

2017

Video killed the interview star: Does picture-in-picture affect interview performance?

Ryan G. Horn
The George Washington University

Tara S. Behrend
The George Washington University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.bgsu.edu/pad>



Part of the [Human Resources Management Commons](#), [Industrial and Organizational Psychology Commons](#), and the [Other Psychology Commons](#)

[How does access to this work benefit you? Let us know!](#)

Recommended Citation

Horn, Ryan G. and Behrend, Tara S. (2017) "Video killed the interview star: Does picture-in-picture affect interview performance?," *Personnel Assessment and Decisions*: Number 3 : Iss. 1 , Article 5.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.25035/pad.2017.005>

Available at: <https://scholarworks.bgsu.edu/pad/vol3/iss1/5>

This Main Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Journals at ScholarWorks@BGSU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Personnel Assessment and Decisions by an authorized editor of ScholarWorks@BGSU.

VIDEO KILLED THE INTERVIEW STAR: DOES PICTURE-IN-PICTURE AFFECT INTERVIEW PERFORMANCE?

Ryan G. Horn¹ and Tara S. Behrend¹

1. The George Washington University

ABSTRACT

KEYWORDS

technology-mediated interview,
video interview,
employee selection,
cognitive load,
picture-in-picture

Although technology-mediated selection interviews have become more prevalent in practice, research on this phenomenon has failed to keep pace. One pressing need is to understand the dimensions upon which technology-mediated interviews might differ from one another. Particular aspects of synchronous video technology may negatively affect interviewees, and those negative effects may be exacerbated by the evaluative nature of the interview. We explored this question by investigating the effects that one such aspect, the picture-in-picture window, has on interviewees. This study used a 2 (picture-in-picture vs. no picture-in-picture) x 2 (evaluative framing vs. nonevaluative framing) between-subjects experimental design to test the hypothesized relationships. We conclude that presence of a picture-in-picture window during a video interview did not directly affect interview performance or applicant reactions but did increase cognitive load. This suggests that picture-in-picture technology affects interviewees in a potentially detrimental way. We discuss how research and practice should navigate these findings.

As technology advances, organizations are faced with difficult decisions regarding how to conduct job interviews. For example, organizations must weigh the advantages and disadvantages of conducting job interviews face to face versus using telephone, synchronous video, or asynchronous video, which are all increasing in availability and quality. Technology-mediated interviews have clear practical advantages when compared with those conducted face-to-face. The use of synchronous video technology can be more convenient, efficient, and cost effective than face-to-face interviews while also giving organizations access to a more diverse pool of applicants (Bauer, Truxillo, Paronto, Weekley, & Campion, 2004; Hendrick, 2011; Toldi, 2011). To date, however, there is little empirical evidence available to guide implementation.

Past research on video-based interviews has explored reliability (Crenshaw, 2005), generalizability to face-to-face interviews (Van Iddekinge, Raymark, Roth, & Payne, 2006), and applicant reactions (Bauer et al., 2004; Chapman, Uggerslev, & Webster, 2003; Toldi, 2011). In a recent meta-analysis, Blacksmith, Willford, and Behrend (2016) found that technology mediation led to lower interview performance and worse applicant reactions when compared with face-to-face interviews. As a whole, this body of literature suggests that video interviews are a potentially viable

selection tool; however, they should not be treated as equivalent to face-to-face interviews.

Simple comparisons of face-to-face versus video interviews provide only the broadest view of how video interviews affect applicants and raters; a more precise understanding of how specific aspects of technology affect performance is also needed. For example, it is known that technology-mediated interviews introduce situational factors not present in face-to-face interviews (Potosky, 2008), such as restricted opportunity to communicate through body language. Little research exists, however, that differentiates within the general category of “technology mediated.” Research addressing how technology-mediated selection methods differ from one another is critical to advancement of theory and practice in this area (Horn, Kaminsky, & Behrend, 2016).

Picture-in-picture (PIP) technology is a unique aspect of synchronous video interviews that may have an effect on candidates. Past research on self-awareness and social facilitation indicates that mirror presence affects task performance, providing a potential explanation for performance differences between video and face-to-face interviews. PIP shows a live image on the applicant’s screen of what interviewers see when interacting with them (i.e., the applicant’s

Corresponding author:

Ryan G. Horn
Email: ryan.gl.horn@gmail.com

likeness); in this way it acts like a mirror for the applicant. Synchronous video software used for selection interviews, such as Skype and FaceTime, has a PIP feature (Apple.com, 2013; Skype.com, 2013). This feature allows users to devote attention to aspects of their appearance they might like to know; based on the PIP image they might decide they are sitting too close to the camera or need to move to one side. In other words, PIP makes users self-aware. In addition to making users self-aware, PIP is an additional stimulus on which to focus one's attention.

