PURDUE UNIVERSITY
GRADUATE SCHOOL
Thesis/Dissertation Acceptance

This is to certify that the thesis/dissertation prepared

By _Danielle Lombard-Sims_

Entitled
Applicant Reactions to Structuring the Selection Interview

For the degree of _Master of Science_

Is approved by the final examining committee:

John T. Hazer
_____
Chair

Jane R. Williams

Mark D. Shermis

To the best of my knowledge and as understood by the student in the *Research Integrity and Copyright Disclaimer (Graduate School Form 20)*, this thesis/dissertation adheres to the provisions of Purdue University's "Policy on Integrity in Research" and the use of copyrighted material.

Approved by Major Professor(s): _John T. Hazer_

_____

Approved by: _Nicholas Grahame_   06/26/2012
Head of the Graduate Program   Date

Graduate School Form 20
(Revised 9/10)

PURDUE UNIVERSITY
GRADUATE SCHOOL

Research Integrity and Copyright Disclaimer

Title of Thesis/Dissertation:

Applicant Reactions to Structuring the Selection Interview

For the degree of   Master of Science _____

I certify that in the preparation of this thesis, I have observed the provisions of *Purdue University Executive Memorandum No. C-22,* September 6, 1991, *Policy on Integrity in Research.**

Further, I certify that this work is free of plagiarism and all materials appearing in this thesis/dissertation have been properly quoted and attributed.

I certify that all copyrighted material incorporated into this thesis/dissertation is in compliance with the United States' copyright law and that I have received written permission from the copyright owners for my use of their work, which is beyond the scope of the law. I agree to indemnify and save harmless Purdue University from any and all claims that may be asserted or that may arise from any copyright violation.

 Danielle Lombard-Sims
_____
Printed Name and Signature of Candidate

 06/26/2012
_____
Date (month/day/year)

APPLICANT REACTIONS TO STRUCTURING THE SELECTION INTERVIEW

A Thesis

Submitted to the Faculty

of

Purdue University

by

Danielle Lombard-Sims

In Partial Fulfillment of the

Requirements for the Degree

of

Master of Science

August 2012

Purdue University

Indianapolis, Indiana

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to Dr. John Hazer, my advisor and thesis chair, for his insight and guidance during my graduate studies. Your patience and encouragement throughout the process of my graduate training kept me going and enabled me to make it to this point. I would also like to thank Dr. Jane Williams and Dr. Mark Shermis for their considerable time and participation on my graduate thesis committee. Lastly, I would like to thank my husband Ray and my son Brendon for their support in allowing me to reach this goal in life. I truly appreciate your understanding, and could not have done this without you.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

LIST OF TABLES

ABSTRACT

Lombard-Sims, Danielle. M.S., Purdue University, August 2012. Applicant Reactions to Structuring the Selection Interview. Major Professor: John T. Hazer.

Initial research on structuring the interview process investigated structure's impact on the interview's psychometric properties (e.g., reliability and validity). In contrast, the empirical literature has begun to consider the impact of increased interview structure on job applicant reactions to the interview and the companies that utilize them. Current research has studied the effects of interviewer characteristics on applicant reactions and the effects of different types of selection procedures on applicant fairness reactions. In addition, while studies have examined the impact of applicants' perceived control on their reactions to selection procedures, few studies have examined this impact specifically for the employment interview. Given the widespread use of the interview in selection, this study adds to current research by focusing on applicant reactions to four elements of the interview identified as being salient to applicants (i.e., the degree to which the interviewee perceives that applicants are asked the same questions, the use of situational or behavioral type questions, controlling the use of ancillary information by the interviewer, and the degree to which questions from the applicant are controlled). In addition, this study focused on need for control as a moderator of the relationships between interview structure and fairness perceptions, recommendation intentions, and

acceptance intentions. Participants consisted of 161 students voluntarily participating in three different interviewing scenarios: unstructured, semi-structured, and structured interviewing scenario. The participants completed post-interview measures asking them about their perceptions of fairness, their intention to recommend the company to others, and their intention of accepting an offer if one is made by the company. Although the hypothesized relationships between elements of structure and applicant evaluations of the interview were largely not supported, the results did indicate that student applicants perceived semi-structured and structured interviews to be fairer than unstructured interviews. In addition, the results suggest that more structured interviews may lead to lower behavioral intent to recommend the job to others or accept a job offer. Implications of the results are discussed in terms of how interview structure relates to the candidates' perception of fairness, recommendation intentions, and acceptance intentions.

INTRODUCTION

The goal of a personnel selection system is to choose individuals who will perform effectively. Because employers have not had an opportunity to observe a prospective worker's performance, they must try to predict it. The need to identify a legal and valid assessment system for the purpose of hiring individuals who will effectively perform the job has resulted in the almost universal usage of the oral interview in the selection process (McCarthy, Van Iddekinge, & Campion, 2010). The interview is popular for many reasons, including its practical nature and allowing the interviewer the opportunity to sell the candidate on the company and position. In addition, organizations believe that the interview will enable them to predict future job performance (Gatewood, Field, & Barrick, 2008).

Historically, reviews have shown that virtually all organizations use the interview as a selection device (e.g., Arvey, 1979; Ulrich & Trumbo, 1965). In addition, the interview continues to be used because interviewers maintain great faith and confidence in their judgments (Arvey & Campion, 1982). Nevertheless, the reliability and validity of the interview have been recurrently questioned, particularly for unstructured interviews (Arvey & Campion, 1982, Harris, 1989; Martin & Nageo, 1989; Wagner, 1949). In the early 1980s, two reviews summarized the empirical findings until that time: Reilly and

Chao (1982) conducted a meta-analysis examining the statistical properties of the interview and concluded that the interview lacks both reliability and validity. Similarly, Hunter and Hunter (1984), in their meta-analysis of the topic, reported a validity coefficient of .14 for the employment interview, and noted that the interview was not as valid as a cognitive ability test in predicting future job performance.

Since the early 1980s, interest has grown in using structure to increase the psychometric properties of the interview. Research shows that there seems to be a consensus among researchers that highly-structured interviews are more valid than unstructured interviews (Judge, Higgins, & Cable, 2000). The use of the structured interview has led to corrected validity coefficients as high as .62 between the interview and measures of job success (Weisner & Cronshaw, 1988). Even the early meta-analytic reviews have been revisited: Huffcutt and Arthur (1994) provided a re-analysis of Hunter and Hunter's (1984) article of the employment interview for entry-level jobs. Huffcut and Arthur found validity coefficients of .57 for interviews with high structure, and .20 for interviews with low structure. Schmidt and Hunter's (1998) meta-analysis of the validity and utility of 19 different selection methods for predicting job performance found structured interviews to be the third best predictor of job performance in terms of adding incremental validity to a general mental ability test. Moreover, when focusing on interviews as sole predictors, these researchers found validity coefficients of .51 for structured interviews as compared to .38 for unstructured interviews. More recently, Jelf's (1999) meta-analysis of the validity of employment interviews since 1989 found structured interviews ($r = .44$) to be more valid than unstructured interviews ($r = .33$). In addition, utility analyses have demonstrated that the high validity coefficients achieved

by the structured interview can result in significant productivity and monetary benefits to the organization (Schmidt & Hunter, 1998).

Research has also investigated whether selection interviews result in different outcomes for certain groups. For example, prior to 1982, research showed some evidence that *women* received lower ratings than men in interviews (Arvey & Campion, 1982). However, newer meta-analytic studies show little evidence for differential validity on the basis of gender (Jelf, 1999). Likewise, prior to 1986, research showed lower ratings for *racial* minorities in employment interviews (Muchinsky, 1986). However, more recent research has found that structured interviews have less adverse impact on minority groups than do cognitive ability tests (Goldberg, 2005). This is part of the diversity-validity dilemma as reviewed by Pyburn, Ployhart, and Kravitz (2008). That is, certain indicators that validly predict future job performance are also correlated with significant racioethnic and sex subgroup predictor score variances. However, alternative predictor measurement methods such as interviews and assessment centers generally demonstrate lower racioethnic subgroup differences than do cognitive ability. Based on a 1999 study, Ployhart and Holtz (2008) concluded that structured interview means for Whites were .23 standard deviations higher than for Blacks. Even so, McCarthy et al. (2010) found that applicants who interviewed with companies who used highly-structured interviews were less concerned with discrimination due to race and gender. As such, utilizing structured interviews may lower the number of legal discrimination claims in the selection process. In addition, using structured interviews may aid in the attraction and subsequent selection of diverse candidates (Avery & McKay, 2006). In summary, some research indicates that females and minority members are not as adversely affected by interview

recommendations, particularly when structured interviews are used, as when cognitive predictors are used (Pyburn et al., 2008). Consequently, the type of interview conducted during the selection process may impact fairness perceptions.

In addition to studying the predictive validity and adverse impact of the interview, perceptions of face validity have consistently been found to be important considerations. Face validity can be defined as applicant perceptions of the job-relatedness of the selection procedure and is typically measured by asking individuals whether or not a test appears to be valid (Elkins & Phillips, 2000). Researchers have also suggested that fairness may be an important determinant in the overall face validity of a selection procedure. Arvey and Sackett (1993) suggested that judgment of the fairness of a selection system has become less of a psychometric issue and more of a perceptual one. To date, the most comprehensive conceptualization of applicants' perceptions of selection system fairness has been offered by Gilliland (1993). From an applicant's perspective, fairness refers to how justly he/she perceives the distribution of outcomes to be (i.e., distributive justice) as well as the justice of procedures used in distributing those outcomes (i.e., procedural justice) (Greenberg, 1990). Although justice theory has been widely applied to understanding applicant reactions to different types of selection tests, it has not been widely applied to understanding reactions to interview content. In addition, interview structure's effects on applicant fairness reactions have not been studied.

In summary, while previous research on the interview has focused on increasing its psychometric properties through the use of increased amounts of structure, little attention has been given to studying applicant reactions to structuring the interview process. Previous research examining the effect of the interview on applicants' reactions

has focused on the effects of interviewer characteristics and behavior (e.g., Jelf, 1999). This line of research, however, has not investigated the effect of interview structure per se on applicant reactions. The current study contributes to this research venue by examining applicant reactions to increased amounts of interview structure.

<div align="center">Interview Structure and Reactions</div>

The available research on applicant reactions to interview structure suggests that elements of interview structure may have a substantial impact on applicants' perceptions and evaluations of the organization (Campion, Palmer, & Campion, 1997; Dipboye, 1994). In fact, the available evidence suggests that increased structure may have a negative impact on applicants' reactions. For example, Latham and Finnegan (1993) examined applicant reactions to hypothetical unstructured, patterned (i.e., structured), and situational interviews. Their results indicated that applicants who did not have experience with situational interviews significantly favored the unstructured and patterned (i.e., structured) interview over the situational interview. These same applicants perceived the unstructured interview as being most likely to help them achieve their interviewing goals of presenting their qualifications, receiving fair treatment, and learning about the job, which in turn would influence them to accept a job offer if given. Applicants who had experience with all three interviewing methods did not view one method as more advantageous than another. However, this line of research focuses mainly on the type of interview question (e.g, situational, behavioral descriptive, or psychological). As will be discussed later, , many elements of interview design that were outlined by Campion et al. (1997) may be implied by the term "structure", and each

element may impact applicants' reactions. Posthuma, Morgeson, and Campion (2002) completed a summary narrative review of the traditional, in-person employment interview by examining 278 studies that were conducted using in-person employment interviews from 1992 - 2002. Within their review, they looked at social factors, cognitive factors, individual difference factors, and applicant reaction outcomes. Their review of the available research on candidate perceptions of fairness to structuring the employment interview showed that elements of interview structure may negatively influence applicants' perceptions and judgment of the organization. For example, Moscoso (2000) performed a review of selection interview research, and found that applicants had more negative reactions to behavioral structured interviews than unstructured interviews. In addition, he found that semi-structured interviews were preferred over highly-structured and unstructured interviews. However, this line of research focuses mainly on a dichotomous definition of structure. As outlined by Campion et al. (1997), there are many elements of structure in an interview that may impact applicants' reactions.

The study of applicants' reactions toward the interview has several practical implications for organizations for various reasons. Hausknecht, Day, and Thomas, (2004) discussed five different grounds for continuing the study of applicant reactions. The first reason is that applicants may view the selection procedure to be invasive and, therefore, find an organization to be less attractive. Secondly, applicants who have negative reactions might dissuade others from applying to the organization. The third reason is that applicants may not accept the offered position if their reactions to the selection procedure are negative. Fourth, applicants could be less likely to apply to the company again (Hausknecht et al., 2004). A fifth reason to be concerned with candidate

perceptions of employment procedures is that if applicants have negative reactions, they may bring about legal complaints and issues. The importance of each of these factors to organizations is integrated within the next three paragraphs.

Organizational Attractiveness

Organizational attractiveness may influence the decision to accept or reject employment offers (Rynes, Bretz, & Gerhart, 1991). If applicants are dissatisfied with the selection interview used by the organization, fewer qualified applicants may accept offers with that company. When the supply of highly-qualified labor is much less than the demand for it, attracting the most highly-qualified applicants becomes increasingly important for organizations and their future.

Legal Challenges

First, procedures that are perceived as unfair or inappropriate may lead to the filing of discrimination complaints or lawsuits under Title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act or other appropriate legislation. It has been suggested that selection procedures that are perceived by applicants as lacking in validity are more likely to be viewed as unfair, resulting in more complaints and court challenges (Elkins & Phillips, 2000). Moreover, a selection procedure with low face validity has influenced court decisions against the use of such a procedure, despite evidence of statistical predictive validity (Vulcan Society v. Civil Service Commission, 1973, as cited in Smither, Reilly, Millsap, Pearlman, & Stoffey, 1993). Williamson, Campion, Malos, Roehling, and Campion (1997) reviewed litigation outcomes with the use of structured interviews. They found that the use of

structure in the interview process was positively related to receiving a favorable verdict in court. The authors found that judges used interview structure, specifically job-relatedness, standardization, and the use of multiple interviewers, as the reason for their favorable judgment for the organization. Litigation charges not only directly impact an organization's immediate profitability (e.g., legal expenses), they can also have an indirect long-term fiscal impact if knowledge of the potential unfairness of the selection interview is shared with others (e.g., spillover effects). Rynes and Barber (1990) have described spillover effects on both consumer behavior (e.g., I would never buy a product/service from a company that treats people that way) and communication with other applicants about the organization. Consequently, it is important to measure psychometric and face validity of a selection procedure to avoid possible litigation as well as negative public relations.

Validity and Utility

Selection procedures that decrease organizational attractiveness may also result in lowered utility (i.e, the dollar benefit associated from the use of a valid selection procedure). Thus, it is important to understand the impact of validity-enhancing techniques on applicants' reactions, because the utility of any selection procedure is partially dependent on the number and quality of applicants, and whether or not the top applicants accept job offers. If highly-qualified individuals tend to either not apply or not accept job offers because of some element of the selection procedure, the instrument's overall utility is likely to be reduced (e.g., Arvey, Strickland, Drauden, & Martin, 1990; Boudreau & Rynes, 1985; Murphy, 1986; Sturman, 2000). In addition, negative

applicant reactions may indirectly impact the validity of a selection procedure. If applicants perceive the selection device as unfair, they may have lower motivation to perform well on the test (Liden, Martin, & Parsons, 1993). This in turn could result in the reduction of the statistical validity of the procedure. Consequently, the utility of the hiring interview cannot be weighted simply by its validity or lack of discriminatory effect. It is also important to consider the perceptions of the applicants who are subjected to it.

<div align="center">Reaction Determinants</div>

In addition to measuring how applicant reactions to selection procedures affect organizational choices, research has also been directed toward understanding what causes applicants to perceive and react differently to selection procedures (Rynes, 1993). According to Gilliland's (1993) model, a number of characteristics are related to perceptions of procedural and distributive fairness of a selection system. Job-relatedness of the interview (Elkins & Phillips, 2000) and the opportunity to perform (Gilliland, 1993) are the most significant determinants of fairness perceptions in employment interviews. In Gilliland's approach, *job-relatedness* refers to the extent to which a test measures aspects of the job that are important for performance, and job-relatedness is also related to face-validity. *Opportunity to perform* refers to the extent that the applicant perceives having a "voice" in the selection process. Research has shown that perceived control relates strongly to the opportunity to perform and influences applicant intentions and reactions. Both Greenberger and Strasser (1991) in the organizational literature and Dweck and Leggert (1988) in the social psychology literature have shown that

perceptions of control over task performance can influence applicant reactions. Specifically, researchers have found that, for individuals with a high need for control, perceptions of control over one's performance in a selection situation led to positive applicant reactions (Bauer, Maertz, Dolen, & Campion, 1998; Kluger & Rothstein 1993; Macan, Avendon, Paese, & Smith, 1994; Ployhart & Ryan , 1997; Rosse, Miller, & Stecher, 1994; Rynes & Connerly, 1993). Schuler (1993) also noted that applicants' control over the situation or their behavior is an important determinant in applicants' reactions to interviews per se. Further, Latham and Finnegan (1993) found that students preferred unstructured to structured interviews because of the perceived opportunity to control the outcome of the interview. More research is needed to determine the extent to which applicant perceptions' of control moderate subsequent reactions to the employment interview. Thus, job applicants' perceptions of perceived control over their performance in unstructured, semi-structured, and structured interviews were also measured here.

Overview

The current study attempted to further scientific understanding of the interview by examining how varying levels of the need for control moderate the relationship between increased amounts of structure and applicant reactions. Specifically, this study examined how the relationship between interview structure and applicant reaction changes depending on whether individuals have either a high or low need for control. It was proposed that varying the amount of interview structure would affect three distinct applicant reactions: perceived fairness of the selection technique itself (Smither et al., 1993), intentions to recommend other applicants to the organization (Gilliland, 1994:

Ployhart & Ryan, 1997), and job acceptance intentions post-interview (Macan et al., 1994; Ployhart & Ryan, 1997), while controlling for general beliefs about the use of interviews for employment hiring. These three applicant reactions are linked to theoretical propositions reviewed below. Controlling for general beliefs about using interviews for hiring purposes helped address the issue of whether the reactions investigated were a function of prior perceptions rather than the amount of structure in the immediate interview. The following literature review will explore past research and theory in interview structure (i.e., the independent variable), the applicant reactions of justice perceptions and recommendation/acceptance intentions (i.e., the dependent variables), and the need for control (i.e., the moderator) in order to derive at the specific hypotheses of interest in this study.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Elements of Interview Structure

Although previous research studies have demonstrated increased validity when using structured versus unstructured interviews (Muchinsky, 2006; Gatewood, Field, & Barrick, 2008), there are many ways in which to structure the interview process. As such, it is essential to know which elements of structure are connected to applicant fairness reactions. The general research conclusion that structured interviews are more valid than unstructured interviews at predicting job performance may mask the fact that there is considerable variability among structured interviews. Campion et al. (1997) defined *interview structure* as any element of the interview designed to increase its validity and reliability through increased standardization of interview content or process. In describing three general levels of structure, (i.e., unstructured, semi-structured, and structured), these researchers discussed 15 potential elements of interview structure: seven interview content elements and eight evaluation process elements. These elements are described in the following paragraphs.

