

2023

Interventions to Improve the Candidate Experience of Structured Videoconference Interviews

Amanda Deacon
University of Guelph

Jordan Moore
University of Guelph

Deborah Powell
University of Guelph

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

Deacon, Amanda; Moore, Jordan; and Powell, Deborah (2023) "Interventions to Improve the Candidate Experience of Structured Videoconference Interviews," *Personnel Assessment and Decisions*: Number 9 : Iss. 1 , Article 1.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.25035/pad.2023.01.001>

Available at: <https://scholarworks.bgsu.edu/pad/vol9/iss1/1>



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License](#).

This 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.

INTERVENTIONS TO IMPROVE THE CANDIDATE EXPERIENCE OF STRUCTURED VIDEOCONFERENCE INTERVIEWS

Amanda Deacon¹, Jodan Moore¹, and Deborah Powell¹

1. University of Guelph

ABSTRACT

KEYWORDS

applicant reactions,
interview anxiety,
employment interview,
interventions

Intense competition for talent has led to increased organizational focus on improving how applicants perceive and respond to selection tools. Because of the recent increased use of technology in selection, we tested whether modifying aspects of videoconference interviews could improve applicant reactions. We tested two interventions—structured rapport building and question provision—with 205 applicants applying for a research assistant position. Applicants were randomly assigned to either an experimental condition (rapport or question provision) or the control condition and participated in a structured videoconference interview, followed by a survey. Structured rapport building had no significant effect on applicant reactions. However, question provision improved applicants' perceptions of overall fairness and chance to perform—but not their reported anxiety,

The hunt to hire the best industry talent is competitive (Ali, 2022; Caminiti, 2021; Christensen, 2020; Collamer, 2022; Jackson, 2017; Morgan, 2017). This high level of competition has led to organizations placing growing value on understanding and improving how applicants perceive and respond to selection tools (Mazor et al., 2017; Talent Board, 2020). Positive applicant reactions, such as perceived fairness, are related to important organizational outcomes, including increased likelihood of accepting an offer and recommending the company to others, and improved candidate attitudes and behaviour post-hire (Chapman et al., 2005; Gilliland, 1994; Hausknecht et al., 2004; Ployhart & Ryan, 1997; Smither et al., 1993; Voyles, 2016). Because applicant reactions are related to so many important outcomes, research on practical interventions to improve applicant reactions to common selection procedures is needed.

One of the most common selection procedures is the employment interview (McCarthy & Cheng, 2014). Yet, despite its long history and frequent use, there remain gaps in the literature on ways to improve the interview process to create more positive applicant reactions (Levashina et al., 2014). Furthermore, as researchers encourage the increased use of structured interviews—based on their predictive validity—and organizations adopt technology—such as videoconference interviews—there is a need for practical interventions to improve applicant reactions in this context

(Baker, 2020; Chapman & Zweig, 2005; Levashina et al., 2014). Meta-analytic findings indicate that videoconference interviews lead to less favorable applicant reactions and decrease attraction to the organization, relative to face-to-face interviews, which are typically viewed positively by applicants (Blacksmith et al., 2016; Melchers et al., 2021; Proost et al., 2021; Sears et al., 2013). Similarly, structured interviews have been found to result in less favorable applicant reactions relative to unstructured interviews (Chapman & Rowe, 2002; Chapman & Zweig, 2005; Conway & Peneo, 1999). Thus, although organizations are increasingly using videoconference interviews, and evidence encourages the use of structure, these formats are associated with less positive applicant reactions. This paradox creates a need for practical and effective interventions aimed at improving applicant reactions toward structured videoconference interviews.

Situational and Dispositional Applicant Reactions

Applicant reactions can be grouped into those that are situationally based (e.g., fairness) and those that are dispositionally based (e.g., anxiety; McCarthy et al., 2013). Each has their own theoretical underpinnings. Applicant reac-

Corresponding author:
Deborah Powell
Author Email: dpowell@uoguelph.ca

tions that fall under the situational grouping are commonly viewed from the theoretical lens of organizational justice. Specifically, seminal work put forth by Gilliland (1993) proposed that applicant reactions to selection systems are primarily driven by perceptions of fairness, which are based on adherence to procedural justice rules. There are 10 procedural justice rules in Gilliland's (1993) model. However, for the purpose of this study, we focus on two that are particularly relevant to the employment interview. The situationally based reactions of interest in our study are (a) opportunity to perform, which taps into the higher order of formal characteristics and captures whether an applicant felt they had a chance to showcase their skills and abilities; and (b) interpersonal effectiveness of administrator, which taps into the higher order of interpersonal treatment and captures how an applicant feels they have been treated by the employee/organization. These rules, according to Gilliland's theory, will influence perceptions of the overall fairness of a selection system. The current study will target enhancing aspects of procedural justice via short interventions designed to improve applicant perceptions of fairness. These reactions were selected because they are salient features in a structured videoconference interview and therefore potentially more amenable to interventions.

In addition to situationally based applicant reactions, this study also investigates an applicant reaction that is considered dispositional—specifically, interview anxiety. Interview anxiety is defined as “feelings of nervousness or apprehension that are relatively stable within job applicants across employment interview situations” (McCarthy & Goffin, 2004; p. 612). Applicant anxiety has received growing recognition in recent years as an important applicant reaction, especially in the context of interviews—a context that is evaluative and highly competitive (McCarthy & Goffin, 2004; Powell et al., 2018). Although interview anxiety was defined by McCarthy and Goffin (2004) as a relatively stable trait, a meta-analysis (Powell et al., 2018) noted that interview anxiety can also be considered a state. When considered as a state, interview anxiety may not be as stable across employment interview situations and, thus, may be more amenable to interventions.

Unlike trait anxiety, state anxiety can vary across time depending on stressors that an individual encounters, such as stressful situations. Situations are more anxiety provoking to the extent that they are uncertain (e.g., Dugas & Ladouceur, 2000). Situational uncertainty occurs when an event is characterized by unpredictability, ambiguity, or a lack of information (Brashers et al., 2000). Thus, an intervention designed to reduce the uncertainty of the interview (by providing additional information, such as the questions themselves) may decrease applicant anxiety. Research has shown that applicant-driven, anxiety-reducing interventions have been successful in reducing interview anxiety (e.g., positive self-imagery; Feiler & Powell, 2016); however,

there is a gap with respect to how organizations can introduce interventions to reduce applicants' levels of state interview anxiety. Understanding ways to improve applicant reactions during the interview is important as organizations adopt both structured interviews and videoconference interviewing into their selection process.

Background Theory

There are at least two theories that can explain why applicants tend to react less positively to videoconference interviews (Melchers et al. 2021). First, media richness theory (e.g., Daft & Lengel, 1986) describes how using different channels of information transmission can reduce the ambiguity of a message and thus reduce the uncertainty of the situation. Presumably, face-to-face interviews provide more channels of communication (e.g., body language) that improve the clarity of the communication. One method to improve reactions to videoconference interviews could be to provide an additional channel of communication, such as written communication, in addition to verbal communication. It may be the case that providing information about the interview through an additional channel, such as writing, could improve the applicants' perceptions of their chance to perform in the interview.

A second theory that can explain applicants' preference for face-to-face interviews is social presence theory (Short et al., 1976). This theory explains that various ways of communicating differ in the extent to which the parties experience each other's presence. More social presence is associated with more mutual attraction, trust, and enjoyment (e.g., Lee et al., 2006). An intervention designed to improve the social presence of the interviewer—by making the interviewer seem warmer and more personable—may consequently improve applicants' perceptions of interpersonal treatment in the interview.

Interventions

Recent research has focused on using interventions as a way of improving applicant reactions during the selection process (Basch & Melchers, 2019; McCarthy et al., 2017; Truxillo et al., 2009). McCarthy et al. (2017) tested the use of *wise interventions* (see Walton, 2014), defined as interventions that are “relatively ordinary, brief, and precise” (p. 44). Using wise interventions offers the benefit of improving applicant reactions without making modifications to the test itself. McCarthy and colleagues (2017) developed a set of wise interventions using cost effective and simple scripts to provide to candidates with different explanations prior to taking an assessment. They found that—in the context of employees taking a work sample test—test takers who were provided with explanations that included a combination of informational fairness, social fairness, and uncertainty reduction reported higher perceptions of overall fairness than did test takers who were not given an explanation. Along

the same lines, Basch and Melchers (2019) applied explanation interventions to participants in a simulated asynchronous video interview (AVI) vignette. Participants received an explanation of the benefits of standardization and flexibility of AVIs, which had positive effects on participants' fairness reactions.

