I completed the project.

Interviewer: This job requires employees who are very good at analyzing problems. How strong is your analytical ability?

Applicant: I think my analytical skills are very good. I have always been interested in solving fact based problems and really enjoy logic questions. I think it is certainly one of my strengths. I have done very well in my classes that require a lot of analytics.

Interviewer: This position requires a great deal of problem solving through data analysis. Describe a situation in which you had to solve a problem through analyzing data.

Applicant: Do you mean at school or on an internship?

Interviewer: This position requires a great deal of problem solving through data analysis. Describe a situation in which you had to solve a problem through analyzing data.

Applicant: I worked in a department store part time during college in the payroll office. My duties were to figure out which checks had to be written and locate those that had been lost or misfiled. Very often employees would come in saying that their check was
the wrong amount or they had not received their check. It was my job to figure out what happened. I would have to go through records and files to trace the events of what occurred. I would have to then put all sorts of pieces of information together to figure out where the money went and what action needed to be taken. Sometimes this was very difficult because it would appear that there was no trace of an employee’s check. I would piece together information until I solved it and got the right check amount for the employee.

**Interviewer:** This job requires that you work with data and solve problems through analysis as opposed to working with clients, why do you feel you are well suited to do this kind of work?

**Applicant:** I prefer working with data and facts than with clients. In this way I know that everything is factual and logical. As long as you get the right data and appropriate documents you are able to solve a problem. Customers can often be irrational and difficult to work with. I like the straightforward nature of working with information that you can verify and is clear. I much prefer working directly with data to working with a client where things are sometimes difficult to read. I am very good with facts and figures. Does this job have any client interaction?

**Interviewer:** Describe a past experience where you have had to work with a large number of documents to compile them into a meaningful interpretation.

**Applicant:** Meaningful interpretation, like conclusions?

**Interviewer:** Describe a past experience where you have had to work with a large number of documents to compile them into a meaningful interpretation.

**Applicant:** As I mentioned earlier I worked in the payroll office for a department store. Everything that happened was documented numerous times. It was a very paper intensive office where everything was written three or four times. Sometimes this made it difficult to compile all the information. People would often fill out conflicting documents which made it difficult to figure out what actually happened. It was often my job to piece together the events. I would take all of these documents and go through them until I figured out the appropriate result. It was very intensive work and required a lot of attention to detail. I really enjoyed that job, and enjoyed working with facts and documents to find an answer to a question.

**Interviewer:** This job is very challenging and demanding of employees. Describe a previous experience where you were in a very challenging and demanding position.
Applicant: My job in the payroll office was both challenging and demanding. Because I was dealing with people's paychecks it was crucial that my solution be correct. Sometimes it was almost impossible to find the correct paper trail to solve the problem. I was always under time pressure to solve the problem because when our office made mistakes employees were very angry and wanted to see the problem solved as quickly as possible. I would have to keep up with all of my other work while solving a problem that could take several hours of my time. This made the job very demanding and required that I pay attention to all of the facts for any given situation. I feel like it was good training for future jobs.

Interviewer: We have offices throughout the U.S.. What geographic area would you want to work in?

Applicant: I am pretty much open to any major city. Where are your head quarters?

Interviewer: Describe a past work related event in which you made an error in recording a piece of information and found the error before it became a serious problem.

Applicant: Well, when I worked in the payroll office, there was one period where we had an enormous amount of work to do. It was very difficult to keep up with all of the documents we had to file. I tried to take a short cut so that we would finish on time, but it wasn't as clear as I had thought. I ended up recording several wrong pieces of information. When I figured out what needed to be done on the basis of the wrong information, I immediately recognized that it didn't appear to be correct. The inconsistencies seemed obvious to me. I knew that something had gone wrong. I traced my steps systematically to figure out how the analysis could have turned out the way it did. I went back over every little detail. When I examined the short cut I invented I realized that it was not perfect. I figured out how the errors were happening and corrected the situation before any wrong steps were taken. I think its important to always check your work.

Interview: Describe a situation in which you . . .

The interview continued for the remainder of the 30 minute period.


Interview 2 Transcript

Interviewer: I am going to ask you a series of questions to evaluate your qualifications. Please do not interrupt me or ask any questions. I will ask all applicants the same series of questions. I am not permitted to change the wording of the questions or ask any questions other than those on the list. If you do not understand a question, you can ask me to repeat it, but I cannot engage in any other conversation. These questions are designed to evaluate requirements of the job for which you have applied. Let me begin with the first question.

Interviewer: Describe a past experience you have had in a previous job in which you had to work directly with data.

Applicant: When I was in college, I took a research methods course in which we had to do a final project. The project was to be on any issue we wanted to research but our data collection and analysis methods were to be graded very strictly. I had to collect data from 200 surveys and enter all of the data into a file. I also had to analyze the data. I realize how important it is to be very careful when doing these sorts of tasks. Entering the data correctly was very important to the entire project. As a matter of fact, all parts of the project from collecting the data forward were very important. One has to be very alert when working with data.

Interviewer: This job requires employees who are very good at analyzing problems. How strong is your analytical ability?

Applicant: Do you mean overall?

Interviewer: This job requires employees who are very good at analyzing problems. How strong is your analytical ability?

Applicant: I have excellent analytic skills. Analytic tasks are the type that I enjoy the most. I love figuring out how to solve a problem from facts. I like solving problems and doing little puzzles. I've always been told by professors that I have good analytic skills.

Interviewer: This position requires a great deal of problem solving through data analysis. Describe a situation in which you had to solve a problem through analyzing data.

Applicant: As I mentioned, I did this research project while in college. After collecting and entering all the data I had to solve this problem and write a paper on it. I had to indicate how I solved the problem and why I reached the conclusions that I did. It was all based on facts and data which I liked. I was able to synthesize the data into a meaningful
interpretation and present it in my report. I received an A on the paper and in the course. It was the most outstanding research project by a student in the class.

**Interviewer:** This job requires that you work with data and solve problems through analysis as opposed to working with clients, why do you feel you are well suited to do this kind of work?

**Applicant:** I think that facts are easier to work with than people. People tend to give you one side of a story which is subjective. I much rather solve a problem through critical examination of facts to reach a solution. In this way, the answers are much clearer. Working with people you never know if they've given you the entire or correct facts so you always have to second guess. If it's all written down for you in some logical manner than it is much easier to work with. This is why I prefer working with data. I find it very direct and clear, something very difficult to say about people.

**Interviewer:** Describe a past experience where you have had to work with a large number of documents to compile them into a meaningful interpretation.

**Applicant:** I held a part time job while in college in the human resources office. I would have to process any paper work that came through our offices. Also, my office was responsible for solving any problems. I often received the problems first since I was the one who was processing most of the paper work. Some solutions were very difficult to reach because they involved so much back tracking to figure out what happened. We also dealt with a huge number of documents so just finding everything was a task in itself. I found solutions to many problems in that job and was very good at my job. I think I am a good problem solver. Is there large amount of documentation at your organization?