The goal of this study is to examine the effect of PIP in an interview context. Drawing from self-awareness theory and social facilitation theory, we predict that PIP will have a detrimental effect on performance and interviewee reactions, and that this effect will be exacerbated in a highly evaluative setting. Specific hypotheses are offered below.

Self-Awareness

Extant research on self-awareness illustrates how the presence of a mirror image during an interview might affect interview performance. Duval and Wicklund's (1972) self-awareness theory proposes that when individuals focus attention on themselves, they compare their behavior to their own values. That is, becoming self-aware causes individuals to focus on their behavior and attempt to bring it in line with their values and goals. Many early and contemporary studies of self-awareness employ the use of a mirror to induce self-awareness (Carver & Scheier, 1978; Dijksterhuis & van Knippenberg, 2000), whereas others have used video cameras (Duval & Silvia, 2002) and webcams. Carver and Scheier (1978) as well as Silvia and Phillips (2013) found that when faced with a mirror, participants increased use of first-person pronouns, which they interpreted as an increase in self-awareness. Their findings suggest that the presence of a mirror can increase self-focused attention. Because PIP acts as a mirror, it is expected that presence of PIP will also result in increased self-awareness.

Hypothesis 1a: The presence of the picture-in-picture window will increase self-awareness.

Social Facilitation

Contemporary social facilitation research tends to draw from a cognitive approach. From this perspective, arousal occurring in social facilitation is caused by an attentional conflict (Baron, Moore, & Sanders, 1978). That is, attention devoted to other things, such as people or other tasks, distracts from and conflicts with the focal task. This occurs due to high levels of cognitive load, which is defined as the amount of mental effort demanded by a task (Block, Hancock, & Zakay, 2010). Simpler tasks are associated with lower cognitive load, whereas tasks that are highly complex result in excessive cognitive load, which produces negative effects on performance (Kahneman, 1973; Sweller, Van Merriënboer, & Paas, 1998).

Interviewing for a job is an inherently complex task, which requires fairly high levels of cognitive load (Van Iddekinge, Raymark, & Roth, 2005). It is well established that increased self-focused attention causes attentional conflicts. When people are placed in a situation where they observe their behavior in a mirror, they are more likely to focus attention on their personal thoughts and feelings (Carver & Scheier, 1996). Self-focused attention can be especially distracting when evaluated on a complex task (Carver & Scheier, 2001; Duval & Wicklund, 1972).

An additional piece of information present using synchronous video technology is the PIP window. PIP is expected to increase self-focused attention, which has been shown to increase cognitive load (Panayiotou & Vrana, 1998; Silvia, 2002; Vallacher, 1978). In general, video communication has been shown to induce higher cognitive load compared with face-to-face (Ferran & Watts, 2008) and audio (Hinds, 1999). Because PIP technology presents more pieces of information to integrate, through increased self-focused attention and attentional distractions, we predict that interviewees will experience increased cognitive load.

Hypothesis 1b: The presence of the picture-in-picture window will increase cognitive load.

Anxiety and Evaluative Framing

Employment interviews cause stress and anxiety due to their evaluative nature (Huffcutt, Van Iddekinge, & Roth, 2011; Posthuma, Morgeson, & Campion, 2002). Interviews can even induce anxiety in individuals who are not normally prone to anxiety (McCarthy & Goffin, 2004). Past work has shown that interview anxiety leads to poorer performance (Feiler & Powell, 2013; McCarthy & Goffin, 2004).

Consistent with previous findings in distraction-conflict research, evaluation apprehension has been shown to cause performance impairment when working on a complex task (Feinberg, & Aiello, 2006). It has also been shown that state anxiety is higher under evaluative conditions (Eysenck, Derakshan, Santos, & Calvo, 2007; Keogh & French, 2001). Interviews vary in the sense of evaluation they create (Latham & Finnegan, 1993). For example, a screening interview is typically framed as less evaluative than a second-round technical interview. An interviewer in a screening interview might tell the interviewee the purpose of the interview is to get to know them by asking a few questions while also allowing the interviewee to learn more about the company and position, whereas an interviewer in a second-round technical interview might tell the interviewee the purpose of the interview is to evaluate their knowledge by answering a series of technical questions. Although both interviews are evaluative, there is likely a difference in the interviewee's perceived intensity of that evaluation. A recruitment-focused interview would be even less evaluative than a screening interview. To date, the effect of evaluative

framing, which is an important aspect of employment interviews, on anxiety has not been explored in the context of video interviews. In this study, evaluative framing is defined as the information communicated to the interviewee regarding the degree to which their performance will be assessed. Because evaluation during complex tasks is anxiety inducing, it is expected that participants who participate in an interview framed as more intensely evaluative will experience increased levels of anxiety. Further, based on past evidence that self-awareness effects are exacerbated in evaluative contexts (Feinberg & Aiello, 2006; Liebling & Shaver, 1973) we expect that evaluation will moderate the effects of PIP.