The first of the seven elements of structure that affect *interview content* is the degree to which interview questions are based on a job analysis or critical incidents of the job and closely related to job requirements. Structured interviews are based on a job analysis, whereas unstructured interviews may be based on a variety of factors unrelated

to actual job performance. Similarly, a second element of content structure involves the degree of structure in the actual interview question. There are four types of structured interview questions: situational, behavioral description, background, and job knowledge questions. In the situational interview (SI) (Latham, Saari, Pursell, & Campion, 1980), the interviewer asks job-related questions calling for the candidate to project what he/she would do in a particular job situation (e.g., What would you do if a customer asked you a product question that you could not answer?). The behavioral description interview (BDI) (Janz, 1982) asks candidates to describe past experiences as related to the job (e.g., Tell me about a successful sales presentation you have made, including the steps you used to prepare and the subsequent outcome). Like SI and BDI questions, structured background and job knowledge questions ask very focused inquiries looking for specific information. On the other hand, unstructured interview questions ask for more-general self-descriptions, goals, opinions, or attitudes (e.g., What are your strengths/ weaknesses?).

A third element of interview content structure is the degree of standardizing questions across applicants. A fourth structural element is the amount of prompting and follow-up questions that interviewers are allowed to ask. Likewise, a fifth element of content structure is the degree of control exerted over applicants asking questions. The interview is considered to be more structured if the applicant must reserve questions until the end of the interview. Conversely, unstructured interviews are conversational, with both parties asking questions throughout. A sixth element of structure found in interview content is the degree to which using ancillary information, such as an applicant's resume, is controlled. More-structured interviews limit interviewers' access to those materials

because it may lead to bias. Finally, the last element of structure affecting the content of the interview is the length of the interview. Longer interviews are proposed to be more structured because they allow the interviewer to obtain more information. Prior research discussed how interview length may have played an important role in applicant perceptions and acceptance intentions (Chapman & Zweig, 2005). Chapman and Zweig suggest that applicants may assume that the longer the interview, the more interested the company is in them. There may then be reciprocation effects exhibited by the applicant (Chapman & Zweig, 2005).

As stated earlier, Campion et al. (1997) proposed eight additional elements of structure that impact the applicant *evaluation process*. The eighth element of structure is the degree to which applicants are evaluated on multiple dimensions. For example, instead of producing a single, global rating of an applicant, more structure occurs when interviewers produce an applicant rating for each knowledge, skill, or ability requirement of the job. By rating the applicant on multiple dimensions, the interviewer may avoid evaluating the applicant based on a global impression that may be contaminated with irrelevant information. A ninth element of structure involves the amount of specificity in rating scale anchors. Highly-specific anchors may help the interviewer maintain consistency of ratings across applicants. A 10th element of structure is the degree of note-taking aimed at assisting the interviewer's memory during the evaluation process. Another element of process structure contrasts using single versus multiple interviewers (i.e., the 11th element). Multiple interviewers provide more structure because they decrease idiosyncratic biases in evaluation. A high amount of structure on the 12th element is to use the same interviewer across applicants, facilitating consistency of

evaluation. The 13th element of structure involves the degree to which limits are put on interviewers discussing applicants between interviews. A 14th structural element is the amount of interviewer training provided; more training is assumed to lead to increased consistency in behavior and evaluation. Finally, the last element of structure is the degree to which the use of statistical techniques is used in combining interviewer judgments after the interview. The more these techniques are used, the more they eliminate individual biases in interviewers' aggregation strategies.

It is clear from the description of these structural elements that there is wide variation across interviews in what elements are structured and to what degree they are structured. In their review of interview structure, Campion et al. (1997) noted that eight of the 15 structural elements may affect applicant reactions. They include: basing the interview on a formal job analysis, asking the same questions of all applicants, limiting the amount of prompting by the interviewer, asking more structured questions, conducting longer interviews, controlling interviewer access to ancillary information, limiting when the candidate can ask questions, and using multiple interviewers. In order to understand the effects of interview structure on applicant reactions, it would be helpful to determine which of these eight proposed elements are most salient to applicants. For example, while applicants are likely to perceive that questions are focused on descriptions of their past experience or general beliefs, they are less likely to be aware of whether or not the questions are based on a formal job analysis.

Based on characteristics of the interview provided by Campion et al. (1997), the current study focused on four elements regarding the *content* of the interview that should be salient to applicants. These included: the use of standard scripted questions, the types

of questions asked, the use of ancillary information (i.e., resume) by the interviewer, and whether or not the applicants were encouraged to ask questions during the course of the interview or to reserve questions until the end. First, applicants should be able to perceive whether the interviewer appears to be following a script (standardized interview) or whether the interview is more conversational. The research on applicant reactions to this element of structure have found mixed results. Some applicants perceive standardized interviews as having face validity, which in turn is related to positive applicant reactions (Smither et al., 1993). However, in a study by Latham and Finnegan (1993), the participants found it unimportant that the same topics were discussed with every applicant and preferred the unstructured interview format to the standardized structured format. Although mixed results have been found, at least this previous research suggests that applicants do make assumptions regarding the standardization of interview questions across applicants. More research is needed on this element to determine its effect on applicant reactions.

Second, applicants should perceive the difference between questions that ask them to describe their past work experience (e.g., Tell me about a time when you had to deal with an angry customer at work), questions that ask them to respond to hypothetical situations (e.g., Suppose an angry customer came into your office, how would you handle that situation?), and general questions that ask for self-descriptions, goals, and opinions (e.g., What are your strengths?). By definition, structured interview questions are based on a job analysis and, therefore, may appear more face valid than unstructured interview questions (Smither et al., 1993). However, research has demonstrated a preference by applicants for unstructured interview questions (Conway & Peneno, 1999; Gilmore,

1989; Latham & Finnegan, 1993). Therefore, it would appear that this element of structure is salient to applicants, and that there are definite reactions to varying the amounts of structure on this element.

Third, applicants should recognize whether or not the interviewer is familiar with the ancillary information provided prior to the interview (e.g., resume, transcripts, application, etc.). Campion et al. (1997) suggest that candidates may react negatively if interviewers are not aware of relevant information about their background that was submitted before the interview. More research is needed to determine how this element may impact applicant reactions.

Lastly, applicants should perceive whether or not they are allowed to ask questions during the course of the interview, or whether or not they must reserve questions until the end of the interview. As mentioned previously, candidates have shown a preference for the conversational nature of the unstructured interview (Herriot, 1989; Latham & Finnegan, 1993). More structure on this element could lead to negative reactions.

Although the length of the interview and the use of multiple raters may be salient to applicants, Campion et al. (1997) noted that these components are not strongly related to structure. Consequently, these two elements of structure were not utilized in this study. In addition, note-taking and limiting the amount of prompting by the interviewer were not included because they did not fit with the method used here. Ostensibly, the remaining seven elements of structure identified by Campion et al. (1997) will generally not be salient to applicants, and therefore will also not be used in this study.

In sum, four elements of interview structure that may be salient to applicants were manipulated in this study. As described later, these four elements were used to produce three levels of structured interviews: structured, semi-structured, and non-structured. In addition to identifying the elements of structure that may be observable by applicants, it is necessary to determine what kinds of reactions applicants may have in response to increasing amounts of structure within those elements. The next section of this literature review will examine the applicant reactions that have been studied in past research and a theoretical framework for understanding the potential impact of prior perceptions and interview structure on applicant evaluations and intentions.

<div align="center">Applicant Reactions</div>

In general, two separate lines of research have addressed applicants' reactions to pre-employment interviews. The first line of inquiry has addressed the effects of the recruiter/interviewer on a broad spectrum of applicants' reactions. The second line of investigation has focused primarily on the effects of different types of selection procedures on applicant fairness reactions. These two lines of research will be described next.

First, the majority of studies and theory development addressing reactions to the employment interview have focused primarily on the effects of recruiter interpersonal characteristics and behaviors, probably because recruiters conduct so many interviews. The usual population studied has been college students who are participating in campus employment recruiting, and the dependent variables studied have included evaluations of the interviewer, perceived organizational attractiveness, and job acceptance intentions

(Rynes, 1991). Liden and Parsons (1986) found that the strongest predictor of an applicant's post-interview general affect was the extent to which the recruiter was personable. Although research has indicated that recruiter characteristics are related to applicant impressions of the recruiter, those impressions are not always related to applicant job choices (Rynes & Cable, 2000). Jelf (1999) summarized post-1989 studies on applicant reactions to interviews and found interviewer behavior, prior applicant perceptions of the job, and face validity to be the strongest determinants of subsequent applicant reactions. Chapman and Webster (2006) conducted a longitudinal field study that integrated prior models of applicant reactions utilizing real job applicants. Using structural equation modeling to test the integrated applicant reaction theory, this study found support for recruiter behavior on applicant job choices.

Economic signaling theory has been used as an explanation for the impact of recruiter characteristics on applicants' decisions about the organization (Rynes et al., 1991). The application of signaling theory in this context proposes that applicants have limited information about the characteristics of the job and organization to which they are applying, and thus they use recruiter behaviors as indicators of other organizational characteristics. Several studies (e.g., Goltz & Giannatonio, 1995; Powell, 1991) have supported the idea that applicants' impressions of the recruiter impact their impressions of the organization. Although interpersonal effectiveness is an important factor in determining applicants' reactions to interviews, signaling theory has not been applied to studying the direct impact of other characteristics of the interview, such as structure, on applicant reactions. In addition, results have shown that applicant reactions are more affected by greater information regarding the company, vacancy characteristics, and

organizational image than by recruiter characteristics (Rynes & Cable, 2000). More research on applicant reactions to structural elements of interview content and procedures would be beneficial given that the pre-employment interview is the most widely used method in personnel selection. Consequently, signaling theory was examined further in the current study to determine how interview structure impacts applicants' impressions of the organization.

The second line of research addressing applicants' fairness reactions has focused on the effects of various selection techniques. The rationale in this line of research is that applicants will perceive a hiring process as fairer so long as the selection procedures seem fair (Bauer, Campion, Paronto, & Truxillo, 2002). Smither et al. (1993) provided an extensive treatment of this topic in a study that examined 110 recently employed, entry-level managers' and 44 recruiting managers' reactions to diverse selection procedures. The results of the Smither et al. study indicated that simulations, structured as well as unstructured interviews, and cognitive ability tests with sensible face-valid items were recognized as having the most validity. Personality inventories, biodata, and cognitive ability tests with items not appearing to be job-related were perceived as having less validity. This finding suggests that applicant reactions are not necessarily constant toward a particular selection procedure per se, but rather vary with the appearance of the job-relatedness (i.e., face validity) of the items. That is, perceptions are affected by an interaction between the selection procedure and the situation in which it is used.

As it relates specifically to employment interviews, Bauer, Truxillo, Paronto, and Weekly (2004), studied whether applicant reactions to structured employment interviews were impacted by the screening method chosen: face-to-face, interactive voice response

(IVR), or telephone interview. Using a pre- and post-screening longitudinal study with 153 students, the authors provided the participants with instructions based upon which group the subject belonged. All three conditions received the same interview questions, but the method of delivery differed. In the face-to-face condition, the participants met with a live recruiter for their interview screening, after which the interviewer brought the participant to a computer to complete the applicant reaction survey. In the IVR group, the subjects received instructions to call the automated screening number, and upon completion of the automated interview, go to a website and take the survey. In the telephone condition, participants were screened by telephone, and then they were directed to the website to complete the survey. The results of the survey responses for all three conditions showed that there were no statistically significant difference between the method used to conduct the interview and applicant perceptions of fairness, consistency, job-relatedness, and opportunity to perform. This research suggests that an applicant's reaction to the fairness of the employment interview is not influenced by the screening method chosen as long as structural fairness exists.

<center>Theories of Applicant Justice Reactions</center>

Applicant reactions have been of interest to researchers for many years and various models of applicant reactions have been suggested (e.g., Chapman & Webster, 2006; Ployhart & Harold, 2004). Although Rynes et al. (1991) proposed the relevance of signaling theory, two different theoretical perspectives have contributed to the growth in the research on applicant reactions: organizational justice theory (Gilliland, 1993) and social validity theory (Schuler, 1993). The research in candidate reactions to

employment assessments has largely come from the organizational justice literature (Chapman &Webster, 2006). Gilliland's (1993) organizational justice model provides a theoretical framework of the procedural and distributive justice rules that may affect the perceived fairness of an employment interview. In this model, *procedural justice* refers to the perceived fairness of the process or procedures used to distinguish job candidates, whereas *distributive justice* refers to the perceived fairness of the organizational and personal outcomes that derive from the use of the selection procedures. Even though procedural and distributive justice perceptions are correlated, research has found them to be distinct constructs (Brockner & Wisenfeld, 1996; Greenberg, 1986; Sheppard & Lewicki, 1987).

In Gilliland's model, procedural justice during selection is composed of three components: formal characteristics of the procedures used, explanations given for the procedures and decision-making, and the applicant's interpersonal treatment. Each component is comprised of procedural rules that, if followed during the selection process, should improve perceptions of process fairness and, thereby, may influence pre-test and post-test applicant intentions and behavior toward the organization (Gilliland, 1993). The formal characteristics' component is comprised of four procedural rules: job-relatedness, opportunity to perform, reconsideration opportunity, and consistency. Explanation of procedures and decision-making is comprised of three procedural rules: feedback, information known about the test, and honesty. The interpersonal treatment component is composed of two procedural rules: two-way communication and propriety of questions.

Distributive justice refers to the perceived fairness of the personal and organizational outcomes that derive from using the selection procedures. Distributive

justice rules are concerned with whether or not candidates receive outcomes consistent with their relative amount of input as compared to a referent other. In accordance with this theory, applicant reactions to both the process and its outcome will influence the applicant's decision to accept an offer, seek litigation, or continue to use the organization's products (Ployhart & Harold, 2004; Truxillo, Steiner, & Gilliland, 2004).

The distributive rules are commonly used as the basis for assessment is equity (Cohen, 1987). An evaluation of equity in the selection situation can be interpreted as whether or not candidates obtain employment decisions they expect based on their capabilities shown. In accordance with this theory, applicant reactions to both the process and its outcome will influence the applicant's decision to accept an offer, seek litigation, or continue to use the organization's products (Ployhart & Harold, 2004; Truxillo et al., 2004).

Hausknecht, Day, and Thomas (2004) proposed a revised model of applicant reactions adapted from Gilliland (1993), Rynes (1991), and other empirical literature. This model describes the following four main categories. The first category, person characteristics, includes demographic information, job history, prior experience with the use of selection tools, and personality. Person characteristics have a direct relationship with the second category, perceived procedure characteristics. This category is comprised of Gilliland's (1993) procedural justice rules, to include how the applicant believes he/she was treated during the process, how long the assessment lasts, perceptions of privacy and transparency of the assessment, and the results of the assessment, both real and perceived. The third category include the characteristics of the job itself, such as the knowledge, skills, and abilities required, societal norms or stereotypes about the industry

or the job, and job appeal. The fourth category is organizational context, and consists of the number of people hired, as well as the hiring history of the company (e.g., Thornsteinson & Ryan, 1997). These four variables directly influence applicant perceptions, which include procedural and distributive justice, apprehension regarding the assessment tool, and general beliefs around the use of assessments in the hiring process. These relationships are moderated by the following six variables: which stage the applicant is within the process, the perception of the work environment, the candidate's self-assessment of job fit, the attractiveness of the job, and the availability of multiple job offer options. These variables also interact with perceived procedure characteristics to influence the outcomes. The outcomes studied in this model include performance on selection procedures (actual as well as self-assessed); self-perceptions (self-efficacy and self-esteem); as well as various attitudes and behaviors towards the organization including organizational attractiveness, intentions/behaviors regarding offer acceptance, recommendation, application, reapplication, retesting, product purchase, litigation, and applicant withdrawal. These reactions come to the fore as being strongly related to applicant justice reactions (Hausknecht et al., 2004).

Procedural justice reactions are influenced by three categories of procedure characteristics (Truxillo et al., 2004). The first category includes reactions towards the perceived relevance of the procedure to the job, the opportunity to perform, the opportunity to be re-evaluated, and the standardization of the procedure among all candidates. The second category of procedural characteristics includes explanation dimensions such as feedback, openness and information known about the selection methods. Regarding the latter characteristic, information known, Bauer, Campion,

Paronto, and Truxillo (2002) tested whether or not the method used in disseminating information regarding the selection procedure impacted applicant fairness perceptions, attraction to the organization, and ability to perform on the test. The authors' findings supported the hypothesis that candidates who are provided selection procedure information rate the procedure more fairly than do those who do not receive this information. In addition, the findings supported the second hypothesis that applicants rated the selection process as fairer once the test results were received. The Campion et al. (1997) study underscores the importance of selection information on applicant reactions. This characteristic, information known, is a part of the present study. The third category of procedural characteristics driving applicant reactions includes interpersonal treatment factors such as propriety of questions, testing environment, and shared interaction between candidate and the organization. Hausknecht et al. (2004) found that the antecedent perceptions (i.e., perceived procedure characteristics) influenced these applicant justice reactions with effect sizes ranging from .15 to .54, thus providing support for this proposed link in their model. In sum, along with signaling theory and justice theories, elements of Hausknecht et al.'s (2004) proposed model were examined further in the current study to determine how interview structure impacts applicants' impressions of the organization.

A closely related theoretical perspective is that of social validity (Schuler, 1993). Social validity refers to those components of the selection situation that affect its social acceptability. Schuler (1993) proposed that, in order to increase the social validity of a selection test, applicants should receive job-relevant information that can assist them with decision making, participate in the development or implementation of testing, understand

the evaluation process and task relevance of the selection procedure, and receive feedback.

Consistent with Gilliland's (1993) justice theory and Schuler's (1993) theory of social validity, the proposed study predicts that the characteristics of the interview will impact applicants' evaluation of the perceived fairness of that technique. Also, consistent with signaling theory (Rynes et al., 1991) and Hausknecht et al. (2004), perceptions of the interview are proposed to relate to perceptions of job and organizational attributes as measured by the applicants' recommendation intentions (i.e., the intent to recommend the organization to others) and acceptance intentions (i.e., the intent of the applicant to accept a job offer if given). Thus, the three post-interview reactions to be used in this study were chosen because they have been studied in past research and have practical significance to organizations.