**Interviewer:** This job is very challenging and demanding of employees. Describe a previous experience where you were in a very challenging and demanding position.

**Applicant:** At school or in a job?

**Interviewer:** This job is very challenging and demanding of employees. Describe a previous experience where you were in a very challenging and demanding position.

**Applicant:** My job at the human resources office was very challenging and demanding. My superiors always wanted problems solved very quickly and accurately. There were serious consequences in that office for making mistakes. I felt like I was under a great deal of pressure to perform quickly. I liked the job though, and the responsibility I felt I had. I think challenging positions keep me interested and motivated.
Interviewer: We have offices throughout the U.S. What geographic area would you want to work in?

Applicant: I would prefer Chicago or New York.

Interviewer: Describe a past work related event in which you made an error in recording a piece of information and found the error before it became a serious problem.

Applicant: When I worked in the human resources office, our system was so complicated that things were always being filed incorrectly. We had this old system for doing things where everything had to be documented five times and then everything was supposed to match. With that kind of system it is very difficult to keep everything straight. One day I had filed two conflicting documents. My supervisor asked me how something like that could have happened. I went back and researched the error. I also wrote a report to recommend changes in the system that would make documentation easier and more efficient. I was glad that I made the error because it gave me the opportunity to research and revise the filing and documentation system we used. I think redundant systems sometimes do more harm than good because of the confusion they cause.

Interview: Describe a situation in which you . . .

The interview continued for the remainder of the 30 minute period.
Interview 3 Transcript

Interviewer: I am going to ask you a series of questions to evaluate your qualifications. Please do not interrupt me or ask any questions. I will ask all applicants the same series of questions. I am not permitted to change the wording of the questions or ask any questions other than those on the list. If you do not understand a question, you can ask me to repeat it, but I cannot engage in any other conversation. These questions are designed to evaluate requirements of the job for which you have applied. Let me begin with the first question.

Interviewer: Describe a past experience you have had in a previous job in which you had to work directly data.

Applicant: I had an internship when I was in college where I had to collect and enter forms for the university. It was data for 2500 students that I was responsible for so it was a large amount of data that I had to file and enter. I also had to develop the filing system and arrange the data so that it was accessible.

Interviewer: This job requires employees who are very good at analyzing problems. How strong is your analytical ability?

Applicant: I think my analytic skills are my strongest point. I like working directly with facts and analyzing potential solutions to problems. Analytics are something I am very strong in which is why I want to work in this position.

Interviewer: This position requires a great deal of problem solving through data analysis. Describe a situation in which you had to solve a problem through analyzing data.

Applicant: Solve an entire problem or a part of one?

Interviewer: This position requires a great deal of problem solving through data analysis. Describe a situation in which you had to solve a problem through analyzing data.

Applicant: In my internship at college I had to process a lot of information about students. We then had to do this tuition analysis and what tuition costs should include. I had to enter all of the fees, and costs to the university for various services. I then had to make recommendations for areas to increase and/or decrease student fees. It was a lot of data to analyze and a difficult problem with many different solutions. I made some recommendations which are still pending. Just working through the problem really gave me exposure to analyzing problems in the interest of finding solutions.
Interviewer: This job requires that you work with data and solve problems through analysis as opposed to working with clients, why do you feel you are well suited to do this kind of work?

Applicant: I like working with actual data as opposed to people. I think its clearer and faster than having to go through people and deal with all of their issues. I would much rather have someone give me all of the documents I need to solve a problem and then solve it. I think it is faster and more efficient than having to work through someone else. In this job, do employees ever have to collect information from people or do they receive documents to work from?

Interviewer: Describe a past experience where you have had to work with a large number of documents to compile them into a meaningful interpretation.

Applicant: The example I gave you earlier about working on the tuition project fits well here. I had to work with 2500 documents to figure out how to adjust tuition figures. Dealing with all of that data could have been overwhelming, but I found a systematic way to solve the problem. I entered the data in the optimal way so that I could analyze it and reach a meaningful conclusion. It was exciting while difficult. I'm glad to have had the opportunity to work on that kind of project.

Interviewer: This job is very challenging and demanding of employees. Describe a previous experience where you were in a very challenging and demanding position.

Applicant: Hum, challenging and demanding, there have been a few. Would you like a class situation or an internship situation?

Interviewer: This job is very challenging and demanding of employees. Describe a previous experience where you were in a very challenging and demanding position.

Applicant: My student internship was very demanding as well as challenging. Being a student, I knew how important the issue of tuition was. I wanted to be sure that my recommendations would be helpful and used. Because of this I had to be sure of all my facts and information. I was constantly having to verify and research facts. It was demanding because of the sheer amount of data that needed to be analyzed. There were so many issues to consider and compile. I used to stay late because I was so interested in the solution. As I said the project is still pending so I haven't heard anything about my recommendations yet. Also, I should mention that I was a double major. I found keeping up with both majors to be extremely challenging and demanding. I was required to take a lot of extra coursework, and keeping up during finals was the most demanding part of the year. I don't regret it though, I think it was really good practice.
**Interviewer:** We have offices throughout the U.S. What geographic area would you want to work in?

**Applicant:** I am pretty much open to any major city. Where are your head quarters?

**Interviewer:** Describe a past work related event in which you made an error in recording a piece of information and found the error before it became a serious problem.

**Applicant:** Actually, in my last semester in college when I was working on the tuition project I made an error in the cost figures. I added something that was should have been subtracted. Needless to say, an error like this one could have caused a lot of problems. I was lucky because before I ever hand anything I always go over two or three times. Even if I have figured it out on a computer I always go back and do random tests to make sure everything checks out. Well, because this project was so important I checked every component of the analyses. I found that I had added instead of subtracted when a figure looked too high. I had delayed writing the report because I wanted to check all my work first. I was glad that I did because the error would have caused a lot of problems for the entire office. Some people can't be bothered to check everything over. I always check everything twice if not three times. When you are dealing with a large amount of data, it is easy to make mistakes. The details can be hard to follow and one needs to be extremely careful. I think I am good at being careful and always double and triple checking. I will not risk getting the right answer by failing to double check. I certainly was glad I took the time to check my work on that project.

**Interview:** Describe a situation in which you . . .

The interview continued for the remainder of the 30 minute period.
Interview 1 Transcript

Interviewer: Hi there. Come on in and have a seat. My name is Brad Winters, I'll be interviewing you today. It certainly is a nice day out, isn't it?

Applicant: Yes, it's a great day for tennis.

Interviewer: Oh, do you play?

Applicant: A little, I really enjoy it though.

Interviewer: My daughter can't seem to get enough of tennis, she's trying to get our whole family to take lessons.

Applicant: It's a really fun sport, I've just started taking lessons.

Interviewer: Yes I think our whole family will be playing soon. So you went to Michigan State University, how did you like it?

Applicant: I liked it a lot. It's a really great school, a lot of fun too.

Interviewer: I was there once for a football game, it seemed like the students had a lot of spirit.