We sought to test interventions that go beyond explanations yet retain the cost-effective and simple guiding principles of wise interventions (McCarthy et al., 2017). We identified two interventions as potential ways to improve applicant reactions during a structured videoconference interview that focus on increasing the social presence of the interviewer and reducing uncertainty in a communication-limited context. These are as follows: (a) a short, structured rapport script delivered before the interview, and (b) providing the actual interview questions, in a written format, just prior to starting the interview. These interventions provide an opportunity to influence applicants' perceptions of the interpersonal treatment and warmth in the interview process (rapport), and to reduce uncertainty while increasing the chance to show one's qualifications (question provision; Gilliland, 1993; Lind, 2001; McCarthy et al., 2017; Van den Bos et al., 2001).

Structured Rapport Script

The first intervention we test is a structured rapport script at the start of the interview. Rapport has been defined as "the ability to maintain harmonious relationships based on affinity for others" (Faranda & Clarke, 2004, p. 274). Granitz et al. (2009) argued that rapport is built based on the three factors of approach, personality, and homophily. Approach refers to conditions such as approachability, trust, and openness. Personality factors include traits such as being caring, positive, and showing empathy. Finally, homophily refers to similarity between two people—including similarity in status or values. We built these three factors into our structured rapport script.

Within the job interview, rapport is typically operationalized as informal conversation, which centers around neutral topics such as personal hobbies or the weather (Barrick et al., 2012). However, researchers have suggested that such informal conversation could reduce the standardization of the interview (Barrick et al., 2012), prompting researchers to urge interviewers to limit or eliminate rapport building entirely from structured interviews (Chapman & Zweig, 2005). Despite this urging, many interviewers and applicants continue to view these unstructured interactions positively (Chapman & Zweig, 2005). We propose that there may be a way to include rapport building without succumbing to the unstructured format that can detract from the standardization of interviews. Specifically, we developed a structured rapport script—a one-sided script that captures the core components of approach, personality, and homophily that can build rapport—without interjecting candidate

information that may lead to bias in the interview process.

A structured rapport intervention is a worthwhile intervention, as the complete absence of rapport building may cause negative reactions, given that many interviewees expect rapport building to occur (Chapman & Zweig, 2005). One study found that not receiving the amount and type of attention people thought they should receive in a social setting was associated with reported feelings of frustration and anxiousness (Geller et al., 1974). It is possible that an absence of any rapport building may result in perceptions of low social presence, leading to reactions such as high anxiety and perceptions of poor interpersonal treatment. In contrast, previous research has found that interviewer warmth improves applicant reactions (Conway & Peneno, 1999; Farago et al., 2013; Schmitt & Coyle, 1976). The information conveyed in the rapport script may increase applicants' perceptions of interviewer social presence and warmth, and thus improve the fairness of the interview.

We propose that the inclusion of structured rapport script may provide many of the same positive effects on applicant reactions as unstructured rapport building while maintaining standardization. This leads us to our first hypothesis:

Hypothesis 1: Applicants in the structured rapport building script intervention will react more positively to the interview, reporting (a) higher interpersonal treatment, (b) higher overall fairness, and (c) lower anxiety than those in the control condition.

Question Provision

The second intervention we test in this study is providing the applicants with the interview questions, in writing, just before the interview begins and allowing them a short amount of time (5 minutes) to review them before starting the interview. Question provision may improve applicant reactions during a structured videoconference interview by providing another line of communication and decreasing applicants' situation uncertainty. Reducing uncertainty during testing has been found to result in improved overall perceptions of fairness (Madigan & Macan, 2005). Indeed, at least one study has found that applicants who received interview questions prior to the interview perceived the interview as being fairer (Day & Carroll, 2003). Advanced questions may also improve perceptions of chance to perform. In a study on asynchronous video interviews, Basch et al. (2021) found that advanced preparation time (60 seconds with the interview question before recording the response) had an indirect effect (via honest impression management) on both opportunity to perform and global fairness perceptions. The practice of advanced question provision also falls in line with digital interview best practices, which recommend allowing a short period of time for preparation prior to the interview (Schmerling, 2017). Although there

is scarce research on the effects of advanced question provision in videoconference interviews, we believe the same underlying mechanisms would be present. Therefore, we expect that providing the questions ahead of time adds an additional channel of communication and will increase applicants' perception that they will be able to voice their knowledge, skills, and abilities leading to increased perceptions of their chance to perform and overall fairness.

In the same vein, question provision may also help with decreasing interview anxiety. Past research has shown that when participants were provided with information designed to reduce their uncertainty about the situation, they exhibited less worry than those whose situational uncertainty increased (Rosen & Knauper, 2009). By providing the questions ahead of time we aim to remove uncertainty of what the interview will entail, thereby reducing anxiety. This leads us to our second hypothesis.

Hypothesis 2: Applicants who receive questions ahead of time will react more positively to the interview, reporting (a) higher chance to perform, (b) higher overall fairness, and (c) lower anxiety than those in the control condition.

We test these hypotheses in the context of a randomized experiment with three conditions (rapport script, question provision, control) with real videoconference interviews for a research assistant position.

METHODS

Participants

Participants were recruited via an advertisement for a psychology department research assistant position (see Appendix A). Participants were made aware in the recruitment advertisement that there was a voluntary research study they would be invited to participate in following their interview. Applicants who chose to take part in the study after their interview were sent a \$5 gift card to a coffee shop. The position entailed an estimated 36 hours of work in a psychology lab with competitive pay of \$23.50 (Canadian dollars) per hour. The position itself was real, thereby helping to encourage genuine participant motivation and reactions throughout the process. The university's research ethics board clearance was obtained prior to data collection and online consent was collected from job applicants if they chose to participate in the study.

A power analysis was conducted to determine how many participants were needed to test the study's hypotheses. Previous research by Feiler and Powell (2016) indicated that applicant interventions aimed at reducing interview anxiety had a small effect size ($d = 0.44$). Given that there has been very little research on experimental interventions and their impact on applicant interview anxiety, this was

used as a guideline for the size of the effect we expect to observe. The results of an a priori power analysis indicated that a sample size of 83 participants per group (249 total) would be needed to detect an effect of this size with 80% power. Although this was the goal, we were constrained by how many people chose to apply for the job.

A total of 350 people were interviewed from October 2020 to April 2021, with 230 interviewees agreeing to participate in the study after finishing their interview. After removing participants who failed at least one of the two attention checks, we were left with a final sample of 205 participants. There was a relatively even distribution of participants across experimental conditions. The conditions did not significantly differ in terms of gender, age, or program year (See Appendix-Tables). A breakdown of participant characteristics can be found in Table 1.

Procedure

Interested applicants were asked to email the researcher, who then provided them with additional information regarding the interview process and the research study and asked them to schedule an interview time (See Appendix B). All applicants were offered the opportunity to interview for the position.

All interviews were conducted over Microsoft Teams and were recorded; interviews took between 20 and 30 minutes. The interviews were scored by both the interviewer and two additional trained research assistants who watched the recorded interview. All interviews began recording once the experimental manipulation was completed so that the second and third rater were blind to the condition the participant was in.

Each structured interview was conducted by a trained undergraduate research assistant. A total of 16 research assistants were trained on how to conduct interviews, with 14 of them (all female) conducting interviews, whereas the remaining two research assistants (1 male and 1 female) provided secondary ratings of interview recordings. The research assistants were third- and fourth-year psychology students, enrolled in a research internship course with the third author. They completed the interview training and conducted interviews as part of the practical component of the course. The interviewers' training focused on how to conduct and score a structured interview, as well as specific instructions for each condition. After each research assistant interviewed one applicant, a member of the research team reviewed the video footage to ensure that the interviewers were following the appropriate structured interview practices.