General Beliefs in Hiring Interview

Sackett and Lievens (2008) indicated that additional studies measuring applicant reactions at more than one point in time are needed. To date, research on reactions to the *interview* has gathered applicant assessments only after the interview has occurred. Because applicants' perceptions prior to testing are usually not controlled, it is possible that applicants' previous experience with and preferences toward interviews affect their reactions even prior to their exposure to the actual interview involved in this research.

In Gilliland's (1993) organizational justice model, he proposed that applicants' prior experiences with selection and hiring processes might influence the salience of the procedural rules and the evaluation of the fairness of a current selection system. Some

evidence exists that examinees who report more positive reactions on a specific test also tend to have a stronger generalized belief that employment tests are a good way of selecting people into jobs. Chan, Schmitt, Sacco, and DeShon (1998) hypothesized relationships among candidates' general belief in employment tests (type of tests not specified), pre-test reactions, test performance, and post-test reactions in a situation where cognitive ability and personality tests were administered. These authors found some support: On the cognitive ability test, general beliefs in tests affected pretest reactions and subsequent test performance. On the personality test, general beliefs in employment tests affected pretest and post-test reactions. Ployhart and Ryan (1998) assessed applicants' perceptions and reactions to a graduate school selection process before these individuals applied to the program and after they learned of the selection decision. The candidates were informed that the application process included a review of their GPA, GRE scores, research and work experience, research interests, letters of recommendation, and personal statement. The researchers found that perceptions of pre-application process fairness were significantly related to intentions to recommend others to the school, application intentions, and acceptance intentions.

Based on the theory and research just reviewed, it is expected that applicants' pre-interview general beliefs about the use of interviews in hiring may affect their post-interview reactions. Therefore, pre-interview general beliefs about the efficacy of selection interviewing were statistically controlled in this current study in order to get a clearer view of the effects of applicant-salient interview structure on post-interview reactions.

Need for Control

Evaluations of the Interview

Individuals differ according to the extent they like to exercise control over their environment, and research has shown that this construct can be validly assessed. Need for control has been suggested as a personality characteristic and potentially important moderator within the fields of achievement, psychological adaptation, stress, and health. However, very little research has been undertaken to assess the construct within the employment context. An exception is the work of Burger and Cooper involving the *Desirability of Control Scale* (Gebhardt & Brosschot, 2002). Burger (1992) defined *need for control* as a personality trait in which people are generally motivated to engage in direct choices or actions in their lives. Although much of the I/O literature about need for control focuses on job stress (Koslowsky, 1999), some research has shown that the need for control acts as a moderator of applicant reactions in employment situations. In Gilliland's model (1993), procedural justice perceptions include opportunity to perform. Gilliland proposed that, if applicants felt like they did not have an opportunity to perform, this would violate the procedural rule that individuals should have a voice in outcomes that affect them. In the selection domain, voice can be interpreted as having the possibility of exerting control in a selection situation (Schuler, 1993). Research in the organizational literature on voice (i.e., control) suggests that procedures are perceived to be fairer if recipients of the decision outcome have the opportunity to express themselves prior to the decision.

Thibaut and Walker (1975, as cited in Gilliland, 1993) approached procedural justice from a legal perspective and emphasized the role of voice of the individual in fairness perceptions. Thibaut and Walker's (1975) basic finding was that procedures are perceived to be fairer when affected individuals have an opportunity to exert control by either influencing the decision process or offering input. Burger (1992) summarized the research on need for control, and found that, compared to people with a low need for control, individuals with a high need for control tend to attribute their success to their own effort and ability. Similarly, Ployhart and Ryan (1997) used organizational justice and attribution theories to study how applicants perceive and react to selection systems. These researchers found that the amount of control the individual perceived to have over the outcome of the selection procedure related strongly to subsequent reactions and intentions. In a field study of applicant reactions to personality and cognitive ability tests, Rosse et al. (1994) found that, for individuals with a high need for control, a lack of perceived control may create negative reactions regardless of whether or not the information itself is perceived as favorable or unfavorable. In addition, individuals with a high need for control tend to be more likely than people with a low need for control to react negatively to perceived threats to their personal control. Kluger and Rothstein (1993) found that business student subjects were more comfortable with a biographical inventory than with a cognitive ability test, because they viewed themselves as having more control over their performance in the former. In addition, Rynes and Connerly (1993) concluded that positive perceptions toward reference checks might derive from the candidate's potential to control the source of the information. Macan et al. (1994) found that perceived control over the factors that influenced test performance on a

cognitive ability test and an assessment center contributed to satisfaction with the selection process as well as to liking for the job and organizational attractiveness. Bauer et al. (1998) found that general perceptions of the fairness of a written employment test were significantly predicted by the perceived chance to perform.

In related studies, Ngah, Ahmad, and Baba (2009) studied the mediating impact of locus of control on job satisfaction. They found that individuals with a higher locus of control score experienced less conflict and increased job satisfaction than did those who scored lower on the locus of control scale. Zimmerman (2008) found that personality and individual dispositions mediated job-related decisions such as turnover.

Although research has examined the general effect of control on applicant reactions to job selection tools, few studies to date have examined this impact specifically on the employment interview. Truxillo et al. (2004) discuss how personality variables, such as locus of control, are keys that influence perceptions of fairness of hiring assessment tools. These authors specifically state that future research should study personal characteristics that may influence applicant reactions to selection procedures (Truxillo et al., 2004). Minimal research exists on the influence of personality variables on applicant reactions to job assessment tools (Berneth, et al. 2006; Viswesvaran & Ones, 2004).

In addition, few studies that have been conducted to examine the impact of perceived control on applicant reactions to selection procedures have examined this impact specifically on the employment interview. Latham and Finnegan (1993) reported that student applicants preferred unstructured to structured interviews due to the amount of perceived control the students believed to have over the outcome of the unstructured

interviewing process. In addition, Schuler (1993) reported on a German study in which 96 students rated their impressions of structured versus unstructured interviews. The results showed that the students preferred interviewers who used an unstructured format because the interviewers were perceived as being easier to influence. When asked about overall selection test preference, these students preferred interviews, both structured and unstructured, to other selection techniques, partially because these students perceived they had greater control over the results (Fruhner, Schuler, Funke, & Moser, 1991, as cited in Schuler, 1993). However, as previously noted, there are many elements of interview structure, and each element may have a significant impact on applicants' evaluations of their ability to control the interview. For example, the four structural elements manipulated in the current study are potential influences on a candidate's ability to control the interview. Therefore, candidates with a high need for control may have different reactions than do those with a low need for control. Specifically, the standardization of questions across applicants, the use of ancillary information by the interviewer, the use of more-structured questions, and the controlling of questions from applicants may all affect applicants' perceptions of control; therefore, people with high or low need for control may have different reactions. Potential links between these four structural elements and the need for control will be described next.

In this study, the first element of interview structure that may impact a candidate's perceptions of control is the degree to which the interviewee perceives that applicants are asked the same questions, with the highest level of structure occurring when the interviewer asks all applicants the exact same questions in the exact same order. A semi-structured interview requires that the same job-related questions be asked, but allows the

interviewer to adjust the interview for different candidates. In the unstructured interview, the interviewer is free to ask each different candidate any questions thought to be appropriate or relevant to the job. Although candidates may view structured interviews as face valid (Smither et al., 1993), research has shown a preference for the freedom provided by unstructured interviews (Latham & Finnegan, 1993). Selection methods that are seen as relevant to the job in question are normally associated with more positive fairness reactions, but applicants typically do not have access to criterion-validity evidence. Consequently, the applicant must assume job-relatedness of the selection technique (Elkins & Phillips, 2000). Smither et al. (1993) found that, although structured interviews are empirically more valid than unstructured interviews, applicants perceived both unstructured and structured interviews to be fair. Thus, the preference that applicants show toward unstructured interviews may be explained due to the amount of control the applicant perceives to have over the process and subsequent outcomes. A predetermined question order may inconvenience candidates prepared to describe their background in a different order. Also, if the interviewer appears to be following a standardized script and question set, applicants may perceive that they have little opportunity to influence (i.e., control) the course of the interview by focusing on those areas where they have the most impressive qualifications. This may affect evaluations of the opportunity to exert some control in the interview, which in turn would lead to negative applicant reactions.

A second element of interview structure that affects a candidate's perception of control involves the use of certain types of more-structured questions (e.g., situational or behavioral). The degree of question structure may impact applicants' evaluations of their

opportunity to exert some control. The use of more-structured questions is fundamental to the concept of a structured interview. However, the more-structured questions may constrain applicants in presenting their relevant experience and provide less of an opportunity to influence or control the interview. Campion et al. (1997) suggested that SI and BDI questions are more structured because they require the applicants to be very specific in their answers, and because these questions are usually based on a formal job analysis. According to organizational justice and social validity theories, procedural justice perceptions and social acceptability would be more favorable for unstructured interview questions, because general questions do not constrain applicants' responses to specific situations and events as SI and BDI questions do. Unstructured questions are probably closer to what applicants expect in employment interviews. In addition, if applicants have not had experiences that are assessed by these questions, they may feel that they did not have an opportunity to present other qualifying experiences. Less-structured questions that ask applicants to describe their past experiences in general terms allow applicants to pick and choose those experiences that they feel best demonstrate their competencies.

Latham and Finnegan (1987; cited by Latham, 1989) found that potential applicants preferred unstructured interviews to SI and BDI interviews because greater freedom is provided in responding. Gilmore (1989) manipulated question type and interviewer affect. He predicted that students viewing scripted, videotaped interviews would rate a BDI as more job-related than an unstructured interview. However, Gilmore did not find any difference in perceived face validity across the two interview types, but he did find that BDIs were perceived as more difficult. Likewise, Smither et al. (1993)

found that unstructured and structured interviews were rated similarly in face and predictive validity. They also found interviewee affect to be among the best predictors of willingness to recommend the employer to other potential applicants. Similarly, Conway and Peneno (1999) compared the effects of SI, BDI, and unstructured interview questions on applicant reactions. They found that, although all question types were seen as face valid and fair in terms of procedural justice, applicants preferred unstructured interview questions. These researchers found that applicants had more positive affective reactions to unstructured interview questions than SI or BDI questions. This finding of higher positive affect for unstructured questions suggests that general questions may produce higher acceptance and recommendation intentions as compared to SI and BDI questions. In sum, the use of more-structured questions seems to affect the applicants' feelings of control and their subsequent reactions.

A third element of structure involves controlling the use of ancillary information by the interviewer. Ancillary information is defined by Campion et al. (1997) as information submitted by the applicant (i.e., resume, application, transcripts, test scores, recommendations, etc.) to the interviewer prior to the interview. In an unstructured interview, interviewers are allowed access to ancillary information even if the information is not available on all candidates and may negatively affect the validity of the interview. In a semi-structured interview, interviewers are allowed access to ancillary information, but only if that information is available on all candidates and evaluated in a standardized manner (e.g., test scores). The highest level of structure is to not allow interviewers' access to such information because it may lead to forming biased impressions. However, candidates may prefer that the interviewer have access to this

information, because it allows them to highlight their credentials. If the interviewer does not appear to have knowledge of the applicants' background as provided prior to the interview, the applicants may feel that they did not have the opportunity to present their qualifications in full detail and wasted their time in submitting the other material. If applicants believe that their resumes present their background in a favorable light and perceive that the interviewer has not been exposed to that information prior to the interview, they may feel less of an opportunity to control the interview due to their inability to impress the interviewer beforehand. Again, applicants' reactions would seem to be filtered through fulfilling or not fulfilling their need for control.

The last element of structure directly affecting applicants' perceptions of influence in this study is the degree to which questions from them are controlled. The interview is by definition more structured if the applicant must reserve questions until the end of the interview. Not allowing candidates to ask questions until the end of the interview could elicit negative applicant reactions, because it restricts freedom and may lead to awkward conversations. In addition, if the applicants are not allowed to ask questions until the end of the interview, they may feel that they have less opportunity to impress the interviewer by asking relevant questions at the appropriate moment. Not allowing candidates to ask questions until the end of the interview also prevents candidates from using the information gained by asking questions to shape some of their remaining answers. To the extent that the interviewer controls when or how applicants ask questions, this should lead to the applicants feeling like they have less freedom or control within the interview. Bies and Shapiro (1988) presented individuals with recruiting interview scenarios in which the interviewee either did or did not have the

opportunity to demonstrate competencies and ask questions of the interviewer. Perceptions of control and procedural fairness were higher when the interviewee had the opportunity to ask questions.

Summary of Current Study and Hypotheses

In this study, applicant's perceptions of interview structure were manipulated by the degree to which four content elements were present: the standardization of questions, the amount of question structure, the control of ancillary information, and the opportunity for the applicant to ask questions. These are four elements from Campion et al.'s (1997) conceptualization of the elements of interview structure but are only those elements that would be particularly salient to the applicant. In turn, the applicant's perceptions of these salient structural elements were expected to affect their perceptions of control and subsequent applicant reactions. An interaction between interview structure and applicant need for control was hypothesized for each of the three applicant reactions. Specifically, the relationship between interview structure and applicant reactions was expected to be negative only for individuals with a higher need for control.

Hypothesis 1a

The amount of interview structure and the candidate's need for control will interact to influence applicants' fairness perceptions. That is, as the amount of interview structure increases, fairness perceptions will decrease for applicants higher in need for control. However, as the amount of interview structure increases, fairness perceptions will remain unchanged for applicants with a low need for control.

Hypothesis 1b

The amount of interview structure and the candidate's need for control will interact to influence applicants' recommendation intentions. That is, as the amount of interview structure increases, recommendation intentions will decrease for applicants higher in need for control. However, as the amount of interview structure increases, recommendation intentions will remain unchanged for applicants with a low need for control.

Hypothesis 1c

The amount of interview structure and the candidate's need for control will interact to influence applicants' acceptance intentions. That is, as the amount of interview structure increases, acceptance intentions will decrease for applicants higher in need for control. However, as the amount of interview structure increases, acceptance intentions will remain unchanged for applicants with a low need for control.

The current study contributes to, and improves, applicant reaction research in several ways: First, the hypotheses derived from this literature review suggest that an applicant personality variable moderates the impact of different levels of structure on applicant reactions. Therefore, although much of the previous research has examined the impact of *interviewer/recruiter* variables (Goltz & Giannatonio, 1995; Rynes, 1991) and question type (Conway & Peneno, 1999) on perceived fairness, acceptance intentions, and recommendation intentions, my hypotheses focus on an *applicant* characteristic, the need for control. The focus on need for control as a moderator was intended to clarify some of the boundary conditions for interview structure-applicant reaction relationships. In addition to looking at the effects of structure and need for control on the three primary dependent variables (i.e., fairness perceptions, recommendation intentions, and acceptance intentions), this study looked at the effects of the independent variables on

two other dependent variables (i.e., perceptions of the importance of structure and opportunity to control).

Second, current research on applicant reactions to interview structure is limited to a simple structured versus unstructured categorization of interview studies, with the primary focus being on the type of questions asked in the interview. Yet a review of the literature suggests a diversity of approaches to structuring the interview. Given these diverse operationalizations, it appears that structure is far more complex than can be represented by a dichotomous distinction on one structural element, as is done in many studies. A more sophisticated framework for classifying interview structural elements and their combined levels of structure was used in the present investigation. The current study used four of the structural elements proposed by Campion et al. (1997) and trichotomized their combined effect into structured, semi-structured, and unstructured interviews.

Finally, most studies have used a single measurement period to examine perceptions of fairness, yet clearly the typical employee selection context involves a number of distinct stages and is influenced by prior experience with the testing instrument (Latham & Finnegan, 1993). Given these relationships, the current study statistically controlled for the effects of prior general beliefs about the interview on post-interview reaction measures.

METHOD

Experimental Design and Variables

The variables in the study included one continuous control variable (i.e., general beliefs), one repeated measures independent variable with 3 levels (i.e., structure), one dichotomized moderator variable (i.e., need for control), three primary dependent variables per structural level (i.e., fairness perceptions, recommendation intentions, and acceptance intentions), two secondary dependent variables (i.e., perceptions of importance of structure and opportunity to control), seven demographic variables comprised of two dichotomized variables (i.e., gender and ethnicity) and five continuous variables (i.e., age, GPA, full-time work experience, part-time work experience, and number of interviews), and two manipulation checks (i.e., structure and perceived opportunity to control the interview). The resulting experimental design was a mixed 3 (levels of structure) x 2 (dichotomized levels of need for control) with repeated measures only across the structure levels.

Participants

Participants were 161 undergraduate students from a large Southern university. They were solicited via classroom announcements in the psychology and business

departments, requesting volunteers for a study. Participants received extra credit for participation. The sample was 34.8% male ($n = 56$), 65.2% female ($n = 105$) and was primarily Caucasian (75.2%). Table 1 shows other summary statistics describing the sample: The average age of the students was 20.35 years old, and their average GPA was 3.11. The sample had an average of 1.11 years of full-time work experience, and 3.06 years of part-time experience. On average, the students had participated in 2.80 interviews prior to this study.

Experimental Materials

Job Description

A description of an entry-level management trainee position was utilized in this study as the target job for which the participants would be interviewing. This job was chosen because it is a common first-level position in many organizations and a position that most college graduates could aspire to and identify with. The management trainee position description was based on an actual job analysis conducted by a large U.S-based insurance company. See Appendix A for a copy of the job description used in the current study.

Interview Structure Manipulation

Three levels of interview structure (i.e., unstructured, semi-structured, structured) were manipulated through written scenarios with participants assuming the identity of a job applicant interviewee. All three "interviews" consisted of a list of 16 questions that student job applicants read. Across the three interviews, there were 48 total interview

questions: 16 unique unstructured questions, 16 unique structured questions, and a third interview repeating eight of the unstructured questions and eight of the structured questions.

The *unstructured* interview consisted of 16 general questions (e.g., what are your strengths/areas of improvement?). It was explained in the written scenario that the interviewer would not ask all candidates the same questions but would ask general questions that allow for adjustment of interview questions for different candidates. In addition, interviewees were told that the interviewer would have access to their resumes prior to and during the interview. Lastly, candidates were allowed to ask questions at any point during the interview (Campion et al., 1997; McDaniel, Whetzel, Schmidt, & Maurer, 1994). See Appendix B for a copy of the unstructured scenario and interview questions.