Applicant: Yes they really do especially about sports events. We take them pretty seriously out there. Where did you go to school?

Interviewer: I went to University of Vermont, it's really cold up there.

Applicant: How did you like it?

Interviewer: Oh, I loved it. It was a lot of fun. I'm originally from South Carolina so I wasn't ready for those harsh winters but I got used to it. I took up skiing and everything. They have some beautiful mountains, really wonderful.

Applicant: I enjoy skiing. I'm not that great at it but I always have a great time going on ski trips.

Interviewer: Yes it certainly is fun. Well I guess we should get started with the interview here. Let me just tell you first off that you should feel free to interrupt me with any questions that you may have or any information you feel I have forgotten. We don't need
to follow any particular format here, so you just let me know if I've missed anything. Why
don't we start out with you describing some of your strengths and weaknesses.

**Applicant:** Sure. On the strengths side, I think I can learn very quickly. Even if I am not
knowledgeable about an area I usually pick it up with no trouble at all. I also feel that I
am a very creative and innovative individual. I am always looking for new ways to
improve a process. I am a very committed and loyal individual. I would do my best to
ensure that the best possible job was done on any given assignment. I also love to work
with people. I think I get along very well with others. On the weaknesses side, I am often
impatient to see things completed quickly. Also, I sometimes expect too much of others
and can push too hard. I try to keep it under control though.

**Interviewer:** So you enjoy working with people, have you worked in a job with people
before?

**Applicant:** Yes, I worked as a customer service representative for a department store. I
really liked the interaction part of it. It gave me a lot of opportunity to work directly with
people and meeting their needs.

**Interviewer:** Oh yes, that's right. I see that here on your application. That kind of job
certainly gives you a lot of direct interaction. It sounds like a challenging position.

**Applicant:** Yes it certainly was, I really enjoyed it. I understand that employees have a lot
of client interaction in this job, is that so?

**Interviewer:** They sure do, we expect employees in this position to do all of our client
interaction work. Does that appeal to you?

**Applicant:** Yes, very much so.

**Interviewer:** I noticed in your application here that you said you were highly creative,
what other personality characteristics do you have that would make you the best applicant
for this job?

**Applicant:** I have a lot of perseverance. If I cannot find a way to solve something the first
time, I will keep trying until it is solved. For example, when I was in college and working
on a research project, the team I was working with said that it couldn't be done. I
disagreed and found a way to make the project work out. Also, I am very patient. I don't
get stressed when things do not work out, instead I find a way to make them work. I take
full accountability for my responsibilities and will not commit to something unless I'm sure
I can complete it successfully. Would you say that's important?
Interviewer: I certainly would. That's a very good quality to have for dealing with people. Sometimes in dealing with these clients it just seems like you'll never find a solution. Those who stick with it though usually find a way to keep a good long term client relationship. So what do you like to do in your spare time other than tennis?

Applicant: Well I really enjoy a lot of different hobbies. I like photography and I have a pilot's license. I do a lot of flying.

Interviewer: Is that so, that must be very exciting.

Applicant: Oh sure, I love it. I've been learning since I was in high school. It's a lot of fun, I really enjoy it.

Interviewer: How interesting, where do you fly?

Applicant: I usually take local trips that span about an hour or two of flying time. Not too many very long trips.

Interviewer: That's very unique. What an exciting hobby to have. I like photography also, but I'm not very good at it. Getting back on track here let me just ask you why you think I should hire you for this job?

Applicant: I think you should hire me because I am a hard working and very committed person. I would give all of my energy to this job and would be very loyal to the company. Also, I plan to make a long term career at your company and rise above an entry level position.

Interviewer: That's great, certainly very ambitious of you. Our best people are those who have started out in entry level positions. So let me ask you . . .

The interview continued for the remainder of the 30 minute period.
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Interviewer: Hello. Come on in and have a seat. My name is Brad Winters, I'll be interviewing you today. Did you have an easy time finding us?

Applicant: Yes, your secretary gave me excellent directions. I had no trouble at all.

Interviewer: Yes, she's usually very good with those things. So you're from Los Angeles, we have many different offices all over the U.S.. Did you want to work in Los Angeles?

Applicant: I really like Los Angeles, but I wouldn't mind relocating at all. I think it would be interesting to live in another city. I grew up in L.A. and then went to school at University of Los Angeles so it would be nice to have a change.

Interviewer: Yes, I know what you mean. I think it's really fun to move to a new city and get exposed to new things. Do you like to travel?

Applicant: Yes, I like it a lot. I spent one summer running around Europe visiting numerous cities and found it very educational.

Interviewer: That must have been great. Where did you visit?

Applicant: Oh, all over, Spain, Italy, Greece, England, Belgium, Switzerland, Germany, and Norway. It was a great trip.

Interviewer: Wow, that certainly is a lot of countries. You must have really enjoyed that. I wish I would have done that during college. I'll just have to take a long vacation at some point. Well I guess we should get started here. I have some questions that I need to ask you. If anything sounds confusing or you'd like to say anything you feel free to interrupt. I'd be happy to answer any questions you have along the way so you just jump in with any that you have. I'm just going to ask you some questions to get a general picture of you. You just let me know anything about yourself and your qualifications you would like if I don't manage to ask you about it.

Interviewer: First off, how skilled are you at dealing directly with clients or customers?

Applicant: I am very skilled at working with people. I have done that sort of work before and find that my social skills really come in handy. Its also very rewarding to help others and interact with people to solve problems. This job is mostly client interaction as I understand it, is that correct?
Interviewer: Yes, employees in this job do all of our client interaction so you would get plenty of exposure to clients. Well I see that you've had numerous internships that you listed on your application here, which one was your favorite?

Applicant: I interned in the student affairs office and that was a great internship. My job was to handle student complaints. It was great to interact with the students. I felt as though I got a different perspective of the whole university. It really kept me up to date on all the events. Working directly with the students was really rewarding.

Interviewer: Well that sure does sound like a great opportunity for a student you must have really enjoyed it. How long did you have that position?

Applicant: My junior and senior year, so two years.

Interviewer: That's a long time for a student internship, you must have done well there. Employees who are good at interacting with people really improve our long term relationships. I notice in your application here that you said you were a highly committed individual, would you expand on that a bit for me.

Applicant: Sure, I think that when you work with people you need to be committed. Moreover, you need to be able to have an impact. I would much rather foster a relationship than win an argument or get a good deal. I think the best deal is a loyal client. I am committed to any responsibility I take on. I have never agreed to complete a project that I couldn't handle. In this way I know that I can be counted on to give all of my pursuits my highest efforts and commitment.

Interviewer: That's a quality we certainly need from our employees. So what are some of your hobbies?

Applicant: Well, I really enjoy reading, I love mystery novels.

Interviewer: Oh, who is your favorite author?

Applicant: Um, I'd have to say Stephen King.

Interviewer: I read Misery, that was a great book. I like his writing but its pretty scary stuff. What else do you like to do?