Hypothesis 2: Evaluative framing will increase anxiety.

Hypothesis 3: Evaluative framing and picture-in-picture will interact such that (a) performance ratings and (b) applicant reactions will be most positive for an interviewee in a nonevaluative interview with no picture-in-picture window and most negative for an interviewee in an evaluative interview with a picture-in-picture window.

METHOD

Design

This study used a 2 (picture-in-picture vs. no picture-in-picture) \times 2 (evaluative framing vs. non-evaluative framing) between-subjects experimental design in order to test the hypothesized relationships. Participants were randomly assigned to one of four groups. Self-awareness was manipulated via picture-in-picture window, which was either present or absent on the interviewee's screen during the interview. Evaluative framing was manipulated via the instructions given to interviewees. Some interviewees were told their performance during the interview was being evaluated and that top performers would be entered into a drawing for a \$25 gift card. Others were told they were not being evaluated and that the reason they were there was to evaluate the performance of the interviewer. This condition was meant to approximate a recruitment-focused or similarly nonevaluative interview setting.

Participants

Participants in this study were 113 undergraduates recruited from a university in the United States. The average participant age was 19.3 years ($SD = 1.6$). The sample included 58% women. The participants were mostly Caucasian/White (56.6%). A smaller number of participants were Asian or Pacific Islander (25.7%), Black or African American (8.0%), Hispanic or Latino (5.3%), or other ethnicities (4.4%). Most participants had some work experience (91.2%) and had participated in an interview as an interviewee in the past (84.1%).

Rater Training

Interviewers were five research assistants who were selected for this role and practiced extensively before conducting interviews. Research assistants were provided a document with detailed guidelines for how to rate the interviews to ensure a common frame of reference among raters. Interrater agreement, $ICC(2) = .84$, indicated good agreement among raters on the overall interview rating.

Procedure

Participants were interviewed for a lead customer service representative position for a fictitious company, UnitedTech. The interviews consisted of 10 behaviorally oriented interview questions (e.g., Describe a situation that required you to handle multiple tasks at one time. What did you do?). All interviews were conducted using Skype. Prior to the interview, participants completed a questionnaire containing personality and demographic items. A facilitator arrived at a designated interview room to execute interview set-up.

The scheduled interviewer, who was in a separate location, signed into Skype and connected with the facilitator. The facilitator executed the PIP manipulation by closing or opening the PIP window. The facilitator then greeted the participant and executed the evaluative framing manipulation by informing the participant about whether they would be evaluated. After the interview, the interviewer rated the participant's performance. Each participant completed a post-interview questionnaire containing fairness perceptions and state anxiety measures.

Measures

Manipulation check. To determine whether participants in the evaluative condition felt more evaluated than those in the nonevaluative condition, participants were asked: "How likely did it feel that someone was evaluating your performance?" (10-point scale, from *not very likely* to *extremely likely*). The manipulation worked as intended ($t(113)=3.76$, $p=.00$, $d=.71$).

Applicant reactions were measured using a 28-item scale ($\alpha=.91$) from Bauer et al. (2001), for example, "I could really show my skills and abilities through this interview." (5-point scale, *strongly disagree* to *strongly agree*). Cognitive load was measured with a 5-item scale adapted from Hart and Staveland (1988), for example, "How mentally demanding was the interview?" (7-point scale, from *very low* to *very high*; $\alpha=.66$).

Interview performance. Interviewers used twelve items ($\alpha=.96$) adapted from Chapman and Rowe (2001) to evaluate the performance of each interviewee (7-point scale, *poor* to *excellent*).

Self-awareness was measured by coding the usage of first-person pronouns (Carver & Scheier, 1978). Two trained research assistants recorded the frequency of first-person

pronouns in each interview and their counts were averaged. Interrater agreement, $ICC(2) = .92$, indicated good agreement among raters.

State anxiety was measured using a 6-item scale ($\alpha = .72$) from Marteau and Bekker (1992), for example, "I felt upset" (4-point scale, *not at all* to *very much*).