The *semi-structured* interview consisted of 16 questions: eight pre-specified job-related questions taken from the structured interview scenario, and eight general questions taken from the unstructured interview scenario. The overlap of the unstructured and structured interview questions resulted in the semi-structured interview being comprised of four questions based on the applicant's past behavior (BDI), four job-related hypothetical questions (SI), and eight questions tailored to the individual (i.e., unstructured). It was explained in the written scenario that the interviewer would ask some of the same questions to all candidates but also would ask some general questions allowing for adjustment of interview questions for different candidates. In addition, instructions were given that the interviewer would have access to the candidate's resume prior to the interview, but not during the interview. Lastly, candidates were told that, for

this interview, they could only ask questions after answering the question that was asked by the interviewer (Campion et al., 1997; Janz, 1982; Latham et al., 1980). See Appendix C for a copy of the semi-structured scenario and interview questions.

The *structured* interview consisted of 16 questions: eight pre-specified job-related questions based on the applicant's past behavior (BDI) and eight pre-specified job-related hypothetical questions (SI). It was explained in the written scenario that the interviewer would pose the exact same questions to all candidates. Furthermore, interviewees were told that the interviewer would not ask questions specific to the applicant's resume and not have the resume prior to or during the interview. Lastly, candidates were instructed that, in this interview, questions could only be asked at its conclusion (Campion et al., 1997; Janz, 1982; Latham et al., 1980). See Appendix D for a copy of the structured scenario and interview questions.

Measures

Pre-interview Questionnaire

A pre-interview questionnaire with 31 items was used to collect applicants' demographic information, applicants' general belief regarding the appropriateness of utilizing the interview for selection, and the individual's level of need for control. The items were grouped in sections: demographics (i.e., items 1 - 7), general belief (i.e., items 1 - 4), and need for control (i.e., items 1 - 20). See a copy of the survey in Appendix E.

Demographics

Demographic information was collected in the first seven items and included gender, age, GPA, part- and full-time work experience, interviewing experience, and ethnicity. Research has shown that differences in race, gender, age, and education level could have implications for the design and operation of recruitment programs (Arvey & Sackett, 1993; Huffcutt & Roth, 1998; Smither et al., 1993; Truxillo & Hunthausen, 1999). Also, differences in work experience (Campion, Pursell, & Brown, 1988) and applicant ability level (Murphy, 1986) could have implications for job pursuit intentions. Lastly, Title VII makes it illegal for organizations to use race, gender, age, and other variables when making selection decisions. If an applicant perceives the selection interview as unfair, the applicant may attribute this to a personal characteristic (e.g., age) instead of a job-related issue (Williamson, et al., 1997). Consequently, it is important to know whether or not perceived differences on the dependent variables are due to subject characteristics, as such differences could impact the use of certain selection interviews as well as generalizing findings.

General Beliefs

Grouped in a separate section, an applicant's general belief regarding the appropriateness of utilizing the interview for selection was measured with four items requiring responses on a 7-point Likert-type scale ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (7). Three items measuring the applicant's general belief in using the interview for selection were adapted from the 3-item *Belief in Testing* Likert scale developed by Arvey, Strickland, Drauden, and Martin (1990). Given that the Arvey et al. (1990) scale referred to tests in general for selecting people into jobs, their items were changed in this study to

obtain beliefs specifically about utilizing the interview for selection. Item 3 was reverse scored. A fourth item was added to be more comprehensive. Coefficient alpha reliability for the Arvey et al., (1990) scale was .79, and coefficient alpha reliability for the scale used in this study was .55. One potential reason for the lower reliability is that items 1, 2, and 4 are more an evaluation of the tool, whereas item 3 is an evaluation of the applicant's understanding of the use of the tool. As such, the items could have different interpretations and not combine cohesively into one scale. In addition, item 3 was reverse scored, which may have confused the applicants. To check on the distinctiveness of item 3, the coefficient alpha reliability was calculated for items 1, 2, and 4 and was found to be .68.

<div align="center">Need for Control</div>

This survey consisted of 20 items with ratings on a 7-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (doesn't apply to me at all) to 7 (always applies to me). The items and scoring key measuring need for control were obtained from the *Desirability of Control Scale* (Burger, 1985; 1992). The descriptive norms and reliability coefficient previously reported for this scale (Burger, 1985; 1992) are relevant here. Burger reported an overall normative mean for the *Desirability of Control Scale* of 100, with a standard deviation of 10 and a coefficient alpha reliability of .81. In the current study, the mean obtained was 97.24 with a *SD* of 9.76 and a coefficient alpha reliability of .80. Thus the current sample reflected the scale norms quite well, and the scale showed an acceptable level of internal consistency.

Post-interview Surveys

After each interview scenario, the same 24-item post-interview survey was used to obtain the primary and secondary dependent reaction measures: perceived fairness, recommendation intentions, acceptance intentions, importance of structure, and importance of need for control. In addition the post-interview questionnaire contained manipulation check items measuring applicants' perceptions of the structural elements of the interview and items measuring perceptions of control. All 24 items were intermixed within the survey; see the survey in Appendix F.

Fairness Perceptions

Evaluations of the fairness of the interview refer to the applicant's immediate evaluative reactions that are directed at the content of the selection technique. To assess perceptions of fairness following each interviewing scenario, applicants responded to four items (i.e., items 2, 10, 13, and 15) on a 7-point Likert-type scale ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (7). Item 10 was reversed scored so that a high score indicated a positive reaction.   These items were modified versions of those used by several researchers (Bauer et al., 1998; Chan et al., 1998; Macan et al., 1994; Ployhart & Ryan, 1998) who adapted questions originally from Gilliland's (1994) measure of the perceptions of face content validity (e.g., the questions asked in the interview were job related). Specifically, this survey was developed on the basis of Gilliland's (1993) procedural justice rules, which ask the degree to which applicants feel that the procedures used for selection are fair.   Coefficient alpha reliability for Gilliland's study was .85. In

this study, coefficient alpha reliability was .77 for unstructured interviews, .74 for semi-structured interviews, and .74 for structured interviews.

Recommendation Intentions

Recommendation intentions refer to the applicant's intentions to tell others about the same job and/or organization and suggest that they apply. Intentions of this type are clearly an indirect measure of the applicants' impressions of the job and organizational characteristics. Three items (i.e., items 4, 11, and 17) adapted from Gilliland (1994) assessed recommendation intentions. The survey required responses on a 7-point Likert-type scale ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (7). Item 11 was reversed scored so that a high score indicated a positive reaction. Coefficient alpha reliability from Gilliland's (1994) study was .83. For the current study, coefficient alpha reliability was .72 for unstructured interviews, .80 for semi-structured interviews, and .66 for structured interviews.

Acceptance Intentions

The third type of applicant reaction measured in the post-interview survey was acceptance intentions. These refer to the applicants' behavioral intentions to continue with or terminate the relationship with the organization. Three items (i.e., items 5, 8, and 16) adapted from Macan et al. (1994) and Ployhart and Ryan (1998) assessed acceptance intentions. The survey required responses on a 7-point Likert-type scale ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (7). Item 5 was reversed scored so that a high score indicated a positive reaction. Coefficient alpha reliabilities obtained in their studies were .70 and .72 respectively. The coefficient alpha reliability in this study was

.67 for unstructured interviews, .59 for semi-structured interviews, and .65 for structured interviews.

In addition to the above-mentioned primary dependent variables, two secondary dependent variables were measured: importance of structure and importance of the ability to control the interview. These measures were added to determine which factors most related to applicant perceived fairness, recommendation intentions, and acceptance intentions.

<u>Importance of Structure</u>

Four items (i.e., items 1b, 6b, 9b, and 12b) measured the importance of amount of structure in each of the three interviewing conditions. Items 1b and 6b were reversed scored so that a high score indicated a higher importance of amount of structure in the interview. Participants responded to a 4-point Likert item ranging from 1 (not at all important) to 4 (very important) for each of these questions. These four items were newly developed for this study. Coefficient alpha reliabilities for the three levels of structure were .51 for unstructured interviews, .58 for semi-structured interviews, and .57 for structured interviews. These newly developed items do not seem to combine cohesively into one scale.

<u>Importance of Control</u>

Three items (i.e., items 3b, 7b, and 14b) measured the importance of the ability to control the interview within each of the three levels of structure. The survey required responses on a 4-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (not at all important) to 4 (very important) for each of the three questions. These three items were newly developed for this study. Coefficient alpha reliabilities obtained on this measure were .65 for the

unstructured interview, .69 for the semi-structured interview, and .73 for the structured interview.

<u>Structure Manipulation Check</u>

In order to check the experimental manipulation, the post-interview questionnaire measured applicants' perceptions of the amount of interview structure in each scenario, specifically assessing the following: the appearance that the interviewer was following a script, the opportunity for the applicant to ask questions, the degree of question structure, and the interviewer's knowledge of the resume. These four items (i.e., 1a, 6a, 9a, and 12a) measuring perceptions of interview structure were newly developed for this study, based on the salient elements described by Campion et al. (1997). When these items were asked, they were paired with the four *importance of structure* items. Participants responded to a 7-point Likert-type item ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (7) for each of these four questions. Items 1a and 6a were reversed scored so that high scores on all items represented more structure. These items were not expected to form a unidimensional scale given their breadth, so coefficient alphas were not calculated for each of the structure conditions.

<u>Ability to Control Manipulation Check</u>

One 7-point Likert-type item scale ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (7) was added to each of the three questions measuring importance of control in order to measure a candidate's perceived ability to control the interview (i.e., items 3a, 7a, and 14a). Item 3a was reversed scored so that a high score indicated a higher ability to control the interview.   As this study involved measuring the interaction of amount of structure and a person's need for control on the dependent measures, perceptions of the

opportunity to control the interview were treated as an indirect manipulation check on structure. Items for this measure were adapted from Bauer et al. (1998) and Macan et al. (1994). Again, these items were not expected to form a unidimensional scale given their breadth, so coefficient alphas were not calculated for each of the structure conditions.

Pilot Testing

Pilot testing was conducted on a sample of 7 participants to test the procedural logistics and ensure that the three interview scenarios represented varying degrees of structure. Data from a manipulation check measure distinguished between the three levels of interview structure and their intended ordering (i.e., unstructured, semi-structured, and structured). Further discussion with the pilot participants about the study materials indicated that, generally, the instructions were clear and the scenarios were realistic. However, the pilot contained a resume, with the instruction for the interviewee to assume the identity showed that, indeed, participants of the candidate in the resume in order to answer the interview questions. Based on feedback from the pilot participants revealing that assuming another identity was problematic, the resume was not included in the actual study. Instead, the participants answered the interview questions based on their own experiences. In addition, a grammatical error was found on the locus of control scale, and this was corrected for the actual study.

Procedure

Participants were given the interview scenarios in a classroom setting in groups ranging in size from 3 to 30 individuals. Data collection occurred at four intervals: pre-

interview and once after each of the three interviews varying by degree of structure. Upon arrival, participants were requested to fill out the 5 - 10 minute pre-interview questionnaire that was used to measure their demographics, general attitudes towards selection interviews, and need for control.

After completing the pre-interview questionnaire, each subject was given a booklet containing a job description for an entry-level management trainee position, the three interviewing scenarios, and the post-interview surveys. Three interviews were specifically constructed so that one was an unstructured interview, one was a semi-structured interview, and one was a structured interview. These three interviews were presented in a counterbalanced order across participants so that the order of viewing the differing amounts of interview structure did not influence the results (i.e., order effects). All of the booklets appeared similar and contained identical information but differed across the six possible variations of interview order. Each booklet contained an ID so that the "interviewees" remained anonymous.

After all participants received their booklets, they were informed that the study concerned different interviewing scenarios used by a large telecommunications organization to select entry-level management trainees. The participants were asked to assume the role of a job applicant who has recently applied for this entry-level management trainee position and, as part of the selection process, was required to participate in a three-step interviewing process. It was emphasized that examinees should use this session as practice for interview situations they might encounter in the future when they apply for jobs after graduation. A copy of the oral instructions is provided in Appendix G.

After this general orientation, participants were told to open to the first page in the booklet, the job description for the target entry-level management trainee position. All participants were informed to read the job description. Upon finishing, the participants were asked if they had any questions. They were then told to turn the page to the first interviewing scenario. Via written directions, the participants were instructed to consider each scenario in terms of how they would react if they were confronted with this type of interview in their own job search. The scenarios gave each participant a brief description of what to expect in the interview. Participants were asked to read the interview items associated with each scenario in order to get an idea of the interview content, and then they were told to mentally answer each of the questions presented. Immediately following each "interview", the participants were asked to complete the post-interview questionnaire.

Each interview was approximately 10 - 15 minutes in length, and the complete participant experience lasted approximately 55 - 70 minutes. Upon completion of the experiment, the participants were debriefed as to the true nature of the experiment and told that the experiment assessed job applicant reactions.

RESULTS

Manipulation Checks

The structure manipulation check measure was analyzed to assess the

effectiveness of the structure manipulation. The results of the repeated measures

ANOVA for the structure manipulation was significant, F (2, 304) =113.19,

$p < .001$. Post hoc paired sample t-tests using Bonferroni's correction for multiple

contrasts showed significance between the means in the expected direction: Participants

indicated lower levels of structure in the unstructured condition than in the semi

structured $(p < .001)$ and structured conditions $(p < .001)$. In addition, the semi-

structured condition reported lower levels than the structured comparison $(p < .001)$.

Based on the statistical findings, the means of the three conditions appear to support the

structure manipulation. The means, standard deviations, repeated measures ANOVA,

and post hoc analyses are included in Table 2.

A check on perceived control was performed to show that the participants also

saw different opportunities to control the interview by level of structure. The results of

the repeated measures ANOVA across all participants was significant, F (2, 310)

=128.67, $p < .001$. As expected, using Bonferroni's correction for multiple contrasts, the

participants perceived more control in the unstructured condition than in the semi-

structured condition $(p < .001)$. However, unexpectedly, the structured condition also

 perceived more control than in the semi-structured position ($p < .001$). In addition, a significant difference was not found between the unstructured condition and the structured condition ($p = .473$). The means, standard deviations, repeated measures ANOVA and post hoc analyses are in Table 3.

<div align="center">

<u>Key Bivariate Relationships</u>

</div>

Within each level of structure, Tables 4 - 6 present the means, standard deviations, correlations and, where appropriate, internal consistency reliability estimates in parentheses along the diagonal for the seven demographic variables, one control variable, one moderator, three primary dependent variables and two secondary dependent variables. The *N* in each table ranged from 158 - 161. As shown in the tables, the internal consistency reliabilities (i.e., coefficient alphas) for the three primary dependent variables, the moderator and the control variable were generally in acceptable ranges (i.e., *α* ranging from .55 to .80). In addition, the two secondary dependent measures, importance of structure and importance of control, had *α* ranging from .51 to .73. One possible explanation for the low reported reliabilities is that each of these scales has only three or four items.

<div align="center">

Dependent Variables

</div>

The three primary dependent variables (i.e., fairness perceptions, recommendation intentions, and acceptance intentions) were significantly inter-correlated within the unstructured interview, the semi-structured interview and the structured interview. These correlations are shown in Tables 4 - 6. Across these tables, the significant correlations

between fairness perceptions and recommendation intentions were $r = .46$, $r = .59$, and $r = .49$ respectively, at $p < .01$. Similarly, the significant correlations between fairness perceptions and acceptance intentions were $r = .39$, $r = .49$ and $r = .45$, respectively, at $p < .01$. Lastly, the correlations between recommendation intentions and acceptance intentions were significant, $r = .75$, $r = .61$, and $r = .73$, respectively, at $p < .01$.

The two secondary dependent variables (i.e., the importance of structure and the importance of control) were significantly correlated in the unstructured interview ($r = .61$, $p < .01$), the semi-structured interview ($r = .56$, $p < .01$) and the structured interview ($r = .62$, $p < .01$). These correlations are shown in Tables 4 - 6.

In the unstructured condition, none of the six correlations *between* the primary and secondary dependent measures were significant (r ranged from -.02 to .07). These results are displayed in Table 4. However, in the semi-structured and structured interviews, 11 of the 12 correlations between the primary and secondary dependent measures were significant (see Tables 5 and 6): Fairness perceptions and structure importance were related $r = .20$, $p < .05$ and $r = .30$, $p < .01$ in the semi-structured and structured interviews, respectively. Fairness perceptions and the importance of control were related $r = .42$, $p < .01$ and $r = .33$, $p < .01$, respectively. In addition, recommendation intentions and structure importance were correlated $r = .20$, $p < .05$ and $r = .27$, $p < .01$ in the semi-structured and structured conditions respectively; recommendation intentions and the importance of control were correlated $r = .37$, $p < .01$ and $r = .26$, $p < .01$, respectively. Lastly, acceptance intentions and structure importance were related $r = .18$, $p < .05$ in the structured interviews. Acceptance intentions was not significantly related to semi-structure importance, $r = .16$, $p > .05$. Acceptance intentions

and the importance of control were related $r = .32$ $p < .01$ and $r = .23$, $p < .01$, respectively.

General beliefs about the interview, the control variable, were not significantly related to any of the five dependent measures across the interview structure conditions, with one exception. In the semi-structured interview, general beliefs were correlated significantly with structure recommendation intentions ($r = .23$, $p < .01$) in Table 5. Need for control, the moderator, did not have any significant relationships with the five dependent measures across the structure conditions.

Demographic Variables

As expected, among the demographic variables, age was significantly related with years of full-time experience ($r = .79$ $p < .01$), years of part-time experience ($r = .24$ $p < .01$) and number of interviews ($r = .27$, $p < .01$). Age was also significantly related with being non-white ($r = .22$ $p < .01$). Full-time work experience was also significantly related with number of interviews ($r = .32$, $p < .01$), and being non-white ($r = .17$, $p < .05$). Lastly, number of interviews was also significantly correlated with years of part-time work ($r = .18$, $p < .05$) and with being non-white ($r = .20$, $p < .05$). There were no significant correlations between general beliefs or need for control and the applicants' demographics. Most importantly, however, the demographic variables showed very few significant relationships with the dependent measures across all three interview conditions. Only six significant relationships were found out of the possible 105, and only two of these significant correlations were above .20 (see Tables 4-6). The absence of a pattern of significant correlations between any of the work experience variables and the dependent measures is noteworthy because it lends credibility to results from the total

sample, even the nonworking participants. This provides some evidence that the results from the total set of participants are generalizable.