Applicant: I play volleyball and swim. I also catch the art exhibits that come to town and love the theater.
Interviewer: Well, I think we have a good deal to offer in the way of arts and theater. I can usually find cultural events here pretty easily.

Applicant: Yes, it's pretty convenient too. The cultural centers are very close here.

Interviewer: So let me ask you this, what quality of yours makes you the best person to hire for this job that others may not have?

Applicant: Well as I mentioned I am very loyal and committed. But above that I need to have an impact. Any project I work on will be done to the best of my ability. I am also very good at finding unique ways to solve problems. There is always a way to get an answer even if it is not obvious at first. I have never given up on any project. I would find a solution if it existed. I am highly committed to top quality work that is thorough and has value for the organization. I like to have a high level of responsibility.

Interviewer: That's great, we love to see initiative and enthusiasm. So what do you think...
Interview 3 Transcript

Interviewer: Hi, how are you? Come on in and have a seat. I'll tell you these Friday afternoons are always so hectic. There must be terrible traffic outside.

Applicant: Yes, it looks pretty bad. Hopefully it will clear up a little later.

Interviewer: I usually try to leave at 7:00 instead of 5:30, that way I find I just miss the traffic and get home at the same time anyway.

Applicant: That's a good idea, do you live very far?

Interviewer: Oh, about an hour south of here, it's more suburban.

Applicant: Yes, its pretty down there.

Interviewer: Let me just begin by saying that I'm going to ask you some questions but you should feel free to interrupt me at any point during the process if you have any questions. Also, if you think I left anything out or there is additional information you want to tell just go ahead. This interview doesn't need to be very rigid, I just want to get a general picture of you and your qualifications. So what made you decide to take up this kind of work?

Applicant: Well, I find it exciting to work directly with people. I'm much more interested in working with people than behind a computer all day. I've always been interested in social dynamics and working in social settings. Working with clients gives me opportunity to work with people and use my interpersonal and social skills.

Interviewer: Well, this job certainly does offer a lot of client interaction. So you said on your application that you have had experience with client contact.

Applicant: Yes, I worked as a customer representative in a large department store. All of the customers who had complaints would come to see me. It was my job to solve their problems. I was very good at it and received an employee of the week reward for solving a very difficult problem for a customer. We almost lost a customer of 10 years, but I managed to work with him and find a solution to his complaint. It was fun work and I really enjoyed direct interaction with the customer.

Interviewer: That's interesting, the worst person to deal with is an angry customer. They can be difficult to calm down.
Applicant: Do employees deal with a lot of angry clients at your company?

Interviewer: Well, I wouldn’t say a large percentage of them are angry but there are always some. When we do get them though we send them right to employees in the position you are interviewing for. We can usually calm them down and maintain the client relationship. You know how it is, it takes a lot of skill to calm down an angry client.

Applicant: I think that is an aspect of the job that really appeals to me. I really like persuading people and helping them to see different points of view. I took a negotiations course in college and found it very informative.

Interviewer: Yes, that kind of coursework would come in really handy. Very often its just a matter of working with people to see different arguments. Did you get the opportunity to practice negotiating in your class?

Applicant: Yes, all of the students were teamed up with another student. We were assigned to different sides of an argument and we had to convince the other of our viewpoint. It was really useful because you get exposed to the thinking styles that people have. After spending a few hours negotiating with them, you become aware of the issues that are important to them. It really helps to consider arguments and issues from another person’s perspective. It was one of my favorite classes.

Interviewer: Well, that certainly is useful. So it says on your application that you moved to Chicago to go to school all the way from Florida. That must have been some adjustment.

Applicant: It was, but I got used to it, and really like it now.

Interviewer: Must be very cold for you in the winters.

Applicant: It certainly is, but I’ve been there for four years so I am pretty well adjusted to colder climates. So where are you from?

Interviewer: I’m originally from South Carolina but I went to school up in Vermont so I also had a similar adjustment to make. It took me quite some time to get used to those winters and driving on ice and all.

Applicant: Yes, I know how you felt.

Interviewer: I was glad I went to school there though. Its really a lovely place.

Applicant: I’ve been to Burlington, but that’s the only place I’ve been in Vermont. I remember thinking it was really charming.
**Interviewer:** It is, I highly recommend it for a vacation spot. Let's see, getting back on course here, where do you see yourself ten years from now?

**Applicant:** I see myself in a more advanced position, with more education. I eventually would like to earn a graduate degree part time so that I may advance. Ideally, I would be working in a more advanced position in the same field. Did you get a graduate degree?

**Interviewer:** Yes I did. I have a masters now. I also took some time, three years, off from school to go out and get a taste of the real world. Then I went and got a masters which took about two and a half years. I was really glad I set it up that way. I think it was more educational for me to be out and working for a couple of years before going back to school. I think I appreciated my education more with the time off in between my undergraduate degree and my graduate degree.

**Applicant:** I would like to get a masters eventually, but right now I want to get some experience first. I would like to get more exposure to practical real world situations. I agree with you in that I think two or three years off from school would be useful for my development.

**Interviewer:** That sounds like a good plan. I certainly found it useful. So when you go back to . . .

The interview continued for the remainder of the 30 minute period.
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**Interviewer:** Hi there. Come on in and have a seat. My name is Brad Winters, I'll be interviewing you today. It certainly is a nice day out, isn't it?

**Applicant:** Yes, it's a great day for tennis.

**Interviewer:** Oh, do you play?

**Applicant:** A little, I really enjoy it though.

**Interviewer:** My daughter can't seem to get enough of tennis, she's trying to get our whole family to take lessons.

**Applicant:** It's a really fun sport, I've just started taking lessons.

**Interviewer:** Yes I think our whole family will be playing soon. So you went to Michigan State University, how did you like it?

**Applicant:** I liked it a lot. It's a really great school, a lot of fun too.

**Interviewer:** I was there once for a football game, it seemed like the students had a lot of spirit.

**Applicant:** Yes they really do especially about sports events. We take them pretty seriously out there. Where did you go to school?

**Interviewer:** I went to University of Vermont, it's really cold up there too.

**Applicant:** How did you like it?

**Interviewer:** Oh, I loved it. It was a lot of fun. I'm originally from South Carolina so I wasn't ready for those harsh winters but I got used to it. I took up skiing and everything. They have some beautiful ski mountains, really wonderful.

**Applicant:** I enjoy skiing. I'm not that great at it but I always have a great time going on ski trips.

**Interviewer:** Yes it certainly is fun. Well I guess we should get started with the interview here. Let me just tell you first off that you should feel free to interrupt me with any questions that you may have or any information you feel I have forgotten. We don't need
to follow any particular format here, so you just let me know if I've missed anything. Why don't we start out with you describing some of your strengths and weaknesses.

**Applicant:** Sure. On the strengths side, I think I can learn very quickly. Even if I am not knowledgeable about an area I usually pick it up with no trouble at all. I also feel that I am a very creative and innovative individual. I am always looking for new ways to improve a process. I am a very committed and loyal individual. I would do my best to ensure that the best possible job was done on any given assignment. I also really enjoy investigative work like analyzing data to reach conclusions and finding solutions to problems. On the weaknesses side, I am often impatient to see things completed quickly. Also, I sometimes expect too much of others and can push too hard. I try to keep it under control though.