Immediately following the interview, applicants were sent an email with a link to complete a voluntary survey within the following 48 hours (see Appendix C and D). Applicant reactions were gathered before applicants were aware of the final selection decision to ensure their memory

TABLE 1.
Participant Demographic Breakdown

Demographic breakdown	<i>n</i>	%
Condition		
<i>Control</i>	72	35.12
<i>Question provision</i>	66	32.20
<i>Structured rapport</i>	67	32.68
Gender		
<i>Female</i>	176	85.85
<i>Male</i>	24	11.71
<i>Non-binary / did not disclose</i>	5	2.44
School year		
<i>1</i>	24	11.71
<i>2</i>	71	34.63
<i>3</i>	67	32.68
<i>4</i>	34	16.59
<i>5th + or transfer student</i>	9	4.39
Program of study		
<i>Psychology</i>	66	32.20
<i>Other program identified</i>	139	67.80
Ethnicity		
<i>White/European</i>	106	51.71
<i>South Asian</i>	38	18.54
<i>Southeast Asian</i>	14	6.83
<i>Other ethnicity identified</i>	47	22.92

of the interview was strong and to get reactions to the interview itself rather than have it potentially be confounded with the selection decision.

Manipulation

This study utilized a between-subjects experimental design. Participants were randomly assigned to one of three conditions: a rapport script condition, a question provision condition, and a control group. A script was provided for each condition to increase standardization of the interview process across interviewers.

Control Condition

In the control condition the interviewer greeted the applicant and briefly introduced themselves (see Appendix E). The control script focused on providing the applicant with information about the interview process (e.g., how long it would take), what to expect (e.g., the nature of the questions), and how they would like the response structured (i.e., STAR approach). It also addressed why the interviewer was recording the interview. At the end of the script, the interviewer provided the applicant with five minutes to review the job description prior to starting the interview. The interviewer turned off the video during that time.

Structured Rapport Building

In the structured rapport script condition, the script base was the same as in the control condition. However, the interviewer also spent approximately 2 minutes reading through a one-way script designed to improve rapport with the applicant (see Appendix F). The script was designed to evoke the three components of rapport (approachability, personality, and homophily), but not allowing for information to be shared from the applicant. Once the rapport building phase was completed, the interviewer began recording the interview.

Question Provision

In the question provision condition, the script was the same as the control script. However, in place of the 5 minutes to review the job application, the applicant was given 5 minutes to review the interview questions they would be asked (see Appendix G). Five minutes was selected to increase the chances of reducing applicants' uncertainty and improving applicant reactions but not allowing for in-depth response preparation. During this time, the interviewer and interviewee turned off their cameras. This time was kept relatively short to allow applicants to become familiar with the questions but not to plan out their answers in detail. Once the applicant finished the 5-minute review, the interviewer began recording the interview.

Measures¹

Overall Fairness

Overall fairness was assessed using a 3-item scale from Warszta (2012) which includes items such as, "I think the interview procedure was fair." The items were scored on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = *strongly disagree*; 5 = *strongly agree*). Cronbach's alpha was .88.

¹ Measures of honest and deceptive impression management, self-verification, recommendation intentions, role attractiveness and anticipated person-job fit were also included as part of a different project.

Interpersonal treatment

The interpersonal treatment scale was composed of 3-items shortened from Bauer et al. (2001) Selection Procedural Justice Scale (SPJS) and included items such as, “I was satisfied with my treatment during the interview.” The items were scored on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = *strongly disagree*; 5 = *strongly agree*). Cronbach’s alpha was .84.

Chance to perform

Chance to perform was measured with a 4-item scale and includes such items as “I could really show my skills and abilities through the interview” (Bauer, et al., 2001). The items were scored on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = *strongly disagree*; 5 = *strongly agree*). Cronbach’s alpha was .88.

Interview anxiety

Interview anxiety was assessed using a modified version of the Measure of Anxiety in Selection Interviews (MASI; McCarthy & Goffin, 2004). Because this measure was originally intended to assess interview anxiety as a situation-specific trait, items were modified slightly, such that they specifically referred to the interview that the applicants just finished rather than interviews in general. For example, a sample item from the original MASI states “I become so apprehensive in job interviews that I am unable to express my thoughts clearly” and was modified to “I became so apprehensive in the job interview that I was unable to express my thoughts clearly.” Similar modifications were applied to all included MASI items. In addition, several items were dropped due to a lack of relevance to the context of a videoconference interview (e.g., “When meeting a job interviewer, I worry that my handshake will not be correct”). Because of these modifications, the MASI utilized in the present study contained 23 items, all of which were scored on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = *strongly disagree*; 5 = *strongly agree*). The final version can be found in the Appendix. Cronbach’s alpha was .91.

Open-Ended Question

All participants were asked to respond to the following open-ended question: “In general, do you think that receiving interview questions before the interview begins would be beneficial to you? Briefly explain your position.” We included this question because we were unclear about how applicants might feel about the concept of question provision before the interview. We did not include a corresponding question about rapport building, as previous literature (e.g., Chapman & Zweig, 2005) led us to believe that applicants generally prefer rapport building to no rapport building.

Interview Performance

All participants were rated using a behaviorally anchored rating scale. There were five questions in total that asked

the competencies of teamwork, communication, decision making, and execution (see Appendix H). The scale ranged from 1 (*ineffective*) to 5 (*highly effective*). Interrater reliability was tested using a two-way random model with absolute agreement. The intraclass correlation coefficient (ICC) between the three raters across conditions was .75. Within conditions we see similar findings with the reported ICC being .69 for the control condition, .79 for the rapport condition, and .74 for the question provision condition. A paired t-test confirmed there were no significant differences between the first rating ($M = 19.3, SD = 3.1$) and second and third rating combined ($M = 19.0, SD = 2.3$) (i.e., between raters who led the interview versus those who rated the applicant post-interview with the introduction removed), $t(194) = 1.73, p = .09$.

RESULTS

Mean, standard deviations, and correlations among all study variables are displayed in Table 2. We also conducted a confirmatory factor analysis of the applicant reactions items (Overall Fairness, Chance to Perform, Interpersonal Treatment) to test the fit of a one-factor versus a three-factor model. A one-factor model that grouped all items onto a single factor was a poor fit (RMSEA = .25, CFI = .67). The three-factor model with factors for Overall Fairness, Chance to Perform, and Interpersonal Treatment had good fit (RMSEA = .05, CFI = .99, factor loadings ranged from .70 - .88). Therefore, we have support for treating these three applicant reactions as separate scales.

Hypothesis 1 stated that applicants in the structured rapport intervention would react more positively to the interview. As shown in Table 3, there was no significant difference between the control and the rapport condition for participants’ perceptions of interpersonal treatment, overall fairness, or interview anxiety. Thus, Hypothesis 1 was not supported.

Hypothesis 2 stated that applicants in the question provision condition would react more positively to the interview. As shown in Table 4, there was a significant difference between the control and the question provision condition for participants’ perceptions of their chance to perform and overall fairness. Those in the question provision condition report higher perceptions of chance to perform ($M = 3.6, SD = 0.9$) than the control condition ($M = 3.1, SD = 1.0$), $t(136) = 2.84, p = .003$. Similarly, those in the question provision condition reported higher perceptions of fairness ($M = 4.3, SD = 0.8$) than the control condition ($M = 3.9, SD = 1.0$), $t(136) = 2.21, p = .01$. The Cohen’s d effect size was translated into a Pearson’s correlation effect size for both chance to perform ($d = 0.48$ or $r = .23$) and overall fairness ($d = 0.38$ or $r = .19$). When interpreting the effect sizes using Bosco and colleagues’ guidelines (2015) for organizational attitudes such as procedural justice, they were considered to be

TABLE 2.
Correlations Among Study Variables

Variable	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1. Fairness	4.1	0.9	(.88)							
2. Interpersonal treatment	4.8	0.5	.48**	(.84)						
3. Chance to perform	3.4	0.9	.65**	.36**	(.88)					
4. Interview anxiety	3.0	0.7	-.15*	.00	-.18**	(.91)				
5. Age	20.3	2.7	.04	-.01	.05	-.20**	-			
6. Program year	2.7	1.1	-.02	-.04	.02	-.14*	.50**	-		
7. Gender	1.9	0.4	-.07	-.03	-.05	.21**	.01	.10	-	
8. Interview score	19.2	2.4	.00	.00	.07	-.21**	.08	.13	.03	(.75)

* $p < 0.05$ level, 2-tailed. ** $p < 0.01$ level, 2-tailed.