Personality was measured with 10-item scales from the International Personality Item Pool (Goldberg et al., 2006), using 5-point scales, from *strongly disagree* to *strongly agree*. Specifically, we measured *Agreeableness* ($\alpha = .86$), for example, "I sympathize with others' feelings"; *Extraversion* ($\alpha = .89$), for example, "I don't mind being the center of attention"; *Conscientiousness* ($\alpha = .90$) for example, "I pay attention to details"; *Emotional Stability* ($\alpha = .88$), for example, "I get irritated easily"; and *Openness to Experience* ($\alpha = .78$), for example, "I have a vivid imagination."

Demographic measures. Age, gender, ethnicity, years of work experience, interview experience (total number), and current employment status were also assessed.

RESULTS

Descriptive statistics are shown in Tables 1 and 2. Hypothesis 1a and 1b predicted that the presence of the picture-in-picture window would increase self-awareness and cognitive load. ANOVA results showed that the main effect of picture-in-picture presence on self-awareness was not significant, $F(1,111) = 1.43, p = .23, \eta^2 = .01$. Thus, Hypothesis 1a was not supported. The main effect of picture-in-picture presence on cognitive load was significant $F(1,111) = 6.08, p < .05, \eta^2 = .05$. Thus, Hypothesis 1b was supported, such that participants in the PIP condition had higher cognitive load than those in the non-PIP condition. Hypothesis 2 predicted that evaluative framing would

increase state anxiety. ANOVA results for state anxiety $F(1,111) = 9.01, p < .05, \eta^2 = .08$ show a statistically significant difference in state anxiety level between the evaluative and nonevaluative groups, thus Hypothesis 2 was supported such that participants in the evaluative condition had a state anxiety level higher than those in the nonevaluative condition.

Hypotheses 3a and 3b predicted that evaluative framing and picture-in-picture would interact such that performance ratings and applicant reactions would be most positive for an interviewee in a nonevaluative interview with no-picture-in-picture window and most negative for an interviewee in an evaluative interview with a picture-in-picture window. ANOVA results show there was no interaction between picture-in-picture and evaluative framing on interview performance $F(1,109) = .05, p = .83, \eta^2 = .00$ or applicant reactions $F(1,109) = .55, p = .46, \eta^2 = .00$. Thus, Hypotheses 3a and 3b were not supported. Furthermore, there was no main effect of picture-in-picture presence or evaluative nature on interview performance or applicant reactions. A summary model of hypotheses is shown in Figure 1.

Post-Hoc Exploratory Analyses

Given the lack of support for some of our hypotheses despite interesting patterns of correlations we felt it would be worthwhile to perform post-hoc analyses to further understand relationships between study variables. As previously noted, past research has shown that highly evaluative interviews result in increased anxiety, which can result in an increased inward focus. We tested these relationships finding that evaluative framing did not result in increased self-awareness $F(1,111) = .03, p = .86, \eta^2 = .00$ or cognitive load $F(1,111) = 3.14, p = .08, \eta^2 = .03$. Additional analyses were conducted to explore the relationship among person-


TABLE 1.
Means, Standard Deviations, and Correlations Among Study Variables

	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
1. PIP	.50	.50													
2. Evaluative nature	.50	.50	.03												
3. State anxiety	1.92	.53	.07	.28**											
4. Self-awareness	59.60	1.02	.11	-.02	.01										
5. Interview performance	4.8	1.57	-.14	-.01	-.24*	.28**									
6. Cognitive load	2.37	1.12	.23*	.16	.48**	.22*	-.07								
7. Applicant reactions	3.63	.51	-.04	.12	-.13	.24*	.22*	-.10							
8. Extraversion	3.55	.68	-.01	-.07	-.04	.14	.28**	-.08	.12						
9. Agreeableness	4.10	.53	-.11	-.10	.14	.17	.25**	.02	.25**	.20*					
10. Conscientiousness	3.50	.74	-.11	-.07	-.02	-.18*	.19	-.12	.10	.10	.28**				
11. Emotional Stability	3.21	.70	-.08	.02	-.10	-.15	.17	-.29**	.15	.04	-.03	.16			
12. Openness to experience	3.71	.47	-.15	.06	-.06	-.11	.38**	-.14	.14	.24*	.17*	.11	.17		
13. Work experience	3.41	1.39	-.04	-.07	-.16	.14	.34**	-.15	.21*	.12	.36**	.22*	.11	.24*	
14. Interview experience	3.74	2.51	.00	-.11	.03	.08	.19*	.13	.06	.28**	.28**	.25**	-.08	.22*	.55**

Note. $N = 113$. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$.