<u>Hypotheses 1a, b and c</u>

Hypotheses 1a, b and c predicted that the amount of interview structure and the candidate's need for control would interact to influence applicants' fairness perceptions, recommendation intentions and acceptance intentions, respectively. Specifically, the amount of interview structure was hypothesized to be significantly negatively related with all three dependent measures only for applicants higher in need for control. The amount of interview structure and the applicant reactions were hypothesized to be unrelated for applicants low in need for control.

A 3 x 2 mixed MANCOVA design was used, with structure as the within-subjects effect, need for control as the between-subjects effect, and the three applicant reactions (i.e., fairness perceptions, recommendation intentions, and acceptance intentions) as the dependent variables (see Table 7). General beliefs concerning selection interviewing efficacy were co-varied. Multivariate analyses only yielded significant main effects for structure ($F (6, 147) = 12.62, p < .01$) and need for control ($F (3, 150) = 2.94, p < .05$). Structure accounted for 34% of the variance in applicant reactions, and need for control accounted for 6%. Importantly, no significant multivariate or univariate effects were found for the interaction between structure and need for control. Thus, Hypotheses 1a, b and c were not supported.

As a follow-up to the two significant multivariate main effects that were found, analogous ANCOVAs showed that all three dependent measures had a significant

structure main effect, but none had a significant need for control main effect. Table 7

contains the ANCOVA results, and Table 8 reveals the means and significant differences

among the three levels of structure for each of the dependent measures. These results are

reviewed next.

Fairness

For fairness, Table 7 reveals that structure's main effect was significant (F (2,

304) = 15.50, $p < .01$), and it accounted for 9% of the variance. In Table 8, post hoc

comparisons using Bonferroni's correction for multiple contrasts show significance

between the means, but not in the expected direction. Participants indicated *lower* levels

of fairness in the unstructured condition ($M = 18.97$, $SE = .36$) than in the semi structured

($M = 21.30$, $SE = .34$, $p < .01$) and structured conditions *($M = 21.35$, $SE = .34$, $p < .01$).*

However, no significant differences in fairness were found between the semi-structured

and structured conditions. Based on these findings, applicants perceived the semi-

structure and structured interviews to be fairer than the unstructured interviews. In

addition, although the need for control showed a significant multivariate difference when

combining dependent variable effects in Table 7, fairness showed no significant

univariate effect (F (1, 152) = 3.13, $p = .079$): low need for control ($M = 20.18$, $SE = .30$)

vs. high need for control ($M = 20.90$, $SE = .27$).

Recommendation Intentions

Table 7 indicates that recommendation intentions also showed a significant main

effect for structure (F (2, 304) = 4.33, $p < .05$, 3% of variance accounted for), and Table

8's post hoc comparisons reveal that the semi-structured condition ($M = 15.61$, $SE = .26$)

had significantly higher recommendation intentions than the structured condition ($M = 14.61$, $SE = .24$, $p < .05$). That is, as expected, those with the most structure had lower recommendation intentions. The recommendation intentions of the structured condition also tended to be lower than the unstructured condition's ($M = 15.04$, $SE = .24$), although this unstructured mean was not significantly different from either of the other two structure conditions' means. Again, the univariate main effect for need for control was not significant in Table 7 ($F (1, 152) = 1.38$, $p = .242$). The lower need for control group ($M = 15.27$, $SE = .23$) did not report recommendation intentions that were significantly different from those of the high need for control group ($M = 14.91$, $SE = .21$).

<div align="center">Acceptance Intentions</div>

The structure main effect for acceptance intentions was also significant ($F (2, 304) = 7.78$, $p < .01$) and accounted for 5% of the acceptance intentions' variance. As structured increased, the acceptance intention means revealed a decreasing trend as expected: unstructured $M = 15.53$, $SE = .24$; semi-structured $M = 14.96$, $SE = .27$; and structured $M = 14.22$, $SE = .27$. However, post hoc comparisons revealed that the only significant difference occurred between the means of the unstructured and structured conditions $(p < .05)$. As with the other two dependent variables, acceptance intentions did not have a significant main effect for need for control ($F (1, 152) = .70$, $p = .407$). That is, the acceptance intentions of the low need for control group ($M = 15.01$, $SE = .27$) did not significantly differ from those of the high need for control group ($M = 14.75$, $SE = .24$).

Secondary Dependent Variables' Analyses

Given the lack of support for Hypotheses 1a – 1c using the primary dependent measures, multivariate tests were conducted on the secondary dependent variables (i.e., importance of structure and perceived control) in order to identify any relationships that do exist between levels of structure and need for control.

As before, a 3 x 2 mixed MANCOVA design was used, with structure as the within-subjects effect, need for control as the between-subjects effect, and the two secondary applicant reactions (i.e., importance of structure and importance of control) as the dependent variables (see Table 9). Again, general beliefs concerning selection interviewing efficacy were co-varied. Multivariate analyses only yielded a significant main effect for structure (F (4, 149) = 4.97, $p < .01$), and this accounted for 12% of the variance. No other significant multivariate or univariate effects were found for the interaction between structure and need for control, or for the main effect for need for control.

As a follow-up to the significant multivariate main effect for structure that was found, analogous ANCOVAs showed that the structure importance dependent measure had a significant structure main effect, but no significant structure main effect was found for control importance. Table 9 contains the ANCOVA results, and Table 10 reveals the means and significant differences among the three levels of structure for each of the secondary dependent measures. These results are reviewed next.

Structure Importance

For structure importance, Table 9 reveals that structure's main effect was significant (F (2, 304) = 5.00, $p < .01$) and accounted for 3% of the structure importance variability. In Table 10, post hoc comparisons using Bonferroni's correction for multiple contrasts show significance between the means in the unstructured and semi-structured conditions. Participants indicated *lower* levels of structure importance in the unstructured condition ($M = 12.26$, $SE = .15$) than in the semi structured ($M = 12.84$, $SE = .20$ $p = .01$). However, no significant differences in structure importance were found between the semi-structured and structured conditions ($M = 12.50$, $SE = .16$, $p = .37$), or between the unstructured and structured conditions ($p = .19$). Based on these findings, applicants perceived structure to be more important in the semi-structure interview than the unstructured interview. In addition, structure importance did not have a significant main effect for need for control (F (1, 152) = 3.56, $p = .06$).

Control Importance

There was no structure main effect for importance of control (F (2, 304) = 1.62, $p = .20$). That is, the importance of control of the unstructured interview group ($M = 10.29$, $SE = .12$,) did not significantly differ from those of the semi-structured interview group ($M = 10.08$, $SE = .15$, $p = .28$) or the structured interview group ($M = 10.18$, $SE = .13$, $p = .72$), and no significant differences in control importance were found between the semi-structured and structured conditions ($p = 1.00$). In addition, control importance did not have a significant main effect for need for control (F (1, 152) = 2.17, $p = .14$).

DISCUSSION

<u>Hypotheses</u>

The current study examined whether differing the amount of structure in the interview led to significantly adverse applicant reactions for individuals with a high need for control. Using a comprehensive theoretical framework (Burger, 1992; Campion et. al, 1994; Gilliland, 1993, Hausknecht et al., 2004) that integrates locus of control, elements of structure, and procedural justice rules, this study attempted to examine the relationships between an applicant's personal characteristics, amount of structure in an interview, and subsequent pre-hire applicant reactions. It was hypothesized that fairness perceptions, recommendation intentions, and acceptance intentions would be negatively correlated with amount of structure for individuals with a high need for control, but not for those with a low need for control.

A secondary goal of this study was to statistically control for general beliefs about the interview as recommended by Latham and Finnegan (1993) because prior experience with the testing instrument may influence results. Controlling for prior beliefs should provide more specific and useful information for both researchers and practitioners about the influence of prior experience with, and beliefs about, selection interviews on perceptions of fairness, recommendation intentions, and acceptance intentions.

From a research perspective, support for the hypotheses would help investigators better understand the role of personality characteristics in predicting applicant reactions to structuring the interview, providing a more targeted course for future study. For example, management should be concerned that applicants perceive organizational procedures as fair so that highly desirable applicants do not self-select out of the interview process or view selection processes as unfair. Support for the hypotheses would suggest that personality measures should be incorporated into the selection system and taken into account when structuring interviews.

Unfortunately, the hypotheses were not supported. That is, no evidence was found that a person's need for control interacts with amount of structure to determine fairness perceptions, recommendation intentions or acceptance intentions. Although a significant interaction was not found between structure and need for control as hypothesized, results of the 3 X 2 MANCOVA indicated significant main effects for structure and need for control. In addition, three follow-up ANCOVAs (i.e., each with a different applicant reaction as the dependent variable) revealed that the structure main effect was significant, but the need for control main effect was not significant.

<center>Fairness Reactions</center>

The effects of structure were clearly evident on each applicant reaction, but not always in the expected direction. Regarding fairness reactions, post-hoc comparisons showed that semi-structured interviews were perceived as fairer than unstructured interviews, and structured interviews were perceived as fairer than unstructured interviews. Previous research in this area was mixed. Latham and Finnegan's (1993)

results, for example, did not find support that structured interviews were perceived as fairer than unstructured interviews. They found that applicant experience with interviews interacts with structure to determine fairness perceptions. They found that applicants with less experience with situational interviewing found the unstructured interview as fairer than the structured or situational interview, whereas applicants with experience with unstructured, structured, and situational interviewing methods did not view one method fairer than another. Similarly, Moscoso (2000) discovered in a review of selection interview research that job applicants had significantly more negative reactions to structured interviews over unstructured interviews. In addition, previous research found that student applicants also had more negative reactions to structured than unstructured interviews. Fairness perceptions and willingness to recommend were correlated with interviewer behavior (e.g., eye contact, interviewer warmth) (Conway & Peneno, 1999). Note that the current study used written scenarios, so the responses were not affected by interviewer behavior.

In contrast, Smither et al. (1993) found that both structured and unstructured interviews were recognized as being fair due to the appearance of face validity. In addition, Schuler (as cited in Latham & Finnegan, 1993) reported that student applicants preferred both structured and unstructured interviews to other selection techniques. As such, the current results match those found by these last two studies in that favorable fairness reactions are positively related with structured job interviews. Moreover, the present results expand upon prior studies of applicant reactions by also demonstrating favorable fairness perceptions to semi-structured interviews. Many of the earlier studies

used a dichotomous approach to structure (e.g., unstructured and structured) instead of the trichotomous approach used in this study.

Given that students found semi-structured and structured interviews to be fairer than unstructured interviews in this study suggests that semi-structured and structured interviews may be perceived as more fair due to their appearance of being more job-related. This was found by Gilliland (1994) when he showed that applicant reactions were affected by perceptions of job relatedness of the interview. The organizational justice model provides a theoretical framework of the procedural justice rules that may explain the perceived fairness of a more structured interview (Gilliland, 1993). In Gilliland's model, procedural justice refers to the perceived fairness of the process or procedures used to distinguish job candidates, and are composed of the formal characteristics of the procedures used, explanations given for the procedures and decision-making, and the applicant's interpersonal treatment. As applicants in this study were not provided with an explanation for the procedure, a decision, or interpersonal treatment by an interviewer, the characteristics of the procedure is the only element impacting fairness perceptions. As such, more structured interviews may be perceived as fairer than unstructured interviews.

Recommendation Intentions

Post-hoc comparisons using Bonferroni's correction for multiple contrasts showed that, as expected, the structured condition had significantly lower recommendation intentions than the semi-structured condition. The recommendation intentions of the structured condition, although not significant, also trended lower than the unstructured condition. Contrary to fairness perceptions, interviews with the most structure had lower

applicant recommendation intentions. These results differed from results obtained in previous research (Gilliland, 1994). One reason why this may have occurred is that previous researchers offered applicants additional information about the organization, the interview process, or an explanation for the selection decision that in turn resulted in positive applicant recommendation intentions. Ployhart and Ryan (1998), for example, found that perceptions of pre-application process fairness and organizational attractiveness in a college admissions context were significantly related to intentions to recommend others to the school. Gilliland (1994) provided an explanation for why each test was being used, and how it related to job performance. Therefore, future research should examine the interactive effects between the three levels of structure and explanation effects on recommendation intentions.

As shown in tables 4 - 6, this study did find that recommendation intentions were highly correlated with fairness perceptions and acceptance intentions, with the strongest relationship between acceptance intentions and recommendation intentions. This finding is aligned with those found in prior research on applicant recommendation intentions (Ployhart & Ryan, 1998; Hausknecht et al., 2004). In addition, a significant relationship was found between general beliefs and recommendation intentions, and this seems to agree with Sackett and Lievens' (2008) conclusion that prior beliefs may affect post-interview reactions. In fact, because of this, general beliefs were controlled in this study.

These findings are important in the context of justice and signaling theories. With regard to justice theories, Hausknecht et al. (2004) stated that applicants who have less favorable reactions to the perceived outcome (i.e., distributive justice) of a selection process might not recommend others to apply to the hiring organization. According to

signaling theory, applicants who have limited information about the characteristics of the job and organization to which they are applying, like the applicants in this study, may use information about the selection tool as indicators of other organizational characteristics. Several studies (e.g., Goltz & Giannatonio, 1995; Powell, 1991) have supported the idea that applicants' impressions of the recruiter impact their impressions of the organization. Although interpersonal effectiveness was not a factor in determining applicants' reactions to interviews in this study, signaling theory may explain why characteristics of the interview, such as structure, had a negative impact on applicant reactions related to organizational justice, namely recommendation and acceptance intentions (Rynes & Cable, 2000).

<div align="center">Acceptance Intentions</div>

Post-hoc comparisons among the levels of structure showed that the structured condition had significantly lower acceptance intentions than the unstructured condition. The acceptance intentions of the semi-structured condition, although not significant, also trended lower than the unstructured condition. As expected, interviews with the most structure had lower applicant acceptance intentions. As structure increased, the acceptance intention means revealed a decreasing trend. Prior research showed mixed results concerning this issue. For example, in agreement with the current study, Chapman and Rowe (2002) found that applicants who were interviewed using a face-to-face format showed less attraction to organizations with more structured interviews. On the other hand, Chapman and Zweig (2005) found that the more structured interviews led to higher acceptance intentions, although the results were not significant. However, these authors also discussed how the length of the interview plays a role in applicant

perceptions. Longer interviews are proposed to be more structured because they allow the interviewer to obtain more information. The authors suggest that applicants may assume that the longer the interview, the more interested the company is in them. The current study did not include interview length as a structural element, as Campion et al. (1997) noted that this component was not strongly related to structure. Given that Chapman and Zweig (2005) found support that length may be related to application acceptance intentions, future research may want to adjust the timing of structured and unstructured interview to determine if length of the interview has an effect.

Similar to recommendation intentions, Macan et. al (1994) found that when applicants have information about an organization before taking the selection test, their perceptions of the procedure play less of a role in acceptance intentions. So here, because applicants were not given organizational information, the effects of interview structure may have been maximized. In addition, Gilliland (1993) found that interviewer behavior was the strongest predictor of job offer acceptance. As this study did not use an interviewer, the results were not influenced by interviewer behavior, again allowing for the maximum effect of the structure manipulation. Future research might vary recruiter behavior along with giving applicants' different amounts and types of background information about an organization to see if those have an effect on acceptance intentions beyond the effects of structure.

The organizational justice model provides a theoretical framework of the justice rules that may explain why perceived fairness of the procedure does not necessarily translate into perceived fairness of the outcomes of the procedure, or positive affect towards the procedure utilized (Gilliland, 1993). While procedural justice refers to the

perceived fairness of the process or procedures used to distinguish job candidates, distributive justice refers to the perceived fairness of the personal and organizational outcomes that derive from using the selection procedures. Distributive justice rules are concerned with whether or not candidates receive outcomes consistent with their relative amount of input as compared to a referent other. Although related, prior research has found procedural and distributive justice to be two separate constructs (Brockner & Wisenfeld, 1996). Research has shown that applicant acceptance intentions are moderated by the degree to which the applicants' perceive the hiring decision is fair, as stated in distributive justice principles (Gilliland, 1993). The distributive justice rules are commonly used as the basis for whether or not candidates obtain employment decisions they expect based on their ability to demonstrate their capabilities (Cohen, 1987). In accordance with this theory, applicant reactions to a selection outcome will influence the applicant's decision to accept an offer (Ployhart & Harold, 2004; Truxillo et al., 2004). As this study did not render an employment decision, acceptance intentions were only influenced by the amount of structure in the interview. Perhaps in the structured condition, the participants did not perceive that they performed as well. As such, although the applicants in this study perceived interviews with more structure as fair, in the absence of other contextual variables, the potential personal and organizational outcomes resulting from that procedure were not perceived as fair. Given that this study only measured the fairness of the procedure, future research might examine the impact of structure in the interview process on applicant reactions when fairness of the employment outcomes is also measured.

Hypotheses Summary

In summary, the current study did not support that applicant fairness, recommendation, or acceptance perceptions are determined by an applicant's need for control and the amount of structure in the interview. Any variance in applicant perceptions explained by amount of structure in the interview cannot be explained by the individual's locus of control, and general preexisting beliefs about selection interviewing did not have key results either. Importantly, the results of the current study did find that structure appears to be somewhat positively related to fairness perceptions, but negatively related to recommendation and acceptance intentions. This begs the question, why have these findings emerged? At least a couple of potential explanations can be advanced. First, these results seem to support previous research suggesting that face validity is tied to perceptions of fairness and job-relatedness. Researchers have suggested that face validity may be an important determinant in the overall fairness perceptions of a selection procedure, and that more structured interviews are viewed as having higher face validity (Arvey & Sackett, 1993). Second, past studies have shown that social dynamics and context can play an integral role in forming applicant perceptions during the interview (Judge et al., 2000). For example, applicants are more likely to recommend the job to others and accept an offer if the interviewer shows warmth. As this study did not include social dynamics or context information (but rather, used written scenarios) recommendation and acceptance intentions were only affected by the interview structure manipulation and not contextual factors that have affected these variables in past research.

Therefore, based upon social validity and organizational justice theories, it appears that applicants find structure to be fair, even if they do not like it. Liking or preference is more of an affective reaction, whereas a fairness judgment is more based on evidence of job-relatedness. More research is needed in examining the interactive effects between levels of structure, contextual variables and applicant reactions.

<div align="center">Secondary Measures - Importance of Structure & Control</div>

As planned, multivariate tests were also conducted on the secondary dependent variables (i.e., importance of structure and perceived control) to determine if any relationships exist between levels of structure and need for control. A parallel approach was used (i.e., a 3 x 2 mixed MANCOVA), and similar to the primary dependent measures, these secondary multivariate analyses only yielded a significant main effect for structure. Further, this main effect was only found for the structure importance dependent measure. No other significant multivariate or univariate effects were found for the interaction between structure and need for control, or for the main effects for need for control or the covariate, general beliefs.