Note. *M* and *SD* are used to represent mean and standard deviation, respectively. Scale reliabilities are represented on the

TABLE 3.
T-Test Results for Control Versus Structured Rapport Condition

Outcome	Condition				<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>p</i> ^a	Cohen's <i>d</i>
	Control		Rapport					
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>				
Interpersonal treatment	4.8	0.5	4.8	0.6	-0.14	137	.44	0.02
Overall fairness	3.9	1.0	4.1	1.0	-0.97	137	.17	0.16
Interview anxiety	3.0	0.7	3.0	0.8	-0.08	137	.47	0.01
Interview score	19.9	2.0	18.6	2.4	3.33	137	<.001	0.57

^a *p*-value is one-sided.

above the 40th percentile and the 25th percentile for effect sizes in this domain, respectively.² There was no significant difference between the control and the question provision condition for participants' perceptions of interview anxiety.³ Thus, Hypothesis 2 was partially supported.

Qualitative Analyses

In addition to the quantitative analyses covered, we also asked participants "In general, do you think that receiving interview questions before the interview begins would be beneficial to you? Briefly explain your position." We coded responses into three categories: (a) Yes, it is beneficial, (b)

no it is not beneficial, or (c) ambivalent. Of the 65 participants in the question provision condition, 56 participants spoke positively about receiving questions ahead of time and just five participants indicated negative feelings about

² The Cohens' *d* effect size was translated into a Pearson's correlation effect size for both chance to perform ($d = 0.48$ or $r = .23$) and overall fairness ($d = 0.38$ or $r = .19$).

³ Post hoc analysis found no significant differences between conditions on the individual MASI Anxiety scale dimensions used in this study, specifically the social, performance, behavioral, and communication subscales.

TABLE 4.
T-Test Results for Control Versus Question Provision Condition

Outcome	Condition				<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>p</i> ^a	<i>Cohen's d</i>
	Control		Question					
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>				
Chance to perform	3.1	1.0	3.6	0.9	2.84	136	.003	0.48
Overall fairness	3.9	1.0	4.3	0.8	2.21	136	.01	0.38
Interview anxiety	3.0	0.7	3.0	0.8	0.22	136	.41	-0.04
Interview score	19.9	2.0	19.0	2.5	2.36	123	.01	0.41

^a *p*-value is one-sided.

receiving questions ahead of time. In the other two conditions, the majority also reported that receiving questions before the interview would have been beneficial. The results of this coding, and sample quotations, are in Table 5.

DISCUSSION

This study sought to determine whether modifying brief and precise aspects of a structured videoconference interview process could improve applicant reactions. We used two targeted interventions: structured rapport building and question provision. The structured rapport building had no significant effect on applicant reactions. However, question provision appeared to improve applicants' perceptions of overall fairness and their chance to perform—but not their reported anxiety, relative to the control condition. Interestingly, data from the open-ended question revealed that of the applicants in the question provision condition, 86% reported that the advanced questions benefited them for a variety of reasons, whereas only 64% in the control condition saw it as being a potential benefit—indicating that question provision may be more positive than people expect it to be. Question provision is a simple and cost-effective intervention, which appears to improve applicants' fairness perceptions, and could be a tool used by practitioners in a structured videoconference interview context (Basch & Melchers, 2019; McCarthy et al., 2017).

Although we saw some positive effects on chance to perform and fairness, neither intervention improved applicants' reported levels of anxiety in comparison to the control condition. One possible reason for this is that, as a “dispositional” applicant reaction (McCarthy et al., 2013), anxiety may be more resistant to change than situational applicant reactions, and the conditions may not have been strong enough to reduce it. Although not impossible to change, as other interventions have proven to be effective (i.e., Feiler & Powell, 2016), anxiety may be a less malleable applicant reaction, even when measured as a state. As well, there was a negative correlation between anxiety with

age (and program year), indicating that anxiety may decrease with more experience and thus may not change with a brief intervention.

A second possible reason can be found in the open-ended qualitative question where all participants were asked about whether they believed having the questions ahead of time would be beneficial to them. Although most agreed it would be helpful (76%), some of the applicants described both positive and negative aspects, including increased stress or anxiety. For example, one participant from the question provision condition wrote:

“Having the interview questions before the interview began would make the interview both more and less stressful for different aspects of it. For example, having the interview questions makes it less stressful beforehand, by allowing me to take time to prepare and not face anxiety about surprises during the interview. However, having more time to think of answers creates pressure to answer them correctly, which would lead to overthinking the entire interview, creating more anxiety than just figuring out the questions within 5 minutes.”

It is possible that although we reduced anxiety for some applicants, we may have increased it for others—at least with respect to the question provision condition. The effect of question provision on anxiety is worthy of further research attention, as the majority of applicants reported (in open-ended responses) that it was beneficial, but we did not see that reflected in anxiety scores. It may be the case that 5 minutes was not the optimal amount of time, and applicants may need a bit more time with the questions to reduce their anxiety.

Based on media richness theory, providing an additional channel of information transmission via written interview questions can reduce the ambiguity of a message and thus improve the overall fairness of an interview. This intervention should be applicable in both videoconference and face-to-face interviews because the underlying principles stay

TABLE 5.

Coding Results for Open Ended Question

Condition	<i>n</i>	%	Sample quotation
Question provision			
Yes	56	86%	<i>“Was extremely helpful as it gave me a chance to collect my thoughts and adequately prepare”</i>
No	5	8%	<i>“Honestly receiving the questions before the interview made me more apprehensive and I felt that I had to rush.”</i>
Ambivalent	4	6%	<i>“Yes, I think it is definitely helpful as it allows me to recall specific events. However, I feel that this also gives the interviewer higher expectations in terms of the quality of answers.”</i>
Total	65		
Rapport condition			
Yes	49	77%	<i>“I think that they can be beneficial, as I believe it would reduce anxiety and allow you to prepare your answers well.”</i>
No	9	14%	<i>“No, because if I am able to prepare in advance I would not appear genuine. I care more about being authentic than I do about appearing overly prepared.”</i>
Ambivalent	6	9%	<i>“I think it would be both beneficial and not. I saw this because, having the questions in advance can eliminate stressors or any anxious feelings before going into the interview. However, this level of preparedness at hand would not be a good representation of how I would be when I am put in an unplanned situation.”</i>
Total	64		
Control condition			
Yes	43	64%	<i>“Yes - as someone who often overthinks and struggles with on the spot wording, having the questions before hand would help this.”</i>
No	12	18%	<i>“I don't think this would have been beneficial to me, as this could have led me to overthink the questions and my responses. I feel that being asked on the spot made my answers more genuine.”</i>
Ambivalent	12	18%	<i>“It may help to answer the questions but it also could increase stress levels to make sure that you answer each question correctly. Having question beforehand may lead individuals to try and memorize their responses.”</i>
Total	67		
Across all conditions			
Yes	148	76%	
No	26	13%	
Ambivalent	22	11%	
Total	196		

Note. 9 individuals chose not to respond.

consistent. We therefore would expect our findings to generalize to face-to-face interviews. However, consideration would need to be given to understanding how the intervention would need to be adapted to fit an in-person context. For example, ensuring applicants can review the interview questions in private would be an important adaptation to a face-to-face interview situation.

One unexpected result of our study was the difference in interview performance between conditions; the control condition scored higher than the two experimental conditions. Previous research has found that increasing the transparency of the dimensions measured in an interview can improve the internal construct validity, maintain criterion validity of an interview, and improve candidate performance (Basch et al., 2021; Klehe et al., 2008). Thus, although we had no hypotheses about performance, we did not expect that providing the questions would be related to a decrease in performance. It is possible this result is an artifact of our sample of interviewers and caution that these effects should be studied further prior to implementation of the interventions.