TABLE 2.*Means and SDs of Study Variables by Condition*

	PIPxEval	PIPxNonEval	NoPIPxEval	NoPIPxNonEval
Self-awareness	63.63 (20.40)	61.60 (29.30)	55.72 (25.04)	58.72 (25.28)
Self-awareness (pronouns per minute)	8.75 (2.36)	8.24 (1.72)	7.71 (2.11)	8.28 (2.06)
Cognitive load	2.86 (.98)	2.37 (1.03)	2.22 (1.09)	2.00 (1.21)
State anxiety	2.04 (.51)	1.88 (.45)	2.09 (.55)	1.68 (.51)
Interview performance	4.63 (1.28)	4.60 (1.37)	4.93 (1.14)	5.00 (1.33)
Applicant reactions	3.64 (.49)	3.58 (.42)	3.75 (.48)	3.55 (.61)

Note. $N = 113$.**FIGURE 1.** Summary model of hypotheses. Solid lines indicate supported (at $p < .05$) hypotheses.

ality traits, demographic variables, and study variables. Interview experience ($\beta = .10, p < .05$) and work experience ($F(5,107) = 3.13, p < .05, \eta^2 = .13$) were both significant predictors of interview performance, such that those with more interview experience and work experience had higher ratings. However, no individual difference or demographic variables, including interview experience and work experience, were found to be moderators of observed effects.

DISCUSSION

The way in which organizations conduct employment interviews is evolving. In the past, interviews took place either face-to-face or over the telephone. Synchronous video interviews are not new, but they have been used with greater regularity in recent years. Because organizations are at times using different tools to conduct interviews, it is critical that we understand nuances of those technologies that could affect interview performance and applicant reactions. This study expands our understanding of how synchronous video interviews affect interview performance, applicant reactions, and mental workload.

Although the results of the current study do not pro-

vide evidence that PIP affects interview performance or applicant reactions directly, evidence is provided that PIP affects the interviewee in an important way. Specifically, the presence of PIP resulted in higher levels of interviewee cognitive load. This finding suggests that PIP acts as an additional piece of information to distract an interviewee during the interview. Furthermore, this study contributes evidence that interviews conducted through synchronous video technology result in higher levels of state anxiety for interviewees. Specifically, when interviewees were told they were being evaluated, they experienced increased state anxiety. Although this effect has been established for other interview modes, this study is the first to show this effect in synchronous video interviews. The potential importance of this finding is evidenced by the negative correlation between state anxiety and both interview performance ($r = -.24$) and applicant reactions ($r = -.13$) respectively.

It is also important to note the effect size of PIP presence on interview performance ($d = .27$) and self-awareness ($d = .21$). This finding suggests there is some variation in interview performance and self-awareness based on PIP presence, even in a small sample of behavior. Though the effect is not statistically significant, we note it as prelimi-

nary evidence that future research is warranted. Although, it is possible PIP is enough to distract, manifesting in increased cognitive load, yet not present a large enough mirror image to induce high levels of self-awareness. However, noteworthy is the relationship between self-awareness and interview performance ($r = .28$). Combined with the small effect size of PIP on self-awareness, this suggests PIP induces some level of self-awareness, which may result in increased performance. Further, we note the relationship between cognitive load and self-awareness ($r = .22$). Increased self-awareness may be a saving grace of PIP, counteracting the negative effect of cognitive load on interview performance. In sum, it is likely self-awareness and cognitive load are intertwined, with varying levels of positive and negative influence on interviewees throughout the interview.

Implications for Theory

The findings from the current study are mostly supported by what is known from social facilitation research. The presence of a distractor, in this case PIP, while performing a complex task resulted in increased cognitive load. However, the presence of PIP did not have a negative effect on interview performance. Although Van Iddekinge et al. (2005) suggest job interviews are inherently complex tasks, perhaps the job interview in the current study was not as complex due to lack of authenticity. It is possible our interview was a task that fell somewhere in the middle on the complexity continuum and thus did not display positive or negative social facilitation.

Social facilitation research also suggests that PIP and evaluative framing would have a greater combined effect on performance than either alone. Our findings did not support this assertion; neither PIP nor evaluative framing affected performance, and there was no interaction effect. Again, it is possible our task was not complex enough for the distraction of evaluation or PIP to affect performance. The mechanisms underlying social facilitation were present, as seen by support of Hypothesis 1b and Hypothesis 2. That is, increased cognitive load and increased state anxiety occurred as a result of the PIP and evaluative framing manipulations respectively. It is possible that increasing the difficulty of the behavioral interview questions in the study would have caused the social facilitation mechanisms to take effect and resulted in statistically significant detriments to performance for those in the PIP with evaluative framing condition. Future research should explore social facilitation effects of PIP on other complex tasks to better understand PIP as a distractor.