**Interviewer:** So you enjoy working with data and analyses, have you worked in a job with where you've had to do that kind of work before?

**Applicant:** Yes, I worked as a research assistant in college. I really like the problem solving aspect of it. Do you get to do a lot of that in this job?

**Interviewer:** Oh, plenty. Your research assistant position must have given you a lot of exposure to analyzing data.

**Applicant:** Yes, it really did. Is the work challenging in terms of in depth analysis?

**Interviewer:** Yes, it sure is. This job involves a lot of problem solving using complex analyses. Does that appeal to you?

**Applicant:** Yes, very much so.

**Interviewer:** I noticed in your application here that you said you were highly creative, what other personality characteristics do you have that would make you the best applicant for this job?

**Applicant:** I have a lot of perseverance. If I cannot find a way to solve something the first time, I will keep trying until it is solved. For example, when I was in college and working on a research project, the team I was working with said that it couldn't be done. I disagreed and found a way to make the project work out. Also, I am very patient. I don't get stressed when things do not work out, instead I find a way to make them work. I take full accountability for my responsibilities and will not commit to something unless I'm sure I can complete it successfully.
**Interviewer:** That's a very good quality to have for this job. Those who persevere usually find solutions to complicated problems. So what do you like to do in your spare time other than tennis?

**Applicant:** Well I really enjoy a lot of different hobbies. I like photography and I have a pilot's license. I do a lot of flying.

**Interviewer:** Is that so, that must be very exciting.

**Applicant:** Oh sure, I love it. I've been learning since I was in high school. It's a lot of fun, I really enjoy it.

**Interviewer:** How interesting, where do you fly?

**Applicant:** I usually take local trips that span about an hour or two of flying time. Not too many very long trips.

**Interviewer:** That's very unique. What an exciting hobby to have. I like photography also, but I'm not very good at it. Getting back on track let me just ask you why you think I should hire you for this job?

**Applicant:** I think you should hire me because I am a hard working and very committed person. I would give all of my energy to this job and would be very loyal to the company. Also, I plan to make a long term career at your company and rise above an entry level position.

**Interviewer:** That's great, certainly very ambitious of you. Our best people are those who have started out in entry level positions. So let me ask you . . .

The interview continued for the remainder of the 30 minute period.
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Interviewer: Hello. Come on in and have a seat. My name is Brad Winters, I'll be interviewing you today. Did you have an easy time finding us?

Applicant: Yes, your secretary gave me excellent directions. I had no trouble at all.

Interviewer: Yes, she's usually very good with those things. So you're from Los Angeles, we have many different offices all over the U.S.. Did you want to work in Los Angeles?

Applicant: I really like Los Angeles, but I wouldn't mind relocating at all. I think it would be interesting to live in another city. I grew up in L.A. and then went to school and University of Los Angeles so it would be nice to have a change.

Interviewer: Yes, I know what you mean. I think its really fun to move to a new city and get exposed to new things. Do you like to travel?

Applicant: Yes, I like it a lot. I spent one summer running around Europe visiting numerous cities and found it very educational.

Interviewer: That must have been great. Where did you visit?

Applicant: Oh, all over, Spain, Italy, Greece, England, Belgium, Switzerland, Germany, and Norway. It was a great trip.

Interviewer: Wow, that certainly is a lot of countries. You must have really enjoyed that. I wish I would have done that during college. I'll just have to take a long vacation at some point. Well I guess we should get started here. I have some questions that I need to ask you. If anything sounds confusing or you'd like to say anything you feel free to interrupt. I'd be happy to answer any questions you have along the way so you just jump in with any that you have. I'm just going to ask you some questions to get a general picture of you. You just let me know anything about yourself and your qualifications you would like if I don't manage to ask you about it.

Applicant: OK

Interviewer: First off, as you know you would be working with data in this position, why do you like that sort of work?

Applicant: I really enjoy solving complicated problems through analyzing data. I'm a very analytical person and I very much enjoy working with complex problems. I've had several
internships while in college that have allowed me to get exposure to that kind of work. I was very successful in them and really enjoyed them. Do employees work with challenging problems here?

**Interviewer:** Oh yes, I think our employees find the work challenging and very analytical. Is that something you would like?

**Applicant:** Definitely, I enjoy solving challenging problems.

**Interviewer:** Well, I see that you've had numerous internships that you listed on your application here, which one was your favorite?

**Applicant:** I interned in the student affairs office and that was a great internship. I analyzed the student budget and how to cut costs. It was really interesting work. I was always collecting facts and information. The exciting part was synthesizing all of it to make some meaningful conclusions and suggestions.

**Interviewer:** Well that sure does sound like a great opportunity for a student you must have really enjoyed it. How long did you have that position?

**Applicant:** My junior and senior year, so two years.

**Interviewer:** That's a long time for a student internship, you must have been very good at it. This job gives employees a lot of opportunity to work with data and conduct analyses to solve problems. Employees who are good at it really improve our services. I notice in your application here that you said you were a highly committed individual, would you expand on that a bit for me.

**Applicant:** Sure, I think that when you work with important issues you have to be committed to solving problems. If you aren't committed to finding a solution it is very easy to just do the job half way. Because the work is so intensive and challenging you must be able to see the long term and not take short cuts along the way. Your analyses must be based on good data collection methods. I think going into a project from the beginning knowing that you will see it through is a requirement when you work on these types of projects with intensive analysis.

**Interviewer:** That's a quality we certainly need from our employees. So what are some of your hobbies?

**Applicant:** Well, I really enjoy reading, I love mystery novels.

**Interviewer:** Oh, who is your favorite author?
Applicant: Um, I'd have to say Stephen King.

Interviewer: I read Misery, that was a great book. I like his writing but its pretty scary stuff. What else do you like to do?

Applicant: I play volleyball and swim. I also catch the art exhibits that come to town and love the theater.

Interviewer: Well, we have a good deal to offer in the way of arts and theater. I can usually find cultural events here pretty easily.

Applicant: Yes, its pretty convenient too. The cultural centers are very close here.

Interviewer: So let me ask you this, what quality of yours makes you the best person to hire for this job that others may not have?

Applicant: Well as I mentioned I am very loyal and committed. But above that I have a genuine interest. I think that serves as a driving force for getting things accomplished and solving problems. I need to have an impact and add as much value as possible. If I feel as though I am not accomplishing as much as possible, I will find a way to. Its very important to me that I accomplish a great deal and have substantial impact.

Interviewer: That's an excellent approach. Let me ask you if you . . .

The interview continued for the remainder of the 30 minute period.
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Interviewer: Hi, how are you? Come on in and have a seat. I'll tell you these Friday afternoons are always so hectic. There must be terrible traffic outside.

Applicant: Yes, it looks pretty bad. Hopefully it will clear up a little later.