Limitations and Future Research

There are some noteworthy limitations of this study. First, it is possible that our structured rapport script was not strong enough. We aimed to evoke the elements of rapport building while still maintaining standardization and structure, thus resulting in our highly structured rapport building. However, this condition did not positively impact our study variables. Nevertheless, previous research has identified the strengths of allowing for rapport building to occur in job interviews (Blackman & Funder, 2002; Lim et al., 2006; Swider et al., 2016), and so we believe it worthwhile to continue to examine how rapport can be included, perhaps with exploring ways to strengthen our study script to evoke stronger effects.

It would also be interesting, in future research, to combine the rapport building intervention with the question provision condition, and test a 2 x 2 design rather than each intervention on its own. Because we were limited by the number of people who chose to apply to the research assistant position and who agreed to be in our study, we were concerned about power in the study, and thus for this initial test of the interventions, we tested each intervention separately, so that we only had three groups—rather than four.

A third limitation of the study was the sample composition. The sample was composed of younger, primarily female, students applying for a contract position, and this may impact the generalizability of our findings. Although effort was made to create a real hiring scenario, such as using a real job, the university-aged sample and the time-limited job may not have evoked the same reactions as a hiring scenario that included a more mature and experienced sample, or the opportunity of a full-time job. With

respect to age, this younger participant group may have had a higher affinity for technology than what would be found in a more mature population, a variable that has been positively correlated to fairness perceptions of videoconference interviews (Basch et al., 2020). However, our study sample could be more representative of a future state as exposure to this type of technology continues to increase (Baker, 2020).

A fourth limitation of the study was the use of a very short (5-minute) time period for the question provision condition. It is unclear if providing more time would lead to even stronger effects. It would be helpful for further research to test the ideal amount of time to maximize the impacts on applicants' reactions.

Finally, it is noteworthy that interpersonal treatment was extremely high, with an average rating of 4.8 (out of 5) for both the control and rapport condition. The very high mean suggests a ceiling effect, making it difficult for any intervention to improve upon interpersonal treatment. This high reported level of interpersonal treatment may be due to the high level of information provided to the applicants *prior* to the interview via the email communications (see Appendix), which then influenced applicant perceptions of treatment during the interview. However, this upfront disclosure of information may in the future be studied as an intervention on its own, as it aligns theoretically with Gilliland's model (1993) and the wise interventions in the form of pretest explanations tested by McCarthy et al. (2017).

CONCLUSION

The use of a brief and precise intervention—question provision, in the structured videoconference interview portion of the selection process—led to improvements in the applicant reactions of chance to perform and overall fairness. This study provides evidence that including such an intervention into the interview process may help to improve the candidate experience.

REFERENCES

- Ali, A. (2022, June 20). Possible pay boosts this year amid tight labour market: Experts. BNN Bloomberg. <https://www.bnnbloomberg.ca/possible-pay-boosts-this-year-amid-tight-labour-market-experts-1.1781323>
- Baker, M. (2020, April 30). Gartner HR survey shows 86% of organizations are conducting virtual interviews to hire candidates during coronavirus pandemic. Gartner. <https://www.gartner.com/en/newsroom/press-releases/2020-04-30-gartner-hr-survey-shows-86--of-organizations-are-cond>
- Barrick, M. R., Dustin, S. L., Giluk, T. L., Stewart, G. L., Shaffer, J. A., & Swider, B.W. (2012). Candidate characteristics driving

- initial impressions during rapport building: Implications for employment interview validity. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 85(2), 330-352. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8325.2011.02036.x>
- Basch, J. M., Brenner, F., Melchers, K. G., Krumm, S., Dräger, L., Herzer, H., & Schuwerk, E. (2021). A good thing takes time: The role of preparation time in asynchronous video interviews. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 29(3-4), 378-392. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ijsa.12341>
- Basch, J. M., & Melchers, K. G. (2019). Fair and flexible?! Explanations can improve applicant reactions toward asynchronous video interviews. *Personnel Assessment and Decisions*, 5(3), 2, 1-11. <https://doi.org/10.25035/pad.2019.03.002>
- Basch, J. M., Melchers, K. G., Kegelmann, J., & Lieb, L. (2020). Smile for the camera! The role of social presence and impression management in perceptions of technology-mediated interviews. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 35(4), 285-299. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JMP-09-2018-0398>
- 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), 387-419. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2001.tb00097.x>
- Blackman, M., & Funder, D. C. (2002). Effective interview practices for accurately assessing counterproductive traits. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 10(1-2), 109-116. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2389.00197>
- Blacksmith, N., Wilford, J. C., & Behrend, T. S. (2016). Technology in the employment interview: A meta-analysis and future research agenda. *Personnel Assessment and Decisions*, 2(1), 12-20. <https://doi.org/10.25035/pad.2016.002>
- Bosco, F. A., Aguinis, H., Singh, K., Field, J. G., & Pierce, C. A. (2015). Correlational effect size benchmarks. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 100(2), 431-449.
- Brashers, D. E., Neidig, J. L., Haas, S. M., Dobbs, L. K., Cardillo, L. W., & Russell, J. A. (2000). Communication in the management of uncertainty: The case of persons living with HIV or AIDS. *Communication Monographs*, 67(1), 63-84. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03637750009376495>
- Caminiti, S. (2021, March 25). Cyber threats, ongoing war for talent, biggest concerns for tech leaders. CNBC. <https://www.cnbc.com/2021/03/25/cyber-threats-war-for-talent-are-biggest-concerns-for-tech-leaders.html>
- 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(3), 185-197. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2389.00208>
- Chapman, D. S., Uggerslev, K. L., Carroll, S. A., Piasentin, K. A., & Jones, D. A. (2005). Applicant attraction to organizations and job choice: A meta-analytic review of the correlates of recruiting outcomes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90(5), 928-944. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.90.5.928>
- Chapman, D. S., & Zweig, D. I. (2005). Developing a nomological network for interview structure: Antecedents and consequences of the structured selection interview. *Personnel Psychology*, 58(3), 673-702. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2005.00516.x>
- Christensen, U. J. (2020, February 10). The secret to winning the war for talent. *Forbes*. <https://www.forbes.com/sites/ulrikjuulchristensen/2020/02/10/the-secret-to-winning-the-war-for-talent/?sh=35f1fa7e6cf2>
- Collamer, N. (2022, February 25). What you need to know about the job market in 2022. *Forbes*. <https://www.forbes.com/sites/nextavenue/2022/02/25/what-you-need-to-know-about-the-job-market-in-2022/?sh=27bf7bfc7bf7>
- 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. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1022914803347>
- Day, A. L., & Carroll, S. A. (2003). Situational and patterned behavior description interviews: A comparison of their validity, correlates, and perceived fairness. *Human Performance*, 16(1), 25-47. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327043HUP1601_2
- Daft, R. L., & Lengel, R. H. (1986). Organizational information requirements, media richness and structural design. *Management science*, 32(5), 554-571.
- Dugas, M. J., & Ladouceur, R. (2000). Treatment of GAD: Targeting intolerance of uncertainty in two types of worry. *Behavior Modification*, 24(5), 635-657. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0145445500245002>
- Farago, B., Zide, J. S., & Shahani-Denning, C. (2013). Selection interviews: Role of interviewer warmth, interview structure, and interview outcome in applicants' perceptions of organizations. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, 65(3), 224-239. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0034300>
- Faranda, W. T., & Clarke I., II. (2004). Student observations of outstanding teaching: Implications for marketing educators. *Journal of Marketing Education*, 26(3), 271-281. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0273475304268782>
- Feiler, A. R., & Powell, D. M. (2016). The role of self-focused attention and negative self-thought in interview anxiety: A test of two interventions. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 24(2), 132-149. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ijsa.12136>
- Geller, D. M., Goodstein, L., Silver, M., & Sternberg, W. C. (1974). On being ignored: The effects of the violation of implicit rules of social interaction. *Sociometry*, 37(4), 541-556. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2786426>
- Gilliland, S.W. (1993). The perceived fairness of selection systems: An organizational justice perspective. *Academy of Management Review*, 18(4), 694-734. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1993.9402210155>
- Gilliland, S. W. (1994). Effects of procedural and distributive justice on reactions to a selection system. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 79(5), 691-701. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.79.5.691>
- Granitz, N. A., Koernig, S. K., & Harich, K. R. (2009). Now it's personal: Antecedents and outcomes of rapport between business faculty and their students. *Journal of Marketing Education*, 31(1), 52-65. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0273475308326408>
- Hausknecht, J. P., Day, D. V., & Thomas, S. C. (2004). Applicant reactions to selection procedures: An updated model and meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology*, 57(3), 639-683. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2004.00003.x>
- Jackson, H. G. (2017, May 30). The war for talent is now a way of life for HR. *SHRM*. <https://www.shrm.org/hr-today/>