Implications for Practice

Although it is encouraging that interview performance and applicant reactions were not dramatically affected by PIP, the increased level of interviewee cognitive load in

the PIP condition is potentially problematic. In the current study, cognitive load was positively correlated with state anxiety ($r = .48$). Heavy cognitive load has also been shown to result in increased errors (Paas, 1992; Sweller, 1988) and poorer performance on complex tasks (Kahneman, 1973; Sweller et al., 1998). Importantly, stereotyping also tends to increase under heavy cognitive load (Brewer, 1996; Sherman & Frost, 2000). Stereotyping during an interview could affect performance through altered responses and impression management tactics. The interviewee may attempt to align responses and tactics with the stereotype they have of the interviewer (Rosenfeld, 1997). Interviewers are not immune to the effects of cognitive load either, and the effects of stereotyping on their part have much more troublesome implications (Lin, Dobbins, and Farh, 1992).

The current study is an initial step toward understanding how aspects of synchronous video technology affect interviewees during job interviews. Research on video interviews thus far has focused mainly on differences in performance and applicant reactions compared to face-to-face interviews. This research typically indicates that interviewees perform better and have more positive reactions to face-to-face interviews. Until now no research has sought to understand why video interviews might negatively affect performance and applicant reactions. The current study addresses this need and provides support for the idea that it is possible to identify aspects of video technology that affect interviewees. We hope the current study inspires more research on video interviews and technology-driven selection tools in general. Important avenues for future research on how technology driven selection might affect performance include: aspects of the technology, environment, and individual differences.

Aspects of technology-driven selection tools are important to explore as use grows. Although these tools (e.g., selection games) are created and used to engage applicants, there are potentially unwanted consequences resulting from aspects of the tools and the technology used to deliver them. Examples of unwanted consequences can be seen in the current study. Increased cognitive load due to PIP presence is an unwanted and until now unexplored consequence of using synchronous video technology as a selection tool. Just as this important aspect of synchronous video technology was unexplored, there are likely similar aspects of other technology-driven selection tools that are just as important. Aspects of the environment in which technology-driven selection tools are used are worthy of consideration as well. Technology-driven selection tools have given applicants added control over the environment in which they perform. Although this isn't an aspect of technology, it is a consequence of using technology for selection and recruitment. Applicants can choose the environment in which they interview or take a selection test. Their choice of environment could introduce elements that have either positive or nega-

tive effects on performance. Interviewee environment was controlled in the current study to limit experimental confounds. Yet organizations regularly draw conclusions from video interviews without taking aspects of the situation into consideration.

Applicant reactions to technology-driven selection tools are an important factor for organizations to consider. The current study provides evidence that applicants prefer traditional selection tools. The majority (89%) of interviewees preferred face-to-face interviews, whereas only 9% preferred video interviews. Even more telling is that the average age of our sample was roughly 20 years old. This means that younger interviewees, who are presumably more tech savvy, almost unanimously prefer face-to-face interviews. The current study indicates that organizations should carefully consider how selection and recruitments tools they use will be perceived by applicants.

Limitations and Future Research

The current study is not without limitations. First, an undergraduate sample was used, which is not representative of the adult workforce; however, it is representative of entry-level job seekers. Further, most participants had participated in multiple job interviews ($M = 3.74$) prior to the study, so they were not without interview experience. The authenticity of the interview might also be called into question, because the participants knew they were not interviewing for a real job. The need for experimental control and manipulation of both interview context and technology features made a field setting impossible. This criticism does shed light on potential limitations of our findings and is a possible explanation for the lack of support for Hypothesis 3. We expect that future field research on this topic would be fruitful.

Continued research exploring aspects of synchronous video technology that might affect interview performance, applicant reactions, and applicant mental work load is vital as technology-mediated interviews see increased use. Further exploration of how PIP induced increases in cognitive load affects the interview process and outcomes is also needed. The more we understand how video interviews differ from face to face, the better able we will be to erase those differences or minimize their influence on selection decisions.