Interviewer: I usually try to leave at 7:00 instead of 5:30, that way I find I just miss the traffic and get home at the same time anyway.

Applicant: That's a good idea, do you live very far?

Interviewer: Oh, about an hour south of here, its more suburban.

Applicant: Yes, its pretty down there.

Interviewer: Let me just begin by saying that I'm going to ask you some questions but you should feel free to interrupt me at any point during the process if you have any questions. Also, if you think I left anything out or there is additional information you want to tell me just go ahead. This interview doesn't need to be very rigid, I just want to get a general picture of you and your qualifications. So what made you decide to take up this kind of work?

Applicant: Well, I find it exciting to work directly with data to solve problems. I'm very interested in analyzing facts to reach conclusions. I've always been interested in complex problems that require a lot of analysis. Working with data to answer questions gives me opportunity to use my analytic skills.

Interviewer: Well, this job certainly does offer a lot of opportunity for employees to work with data to solve problems. So you said on your application that you have had experience with data analysis?

Applicant: Yes, I worked as a payroll employee in a large department store. All of the employees who had problems with their checks had to file complaints. It was my job to investigate the complaints. It was very challenging because I was constantly having to find a trail of documents to figure out what happened and solve problems. I was very good at it and received an employee of the week reward for solving a very difficult problem for an employee. I managed to work with the data we had and recreate the events that occurred to solve the problem. It was fun work and I really enjoyed adding value.
Interviewer: That's interesting, a high profile problem to deal with is incorrect employee paychecks.

Applicant: That is certainly true, but you do your best. I really enjoyed it.

Interviewer: Well, that certainly is useful. So it says on your application that you moved to Chicago to go to school all the way from Florida. That must have been some adjustment.

Applicant: It was, but I got used to it, and really like it now.

Interviewer: Must be very cold for you in the winters.

Applicant: It is, but I've been there for four years so I am pretty well adjusted to colder climates. So where are you from?

Interviewer: I'm originally from South Carolina but I went to school up in Vermont so I also had a similar adjustment to make. It took me quite some time to get used to those winters and driving on ice and all.

Applicant: Yes, I know how you felt.

Interviewer: I was glad I went to school there though. Its really a lovely place.

Applicant: I've been to Burlington, but that's the only place I've been in Vermont. I remember thinking it was really charming.

Interviewer: It is, I highly recommend it for a vacation spot. Let's see, getting back on course here, where do you see yourself ten years from now?

Applicant: I see myself in a more advanced position, possibly with more education. I eventually would like to earn a graduate degree part time so that I may advance. Ideally, I would be working in a more advanced position in the same field. Did you get a graduate degree?

Interviewer: Yes I did. I have a masters now. I also took some time, three years, off from school to go out and get a taste of the real world. Then I went and got a masters which took about two and a half years. I was really glad I set it up that way. I think it was more educational for me to be out and working for a couple of years before going back to school. I think I appreciated my education more with the time off in between my undergraduate degree and my graduate degree.
**Applicant:** I would like to get a masters eventually, but right now I want to get some experience first. I would like to get more exposure to practical real world situations. I agree with you in that I think two or three years off from school would be useful for my development.

**Interviewer:** So what are your hobbies?

**Applicant:** I enjoy writing a lot and I read vampire novels. I also like to travel when I have the opportunity.

**Interviewer:** I know how that is, I just love to travel. It's always an interesting experience to see a new city. I was in Europe this summer on vacation. I really enjoyed it.

**Applicant:** Oh, where did you go?

**Interviewer:** I spent most of the time in Italy and some time in France. It was really beautiful.

**Applicant:** I was in Italy two years ago, it was really great. I've never been to France though.

**Interviewer:** Well, when you get the opportunity, do go. Its really lovely. So how long do you think you will . . .

The interview continued for the remainder of the 30 minute period.
Please answer the questions on the following pages as best you can. Although you may not have complete information please indicate your impressions on the basis of the information you were given.

Please rate the following on a scale of 1 (low) to 7 (high):

1- How likely would you be to accept an employment offer from this company?

1  2  3  4  5  6  7
Very unlikely  Moderately likely  Very likely

2-How fair was the interview process this company used?

1  2  3  4  5  6  7
Very unfair  Moderately fair  Very fair

3- How attractive is this company to you as a place to work?

1  2  3  4  5  6  7
Very unattractive  Moderately attractive  Very attractive

4-How fair would the interviewer’s employment decision be about applicants?

1  2  3  4  5  6  7
Very unfair  Moderately fair  Very fair

5-How likely is it that you would explore employment opportunity further with this company if you had not heard from the company in two weeks?

1  2  3  4  5  6  7
Very unlikely  Moderately likely  Very likely

6-How fair was the procedure that this interviewer used to interview applicants?

1  2  3  4  5  6  7
Very unfair  Moderately fair  Very fair

7-How fairly did the interviewer treat the applicants during the interview procedure?

1  2  3  4  5  6  7
Very unfairly  Moderately fairly  Very fairly
8-On the basis of this interview, how accurate do you believe the interviewer will be in determining the best applicants for the job?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Very inaccurate Moderately accurate Very accurate

9-Overall, how would you rate the interview this company used?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Very poor Average Very good

10-How similar do you believe this interviewer is to other employees at this company?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Not at all similar Moderately similar Very similar

11-To what extent does the tone and style of this interviewer represent what the company is like?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Not at all A moderate amount A great amount

11-Would you accept an offer from this company?

______yes _________no

12-If you were to take a job with this company, how long do you think you would like to work with this company?

______a few months
______a year
______two years
______three years
______four years
______five years or more
The following questions are about the interviewer for this company. Please rate on a scale of 1 (low) to 7 (high) the extent to which you believe the interviewer possessed the following characteristics. Although you may not have complete information please indicate your impressions on the basis of the information you were given.

1-How prepared was the interviewer for this company?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Very unprepared Moderately prepared Very prepared

2-How competent was the interviewer for this company?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Very incompetent Moderately competent Very competent

3-How pleasant was the interviewer for this company?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Very unpleasant Moderately pleasant Very pleasant

4-To what extent did the interviewer have a warm personality?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Not at all A moderate amount A great amount