Structure Importance

Structure importance was a newly-created measure and summed how important four different elements of interview content were in each of the three interviewing conditions. The four elements were gleaned from Campion et al.'s (1997) categorization of structure and were chosen because they should be salient in the current scenario. This secondary measure facilitated determining the effects of the three levels of structure on the importance of the perceived amount of structure.

For structure importance, structure's main effect was significant. Post hoc comparisons found that participants indicated lower levels of structure importance in the unstructured condition than in the semi-structured condition; however, no significant differences in structure importance were found between the semi-structured and structured conditions, or between the unstructured and structured conditions. Based on these findings, applicants perceived the four elements of structure measured in this study to be more important in the semi-structured interview than the unstructured or structured interview. Perhaps applicants find it important to have some structure, but not too much structure. This is supported by the trend across the means of the three conditions. Although a significant difference did not occur between the means of the unstructured and structured conditions, the mean for the structured interview was trending higher and the unstructured interview mean was the lowest of the three conditions. This finding complements the findings of the primary dependent measures and suggests that elements of structure have important applicant reaction implications. As such, future research may want to further examine the affects of amount of structure on perceptions of face validity and post-applicant behavior.

Control Importance

Control importance measured the importance of the ability to control the interview within each of the three levels of structure. Control importance was added as a secondary measure to determine the effects of the three levels of structure on the importance of the perceived ability to control the interview. Past literature did not focus on applicant perceived ability to control the interview as it relates to the three levels of

structure in the interview, and as such, this variable was a newly developed measure for this study.

No structure main effect was found for importance of control. That is, the importance of control of the unstructured interview group did not significantly differ from those of the semi-structured interview group or the structured interview group, and no significant differences in control importance were found between the semi-structured and structured conditions. In addition, need for control did not have a significant main effect on control importance, instead of the strong positive relationship that was expected. The current finding was also different from results found in previous research aimed at applicant reactions in general. For example, Schuler (1993) noted that applicants' control over the situation or their behavior is an important determinant in their reactions to interviews per se. Further, Latham and Finnegan (1993) found that students preferred unstructured to structured interviews because of the perceived opportunity to control the outcome of the interview. In contrast, this study did not reveal results that supported the importance of control in the interview, perhaps because the measure assessed more of the value of the ability to control the interview process per se, rather than the perceived ability to generally control the entire hiring situation.

Limitations

Potential limitations of the current study should be noted when interpreting the results presented here. While the current methodology does attempt to provide a balance between internal control (e.g., balanced ordering of interview conditions) and ecological validity (e.g., answering interview questions in an actual hiring situation), one potential

limitation of this study is the use of a student sample from psychology and business-related disciplines. However, it should be noted that 25% of the students indicated having 1 or more years of full-time experience, and almost 94% indicated having worked part-time. If student workers are targeted in the future, one way to slightly increase the generalizability in future research is to recruit with an ad in a campus newspaper rather than from specific undergraduate disciplines that may be more familiar with the constructs in this study. Another way is to recruit students who have applied for jobs through the campus career center.

Another potential limitation is the use of a paper-and-pencil interview method as opposed to a face-to-face interview. A traditional unstructured interview is a free flowing conversation that may or may not be job-related (Blackman, 2002). In this study, written scenarios were used in place of a face-to-face conversation in order to control for extraneous variables, but may have changed the effect of the structure manipulation. For example, if a face-to-face interview was used that did not control for extraneous variables, the structure of the interview may have interacted with need for control to show a significant effect on how participants rated the dependent variables. Additionally, perhaps the unstructured instructions provided to the student applicants led to perceptions of unfairness, as they were informed in the instructions that applicants would not get the same questions. In a face-to-face interview, interviewers are not likely going to inform an interviewee that all applicants are not going to be asked the same questions. As such, the method utilized may have impacted applicant perceptions of fairness.

In addition, students in the present study viewed the interview experience as if they were applying for a job, but they knew that getting hired was not a real possibility.

As such, the pressure or anxiety that sometimes accompanies an actual interview situation was not present. Rather, participants read interview questions and materials to simulate an interview and render a judgment on the perceived fairness of the process, along with their recommendation and acceptance intentions. In an actual interview situation, applicant anxiety regarding their perceived performance in the interview may impact their reactions to the interview process.

Lastly, it is important to consider the state of the economy when interpreting these results. Two of the measures in this study addressed behavioral intent (i.e., recommendation intentions and acceptance intentions). Applicant behavioral intent may differ in periods of low unemployment as compared to high unemployment. During periods of high unemployment, people who are currently or soon will be seeking employment, such as students, may be less concerned with whether their interview is structured or unstructured, thereby decreasing the effect of structure on their behavioral intent. As such, the state of the economy should be taken into consideration when interpreting the results for the hypotheses, and controlled in future research studies.

Future Research

The present study used psychology and business undergraduate students at a private Jesuit university as applicants. The fact that these student applicants' need for control did not interact with structure to create significant results may have reflected their self-efficacy in getting a job regardless of type of interview. Subsequent studies should measure whether interactions exist between applicants' need for control and a broader set

of participant characteristics, considering differences in personality, demographics, and general beliefs (McCarthy et al., 2010).

This study measured applicant reactions to structuring the interview process based upon the application for an entry-level management position. The selection process may be different for individuals who are applying for senior-level and executive promotions when compared with reactions of entry-level positions (Hausknecht et al., 2004). As such, future research may want to study the reactions held by executive job applicants or current working professionals in executive levels who are being interviewed for promotion opportunities.

One limitation of the current study was the inability to track whether or not the participants would behave differently on the job based upon their pre-hire perceptions of the interview. Future research may want to measure the relationships of fairness perceptions, recommendation intentions, and acceptance intentions with performance outcomes. Very few studies have tracked applicant performance as a spillover effect from pre-acceptance reactions (Gilliland, 1994). Thus, more research is needed to measure the impact of applicant reactions on performance (Hausknecht et al, 2004).

Conclusions

The present study investigated whether different amounts of structure in the interview led to significantly adverse applicant reactions for individuals with a high need for control. Applicant reactions are important to consider because applicants who view the selection procedure to be invasive may be less attracted to the organization, may not recommend the organization to others, may not accept an offered position, could be less

likely to apply to the company again, and/or may have legal complaints and issues (Hausknecht et al., 2004).

Although the hypotheses were not supported, that is, no evidence was found that a person's need for control interacts with amount of structure to determine fairness perceptions, recommendation intentions or acceptance intentions, student applicants did perceive semi-structured and structured interviews to be fairer than unstructured interviews. In addition, the results suggest that more structured interviews may lead to lower behavioral intent to recommend or accept a job offer. Based on this last finding, organizations may want to consider how interviewer warmth and/or other contextual variables interact with fairness perceptions of structured interviewed to achieve positive outcome behaviors.

The current study has also made a unique contribution to applicant research by testing for relationships between the individual difference characteristic of need for control and the amount of structure in the interview. Although the hypotheses were not supported, more research examining personal characteristics and subsequent applicant reactions is warranted (Truxillo et al., 2004).

LIST OF REFERENCES

LIST OF REFERENCES

Arvey, R.D. (1979). Unfair discrimination in the employment interview: Legal and psychological aspects. *Psychological Bulletin, 86(4)*, 736-765.

Arvey, R.D. & Campion, J.E. (1982). The employment interview: A summary and review of recent research. *Personnel Psychology, 35*, 281-322.

Avery, R.D. & McKay, F.P. (2006). Target practice: An organizational impression management approach to attracting minority and female job applicants. *Personnel Psychology*, *59*, 157-187.

Arvey, R.D. & Sackett, P.R. (1993). Fairness in Selection: Current developments and perspectives. In N. Schmitt and W.C. Borman (Eds)., *Personnel Selection in Organizations* (pp. 171-202). San Francisco, CA: Josey-Bass.

Arvey, R.D., Strickland, W., Drauden, G., & Martin, C. (1990). Motivational components of test-taking. *Personnel Psychology, 43*, 695-716.

Bauer, T., Campion, M., Paronto, M., & Truxillo, D. (2002). Selection Fairness Information and applicant reactions: A longitudinal field study. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87(6)*, 1020-1031.

Bauer, T.N., Maertz, C.P., Dolen, M.R., & Campion, M.A. (1998). Longitudinal assessment of applicant reactions to employment testing and test outcome feedback. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 83(6)*, 892-903.

Bauer, T.N., Truxillo, D.M., Paronto, M.E., & Weekley, J.A. (2004). Applicant Reactions to Different Selection Technology: Face-to-Face, Interactive Voice Response, and Computer-Assisted Telephone Screening Interviews. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 12(1)*, 135-148

Berneth, J.B., Field, H., Giles, W.F., & Cole, M.S. (2006). Perceived fairness in employee selection: The role of applicant personality. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 20(4,)* 545-563.

Bies, R.J. & Shapiro, D.L. (1988). Voice and justification: Their influence on procedural fairness judgments. *Academy of Management Journal, 31*, 676-685.

Bobko, P., Roth, P.L., & Potosky, D. (1999). Derivation and implications of a meta-analytic matrix incorporating cognitive ability, alternative predictors, and job performance. *Personnel Psychology, 52*, 561-589.

Borman, W.C., Hansen, M.A., & Hedge, J.W. (1997). Personnel selection. *Annual Review of Psychology, 48*, 299-337.

Boudreau, J.W., & Rynes, S.L. (1985). Role of recruitment in staffing utility analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 70*, 354-366.

Brockner, J. & Wiesenfeld, B.M. (1996). An integrative framework for explaining reactions to decision: Interactive effects of outcomes and procedures. *Psychological Bulletin, 120*, 189-208.

Burger, J. (1992). *Desire for control: Personality, social, and clinical perspectives*. NY: Plenum Press.

Campion, M.A., Palmer, D.K., & Campion, J.E. (1997). A review of structure in the selection interview. *Personnel Psychology, 50*, 655-702.

Campion, M.A., Pursell, E.D., & Brown, B.K. (1988). Structured interviewing: Raising the psychometric properties of the employment interview. *Personnel Psychology, 41*, 25-42.

Chan, D., Schmitt, N., Sacco, J.M., & DeShon, R.P. (1998). Understanding pretest and posttest reactions to cognitive ability and personality tests. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 83(3)*, 471-485.

Chapman, D. & Webster, J. (2006). Toward an integrated model of applicant reactions and job choice. *International Journal of Human Resource Management, 17(6),* 1032-1057.

Chapman, D.S. & Rowe, P.M. (2002). The influence of videoconference technology and interview structure on the recruiting function of the employment interview: A field experiment. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 10*, 185-197.

Chapman, D.S. & Zweig, D.L. (2005). Developing a nomological network for interview structure: Antecedents and consequences of the structured selection interview. *Personnel Psychology, 58*, 673-702.

Cohen, R.L. (1987). Distributive justice: Theory and research. *Social Justice Research, 1*, 19-40.

Conway, J.M. & Peneno, G.M. (1999). Comparing structured interview question types: Construct validity and applicant reactions. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 13(4)*, 485-506.

Dipboye, R.L. (1994). Structured and unstructured interviews: Beyond the job-fit model. *Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management, 12*, 79-113.

Dweck, C.S. & Leggert, E.L. (1988). A social-cognitive approach to motivation and personality. *Psychological Bulletin, 95*, 256-273.

Elkins, T.J. & Phillips, J.S. (2000). Job context, selection decision outcome, and the perceived fairness of selection tests: Biodata as an illustrative case. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 85(3)*, 479-484.

Gatewood, R.D., Feild, H.S., & Barrick, M. (2008). *Human resource selection (6th ed).* Mason, OH:Thomson/South-Western.

Gebhardt, W.A. & Brosschot, J.F. (2002). Desirability of control: psychometric properties and relationships with locus of control, personality, coping, and mental and somatic complaints in three Dutch samples. *European Journal of Personality, 16*, 423-438.

Gilliland, S.W. (1993). The perceived fairness of selection systems: An organizational justice perspective. *Academy of Management Review, 18*, 694-734.

Gilliland, S.W. (1994). Effects of procedural and distributive justice on reactions to a selection system. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 79*, 691-701.

Gilmore, D.C. (1989). Applicant perceptions of simulated behavior description interviews. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 3*, 279-287.

Goldberg, C.B. (2005). Relational demography and similarity-attraction in interview assessments and subsequent offer decisions: Are we missing something? *Group & Organization Management, 30*, 597-624.

Goltz, S.M. & Giannatonio, C.M. (1995). Recruiter friendliness and attraction to the job: The mediating role of inferences about the organization. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 46(1)*, 109-118.

Greenberg, J. (1986). Determinants of perceived fairness of performance evaluations. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 71*, 340-342.

Greenberg, J. (1990). Organizational justice: Yesterday, today, and tomorrow. *Journal of Management, 16*, 399-432.

Greenberger, D.B. & Strasser, S. (1991). The role of situational and dispositional factors in the enhancement of personal control in organizations. *Research in Organizational Behavior, 13*, 111-145.

Harris, M.M. (1989). Reconsidering the employment interview: A review of recent literature and suggestions for future research. *Personnel Psychology, 42*, 691-726.

Hausknecht, J., Day, D., & Thomas, S. (2004). Applicant reactions to selection procedures: An updated model and meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology, 57(3)*, 639-683.

Herriot, P. (1989). Selection as a social process. In M. Smith and I. Robertson (Eds.), *Advances in selection and assessment (pp.171-188)*. New York: Wiley.

Huffcut, A.I. & Arthur, W., Jr. (1994). Hunter and Hunter (1984) revisited: Interview validity for entry-level jobs. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 79*, 184-190.

Huffcutt, A.I. & Roth, P.L. (1998). Racial group differences in employment interview evaluations. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 83(2),* 179-189.

Hunter, J.E. & Hunter, R.F. (1984). Validity and utility of alternative predictors of job performance. *Psychological Bulletin, 96*, 72-98.

Janz, T. (1982). Initial comparisons of patterned behavior description interviews versus unstructured interviews. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 67*, 577-580

Jelf, G.S. (1999). A narrative of post-1989 employment interview research. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 14(1)*, 25-58.

Judge, T.A., Higgins, C.A., & Cable, D.M. (2000). The employment interview: A review of recent research and recommendations for future research. *Human Resource Management Review, 10(4)*, 383-406.

Kluger, A.N. & Rothstein, H.R. (1993). The influence of selection test type on applicant reactions to employment testing. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 8*, 3-25.

Koslowsky, M. (1999). *Modeling the stress-strain relationship in work settings*. New York: Routledge.

Latham, G.P. (1989). The reliability, validity, and practicality of the situational interview. In R.W. Eder & G.R. Ferris (Eds.), *The Employment Interview: Theory, Method and Practice* (pp. 169-182). Sage: London

Latham, G.P. & Finnegan, B.J. (1993). Perceived practicality of unstructured, patterned, and situational interviews. In H. Schuler, J.L. Farr, and M. Smith (Eds.), *Personnel Selection and Individual Assessment: Individual and Organization Perspectives* (pp. 41-55). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Latham, G.P., Saari, L.M., Pursell, E.D., & Campion, M.A. (1980). The situational interview. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 65*, 422-427.

Liden, R.C., Martin, C.L., & Parsons, C.K. (1993). Interviewer and applicant behaviors in employment interviews. *Academy of Management Journal, 36*, 372-386.

Liden, R.C. & Parsons, C.K. (1986). A field study of job applicant interview perceptions, alternative opportunities, and demographic characteristics. *Personnel Psychology, 39*, 109-122.

Macan, T.H., Avendon, M.J., Paese, M., & Smith, D.E. (1994). The effects of applicants' reactions to cognitive ability tests and an assessment center. *Personnel Psychology, 47*, 715-738.

Martin, C.L. & Nageo, D.H. (1989). Some effects of computerized interviwing on job applicant responses. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 74*, 72-80.

McCarthy, J.M., Van Iddekinge, C.H., & Campion, M.A. (2010). Are highly structured job interviews resistant to demographic similarity effects? *Personnel Psychology, 63*, 325-359.

McDaniel, M.A., Whetzel, D.L., Schmidt, F.L., & Maurer, S.D. (1994). The validity of the employment interview: A comprehensive review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 79*, 599-616.

McFarland, L.A., Ryan, A.M., Sacco, J.M., & Kriska, D.V. (2004). Examination of structured interview ratings across time: The effects of applicant race, rater race, and panel composition. *Journal of Management*, *30(4),* 435-452.

Moscoso, S. & Salgado, J.F. (2004). Fairness reactions to personnel selection techniques in Spain and Portugal. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 12(1/2),* 187-196.

Muchinsky, P.M. (1986). Personnel selection methods. In C. Cooper & I. Robertson (Eds.), *International Review of Industrial and Organizational Psychology* (pp.37-70). Chichester; New York: Wiley.

Muchinsky, P.M. (2006). *Psychology Applied to Work* (8th ed.). Belmont, CA: Thomson Wadsworth.

Murphy, K.R. (1986). When your top choice turns you down: Effect of rejected offers on the utility of selection tests. *Psychological Bulletin, 99*, 133-138.

Ngah, N., Ahmad, A., Baba, M. (2009). The Mediating Effect of Work-Family Conflict on the relationship between locus of control and job satisfaction. *Journal of Social Sciences, 5(4)*, 348-354.

Ployhart, R.E. & Harold, C.M. (2004). The applicant attribution-reaction theory (AART): An integrative theory of applicant attributional processing. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 12*, 84-98.

Ployhart, R.E. & Holtz, B.C. (2008). The diversity-validity dilemma: Strategies for reducing racioethnic and sex subgroup differences and adverse impact in selection. *Personnel Psychology, 61(1),* 153-172.

Ployhart, R.E. & Ryan, A.M. (1997). Toward an explanation of applicant reactions: An examination of organizational justice and attribution frameworks. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 72(3)*, 308-335.

Ployhart, R.E. & Ryan, A.M. (1998). Applicants' reactions to the fairness of selection procedures: the effects of positive rule violation and time of measurement. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 83*, 3-16.

Posthuma, R.A., Morgeson, F.P., & Campion, M.A. (2002). Beyond employment interview validity: A comprehensive narrative review of recent research and trends over time. *Personnel Psychology, 55,* 1-81.

Powell, G.N. (1991). Applicant reactions to the initial employment interview: Exploring theoretical and methodological issues. *Personnel Psychology, 44*, 67-83.

Reilly, R.R. & Chao, G.T. (1982). Validity and fairness of some alternative employee selection procedures. *Personnel Psychology, 35*, 1-62.