REFERENCES

- Apple.com. (2013). FaceTime for Mac. <http://www.apple.com/mac/facetime/>
- Baron, R. S., Moore, D., & Sanders, G. S. (1978). Distraction as a source of drive in social facilitation research. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 36(8), 816-824. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.36.8.816
- Bauer, T. N., Truxillo, D. M., Sanchez, R. J., Craig, J. M., Ferrara, P., & Campion, M. A. (2001). Applicant reactions to selection: Development of the selection procedural justice scale (SPJS). *Personnel Psychology*, 54(2), 388-420. doi:10.1111/j.1744-6570.2001.tb00097.x
- Bauer, T. N., Truxillo, D. M., Paronto, M. E., Weekley, J. A., & Campion, M. 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(1-2), 135-148. doi:10.1111/j.0965-075X.2004.00269.x
- Blacksmith, N., Willford, J., & Behrend, T.S. (2016). Technology in the employment interview: A meta-analysis and future research agenda. *Personnel Assessment and Decisions*, 2(1), 2.
- Block, R. A., Hancock, P. A., & Zakay, D. (2010). How cognitive load affects duration judgments: A meta-analytic review. *Acta Psychologica*, 134(3), 330-343. doi:10.1016/j.actpsy.2010.03.006
- Brewer, M. B. (1996). When stereotypes lead to stereotyping: The use of stereotypes in person perception. In C. N. Macrae, C. Stangor, & M. Hewstone. *Stereotypes and stereotyping* (pp. 254-275). New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Carver, C. S., & Scheier, M. F. (1978). Self-focusing effects of dispositional self consciousness, mirror presence, and audience presence. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 36(3), 324-332. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.36.3.324
- Carver, C. S., & Scheier, M. F. (1996). Self-regulation and its failures. *Psychological Inquiry*, 7(1), 32-40. doi:10.1207/s15327965pli0701_6
- Carver, C. S., & Scheier, M. (2001). *On the self-regulation of behavior*. Cambridge, UK; New York, NY, USA: Cambridge University Press.
- Chapman, D. S., & Rowe, P. M. (2001). The impact of videoconference technology, interview structure, and interviewer gender on interviewer evaluations in the employment interview: A field experiment. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 74(3), 279-298. doi:10.1348/096317901167361
- Chapman, D. S., Uggerslev, K. L., & Webster, J. (2003). Applicant reactions to face-to face and technology-mediated interviews: A field investigation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(5), 944-953. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.88.5.944
- Crenshaw, J. (2005, April). *The use of video and audio technology in the structured interview process: A meta-analytic review of reliability and race-based group differences*. Paper presented at the 20th Annual Conference of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Los Angeles, CA.
- Dijksterhuis, A., & Knippenberg, A. V. (2000). Behavioral indecision: Effects of self focus on automatic behavior. *Social Cognition*, 18(1), 55-74. doi:10.1521/soco.2000.18.1.55
- Duval, S., & Wicklund, R. A. (1972). *A theory of objective self awareness*. Oxford, England: Academic Press.