5-To what extent would most people like this interviewer?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Not at all A moderate amount A great amount
6-To what extent was this interviewer interested in the applicants he/she interviewed?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>A moderate amount</td>
<td>A great amount</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7-To what extent was this interviewer effective?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>A moderate amount</td>
<td>A great amount</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8-To what extent was this interviewer cold?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>A moderate amount</td>
<td>A great amount</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9-To what extent did this interviewer like his/her company?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>A moderate amount</td>
<td>A great amount</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10-To what extent was this interviewer interested in the potential contributions of the applicants they interviewed?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>A moderate amount</td>
<td>A great amount</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11-To what extent was this interviewer calm and relaxed?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>A moderate amount</td>
<td>A great amount</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
12-To what extent did this interviewer understand the applicants' point of view?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>A moderate amount</td>
<td>A great amount</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13-To what extent did this interviewer use clear questions?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>A moderate amount</td>
<td>A great amount</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14-To what extent was this interviewer familiar with the applicants' background?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>A moderate amount</td>
<td>A great amount</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15-To what extent was this interviewer concerned with determining the applicants' personal "fit" with the organization?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>A moderate amount</td>
<td>A great amount</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16-To what extent was this interviewer concerned with determining the applicants' job qualifications?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>A moderate amount</td>
<td>A great amount</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
17-To what extent was this interviewer interested in determining the outside interests of applicants?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>A moderate amount</td>
<td>A great amount</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18-To what extent did this interviewer attempt to get a broad picture of the applicants?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>A moderate amount</td>
<td>A great amount</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19-To what extent did this interviewer make an attempt to meet the applicants' needs?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>A moderate amount</td>
<td>A great amount</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20- To what extent would you like to be interviewed by this interviewer if you were an applicant for this job?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>A moderate amount</td>
<td>A great amount</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following questions are about your impressions of the organization. Please rate on a scale of 1 (low) to 7 (high) the extent to which you believe the organization possessed the following characteristics. Although you may not have complete information please indicate your impressions on the basis of the information you were given.

1-To what extent is this organization team-oriented?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>A moderate amount</td>
<td>A great amount</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-To what extent is this organization cooperative?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>A moderate amount</td>
<td>A great amount</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3-To what extent is this organization impersonal?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>A moderate amount</td>
<td>A great amount</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4-To what extent is this organization rigid?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>A moderate amount</td>
<td>A great amount</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5-To what extent is this organization fun/enjoyable?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>A moderate amount</td>
<td>A great amount</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9-To what extent does this organization have domineering leaders?

Not at all  A moderate amount  A great amount

10-To what extent is this organization social?

Not at all  A moderate amount  A great amount

11-To what extent is this organization innovative?

Not at all  A moderate amount  A great amount

12-To what extent is this organization flexible?

Not at all  A moderate amount  A great amount

13-How large do you think this organization is?

10-15 employees  50-100 employees  200 or more employees

14-To what extent is this organization achievement oriented?

Not at all  A moderate amount  A great amount
15-To what extent would you like to work in this organization?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>A moderate amount</td>
<td>A great amount</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16-How would you evaluate your qualifications for this job?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Poor fit</td>
<td>Moderate fit</td>
<td>Very high fit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17-If you were to interview for this job in this organization, how likely would it be that you would receive a job offer?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very unlikely</td>
<td>Moderately likely</td>
<td>Very likely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18-To what extent do you believe your personal interests and personality fit this job?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Poor fit</td>
<td>Moderate fit</td>
<td>Very high fit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19-To what extent do you think that you would like to perform this job?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>A moderate amount</td>
<td>A great amount</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20-To what extent do you believe your personal interests and personality fit this organization?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Poor fit</td>
<td>Moderate fit</td>
<td>Very high fit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please answer the following questions as best you can. Although you may not have complete information please indicate your impressions on the basis of the information you were given.

1-To what extent did this interviewer use the exact same questions for all applicants?

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>A moderate amount</td>
<td>A great amount</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-To what extent did this interviewer use the exact same questions in the exact same order for all applicants?

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>A moderate amount</td>
<td>A great amount</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3- How relevant were the interviewer's questions for assessing the applicant's ability to perform the job duties?

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all relevant</td>
<td>Moderately relevant</td>
<td>Highly relevant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4-A structured interview is one in which the interviewer uses the exact same questions in the exact same order for all applicants. Also, a structured interview includes only those questions that are directly related to the job. To what extent was this interview structured?

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all structured</td>
<td>Moderately structured</td>
<td>Highly structured</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please read each statement and decide whether or not it describes you. Then indicate your answer by circling true or false. If you agree with a statement or decide that it does describe you, circle TRUE. If you disagree with a statement or feel that it is not descriptive of you, circle FALSE.

1-People should be more involved with their work.  
2-I seldom set standards which are difficult for me to reach.  
3-I enjoy difficult work.  
4-I have rarely done extra studying in connection with my work.  
5-I will not be satisfied until I am the best in my field of work.  
6-I try to work just hard enough to get by.  
7-I would work just as hard whether or not I had to earn a living.  
8-I do not let my work get in the way of what I really want to do.  
9-My goal is to do at least a little bit more than anyone else has done before.  
10-In my work I seldom do more than is necessary.  
11-I often set goals that are very difficult to reach.  
12-People seldom think of me as a hard worker.  
13-As a child I worked a long time for some of the things I earned.  
14-It doesn't really matter to me whether or not I become one of the best in my field.  
15-I don't mind working while other people are having fun.  
16-I am not really very certain what I want to do or how to go about doing it.
Please read each statement and decide whether or not it describes you. Then indicate your answer by circling true or false. If you agree with a statement or decide that it does describe you, circle TRUE. If you disagree with a statement or feel that it is not descriptive of you, circle FALSE.

1-I am quite independent of the people I know.  
   True  False
2-I choose hobbies that I can share with other people.  
   True  False
3-I seldom put out extra effort to make friends.  
   True  False
4-I go out of my way to meet people.  
   True  False
5-I don't really have fun at large parties.  
   True  False
6-People consider me to be quite friendly.  
   True  False
7-I would not be very good at a job which required me to meet people all day long.  
   True  False
8-I truly enjoy myself at social functions.  
   True  False
9-When I see someone I know from a distance, I don't go out of my way to say hello.  
   True  False
10-I spend a lot of time visiting friends.  
   True  False
11-Sometimes I have to make a real effort to be sociable.  
   True  False
12-My friendships are many.  
   True  False
13-I don't spend much of my time talking with people I see every day.  
   True  False
14-I trust my friends completely.  
   True  False
15-Often I would rather be alone than with a group of friends.  
   True  False
16-I try to be in the company of friends as much as possible.  
   True  False
Please read each statement and decide whether or not it describes you. Then indicate your answer by circling true or false. If you agree with a statement or decide that it does describe you, circle TRUE. If you disagree with a statement or feel that it is not descriptive of you, circle FALSE.

1-I feel confident when directing the activities of others. True False

2-I would make a poor military leader. True False

3-I would like to be a judge. True False

4-I avoid positions of power over other people. True False

5-I try to control others rather than permit them to control me. True False

6-I don't like to have the responsibility for directing the work of others. True False

7-I would like to play a part in making laws. True False

8-I have little interest in leading others. True False

9-In an argument, I can usually win others over to my side. True False

10-I feel uneasy when I have to tell people what to do. True False

11-The ability to be a leader is very important to me. True False

12-Most community members do a better job than I could possibly do. True False

13-I am quite effective in getting others to agree with me. True False

14-I am not very insistent in an argument. True False

15-I would like to be an executive with power over others. True False

16-I would not want to have a job enforcing the law. True False
Instructions: For each pair of adjectives please circle the adjective that better describes you. This is a forced-choice exercise. This type of exercise requires you to choose the adjective from each pair that is closer to your personality, even if the adjective is not a completely accurate description of you.