Rosse, J.G., Miller, J.L., & Stecher, M.D. (1994). A field study of job applicants' reactions to personality and cognitive ability testing. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 79*, 987-992.

Rynes, S.L. (1991). Recruitment, job choice, and post-hire consequences: A call for new research directions. In M.D. Dunnette & L.M. Hough (Eds.), *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology, 2nd ed,. Vol. 2* (pp.399-444). Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Rynes, S.L. (1993). Who's selecting whom? Effects of selection practices on applicant attitudes and behavior. In N. Schmitt & W.C. Borman (Eds.), *Personnel Selection in Organizations* (pp.240-274). San Francisco, CA: Josey Bass.

83

Rynes, S.L. & Barber, A.E. (1990). Applicant attraction strategies: An organizational perspective. *Academy of Management Review, 15*, 286-310.

Rynes, S.L., Bretz, R.D., & Gerhart, B. (1991). The importance of recruitment in job choice: A different way of looking. *Personnel Psychology, 44*, 487-521.

Rynes, S.L. & Connerly, M.L. (1993). Applicant reactions to alternative selection procedures. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 7*, 261-277.

Sackett, P.R. & Lievens, F. (2008). Personnel Selection. *Annual Review of Psychology, 59,* 419-450.

Schmidt. F. & Hunter, J. (1998). The validity and utility of selection methods in personnel psychology: Practical and theoretical implications of 85 years of research findings. *Psychological Bulletin, 124*, 262-274.

Schuler, H. (1993). Social validity of selection situations: A concept and some empirical results. In H. Schuler, J.L. Farr, and M. Smith (Eds.), *Personnel Selection and Assessment: Individual and Organizational Perspectives* (pp 11-26). Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Sheppard, B.H. & Lewicki, R.J. (1987). Toward general principles of managerial fairness. *Social Justice Research, 1*, 161-176.

Smither, J.W., Reilly, R.R., Millsap, R.E., Pearlman, K., & Stoffey, R.W. (1993). Applicant reactions to selection procedures. *Personnel Psychology, 46*, 49-76.

Steiner, D.D. & Gilliland, S.W. (1996). Fairness reactions to personnel selection techniques in France and the United States. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 81*, 134-141.

Steiner, D.D. & Gilliland, S.W. (2001). Procedural justice in personnel selection: International and crosscultural perspectives. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 9*, 124-137.

Sturman, M.C. (2000). Implications of utility analysis adjustments for estimates of human resource intervention value. *Journal of Management, 26(2),* 281-299.

Thorsteinson, T.J., and Ryan, A.M. (1997). The effect of selection ratio on perceptions of the fairness of a selection test battery. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 5*, 159-168.

Truxillo, D.M., Bauer, T.N., Campion, M.A. & Paronto, M.E. (2002). Selection fairness information and applicant reactions: A longitudinal field study. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*, 1020-1031.

Truxillo, D.M. & Hunthausen, J.M. (1999). Reactions of African-American and White applicants to written and video-based police selection tests. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality, 14(1)*, 101-112.

Truxillo, D.M., Steiner, D.D., & Gilliland, S.W. (2004). The importance of organizational justice in personnel selection: Defining when selection fairness really matters. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 12(1/2),* 39-53.

Ulrich, L. & Trumbo, D. (1965). The selection interview since 1949. *Psychological Bulletin, 63*, 100-116.

Wagner, R. (1949). The employment interview: A critical summary. *Personnel Psychology, 2*, 17-46.

Weisner, W.H. & Cronshaw, S.F. (1988). A meta-analytic investigation of the impact of interview format and degree of structure on the validity of the employment interview. *Journal of Occupational Psychology, 61*, 275-290.

Williamson, L.G, Campion, J.E, Malos, S.B., Roehling, M.V., & Campion, M.A. (1997). Employment interview on trial: Linking interview structure with litigation outcomes. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 82(6)*, 900-912.

Viswesvaran, C. & Ones, D.S. (2004). Importance of perceived personnel selection system fairness determinants: Relations with demographics, personality, and job characteristics. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 12(1/2),* 172-186.

TABLES

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics of the Sample Population

Demographic Variable	*Mean*	*SD*
Age	20.35	3.17
GPA	3.11	.48
Yrs. F/T Work exp	1.11	3.03
Yrs. P/T work exp	3.06	1.88
No. of interviews	2.80	2.34

Note. N = 161 for Age, Yrs. F/T work exp, Yrs. P/T work exp, and No. of interviews. N = 159 for GPA.

Table 2: Mean, SD, Repeated Measures ANOVA and Post-Hoc Analyses for Type of Structure Manipulation Check

Type of Interview	Mean	SD
Unstructured	12.67[a]	3.64
Semi-Structured	17.25[b]	4.21
Structured	19.21[c]	3.32

Note. Repeated Measures ANOVA: $F(2, 304) = 113.19$, $p < .001$. Post hoc comparisons were made using Bonferroni's correction for multiple contrasts. Within column, means with different superscripts are significantly different, $p < .001$.

Table 3: Mean, SD, Repeated Measures ANOVA and Post-Hoc Analyses for Perceived
Control Manipulation Check

Type of Interview	*Mean*	*SD*
Unstructured	14.47[a]	3.01
Semi-Structured	10.10[b]	1.90
Structured	13.97[a]	3.16

Note. Repeated Measures ANOVA: $F(2, 310) = 128.67$, $p < .001$. Post hoc comparisons were made using Bonferroni's correction for multiple contrasts. Within column, means with different superscripts are significantly different, $p < .001$.

Table 4: Correlation Table for Unstructured Interviews

Variable	*M*	*SD*	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. Gender[a]	1.65	.48							
2. Age	20.35	3.17	−.03						
3. Cumulative GPA	3.11	.48	.04	.04					
4. Yrs of full-time work exp	1.11	3.03	−.06	.79**	.04				
5. Yrs of part-time work	3.06	1.88	−.06	.24**	−.01	.08			
6. No. of interviews	2.80	2.34	−.09	.27**	.01	.32**	.18*		
7. Ethnicity[b]	1.25	.43	−.09	.22**	−.13	.17*	−.05	.16*	
8. General Beliefs	21.56	3.54	.00	−.03	−.10	−.01	−.08	.02	.04
9. Need for Control[c]	1.54	.50	−.02	.02	.09	.01	.00	−.05	.04
10. Fairness	19.01	4.41	−.02	.11	.15	.09	.02	.07	.19*
11. Recommend Intention	15.02	3.05	.05	−.01	.27**	−.05	−.10	.03	.19*
12. Accept Intention	15.52	3.01	−.03	−.06	.26**	−.10	.01	−.07	.08
13. Structure Importance	12.22	2.05	.09	−.09	.13	−.11	−.09	.07	−.02
14. Control Importance	10.31	1.54	.00	.04	.16	.03	.04	.00	.03

Table 4 cont.

Variable	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
1. Gender[a]							
2. Age							
3. Cumulative GPA							
4. Yrs of full-time work exp							
5. Yrs of part-time work							
6. No. of interviews							
7. Ethnicity[b]							
8. General Beliefs	(.55)						
9. Need for Control[c]	−.02	(.80)					
10. Fairness	.08	.09	(.77)				
11. Recommend Intention	.16	−.08	.46**	(.72)			
12. Accept Intention	.13	−.04	.39**	.75**	(.67)		
13. Structure Importance	.08	.15	.07	.06	−.02	(.51)	
14. Control Importance	.01	.16	.07	.05	.02	.61**	(.65)

Note. Given pairwise deletion, *N* ranged from 158-161.

[a] 1 = Male, 2 = Female
[b] 1 = Caucasian, 2 = Non-Caucasian
[c] 1 = Low, 2 = High

** $p < .01$
 * $p < .05$

Table 5: Correlation Table for Semi-Structured Interviews

Variable	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. Gender[a]	1.65	.48							
2. Age	20.35	3.17	−.03						
3. Cumulative GPA	3.11	.48	.04	.04					
4. Yrs of full-time work exp	1.11	3.03	−.06	.79**	.04				
5. Yrs of part-time work	3.06	1.88	−.06	.24**	−.01	.08			
6. No. of interviews	2.80	2.34	−.09	.27**	.01	.32**	.18*		
7. Ethnicity[b]	1.25	.43	−.09	.22**	−.13	.17*	−.05	.16*	
8. General Beliefs	21.56	3.54	.00	−.03	−.10	−.01	−.08	.02	.04
9. Need for Control[c]	1.54	.50	−.02	.02	.09	.01	.00	−.05	.04
10. Fairness	21.35	4.24	.02	.08	−.05	.04	−.10	−.08	.05
11. Recommend Intention	15.61	3.26	−.01	.02	−.02	.03	−.17	.06	.13
12. Accept Intention	14.97	3.37	.04	.01	−.08	.03	−.02	.12	.12
13. Structure Importance	12.58	2.50	−.09	−.12	.03	−.05	−.17*	.13	−.08
14. Control Importance	10.08	1.89	−.02	−.01	.09	.03	−.04	.08	.01

Table 5 cont.

Variable	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
1. Gender[a]							
2. Age							
3. Cumulative GPA							
4. Yrs of full-time work exp							
5. Yrs of part-time work							
6. No. of interviews							
7. Ethnicity[b]							
8. General Beliefs	(.55)						
9. Need for Control[c]	−.02	(.80)					
10. Fairness	.07	.11	(.74)				
11. Recommend Intention	.23**	−.03	.59**	(.80)			
12. Accept Intention	.13	−.03	.49**	.61**	(.59)		
13. Structure Importance	.08	.01	.20*	.20*	.16	(.58)	
14. Control Importance	.01	.13	.42**	.37**	.32**	.56**	(.69)

Note. Given pairwise deletion, *N* ranged from 158-161.

[a] 1 = Male, 2 = Female
[b] 1 = Caucasian, 2 = Non-Caucasian
[c] 1 = Low, 2 = High

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

Table 6: Correlation Table for Structured Interviews

Variable	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. Gender[a]	1.65	.48							
2. Age	20.35	3.17	−.03						
3. Cumulative GPA	3.11	.48	.04	.04					
4. Yrs of full-time work exp	1.11	3.03	−.06	.79**	.04				
5. Yrs of part-time work	3.06	1.88	−.06	.24**	−.01	.08			
6. No. of interviews	2.80	2.34	−.09	.27**	.01	.32**	.18*		
7. Ethnicity[b]	1.25	.43	−.09	.22**	−.13	.17*	−.05	.20*	
8. General Beliefs	21.56	3.54	.00	−.03	−.10	−.01	−.08	.02	.04
9. Need for Control[c]	1.54	.50	−.02	.02	.09	.01	.00	−.05	.04
10. Fairness	21.36	4.25	.17*	.02	.10	−.02	−.10	−.01	−.01
11. Recommend Intention	14.59	3.01	.16	.08	.02	.02	−.03	.09	.03
12. Accept Intention	14.17	3.36	.15	.02	−.01	−.03	.05	.13	.10
13. Structure Importance	12.46	2.24	.06	−.04	.10	−.06	−.07	−.04	.00
14. Control Importance	10.12	1.76	.01	−.05	.13	−.09	−.11	−.07	.03

Table 6 cont.

Variable	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
1. Gender[a]							
2. Age							
3. Cumulative GPA							
4. Yrs of full-time work exp							
5. Yrs of part-time work							
6. No. of interviews							
7. Ethnicity[b]							
8. General Beliefs	(.55)						
9. Need for Control[c]	−.02	(.80)					
10. Fairness	.05	.07	(.74)				
11. Recommend Intention	−.02	−.05	.49**	(.66)			
12. Accept Intention	−.03	−.10	.45**	.73**	(.65)		
13. Structure Importance	.05	.14	.30**	.27**	.18*	(.57)	
14. Control Importance	.04	.09	.33**	.26**	.23**	.62**	(.73)

Note. Given pairwise deletion, *N* ranged from 158-161.

[a] 1 = Male, 2 = Female
[b] 1 = Caucasian, 2 = Non-Caucasian
[c] 1 = Low, 2 = High

** $p < .01$
 * $p < .05$

Table 7: Multivariate and Univariate Analyses of Covariance Testing Hypotheses 1a, 1b, and 1c

	Multivariate Effects				Univariate effects		
	Wilks' λ	*F*	*df*	*Partial Eta²*	Fairness *F*	Recommendation Intentions *F*	Acceptance Intentions *F*
Covariate Effects							
General Beliefs	.965	1.81	3,150	.035	1.84	5.18*	1.12
Structure x General Beliefs	.951	1.25	6,147	.049	.02	2.87	1.36
Factor Effects							
Structure	.660	12.62**	6,147	.340	15.50**	4.33*	7.78**
Need for Control	.944	2.94*	3,150	.056	3.13	1.38	.69
Structure x Need for Control	.975	.64	6,147	.025	.27	.18	1.35

Note. General beliefs were centered.

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

Table 8: Post-Hoc Analyses for Interview Structure on Fairness, Recommendation Intentions and Acceptance Intentions

Type of Interview	Fairness *Mean*	Recommendation Intentions *Mean*	Acceptance Intentions *Mean*
Unstructured	18.97^a	$15.04^{c,d}$	15.53^e
Semi-Structured	21.30^b	15.61^c	$14.96^{e,f}$
Structured	21.35^b	14.61^d	14.22^f

Note. Post hoc comparisons were made using Bonferroni's correction for multiple contrasts. Within column, means with different superscripts are significantly different, $p < .05$ or less.

Table 9: Multivariate and Univariate Analysis of Covariance Testing Structure and Control Importance

	Multivariate Effects				Univariate effects	
	Wilks' λ	*F*	*df*	*Partial Eta²*	Structure Importance *F*	Control Importance *F*
Covariate Effects						
General Beliefs	.997	.21	2,151	.003	.23	.42
Structure x General Beliefs	.996	.17	4,149	.004	.09	.14
Factor Effects						
Structure	.882	4.97**	4,149	.118	5.00**	1.62
Need for Control	.976	1.84	2,151	.024	3.56	2.17
Structure x Need for Control	.979	.80	4,149	.021	.07	1.01

Note. General beliefs were centered.

** $p < .01$
 * $p < .05$

Table 10: Post-Hoc Analyses for Interview Structure on Structure and Control Importance

Type of Interview	Structure Importance *Mean*	Control Importance *Mean*
Unstructured	12.26[a]	10.29[c]
Semi-Structured	12.84[b]	10.08[c]
Structured	12.50[a,b]	10.18[c]

Note. Post hoc comparisons were made using Bonferroni's correction for multiple contrasts. Within column, means with different superscripts are significantly different, $p < .05$ or less.

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Management Trainee Job Description

JOB DESCRIPTION

Position Title: Management Trainee

Job Summary:

The Management Trainee is responsible for various tasks involved in the overall operation of a store including measuring business trends, establishing and maintaining customer service, developing staff personnel, controlling expenses and shortages, and all aspects of inventory control in order to maximize sales/profitability.

ESSENTIAL JOB FUNCTIONS:

☐ Performs supervisory activities under the direction of the manager on personnel issues such as staffing, training, scheduling work hours, conducting employee performance evaluations, and assisting in termination decisions.

☐ Assists in conducting weekly staff meetings to communicate policies and goals and motivate staff in achievement of goals.

☐ Maintains existing business accounts and assists the manager in developing new business accounts.

☐ Completes reports, such as sales reports and internal audit reports.

☐ Verifies that all security procedures are followed in opening and closing the store daily.

☐ Ensures that each customer receives outstanding customer service by providing a friendly environment which includes greeting and acknowledging every guest, and assisting customers in resolving account problems.

☐ Maintain adherence to all Company policies and procedures.

☐ Assists Management with all office tasks including budget, inventory, and payroll.

☐ Any other duties as assigned by supervisor.

KNOWLEDGE, SKILLS, AND ABILITIES

☐ Ability to deal with routine problems of high complexity due to the variety of possible solutions and the knowledge needed to determine the appropriate solution.

☐ Independent judgment in making decisions.

- [ ] Ability to perform non-complex math using calculator sufficient to balance daily transactions.
- [ ] Experience with computer software applications. MS Word and Excel a plus.
- [ ] Excellent verbal communication skills.
- [ ] Ability to read, count, and write to accurately complete all documentation.
- [ ] Demonstrated leadership ability.
- [ ] Bachelor's degree, preferably in business administration or management.
- [ ] Experience and/or training in supervisory duties a plus, but not necessary.

WORKING CONDITIONS:

- [ ] Work is performed in a customer contact area.
- [ ] Work involves standing 80-90% of the day.

<center>Appendix B: Oral Instructions</center>

After all participants received their booklets, they were informed that I was the human resources manager for a large international telecommunications company. They were told that they were going to view three different types of interviewing scenarios and questions on paper that my company used to select entry-level management trainees. The participants were asked to assume the role of a job applicant who has recently applied for this entry-level management trainee position and, as part of the selection process, was required to participate in a three-step interviewing process. It was emphasized that examinees should use this session as practice for interview situations they might encounter in the future when they apply for jobs after graduation.

Appendix C: Unstructured Interview Scenario

This interview will be conducted with one interviewer and you, the applicant. The interviewer will not be asking all candidates the same questions but will ask general questions that will allow for adjustment of interview questions for different candidates. For that reason, the interviewer will have access to your resume prior to and during the interview. Lastly, the interviewer will allow you to ask questions at any point during the interview. The next page contains the questions the interviewer will ask in this interview. Please read each question carefully and consider this interview scenario in terms of how you would react if you were confronted with this type of interview in your own job search. You are to read the interview items to get an idea of the interview content, and then you are to take some time and mentally answer each of the questions presented. Immediately following this interview, you will be given a post-interview questionnaire to complete. This questionnaire must be answered completely in order to receive extra credit. All answers are strictly confidential and anonymous.

1. I see on your resume that you attend Spring Hill College. What led you to making the decision to go this university as opposed to somewhere else?
2. Of the courses you have had at college, which courses have you enjoyed the most/least?
3. What challenges are you looking for in a position?
4. How do you think a friend or professor who knows you well would describe you?
5. What motivates you to put forth your greatest effort?
6. How do you determine or evaluate success?
7. What do you see as a manager's most important role?
8. What two or three accomplishments have given you the most satisfaction? Why?
9. Everyone has strengths and weaknesses as workers. What are your strong points for this job? What would you say are areas needing improvement?
10. What are some things you would like to avoid in a job?
11. How does this job fit in with your overall career goals?
12. What are the personal characteristics and qualities that you would bring to this position that would be particularly helpful in fulfilling the responsibilities of this position?
13. With what kind of people do you like to work? With what kind of people do you find it most difficult to work?
14. How has college prepared you to take on greater responsibility?
15. How would you describe the ideal job for you following graduation?
16. We are looking at a lot of great candidates; why are you the best person for this position?