- news/hr-magazine/0617/pages/the-war-for-talent-is-now-a-way-of-life-for-hr.aspx?msclkid=f3477760a62011ec-974144c625b94bc1
- Klehe, U. C., König, C. J., Richter, G. M., Kleinmann, M., & Melchers, K. G. (2008). Transparency in structured interviews: Consequences for construct and criterion-related validity. *Human Performance*, 21(2), 107-137. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08959280801917636>
- Lee, K. M., Jung, Y., Kim, J., and Kim, S. R. (2006). Are physically embodied social agents better than disembodied social agents? The effects of physical embodiment, tactile interaction, and people's loneliness in human-robot interaction. *Int. J. Hum. Comput. Stud.* 64, 962-973. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhcs.2006.05.002>
- Levashina, J., Hartwell, C. J., Morgeson, F. P., & Campion, M. A. (2014). The structured employment interview: Narrative and quantitative review of the research literature. *Personnel Psychology*, 67(1), 241-293. <https://doi.org/10.1111/peps.12052>
- Lim, C. H., Winter, R., & Chan, C. C. A. (2006). Cross-cultural interviewing in the hiring process: Challenges and strategies. *Career Development Quarterly*, 54(3), 265-268. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2161-0045.2006.tb00157.x>
- Lind, E. A. (2001). Fairness heuristic theory: Justice judgments as pivotal cognitions in organizational relations. In J. Greenberg & R. Cropanzano, *Advances in organizational justice* (pp. 56-86). Stanford University Press.
- Madigan, J., & Macan, T. H. (2005). Improving applicant reactions by altering test administration. *Applied HRM Research*, 10(2), 73-88.
- Mazor, A., Clearly, B., & Brandis, N. B. (2017). Your candidate experience. Creating an impact or burning cash? Deloitte. <https://www2.deloitte.com/us/en/pages/human-capital/articles/candidate-experience-creating-an-impact.html>
- McCarthy, J. M., Bauer, T. N., Truxillo, D. M., Campion, M. C., Van Iddekinge, C. H., & Campion, M. A. (2017). Using pre-test explanations to improve test-taker reactions: Testing a set of "wise" interventions. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 141(1), 43-56. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.obhdp.2017.04.002>
- McCarthy, J. M., & Cheng, B. H. (2014). Through the looking glass: Employment interviews from the lens of job candidates. In U. Klehe & E. van Hooft, (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of job loss and job search* (pp. 329-357). Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199764921.013.015>
- McCarthy, J., & Goffin, R. (2004). Measuring job interview anxiety: Beyond weak knees and sweaty palms. *Personnel Psychology*, 57(3), 607-637. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2004.00002.x>
- McCarthy, J. M., Van Iddekinge, C. H., Lievens, F., Kung, M. C., Sinar, E. F., & Campion, M. A. (2013). Do candidate reactions relate to job performance or affect criterion-related validity? A multistudy investigation of relations among reactions, selection test scores, and job performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 98(5), 701.
- Melchers, K. G., Petrig, A., Basch, J. M., & Sauer, J. (2021). A comparison of conventional and technology-mediated selection interviews with regard to interviewees' performance, perceptions, strain, and anxiety. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 11, Article 603632, 1-16. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.603632>
- Morgan, J. (2017, December 22). The war for talent: It's real and here's why it's happening. Inc. <https://www.inc.com/jacob-morgan/the-war-for-talent-its-real-heres-why-its-happening.html>
- 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. <https://doi.org/10.1006/obhd.1997.2742>
- Powell, D. M., Stanley, D. J., & Brown, K. N. (2018). Meta-analysis of the relation between interview anxiety and interview performance. *Canadian Journal of Behavioral Science*, 50(4), 195-207. <https://doi.org/10.1037/cbs0000108>
- Proost, K., Germeys, F., & Vanderstukken, A. (2021). Applicants' pre-test reactions towards video interviews: The role of expected chances to demonstrate potential and to use non-verbal cues. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 30(2), 265-273. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1359432X.2020.1817975>
- Rosen, N. O., & Knauper, B. (2009). A little uncertainty goes a long way: State and trait differences in uncertainty interact to increase information seeking but also increase worry. *Health Communication*, 24(3), 228-238. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10410230902804125>
- Schmerling, D. (2017, April). Caught on video: Best practices in one-way video interviewing. Panel discussion presented at the 32nd Annual Conference for the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Orlando, FL.
- Schmitt, N., & Coyle, B. W. (1976). Applicant decisions in the employment interview. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 61(2), 184-192. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.61.2.184>
- Sears, G. J., Zhang, H., Wiesner, W. H., Hackett, R. D., & Yuan, Y. (2013). A comparative assessment of videoconference and face-to-face employment interviews. *Management Decision*, 51(8), 1733-1752. <https://doi.org/10.1108/MD-09-2012-0642>
- Short, J., Williams, E., & Christie, B. (1976). *The social psychology of telecommunications* (Vol. 19, No. 4, pp. 451-484). London: Wiley.
- Smither, J. W., Reilly, R. R., Millsap, R. E., Pearlman, K., & Stoffey, R. W. (1993). Applicant reactions to selection procedures. *Personnel Psychology*, 46(1), 49-76. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.1993.tb00867.x>
- Swider, B. W., Barrick, M. R., & Harris, T. B. (2016). Initial impressions: What they are, what they are not and how they influence structured interview outcomes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 101(5), 625-638. <https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000077>
- Talent Board. (2020). 2020 North American Talent Board Candidate Experience (CandE) benchmark research report. Talent Board.
- Truxillo, D. M., Bodner, T. E., Bertolino, M., Bauer, T. N., & Yonce, C. A. (2009). Effects of explanations on applicant reactions: A meta-analytic review. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 17(4), 346-361. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2389.2009.00478.x>
- Van den Bos, K., Lind, E. A., & Wilke, H. A. (2001). The psycholo-

- gy of procedural and distributive justice viewed from the perspective of fairness heuristic theory. In R. Cropanzano (Ed.), *Justice in the workplace: From theory to practice* (pp. 49–66). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- Voyles, E. (2016). Do anxious applicants become lower performing employees? [Unpublished master's thesis]. Northern Illinois University.
- Walton, G. M. (2014). The new science of wise psychological interventions. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 23(1), 73–82. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0963721413512856>.
- Warszta, T. (2012). Application of Gilliland's model of applicants' reactions to the field of web-based selection. [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Christian-Albrechts Universität Kiel.

RECEIVED 05/03/22 ACCEPTED 09/13/22

Appendix A

Job Advertisement

Are you interested in making extra money next semester?

Do you need more research experience?

[Supervisor name] at the [university name] is looking for a virtual research assistant to help with basic research assistant duties in the [lab name].

If interested, you will automatically be eligible for an interview regardless of qualifications or experience.

Details of the position:

- \$23.50 per hour
- Undergraduate students from any program are welcome to interview
- 36 hours of work in total to be completed on a flexible, part-time basis in winter term 2021

To interview or find out more please email [email address].

Please note that members of [supervisors lab] will be conducting the interviews.

After the interview has taken place, a researcher from the [lab name] will invite you to participate in a study being conducted by [supervisors name].

This research will be entirely voluntary and will have no bearing on the hiring process should you choose not to participate.

This study will involve filling out a 25-minute survey asking you about your feelings throughout the interview and your interview strategies.

Applicants who choose to participate will receive \$5 in compensation for their time.

This project has been reviewed by the Research Ethics Board for compliance with federal guidelines for research involving human participants (REB# 20-08-007)

Appendix B

Email to Job Applicants

Hi,

Thank you for your interest in the research assistant position in [supervisor name]'s lab!

The job description is attached for more information about the position.

If you are interested in interviewing for this position, please reply back to this email indicating all the times that you are available within the next 2 weeks. Please set aside at least 1 hour for the interview.