1. Retiring - Sociable
2. Sober - Fun Loving
3. Reserved - Affectionate
4. Aloof - Friendly
5. Inhibited - Spontaneous
6. Irritable - Good-Natured
7. Ruthless - Soft-hearted
8. Rude - Courteous
9. Selfish - Selfless
10. Uncooperative - Helpful
11. Negligent - Conscientious
12. Careless - Careful
13. Undependable - Reliable
14. Lazy - Hardworking
15. Disorganized - Organized
16. Calm - Worrying
17. At ease - Nervous
18. Relaxed - High-strung
19. Unemotional - Emotional
20. Even-tempered - Temperamental
21. Conventional - Original
22. Down-to-earth - Imaginative
23. Uncreative - Creative
24. Narrow Interests - Broad Interests
25. Simple - Complex
Please use the scale provided to indicate the extent to which you agree with the statements below. Please check the level of agreement which most represents your opinion.

1- On the whole, I am satisfied with myself.
   ___ Strongly agree   ___ Agree   ___ Disagree   ___ Strongly disagree

2- At times I think I am no good at all.
   ___ Strongly agree   ___ Agree   ___ Disagree   ___ Strongly disagree

3- I feel that I have a number of good qualities.
   ___ Strongly agree   ___ Agree   ___ Disagree   ___ Strongly disagree

4- I am able to do things as well as most other people.
   ___ Strongly agree   ___ Agree   ___ Disagree   ___ Strongly disagree

5- I feel I do not have much to be proud of.
   ___ Strongly agree   ___ Agree   ___ Disagree   ___ Strongly disagree

6. I certainly feel useless at times.
   ___ Strongly agree   ___ Agree   ___ Disagree   ___ Strongly disagree

7. I feel that I am a person of worth, at least on an equal plane with others.
   ___ Strongly agree   ___ Agree   ___ Disagree   ___ Strongly disagree

8. I wish I could have more respect for myself.
   ___ Strongly agree   ___ Agree   ___ Disagree   ___ Strongly disagree

9. All in all, I am inclined to feel that I am a failure.
   ___ Strongly agree   ___ Agree   ___ Disagree   ___ Strongly disagree

10. I take a positive attitude toward myself.
    ___ Strongly agree   ___ Agree   ___ Disagree   ___ Strongly disagree
Please indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statements:

1. In general, I'm not very good at impressing potential employers with my qualifications.
   
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Moderately Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. I know a lot more than most students about how to use a wide range of job opportunity sources.
   
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Moderately Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. I have a good idea of what my job market opportunities are like.
   
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Moderately Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. I am confident of my ability to make a good impression in job interviews.
   
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Moderately Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. I have no idea which are the best ways to look for a job.
   
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Moderately Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. I know exactly how to find the kind of job I'm looking for.
   
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Moderately Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. If I'm really interested in a job, I can persuade the employer to make me an offer.
   
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Moderately Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. I doubt that I will be able to locate as many job openings as other students like me in the job market.
9. I don't have any trouble finding out all I want to know about a company or job.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Moderately Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. Overall, I don't expect to be very good at job search.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Moderately Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please use the scale provided to indicate the extent to which you agree with the statements below. Please check the level of agreement which most represents your opinion.

1- On the whole, I am satisfied with my ability to perform on a job.

___ Strongly agree     ___ Agree     ___ Disagree     ___ Strongly disagree

2- At times I think I am no good at all at work.

___ Strongly agree     ___ Agree     ___ Disagree     ___ Strongly disagree

3- I feel that I have a number of good work related qualities.

___ Strongly agree     ___ Agree     ___ Disagree     ___ Strongly disagree

4- I am able to do things as well as most other people in the jobs I have had.

___ Strongly agree     ___ Agree     ___ Disagree     ___ Strongly disagree

5- I feel I do not have much to be proud of when it comes to my work performance.

___ Strongly agree     ___ Agree     ___ Disagree     ___ Strongly disagree

6. I certainly feel useless at times in work situations.

___ Strongly agree     ___ Agree     ___ Disagree     ___ Strongly disagree

7. I feel that I am a person of worth, at least on an equal plane with others in jobs I have had.

___ Strongly agree     ___ Agree     ___ Disagree     ___ Strongly disagree

8. I wish I could have more respect for myself when it comes to my work performance.

___ Strongly agree     ___ Agree     ___ Disagree     ___ Strongly disagree

9. All in all, I am inclined to feel that I am a failure in most jobs.

___ Strongly agree     ___ Agree     ___ Disagree     ___ Strongly disagree

10. I take a positive attitude toward my work performance.

___ Strongly agree     ___ Agree     ___ Disagree     ___ Strongly disagree
What is your major?

What career do you plan to pursue when you graduate college?

What is your age?

What is your gender?

What is your race?

Do you currently have a job?

If you currently have a job, what is your job title?

How long have you been working in your current job?

How long have you held a full time employment position?
APPENDIX B

All Stimulus Materials for Study 2
You have just finished interviewing for a job with 16 different companies. You are forming your impressions about each company you interviewed with. Your experiences with the 16 companies are described on the following pages.
Company A

You heard about Company A at the college placement center and signed up for an interview.

- During the interview, the interviewer asked only job related questions of you. The interviewer did not ask you any questions about your personal hobbies, interests, or friends and family. The interviewer asked a set of questions that were only related to the knowledge, skills, and abilities that were necessary to perform the job.

- The interviewer asked the same questions of all applicants. The questions the interviewer asked were not designed for you as an individual.

- During and after the interview, the interviewer allowed you plenty of time to raise topics and ask questions not covered previously.

- Throughout the interview, the interviewer presented a warm and friendly style.
(Low Condition for All Manipulated Variables)

**Company B**

You heard about Company B at the college placement center and signed up for an interview.

- During the interview, the interviewer asked you questions about your personality, interests, and hobbies. The interviewer tried to get a general picture of you as a person rather than only discussing your knowledge, skills, and abilities as they related to the job.

- The interview was tailored to you as an individual and dealt with specifics of your background and history.

- During and after the interview, the interviewer did not ask you if you had any questions, nor did the interviewer give you an opportunity to raise further issues which were not previously discussed.

- Throughout the interview, the interviewer was neutral and impersonal.
Please answer the following questions on a scale of 1 (low) to 7 (high):

1-How fair do you feel the interview procedure was?

1  2  3  4  5  6  7
Unfair  Moderately Fair  Very Fair

2-How likely would you be to accept an offer with this company?

1  2  3  4  5  6  7
Unlikely  Moderately likely  Very Likely

3-How attractive would this company be to work for on the basis of your experience with the company during the employment interview?

1  2  3  4  5  6  7
Unattractive  Moderately Attractive  Very Attractive

4-Do you think the type of interview procedure used by this company would be accurate in determining which applicants were qualified to perform the job?

1  2  3  4  5  6  7
Inaccurate  Moderately Accurate  Very Accurate

5- Overall, how would you evaluate this interview?

1  2  3  4  5  6  7
Poor  Moderately Good  Very Good