- Duval, T. S., & Silvia, P. J. (2002). Self-awareness, probability of improvement, and the self-serving bias. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 82(1), 49-61. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.82.1.49
- Eysenck, M. W., Derakshan, N., Santos, R., & Calvo, M. G. (2007). Anxiety and cognitive performance: Attentional control theory. *Emotion*, 7(2), 336-353. doi:10.1037/1528-3542.7.2.336
- Feiler, A. R., & Powell, D. M. (2013). Interview anxiety across the sexes: Support for the sex-linked anxiety coping theory. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 54(1), 12-17. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2012.07.030
- Feinberg, J. M., & Aiello, J. R. (2006). Social facilitation: A test of competing theories. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 36(5), 1087-1109. doi:10.1111/j.0021-9029.2006.00032.x
- Ferran, C., & Watts, S. (2008). Videoconferencing in the field: A heuristic processing model. *Management Science*, 54(9), 1565-1578. doi:10.1287/mnsc.1080.0879
- Goldberg, L. R., Johnson, J. A., Eber, H. W., Hogan, R., Ashton, M. C., Cloninger, C. R., & Gough, H. G. (2006). The international personality item pool and the future of public-domain personality measures. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 40(1), 84-96. doi:10.1016/j.jrp.2005.08.007
- Hart, S. G., & Staveland, L. E. (1988). Development of NASA-TLX (Task Load Index): Results of empirical and theoretical research. In P. A. Hancock, N. Meshkati, P. A. Hancock, and N. Meshkati (Eds.), *Human mental workload* (pp. 139-183). Oxford, England: North-Holland. doi:10.1016/S0166-4115(08)62386-9
- Hendrick, E. (2011). What are the pros and cons of using video for recruitment? *Strategic HR Review*, 10(6), 46-47.
- Hinds, P. J. (1999). The cognitive and interpersonal costs of video. *Media Psychology*, 1(4), 283-311. doi:10.1207/s1532785xmep0104_1
- Horn, R.G., Kaminsky, S., Behrend, T.S. (2016). Don't forget to properly use your signal: Driving down new roads to selection decisions. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 9(3), 666-671. doi:10.1017/iop.2016.68
- Huffcutt, A. I., Van Iddekinge, C. H., & Roth, P. L. (2011). Understanding applicant behavior in employment interviews: A theoretical model of interviewee performance. *Human Resource Management Review*, 21(4), 353-367.
- Kahneman, D. (1973). *Attention and effort*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Keogh, E., & French, C. C. (2001). Test anxiety, evaluative stress, and susceptibility to distraction from threat. *European Journal of Personality*, 15(2), 123-141. doi:10.1002/per.400
- Latham, G. P., & Finnegan, B. J. (1993). Perceived practicality of unstructured, patterned, and situational interviews. In H. Schuler, J. L. Farr, M. Smith, H. Schuler, J. L. Farr, and M. Smith (Eds.), *Personnel selection and assessment: Individual and organizational perspectives* (pp. 41-55). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Liebling, B. A., & Shaver, P. (1973). Evaluation, self-awareness, and task performance. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 9(4), 297-306. doi:10.1016/00221031(73)90067-X
- Lin, T., Dobbins, G. H., & Farh, J. (1992). A field study of race and age similarity effects on interview ratings in conventional and situational interviews. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 77(3), 363-371. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.77.3.363
- Marteau, T. M., & Bekker, H. (1992). The development of a six-item short-form of the state scale of the Spielberger State-Trait Anxiety Inventory (STAI). *British Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 31(3), 301-306. doi:10.1111/j.20448260.1992.tb00997.x
- McCarthy, J., & Goffin, R. (2004). Measuring job interview anxiety: Beyond weak knees and sweaty palms. *Personnel Psychology*, 57(3), 607-637. doi:10.1111/j.1744-6570.2004.00002.x
- Paas, F. G. (1992). Training strategies for attaining transfer of problem-solving skill in statistics: A cognitive-load approach. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 84(4), 429-434. doi:10.1037/0022-0663.84.4.429
- Panayiotou, G., & Vrana, S. R. (1998). Effects of self-focused attention on the startle reflex, heart rate, and memory performance among socially anxious and nonanxious individuals. *Psychophysiology*, 35(3), 328-336. doi:10.1017/S0048577298960875
- 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), 1-81. doi:10.1111/j.17446570.2002.tb00103.x
- Potosky, D. (2008). A conceptual framework for the role of the administration medium in the personnel assessment process. *Academy of Management Review*, 33(3), 629-648. doi:10.2307/20159428
- Rosenfeld, P. (1997). Impression management, fairness, and the employment interview. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 16(8), 801-808. doi:10.1023/A:1017972627516
- Sherman, J. W., & Frost, L. A. (2000). On the encoding of stereotype-relevant information under cognitive load. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 26(1), 26-34. doi:10.1177/0146167200261003
- Silvia, P. J. (2002). Self-awareness and the regulation of emotional intensity. *Self and Identity*, 1(1), 3-10. doi:10.1080/152988602317232768
- Silvia, P. J., & Phillips, A. G. (2013). Self-awareness without awareness? Implicit self-focused attention and behavioral self-regulation. *Self and Identity*, 12(2), 114-127.
- Skype.com. (2013) Skype. Retrieved from <http://www.skype.com/en/>
- Sweller, J. (1988). Cognitive load during problem solving: Effects on learning. *Cognitive Science*, 12(2), 257-285. doi:10.1207/s15516709cog1202_4
- Sweller, J., Van Merriënboer, J. J., & Paas, F. G. (1998). Cognitive architecture and instructional design. *Educational Psychology Review*, 10(3), 251-296. doi:10.1023/A:1022193728205

- Toldi, N. L. (2011). Job applicants favor video interviewing in the candidate-selection process. *Employment Relations Today*, 38(3), 19-27. doi:10.1002/ert.20351
- Vallacher, R. R. (1978). Objective self-awareness and the perception of others. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 4(1), 63-67. doi:10.1177/014616727800400113
- Van Iddekinge, C. H., Raymark, P. H., Roth, P. L., & Payne, H. S. (2006). Comparing the psychometric characteristics of ratings of face-to-face and videotaped structured interviews. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 14(4), 347-359. doi:10.1111/j.1468-2389.2006.00356.x
- Van Iddekinge, C. H., Raymark, P. H., & Roth, P. L. (2005). Assessing personality with a structured employment interview: construct-related validity and susceptibility to response inflation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90(3), 536. doi:10.1037/00219010.90.3.536

RECEIVED 10/26/16 **ACCEPTED** 3/24/17