Interview information: The interview will take place over Microsoft Teams. This interview is a structured behavioral interview and will take about 25 minutes. When interviewing we encourage you to answer each question using the STAR approach (meaning when answering you should talk about the situation, tasks, actions, and results) along with anything else you would like to speak to. We will record the interview so that two more interviewers can provide a rating later to improve reliability of interview scores.

Research study: After your interview, you will be emailed an invitation to take part in a research study conducted by [researcher name] (master's student, department of psychology) [supervisor name] (department of psychology). Should you wish to participate, you will be asked to complete a 25-minute questionnaire about yourself and the interview (e.g., your reactions to the interview). Your participation, or lack of participation, in the study will have NO impact on the hiring decision for the position. **Neither the interviewer nor the person in charge of the hiring decision ([supervisor name]) will know whether or not you choose to participate.** If you choose to participate, your data from the study will NOT be used in any way to inform the hiring decision.

You can apply and interview for this position even if you do not want to participate in the study. Participation in the study (which will take place after the interview) is completely voluntary. You do not have to make any decisions about participating in the study at this point. We just want to make you aware that after your interview you will be invited to participate in a study and you can decide to participate or not at that point.

The letter of information for the study is attached for your reference.

Please email me if you have any questions about the job position or the study.

I am looking forward to hearing back from you!

Sincerely,
[researcher name]

Appendix C

Applicant Reaction and Outcome Survey Questions

The response scale for all questions was a 5-point rating scale (strongly disagree/somewhat disagree/neither agree nor disagree/somewhat agree/strongly agree)

Interpersonal treatment

1. I was satisfied with my treatment during the interview.
2. During the interview, I was treated politely.
3. During the interview, I was treated with respect.

Chance to perform

1. This interview gave me the opportunity to show what I can really do.
2. I could really show my skills and abilities through the interview.
3. This interview allowed me to show what my job skills are.
4. I was able to show what I can do on the interview.

Overall fairness

1. I think this interview is a fair procedure to select people for the job.
2. All things considered, this selection procedure was fair.
3. I think the interview procedure was fair.

Appendix D

Modified Measure of Anxiety in Selection Interviews (MASI)

The response scale for all questions was a 5-point rating scale (strongly disagree/somewhat disagree/neither agree nor disagree/somewhat agree/strongly agree)

Social Subscale

1. While taking the job interview, I became concerned that the interviewer would perceive me as socially awkward.
2. I became very uptight about having to socially interact with the job interviewer.
3. I became afraid about what kind of personal impression I was making in the job interview.
4. During the job interview, I worried that my actions would not be considered socially appropriate.
5. I worried about whether the interviewer would like me as a person.

Performance subscale

1. In the job interview, I became very nervous about whether my performance was good enough.
2. I was overwhelmed by thoughts of doing poorly during the interview.
3. I worried that my job interview performance would be lower than other applicants.
4. During the interview, I was so troubled by thoughts of failing that my performance was reduced.
5. During the interview, I worried about what will happen if I don't get the job.
6. While taking the interview, I worried about whether I am a good candidate for the job.

Behavioral subscale

1. During the job interview, my hands shook.
2. My heartbeat was faster than usual during the job interview.
3. It was hard for me to avoid fidgeting during the job interview.
4. The job interview made me perspire (e.g., sweaty palms and underarms).
5. My mouth became very dry during the job interview.
6. I felt sick to my stomach during the job interview.

Communication anxiety

1. I became so apprehensive in the job interview that I was unable to express my thoughts clearly.
2. I got so anxious while taking the interview that I had trouble answering questions that I knew.
3. During the job interview, I often couldn't think of a thing to say.
4. I felt that my verbal communication skills were strong in the interview.
5. During the interview, I found it hard to understand what the interviewer was asking me.
6. I found it easy to communicate my personal accomplishments during the interview.

Appendix E

Control Script

BEFORE INTERVIEW

“Good morning/afternoon! My name is _____.”

(They will tell you their name.)

“Nice to meet you. Can you hear me okay?”

[**If no**, try to address the sound issue; **if yes** continue to next line.]

“Perfect, do you mind if we jump right into things?”

[**If no**, tell them that you will take questions at the end of the interview; **if yes**, continue to script below.]

“Before we get started, I just want to give you some information that we provide to all of the candidates. First, anything you say during the interview will be kept confidential. As a reminder, this is a structured behavioral interview, and it will take about 15 to 20 minutes. I will ask you five interview questions and might ask some follow-up questions too. As a reminder, we encourage you to use the STAR (situation, task, action, result) approach when answering questions, in addition to anything else you would like to say. To increase accountability across interviewers, I will be taking notes during the process.

These five interview questions will require you to recall a specific past event or experience. When answering you may be tempted to talk about things generally, but we are actually looking for a description of a specific situation from your past and what you did specifically. Try to be as comprehensive as possible in your response. Sometimes it takes a while to remember a past event—and that is nothing to worry about—just take the time you need to pause and think at any point. Before moving onto the next question, I will always ask you if there is anything else you would like to add so that you have a chance to say anything that was not captured in your previous response.”

“As a reminder, you will be videotaped for the duration of the interview only, and this is so that a second and third interviewer can provide ratings of the interview later. If you have any questions about the job or hiring process, you can ask at the end of the interview.”

“Before we begin, I will share my screen and give you up to 5 minutes to review the job description. I will just step out for a moment and I will let you know when 5 minutes have passed and we will begin.”

[Share your screen and show the job description. Turn off your camera and mute yourself while you time the 5 minutes.]

[Once the 5 minutes are up, turn your camera back on and unmute yourself. End screen share.]

“Are you okay to start the interview now?”

[**If no**, tell them that you will take questions at the end of the interview; **if yes**, continue to instructions below.]

[**Turn on the videotape.** Interview the candidate. Always take notes for each BAR, check off BARS, and score a question before moving onto the next question.]

Appendix F

Structured Rapport Building Script

BEFORE INTERVIEW

“Good morning/afternoon! My name is _____.”

(They will tell you their name.)

“Nice to meet you. Can you hear me okay?”

[If no, try to address the sound issue; if yes continue to next line.]

“Perfect, do you mind if we jump right into things?”

[If no, tell them that you will take questions at the end of the interview; if yes, continue to script below.]

Thank you so much for taking the time to meet with me today. Before we begin, I want to provide you with some information about the interview that we provide to all of the candidates, as well as introduce myself. My name is [interviewer name], I am a third/fourth year undergraduate research assistant in [supervisor name]'s lab. I've been working with [supervisor name] since the start of January and I will be conducting today's interview with you. If you have any questions about what it is like to work in a psychology lab, I would be happy to discuss that with you after the interview.

As for the interview itself, today we will be conducting a structured behavioral interview, and it will take about 15 to 20 minutes. I will ask you five interview questions and might ask some follow-up questions too. As a reminder, we encourage you to use the STAR (situation, task, action, result) approach (that's situation, task, action then result), when answering questions, in addition to anything else you would like to say.

During the interview, please do not be alarmed if I am not making eye contact—it is only because I am taking notes. Also, if I seem to have a poker face, it's only because I am trying to remain neutral so that we are treating all applicants in the same, fair way. Please do not take my straight face as a response to your answers—I am simply trying to remain standard across applicants.

These five interview questions will require you to recall a specific past event or experience. When answering you may be tempted to talk about things generally, but we are actually looking for a description of a specific situation from your past and what you did specifically. Try to be as comprehensive as possible in your response. Sometimes it takes a while to remember a past event—and that is nothing to worry about—just take the time you need to pause and think at any point. Before moving onto the next question, I will always ask you if there is anything else you would like to add so that you have a chance to say anything that was not captured in your previous response.”

As a reminder, you will be videotaped for the duration of the interview only. *I understand that this may seem a bit uncomfortable and out of the ordinary, but I just want to reassure you that this is just so that we can have multiple observers scoring the interview and to ensure a fair hiring process for you. I also understand that job interviews can be a bit uncomfortable in general. This is completely understandable and happens to most people. We have allotted ample time for today's interview, so you do not need to rush to answer anything. Feel free to take a few moments to collect your thoughts before answering. My hope is to use this time as an opportunity to learn more about you. I will also make sure to leave time at the end of the interview to allow you to ask any questions you may have about the job itself. I would be happy to share any insight I have or my experiences with you.*

“Before we begin, I will share my screen and give you up to 5 minutes to review the job description. I will just step out for a moment and I will let you know when 5 minutes have passed and we will begin.”

CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE

[Share your screen and show the job description. Turn off your camera and mute yourself while you time the 5 minutes.]

[Once the 5 minutes are up, turn your camera back on and unmute yourself. End screen share.]

Are you okay to start now?

[**If no**, tell them that you will take questions at the end of the interview; **if yes**, continue to instructions below.]

[Turn on the videotape. Interview the candidate. Always take notes for each BAR, check off BARS, and score a question before moving onto the next question.]

Appendix G

Question Provision Script

BEFORE INTERVIEW

“Good morning/afternoon! My name is _____.”

(They will tell you their name.)

“Nice to meet you. Can you hear me okay?”

[**If no**, try to address the sound issue; **if yes** continue to next line.]

“Perfect, do you mind if we jump right into things?”

[**If no**, tell them that you will take questions at the end of the interview; **if yes**, continue to script below.]

“Before we get started, I just want to give you some information that we provide to all of the candidates. First, anything you say during the interview will be kept confidential. As a reminder, this is a structured behavioral interview, and it will take about 15 to 20 minutes. I will ask you five interview questions and might ask some follow-up questions too. As a reminder, we encourage you to use the STAR (situation, task, action, result) approach when answering questions, in addition to anything else you would like to say. To increase accountability across interviewers, I will be taking notes during the process.

These five interview questions will require you to recall a specific past event or experience. When answering you may be tempted to talk about things generally, but we are actually looking for a description of a specific situation from your past and what you did specifically. Try to be as comprehensive as possible in your response. Sometimes it takes a while to remember a past event—and that is nothing to worry about—just take the time you need to pause and think at any point. Before moving onto the next question, I will always ask you if there is anything else you would like to add so that you have a chance to say anything that was not captured in your previous response.”

“As a reminder, you will be videotaped for the duration of the interview only, and this is so that a second and third interviewer can provide ratings of the interview later. If you have any questions about the job or hiring process, you can ask at the end of the interview.”

“Before we begin, I will share my screen and give you up to *5 minutes to review the questions I will be asking you today*. I will just step out for a moment, and I will let you know when 5 minutes have passed, and we will begin.”

[*Share your screen and show the slide with the interview questions*. Turn off your camera and mute yourself while you time the 5 minutes.]

[Once the 5 minutes are up, turn your camera back on and unmute yourself. End screen share.]

“Are you okay to start the interview now?”

[**If no**, tell them that you will take questions at the end of the interview; **if yes**, continue with instructions below.]

Appendix H

Interview Questions

Talent: Communication		Competency: Listening and attending to others		
<p>Describe a time when a colleague was explaining a particularly complicated concept, task, or procedure to you.</p> <p>Probes: <i>What was the situation? Why was the task complicated? What did you do? What did that conversation look like? What did you say? What did they say? What was the outcome?</i></p>				
Ineffective (1)	Somewhat effective (2)	Effective (3)	Mostly effective (4)	Highly effective (5)
Provides a situation in which the concept, task, or procedure was not complex or did not require adapting. Or they were unsuccessful in understanding a complicated task.		Provides a situation in which the concept or procedure explained was complex. They asked clarifying questions, listened carefully and used some nonverbal signals. They were partially successful in understanding the task or procedure explained by the colleague.		Provides a situation in which the concept or procedure explained was very complex. They asked clarifying questions, paraphrased and restated concepts to ensure understanding, took notes, and used encouraging nonverbal signals such as nodding and eye contact. They were ultimately successful in grasping and applying the procedure explained by the colleague.

Talent: Execution		Competency: Focusing on quality of output		
<p>Tell me about a time when your work required particular attention to detail.</p> <p>Probes: <i>What was the situation? What did you do? Why did this require attention to detail? Why did you do things this way? What was the outcome?</i></p>				
Ineffective (1)	Somewhat effective (2)	Effective (3)	Mostly effective (4)	Highly effective (5)
Provides a situation in which the work did not require particular attention to detail, or performed the task unsuccessfully.		Provides a situation in which the work required attention to detail. The individual organized before starting the task, paid attention to details, and was partially successful in completing the task effectively. Responsibility for mistakes was shared with others.		Provides a situation where the work required very close attention to detail. The individual describes a strategy used to check for any errors and ensure high quality of work. The task was completed successfully. The individual took responsibility for any mistakes that were made.

Talent: Execution				Competency: Taking initiative
<p>Describe a time when you had sole responsibility for completing an important task or project.</p> <p>Probes: <i>What was the situation? What did you do? Why did you choose this course of action? What was the outcome?</i></p>				
Ineffective (1)	Somewhat effective (2)	Effective (3)	Mostly effective (4)	Highly effective (5)
Describes a situation in which they did not have sole responsibility for completing an important task or did not complete the task successfully. Required explicit instructions on what steps to take.		Describes a situation in which they had sole responsibility for an important project but was only partially successful in completing it. Took some prompting to take action but ultimately completed the task on time. Some effort was made to ensure that best practices were used.		Describes a situation in which they had sole responsibility for an important task and successfully completed it. The individual was proactive in determining how to best complete the project and went to great lengths to ensure that they followed best practices.

Talent: Teamwork				Competency: Collaborating with others to achieve goals
<p>Describe the most recent team project on which you have worked.</p> <p>Probes: <i>What was the situation? Can you tell me about the team's decision making process? What was your role on this project? What did you do? What was the outcome?</i></p>				
Ineffective (1)	Somewhat effective (2)	Effective (3)	Mostly effective (4)	Highly effective (5)
Presents a situation that did not include any team work or did not engage with their team effectively (ex. took control and did not listen to their peers). The project was not successfully completed on time. Did not participate in team decisions or did not solicit input from other members.		Presents a situation in which the individual communicated with team members when necessary and made adjustments to accommodate the needs of others. The team was partially successful in completing their assigned task. Actively participates in team decision making process.		Presents a situation in which the individual regularly worked with team members and adjusted their work style to accommodate the needs of peers. Proactively provided peer support and successfully completed the task. Helps to organize and lead team decision making progress. Solicits input from other team members.

Talent: Decision making				Competency: Taking responsibility for outcomes
<p>Describe a time you implemented a decision that did not work out.</p> <p>Probes: <i>What was the situation? What did you do? What was the outcome?</i></p>				
Ineffective (1)	Somewhat effective (2)	Effective (3)	Mostly effective (4)	Highly effective (5)
Presents a situation in which they did not take responsibility for their error or identify ways to avoid making similar mistakes in the future. Did not accept criticism or feedback from others.		Shared responsibility with others for errors in decision making. Identified ways to avoid making future mistakes with some success. Accepted criticism and feedback.		Took responsibility for their errors in decision making. Identified and effectively implemented ways to avoid making similar mistakes in the future with great success. Accepted criticism and incorporated feedback into future behavior.

Appendix -Tables

TABLE 1.

Descriptive Results for Demographic Differences of Experimental Conditions

Variable	Condition	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Age	Control	72	20.3	2.3
	Question	66	19.8	1.2
	Rapport	66	20.8	3.9
	Total	204	20.3	2.7
Program year	Control	72	2.7	1.0
	Question	66	2.6	1.0
	Rapport	67	2.7	1.2
	Total	205	2.7	1.1
Gender	Control	71	1.9	0.3
	Question	66	1.9	0.5
	Rapport	67	2.0	0.4
	Total	204	1.9	0.4

Note. *M* and *SD* are used to represent mean and standard deviation, respectively.

TABLE 2.

ANOVA Results for Demographic Differences of Experimental Conditions

Outcome	Levene statistic		ANOVA		
	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>p</i>
Age	4.78	.01	2.56	114.11	.08
Program year	1.83	.16	0.21	137	.81
Gender	4.77	.01	1.94	129.76	.15

Note. *M* and *SD* are used to represent mean and standard deviation, respectively. Gender (1 = male, 2 = female). Correction for unequal variances was made using Welch.