Appendix D: Semi-Structured Interview Scenario

This interview will be conducted with one interviewer and you, the applicant. In this interview, the interviewer will be asking some of the same job-related questions to all candidates but will ask some general questions that will allow for adjustment of interview questions for different candidates. For this reason, the interviewer will have access to your resume prior to the interview but not during the interview (it is assumed that this interviewer has a resume on every applicant who has applied; otherwise, the interviewer would not have had access to your resume). Lastly, in this interview, all applicants are allowed to ask questions after answering the question that is asked by the interviewer. Please read each question carefully and consider this interview scenario in terms of how you would react if you were confronted with this type of interview in your own job search. You are to read the interview items to get an idea of the interview content, and then you are to take some time and mentally answer each of the questions presented. Immediately following this interview, you will be given a post-interview questionnaire to complete. This questionnaire must be answered completely in order to receive extra credit. All answers are strictly confidential and anonymous.

1. I see on your resume that you attend the University of the South. What led you to making the decision to go this university as opposed to somewhere else?
2. Of the courses you have had at college, which courses have you enjoyed the most/least?
3. Our customers frequently create a great deal of pressure. What types of experiences have you had in dealing with difficult customers? Give a specific example including how you normally cope with stressful situations.
4. The person in this position needs to be innovative and proactive. Can you describe some things you have done to demonstrate these qualities?
5. If you were the manager, how would you help build enthusiasm in others?
6. If you were the manager, how would you positively influence the actions of others in a desired direction?
7. How has college prepared you to take on greater responsibility?
8. Describe how you schedule your time on an unusually hectic day. Give a specific example.
9. If you were hired as the manager, how would you handle an irate customer who is complaining about a new company policy that now adds surcharges to customer accounts the first day the customer is late? The customer has been a client for 25 years.
10. What motivates you to put forth your greatest effort?
11. What two or three accomplishments have given you the most satisfaction? Why?
12. Everyone has strengths and weaknesses as workers. What are your strong points for this job? What would you say are areas needing improvement?
13. How would you describe the ideal job for you following graduation?
14. You were told by another worker that another employee was seen stealing. What would you do?
15. Give me a specific example of a time when you used good judgment and logic in solving problem.
16. We are looking at a lot of great candidates; why are you the best person for this position?

Appendix E: Structured Interview Scenario

In this interview, there will be one interviewer and you, the applicant. The interviewer will ask job-related questions but will not ask questions specific to your resume. In addition, the interviewer will not have access to your resume prior to or during the interview. Lastly, the interviewer will allow you to ask questions at the end of the interview. Please read each question carefully and consider this interview scenario in terms of how you would react if you were confronted with this type of interview in your own job search. You are to read the interview items to get an idea of the interview content, and then you are to take some time and mentally answer each of the questions presented. Immediately following this interview, you will be given a post-interview questionnaire to complete. This questionnaire must be answered completely in order to receive extra credit. All answers are strictly confidential and anonymous.

1. Describe how you schedule your time on an unusually hectic day. Give a specific example.
2. Give me a specific example of a time when you used good judgment and logic in solving a problem.
3. If you were hired as the manager, how would you handle an irate customer who is complaining about a new company policy that now adds surcharges to customer accounts the first day the customer is late? The customer has been a client for 25 years.
4. Tell me about a time you had to handle multiple responsibilities. How did you organize the work you needed to do?
5. You were told by another worker that another employee was seen stealing. What would you do?
6. How would you help to resolve a dispute between two co-workers.
7. Give me an example of a time you had to make an important decision. How did you make the decision? How does it affect you today?
8. A customer comes into your office complaining that one of your employees was rude to her. How would you handle this situation?
9. Give me an example of a time when you used your fact-finding skills to solve a problem.
10. Give me an example of when you showed initiative and took the lead.
11. If you were the manager hiring a graduate for this position, what qualities would you look for?
12. By providing examples, convince me that you can adapt to a wide variety of people, situations and environments.
13. Our customers frequently create a great deal of pressure. What types of experiences have you had in dealing with difficult customers? Give a specific example including how you normally cope with stressful situations.
14. If you were the manager, how would you positively influence the actions of others in a desired direction?
15. The person in this position needs to be innovative and proactive. Can you describe some things you have done to demonstrate these qualities?
16. If you were the manager, how would you help build enthusiasm in others?

Pre-interview Survey
Please fill out the following demographic information (for research purposes only).

1. Gender   M or F   (please circle)

2. Age   _____

3. Cumulative GPA   _____

4. Years of full-time work experience _____

5. Years of part-time work experience _____

6. Number of interviews you have participated in to date _____

7. What is your ethnicity? (For research purposes only. Please check only one)

      a. White (non-hispanic)   _____

      b. African-American   _____

      c. Hispanic   _____

      d. Asian American   _____

      e. Native American   _____

      f. Other   _____

Please circle your response to the following questions:

1. I believe that an interview is a good selection tool to use for hiring entry-level employees.

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Slightly disagree	Neutral	Slightly agree	Agree	Strongly agree
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

2. I see a clear connection between hiring interviews and knowing how well an applicant will perform on the job.

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Slightly disagree	Neutral	Slightly agree	Agree	Strongly agree
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

3. I do not understand why interviews are conducted to select applicants for the job.

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Slightly disagree	Neutral	Slightly agree	Agree	Strongly agree
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

4. I think interviewing is a fair way to determine applicants' abilities.

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Slightly disagree	Neutral	Slightly agree	Agree	Strongly agree
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Below you will find a series of statements. Please read each statement carefully and respond to it by expressing the extent to which you believe the statement applies to you. For all items, a response from 1 to 7 is required. Use the number that best reflects your belief when the scale is defined as follows:

1. The statement doesn't apply to me at all

2. The statement usually does not apply to me

3. Most often, the statement does apply to me

4. I am unsure about whether or not the statement applies to me, or, it applies to me about half of the time

5. The statement applies to me more often than not

6. The statement usually applies to me

7. The statement always applies to me

It is important that you respond to all items.

1. I prefer tasks/jobs where I have a lot of control over what I do and when I do it.

   1   2   3   4   5   6   7

2. I participate in politics because I want to have as much say as possible in running the government.

   1   2   3   4   5   6

3. I try to avoid situations where someone else tells me what to do.

    1   2   3   4   5   6   7

4. I prefer to be a leader rather than a follower.

    1   2   3   4   5   6   7

5. I enjoy being able to influence others.

    1   2   3   4   5   6   7

6. I am careful to check everything on an automobile before I leave for a long trip.

    1   2   3   4   5   6   7

7. Others usually know what is best for me.

    1   2   3   4   5   6   7

8. I enjoy making my own decisions.

    1   2   3   4   5   6   7

9. I believe I have control over my own destiny.

    1   2   3   4   5   6   7

10. I would rather someone else take the leadership role when I am involved in a group project.

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

11. I consider myself generally more capable of handling situations than others are.

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

12. I'd rather run my own business than to work for someone else.

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

13. I like to get a good idea of what a job is all about before I begin.

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

14. When I see a problem, I prefer to do something about it rather than letting someone else solve the problem.

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

15. When it comes to orders, I would rather give them than receive them.

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

16. I wish I could push many of life's daily decisions off on someone else.

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

17. When driving, I consciously avoid putting myself in a situation where I could be hurt by someone else's mistake.

    1   2   3   4   5   6   7

18. I prefer to avoid situations where someone else has to tell me what it is I should be doing.

    1   2   3   4   5   6   7

19. There are many situations in which I prefer only one choice rather than having to make a decision.

    1   2   3   4   5   6   7

20. I like to wait and see if someone else is going to solve a problem so that I don't have to be bothered by it.

    1   2   3   4   5   6   7

Appendix G: Post-Interview Survey

Please answer each question by circling the appropriate corresponding number.

1a. The interviewer would have allowed me to ask questions in this type of interview.

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Slightly disagree	Neutral	Slightly agree	Agree	Strongly agree
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

1b. How important is it to you that you have the opportunity to ask questions in an interview?

Not at all important	Somewhat important	Important	Very Important
1	2	3	4

2. The questions asked in the interview appeared to be related to the job.

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Slightly disagree	Neutral	Slightly agree	Agree	Strongly agree
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

3a. I would not have the opportunity to demonstrate my competencies in this type of interview.

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Slightly disagree	Neutral	Slightly agree	Agree	Strongly agree
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

3b. How important is it to you that you be able to demonstrate your competencies in an interview?

Not at all important   Somewhat important Important   Very Important

      1   2   3   4

4. I would recommend this company to other people.

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Slightly disagree	Neutral	Slightly agree	Agree	Strongly agree
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

5. I would not accept an offer from this company.

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Slightly disagree	Neutral	Slightly agree	Agree	Strongly agree
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

6a. The interviewer was aware of the information that was on my resume

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Slightly disagree	Neutral	Slightly agree	Agree	Strongly agree
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

6b. How important is it to you that the interviewer have access to the information you provide in a resume?

Not at all important	Somewhat important	Important	Very Important
1	2	3	4

7a. I would be able to control the factors that influenced my performance on this type of interview.

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Slightly disagree	Neutral	Slightly agree	Agree	Strongly agree
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

7b. How important is it to you that you be able to control the factors that influence your performance in an interview?

Not at all important	Somewhat important	Important	Very Important
1	2	3	4

8. If this company did not offer me the management trainee position, but did offer another position with comparable responsibilities and pay, I would accept the offer.

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Slightly disagree	Neutral	Slightly agree	Agree	Strongly agree
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

9a. The interviewer asked every candidate that applied for the management trainee position the same questions asked of me during the interview.

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Slightly disagree	Neutral	Slightly agree	Agree	Strongly agree
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

9b. How important is it to you that every candidate who applies for a similar position be asked the same questions?

Not at all important	Somewhat important	Important	Very Important
1	2	3	4

10. Most of the questions asked were not related to the job.

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Slightly disagree	Neutral	Slightly agree	Agree	Strongly agree
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

11. I would not encourage others to apply for a job with this company

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Slightly disagree	Neutral	Slightly agree	Agree	Strongly agree
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

12a. The interviewer asked me to describe specific experiences from my past.

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Slightly disagree	Neutral	Slightly agree	Agree	Strongly agree
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

12b. How important is it to you that the interviewer ask you to describe experiences from your past during an interview?

Not at all important	Somewhat important	Important	Very Important
1	2	3	4

13. The interview questions asked about my qualifications for the job.

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Slightly disagree	Neutral	Slightly agree	Agree	Strongly agree
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

14a. I would have the opportunity to present my qualifications for the job in this type of interview.

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Slightly disagree	Neutral	Slightly agree	Agree	Strongly agree
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

14b. How important is it to you to be able to present your qualifications for the job during an interview?

Not at all important	Somewhat important	Important	Very Important
1	2	3	4

15. The interview was fair.

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Slightly disagree	Neutral	Slightly agree	Agree	Strongly agree
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

16. If this company offered me a position, I would accept the offer.

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Slightly disagree	Neutral	Slightly agree	Agree	Strongly agree
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

17. I would recommend this company's services/products to others.

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Slightly disagree	Neutral	Slightly agree	Agree	Strongly agree
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

VITA

VITA

Danielle Lombard-Sims

EDUCATION
Master of Science in Industrial/Organizational Psychology, Purdue University (IUPUI) August 2012
Thesis: *Applicant Reactions to Structuring the Selection Interview*
Chair: John T. Hazer, PhD
Committee Members: Jane R. Williams, PhD and Mark Shermis, PhD

Master of Science in Management, Indiana Wesleyan University, April 2007

Bachelor of Arts in Psychology, Minor in Business Administration
Spring Hill College, May 1994, *Summa Cum Laude*

TEACHING EXPERIENCE
Adjunct Faculty, Delgado Community College, General Psychology
Adjunct Faculty, University of Phoenix, Human Capital Management, Human Resource Management, and Transformational Leadership
Adjunct Faculty, DeVry University, Human Resource Management
Adjunct Faculty, Southern New Hampshire University, Human Resource Management

RESEARCH EXPERIENCE
Purdue University, IUPUI
Graduate Student Researcher, Dept. of Psychology
Supervisor: Mark Shermis
Developed an online test for school admissions; coded and analyzed data on the effectiveness of using computers as a medium for data collection.

Spring Hill College
Student Researcher, School of Psychology Aug. 1991 – May 1994

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

OCHSNER HEALTH SYSTEM, New Orleans, Louisiana   2011 - present
Human Resources Director, Talent Management and Organizational Effectiveness
- Responsible for creating and directing the leadership development, performance management, change management, employee engagement, and service excellence processes for leaders.
- Working with the Executive Office team, design, develop, implement, and assess nominated leadership development solutions for high potential employees
- Developed a Supervisor Leadership Program to develop Ochsner's 600 frontline leaders
- Revised the performance management process to meet organizational strategic initiatives.
- Developed a mentoring framework to address retention issues with new hires
- Developed training classes to address diversity and inclusion values in the organization
- Implemented blended learning solutions to meet the learning and business financial needs of geographically dispersed employees
- Developed communication and marketing strategies for Ochsner Leadership Institute
- Developed performance metrics and goals for the Ochsner Leadership Institute team.
- Manage a staff of six exempt employees
- Received the 2011 Ochnser New Leader of the Year Award

ENTERGY CORPORATION., New Orleans, Louisiana   2008 - 2011
Manager, Training and Development
- Led the development and execution of a fully integrated organizational and training development strategy to meet business goals
- Chair of the employee development advisory council, consisting of the CEO of Entergy Louisiana and Sr. VP's of the business units to design, develop, and implement customized change management, organizational effectiveness, and organizational development interventions.
- Developed a performance management process to meet organizational strategic initiatives.
- Managed vendor/supplier relationships, including contract negotiations
- Developed an on-boarding process to address retention issues with new hires
- Implemented alternative learning solutions (i.e., e-learning and webcasting) to meet the learning and business financial needs of geographically dispersed Entergy employees
- Developed communication strategies around employee development offerings and services
- Developed performance metrics and goals for the Employee Development team.
- Managed a budget of $1.2 million and five staff

SHELL EXPLORATION AND PRODUCTION CO., New Orleans, Louisiana 2007 - 2008
Human Resources Account Manager/Business Advisor
- HR lead on the Exploration and Production Leadership Team
- Managed global human resources processes, including employee relations, leadership development, change and performance management, succession planning, engagement strategies, staffing, diversity, employee relations, and expatriation, for offshore and onshore sites, and a chemical/gas plant in Alabama.
- Enhanced the talent acquisition process to address recruiting, retention, and onboarding issues
  - Created diversity talent, recruitment, and retention programs, such as the Women's Career Development Program, DPEP (recruitment focused on the hiring of people of color and women), and the Operations Supervisors Development Program.
- Given a Special Recognition Award for establishing a daycare partnership downtown for employees, an identified need based on the results of the women's recruitment and retention study.
- Conduct Executive, Mid-Level, Frontline Leadership, and Verbal 360 Development sessions.
- Member of the employee board advisory committee for diversity employee networks
- Oversee and direct an HR analyst and an HR associate; encourage ongoing development of staff.
- Interface with HSE and corporate security to provide safety and wellness training programs.

HUMANA, INC., Metairie, Louisiana 2005 - 2007
Human Resources Consultant
- Created and managed organizational development and workforce planning strategies to optimize business results in 26 states.
- Provided HR support to the Regional Vice-President, 3 Market Presidents, and associates.
- Responsible for understanding the competitive and regulatory environment, and how the components of Humana's business model interrelate to increase competitiveness in the marketplace.
- DDI certified in Targeted Selection and Essentials of Leadership

TELECORP/AT&T WIRELESS, New Orleans, Louisiana 2000 – 2005
Regional Human Resources Manager
- Directed the HR start-up for TeleCorp Communications, Inc., later purchased by AT&T Wireless.
- Managed the organizational development/training, employment, employee relations, compensation, and benefit administration functions for the 43 stores in the Southeast Region.

- Developed and delivered training sessions on leadership development, performance appraisals, conflict resolution, succession planning, behavioral interviewing, and employment law.
- Managed a budget of $900,000; Supervised 4 staff members
- Corporate liaison for Community Partnerships
- Provided HR services during merger/acquisition with Cingular Wireless
- Received the "Spirit of Excellence Award", 2003

GOLDEN RULE INSURANCE CO., Indianapolis, IN   1997 – 2000
Employment/Employee Relations Specialist
- Managed the employment, training, and employee relations functions for the Executive and Regional Offices.
- Co-developer and trainer of in-house management development programs.
- Conducted Zenger-Miller Frontline Leadership training and LOMA "The Edge" training programs.
- Certified in administering the Myers-Briggs and Kolbe Index psychological tests

PURDUE UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF SCIENCE (IUPUI), Indianapolis, IN
1994 – 1996
Research/Teaching Assistant

- Taught an undergraduate experimental psychology course to sophomore and junior college students.
- Developed teaching materials such as syllabi, visual aids, answer keys, supplementary notes, and examinations.
- Evaluated and assigned grades to examinations, assignments, and papers; recorded grades.
- Returned assignments to students in accordance with established deadlines.
- Scheduled and maintained regular office hours to meet with students.
- Provided statistical analysis assistance to faculty members or staff for laboratory or field research.
- Co-authored several publications
    - Shermis, Mark D. and Lombard, Danielle (1999), "A Comparison of Survey Data Collected by Regular Mail and Electronic Mail Questionnaires", Journal of Business and Psychology, 14(2): 351 - 354.
    - Shermis, Mark D. and Lombard, Danielle (1998), "Effects of Computer-Based Test Administrations on Test Anxiety and Performance. Computers in Human Behavior, 14(1), 111-123.
    - Shermis, Mark D., Wolting, Mary, and Lombard, Danielle (1996), "Development of a Computerized Test for College Reading Placement". Journal of Developmental Education, 20(2), 18-24.

MEMBERSHIPS
- **2008 President,** Human Resources Management Association Board of Directors, New Orleans
- **2009 Co-Chair,** 61st Annual SHRM Conference and Exposition
- **2010 Certification Chair,** HRMA Board of Directors, New Orleans
- **Member,** ASTD – American Society of Training and Development
- **Member**, SHRM – Society of Human Resources Management
- **Board Member,** New Orleans Workforce Investment Board; LA Diversity Council

PRESENTATIONS
Conference Presentations
Lombard-Sims, D. & Greer, K. (2011, October). *Onsite. New Orleans, Louisiana* Presentation at the annual Human Resource Management Conference. *Developing a High Potential Leadership Development Program.* Awarded Strategic HR credits